



MENTAL ENLIGHTENMENT SCIENTIFIC – METHODOLOGICAL JOURNAL



<http://mentaljournal-jspu.uz/index.php/mesmj/index>

INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION IN TEACHING LANGUAGES

Rano Norbekova

Senior Lecturer

Jizzakh State Pedagogical University

Jizzakh, Uzbekistan

E-mail: norbekova@mail.ru

ABOUT ARTICLE

Key words: intercultural communication, culture shock, worldview, challenges, researchers, travellers, educators.

Received: 20.04.23

Accepted: 30.04.23

Published: 01.05.23

Abstract: The aim of this article is to explore, review and critique the multi-disciplinary literature on the concept of culture shock which is the unexpected and often negative reaction of people to new environments. Whilst it touches on a wider literature on such things as intercultural contact and competence and the process of adaptation and adjustment to new cultures, it focuses on the short-term reaction of travellers. Its aim is primarily educational, aimed specifically at travellers and educators.

INTRODUCTION

People have, and will, always travel to “far off lands”, different countries and continents and possibly soon planets, for very different purposes. They go to convert, conquer, explore, trade, teach, learn, holiday and settle. Over the last century, the reduced costs and increased ease of short and long-distance travel have shown a dramatic rise in people’s movements around the world. This means that although they do not anticipate experiencing it, more and more people are confronted with culture shock. There are many ways to classify these travellers i.e. how long they go for (i.e. migrants vs. sojourners vs. tourists); how far they travel (near vs. far; familiar vs unfamiliar); their motives for movement (education, trade, expansion); the nature of stranger-host relations (friendly vs. antagonistic) etc. Furthermore, they are of interest

to different academic disciplines like anthropology, economics, education, psychiatry, psychology and sociology. What they have in common is that they have to “adapt to the new environment”: to learn new ways of behaving, feeling and thinking. This can be unexpected and demanding.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The data on the sheer number of people moving between countries is staggering. According to the UN High Commissioner for Refugees report for 2016, in all 65.6 million people are displaced worldwide; one person flees every 3 seconds, and over half of the world’s refugees are children. It is estimated that currently around 400 million people are migrants (nearly 4% of the world population); there are currently 70 million refugees; that there are nearly 5 million foreign students; and that 1.3 billion people go abroad as tourists every year. The comparative ease and cheapness of travel means that these numbers are likely to increase. Two generations ago, people in all countries tended to stay where they were: now children need passports to travel abroad. This has resulted in what Moufakkir (2013) has described as the rapid implosion of the Third World into the First World with culture shock soon becoming culture unrest. The sheer number of people moving around the earth for very different reasons presents challenge for the researcher: Chinese professional working in East Africa, Honduran migrants stuck in Mexican limbo; West Africans trying to cross the Mediterranean; young people volunteering to work abroad. They all experience shock of many kinds often with very severe consequences. Hence, researchers have tried to identify risk factors associated with culture shock in Asylum Seekers such as gender, employment status, urban experience, previous travel, language proficiency, PTSD, and perceived discrimination (Slonim-Nevo & Regev, 2015) .Most people even experience some sort of culture shock when they go on holiday. Whilst some attempt to minimize contact with the locals/natives, others revel in the prospect of eating new food at different times of day, learning a few words of a foreign culture and seeing religious and political sights. Inevitably the more they travel the less the shock, although many report sudden shock and surprise about being confronted with beliefs and behaviours alien to their own (Furnham, 1984) . The

whole point of the concept of shock is that it is unexpected and often unpleasant. It can also have a sudden and profound impact on an individual's identity (Cupsa, 2018) .Massive migration movements have of course led to an interest in the “shock of being visited” namely attitudes to immigrants of many kinds (McGhee, 2006; McLaren & Paterson, 2018). It has also resulted in the study of how groups of individuals react to acculturation through the processes either of integration, assimilation, separation or marginalisation (Sam & Berry, 2010) . There is also a particular interest in young migrants who are increasing in number (Titzmann & Lee, 2018).

There are many types of sojourners namely people who go abroad for a select period: business people, diplomats, the armed forces, students, voluntary and aid workers, missionaries, etc. They may spend six months to over five years in “other countries” in order to do business; represent their country; protect others or instruct other armed forces; study; teach or advise locals; convert and pro-selytize, respectively. Others move for good; be they migrants or refugees. Further, there are new types of travelers such as “gap year” travelers who also experience by now well documented medical and psychological problems (Furuya-Kanamori et al., 2017) .One question of concern is whether different types of migrant or travelling groups experience culture shock differently. There seem to be no specific studies that have done a careful comparative analysis but an examination of the literature pin-points numerous factors that would lead one to expect this (Ward et al., 2001) . Thus, there are demographic factors (age, education), personality factors (neuroticism, extraversion), ideology factors (religion, politics), etc which means that the culture shock experienced by a professional diplomat would be rather different from that of a refugee. However, it seems that these differences are more quantitative than qualitative in the sense that it is the acuity and chronicity of the shock experience involved rather than there being very different types with different processes, though this an important topic to pursue.Because it is important that sojourners adapt quickly and well so that they can function effectively many organisations attempt to prepare them for working in the new culture and dealing with culture shock (Cohen, 2007;

Furnham, 2011; Ward, Bochner, & Furnham, 2001) . The cost to any business of sending staff to work abroad means that they have become very interested in the “management” of culture shock which they know inevitably occurs (Kocak, 2014) . Indeed, Human Resource experts are very interested in what sort of people make effective expatriate leaders (Engle, Dimitriadi, & Sadrieh, 2012; Luring, Selmer & Kubovcikova, 2017).This paper will explore how people define and react to new situations: what predicts why some adapt better than others and how to help those maximize the opportunity that culture travel provides (Furukawa, 1997) . It also considers tangentially also the research on ever increasing migrants and refugees (Crawley & Skleparis, 2018; McLaren & Paterson, 2019; Titzmann & Lee, 2018) as well as sojourners (Geeraert, Li, Ward, Gelfand, & Demes, 2019) and expatriates (Valenzuela & Rogers, 2018) as well as the often ignored shock of being visited: namely a host person coming into contact with travelers to his or her home (McGhee, 2006) