

DEEPSTRUCTURE DYNAMICS OF CROSSCULTURAL RELATIONS IN LIGHT OF HUMANISTIC PRAGMATISM

Zharkyyh Volodymyr

Research of crosscultural communicative processes in present-day technologically open world is one of the urgent issues of philosophical reflections.

Key Words: cultural diversity, crosscultural situation, communicative competence, pluralistic attitude, dialogical thinking.

Research of crosscultural communicative processes in the present-day technologically open world is one of the urgent issues of philosophical reflection. Its most widely discussed problems include conditions, characteristics and motivational goals of crosscultural contacts and correspondingly their probable outcomes. Prospects of optimizing their results attract no less attention.

Cultural interaction/confrontation is an important mark of everyday life. Through processes of objective socialization and self-realization people are always part of international cultural contacts. They also witness and participate in cultural conflicts within their own culture and experience cultural disagreements inside their family or communal environment. The style and ways of crosscultural interactions have a lot of particular distinctions both in individual behavior and organized activity. Their diversity is motivated by changing life circumstances and modifications in social conditions. No wonder there is often little clarity and much misunderstanding in the atmosphere of crosscultural events.

Each culture is a complex and flexible phenomenon which undergoes changes and modifications in the historic development of society. Its structure includes ideas of particular ways of world perception, where the logic of things and phenomena is organized according to special «grammar rules» [Avruch, 2012] of understanding their changing reality. It contains categories of thinking and social norms that man both learns and creates all through his growth and development. The unique features distinguishing a culture from any other are displayed in written/unwritten principles, taboos and laws which reflect and sustain the potentials of its bearers. Their systemic multitude unites society into a common cultural and communicative identity. They form a set of values for the formation of social and interpersonal relations and ways of resolving life problems. Those of them, that proved acceptable and useful, are passed from generation to generation providing and supporting social harmony in a given historical and geographical environment.

Culture accumulates motivation goals and leading life principles. In accord with them it crystallizes structural models of interaction both inside a society and on the international ground. Within this system of perception there develops a common life philosophy which represents the synthesis of individual thinking and collectively expressed worldview targets. Cultural communality forms behavioral norms, beliefs and ethical canons. The sensation of common cultural identity becomes the main consolidating feature that symbolizes solidarity and unity of different social and cultural groups [Le

Baron, 2006]. It defines intentional and emotional characteristics of interactive events and has a crucial influence on the quality of communicative events, their sense and atmosphere.

The mode of behavior in different situations and especially in a stressful state reflects the style and norms of communicative attitudes which are universally accepted and considered natural in a given culture. Traditional understanding of values defines the way a person deals with various events and circumstances he comes across in his daily life. It is his value orientations, perceived as a given, that dictate the choice and connotation of communicative attitudes in any type of communication contacts. A strong influence of culture on the formation of ideology and spirit of communicative processes is revealed in the use of verbal/nonverbal means. The choice of words, intonation, gestures, mimics, body language, physical and intellectual positions, attitudes and reactions betray the communicative style, manner and behavioral models that are natural and expected in a given society but usually hugely misunderstood in a different one.

Culture often turns out to be the source of misunderstanding, enmity and conflict in crosscultural communication through objective reasons. Human civilizations developed and crystallized in different natural and social environments. Their influence caused the appearance of certain features that were indispensable for survival and progress. These «cultural grammar rules» make every culture specific and unlike any other. The nucleus of culture is a certain set of communicative rules, created and used in the process of collective existence. It is within these rules that man seeks and finds ways of forming meanings by which he calls and evaluates things and relations. In context of his own culture he perceives them as clear, true and right. But in another culture everything that is different from them seems to him strange, untrue, illogical, wrong and sometimes dangerous. All through history because of objective existential circumstances culture assumed different forms not only in different nations and states. Even within one nation, on the territory of one state there may and does exist a lot of cultural diversity. That is why the obvious truth is that there is no single global culture that is true and obligatory for all people on the Earth.

The paradox is that deep in their essence the sense and purpose of world cultures have much in common. They all aim at making man's life easier and better. All of them were formed by the effort of man and are a result of his knowing the objective reality. Their distinctive features developed in the process of evaluating the meaning and quality of the results of human knowing in human practice. Every culture is based on general perceptions of optimal conditions necessary to provide and improve human existence. Focused on 'logic for use,' [Schiller F.C.S., 1930] cultural distinctions reflect the sum of actual reasoning which makes them applicable and necessary for life. They express values tested historically and contain rules beneficial for human survival, adaptation and development. On a wide humanistic scale their sense and purpose are universal. But they are not alike in the practical realization of their fundamental principles.

Cultural rules, their use and modes of understanding/ interpreting their content are historically changeable. Their meaning and relevance are modulated and reinterpreted with the changes in the historical and social context. The forms, styles and connotation of communicative exchanges acquire new qualities and expression depending on the current trends in the cultural development of a concrete human community. Since unfamiliar

cultural diversities are the most easily perceived, they often lead to open enmity and violence. Parties in a communicative event often fail to overcome deep differences in behavior rules and communication models. Their inability to interpret and evaluate the situation in the positive way is strengthened by historical and cultural memory of old offenses and disputes. Memories saved in the subconscious and living in myths, reminded in slogans and stories, sharpen and feed cultural disagreements of the present. No less aggravating are personal ambitions and judgments.

The role of culture is great in any type of relations. In the present global interrelation openness its significance becomes still more vivid. Unbiased interpretation of cultural differences is now a must. Understanding possible outcomes and results of differences/likenesses in cultural peculiarities is crucial in forming the atmosphere of crosscultural events. Dogmatic orientation to one's own intersubjective behavioral norms and ethic values offers many reasons and causes for disappointment, alienation and failure. Its strong influence is often revealed unconsciously because when taking a decision or acting spontaneously man acts within the context of his culture and education. He acts impulsively in accordance with habitual reactions, without even being aware of what impression he makes and how provocative for conflict his behavior may be.

Conflict per se makes a natural and unavoidable part of human life. In fact it is an inescapable sign of movement, growth and change. Potentially it is present in human relations in every society. Whatever decision is taken it is in a way the result of resolving a conflict among several alternatives by thoughtfully and carefully choosing the one that seems the best. Likewise, in a crosscultural interaction the modus and vector of communication depend on a balanced and tolerant choice of the attitude the parties take on.

Depending on how a conflict is resolved its consequences may have positive/negative influence on the life experience of its parties or the whole society. In a crosscultural communication no matter what its content is or how deep cultural inconsistencies are, its negative development is, as a rule, the result of communicative incompetence. Parties of the communicative event, due to deep differences in their world outlook, interests and positions, operate in the system of their own settled assumptions and judgments. Each of them acts being fully assured of the fact that the only true way of harmonizing their cultural misunderstanding is in agreeing with his system of meanings [Zharkyykh V., 2019]. Neither of them is ready to listen to the opponent's arguments but insists that he alone is able to establish the cultural norm and judge everything on the basis of his far-fetched standards. The unshakable certainty of his rightness may turn the slightest inconsistency in their cultural background into a hopeless deadlock. Prevention/resolution of a crosscultural conflict depends on the parties' ability to overcome their firm conviction that truth is exclusively in his own cultural identity.

The content and quality of crosscultural interactions is defined by the parties' communicative competence, i.e. by their ability to clearly understand people of a different culture. In a confrontation, that has gone too far, a positive transformation of the conflict situation is entirely dependent on the initial intention of the parties. If from the start they were inclined and ready to receive another culture openly and respectfully their confrontation may not even begin. Still intention alone is often not enough. It is important to bear in mind that for any problem there is always some way out. If you look at it from a

different angle or realistically analyze the reasons and consequences of the disagreement its solution can easily be found. In such conflict situations one should remember that effective crosscultural communication is based on the parties' ability and intention to compare peculiarities of their own culture with those of the other. The comparison may reveal some likeness or at least some points of contact between them. The secret of effective communication is simple - it is desirable not to let a conflict start, and if it started, parties should prevent it from escalating. All it takes is changing the focus of disagreement. Without unnecessary emotions the parties have to think of how to escape ruinous consequences and establish friendly/peaceful relations.

Productive and creative crosscultural communication is built by forming and developing, improving and sustaining mutually acceptable, respectful attitudes in dealing with another culture. The use of this ability in a dynamically changing communicative reality requires information. The structure of this information should include knowledge of a great many facts and phenomena connected with both symbolic meanings and communicative/ behavioral models. It must be continuously generated and renovated because knowledge received previously in the process of socialization and education is helpful but not enough. It is not sufficient to make a person able to consciously and effectively perceive the unknown cultural reality. Same as learning a foreign language or playing the piano crosscultural communication needs skills which are best acquired through practice and learning.

In light of this idea teaching culture in all its different, contradictory and unexpected dimensions becomes important for creating ability for a pluralistic perception of cultural diversion. Pluralistic worldview [Zharkyykh V., 2019] will help to understand the necessity of looking for ways of sustaining healthy crosscultural relations in a socium. The system of teaching culture on the basis of pluralistic perception of its diversity should include developing dialogical thinking, i.e. the potential to engage in a dialogue. Dialogue is one of the well-known and historically tested instruments of transforming disagreements. It is invaluablely effective in mending crosscultural difficulties and reaching consensus. The advantage of dialogue is in its structure. Dialogue communication is built on the basis of parity, equal rights and possibilities of the parties and therefore it is capable of selfregulating. It is also capable of generating and back-feeding information. Depending on the intention of the parties it can easily pass over from confrontation to meaningful exchange of ideas, making them clear and compatible. It gives the parties time and ground to think, i.e. a chance to understand the depth of both cultures, evaluate their potentials and consider their cultural differences without prejudice. As a result there will appear a chance to perceive them not as an obstacle, but as a real perspective for solving burning problems in their relations.

Parity dialogue, based in pluralistic attitude, is an effective means of creating constructive positive changes in crosscultural relations. It is valuable for both parties because it paves the way for predicting, foreseeing and possibly preventing probable reasons of cultural disagreements in future. The very meaning of dialogue contains the idea of commonness and cooperation. A dialogue situation consists of searching for a means of resolving a conflict together. By their mutual effort parties find a common symbolic meaning which will serve a dependable landmark for their future interrelations. It is highly possible that thinking dialogically they may eventually create a «third culture»

[Le Baron, 2006] comprising the best features of each of their cultures. Even in case of a continuous disagreement dialogue will add a new dimension to their confrontation, stimulating its softening or cessation. Potentially, thinking dialogically, they may turn their confrontation into some cultural co-operation. Such initiatives in a multicultural socium are highly welcome as they provide a ground for and create prospects of devising a strategy of collective interrelations.

The obvious advantage of parity dialogue as an instrument of crosscultural communication is seen in providing a possibility to engage in constructive interactions in the course of which all previous misunderstanding will be gradually forgotten. Dialogical thinking, based on pluralistic attitude, will lower the degree and pain of the adaptive period in a conflict situation which is always open to new contradictory information. It will give a chance to devise flexible structures of co-operation and co-ordinate joint peaceful co-existence.

In present-day deep crosscultural conflict in Ukraine the search for instruments likely to stimulate social harmony raises the significance and necessity of parity dialogue to a new height. Its successful use will harmonize social relations and balance cultural disagreements. All it needs is a change from dogmatic to pluralistic attitude in dealing with cultural diversity. Correspondingly steps should be taken to create conditions in which developing dialogical thinking and ability creatively and tolerantly perceive cultural differences becomes a priority. Skills of a constructive flexible dialogue combined with a pluralistic friendly attitude may become a decisive factor in the effective resolution of crosscultural disagreements. Thanks to that the maxim «e pluribus unus» understood in its present-day meaning «living together remaining different» will have not only a symbolic but a genuinely true meaning.

References

1. Avruch Kevin (2012) Context and Pretext in Conflict Resolution: Culture, Identity, Power and Practice. Paradigm Publishers, 256 p.
2. Le Baron M. (2006) Conflict across Cultures: A Unique Experience of Bridging Differences. Intercultural Press, 224 p.
3. Schiller F.C.S. (1930) Logic for Use. N-Y, 495 p.
4. Zharkikh V. (2019) «Pluralistichne muslennia yak osnova harmoniynoi kroskulturnoi vzaemodii». *Filosofiya ta humanism*. vol. 9, P. 4-8.

Володимир Жарких

СТРУКТУРНА ДИНАМІКА КРОСКУЛЬТУРНОЇ ВЗАЄМОДІЇ У СВІТЛІ ГУМАНІСТИЧНОГО ПРАГМАТИЗМУ

Дослідження міжкультурних комунікативних процесів у сучасному технологічно відкритому світі є одним із нагальних питань філософських роздумів. Зміст та якість міжкультурної взаємодії визначається комунікативною компетенцією сторін, тобто здатністю до діалогічного мислення. Ситуації діалогу містять ідею спільності та співпраці, яка потенційно може розвинути здатність чітко розуміти людей різної культури.

Ключові слова: культурне розмаїття, кроскультурна ситуація, комунікативна компетенція, плюралістичне ставлення, діалогічне мислення.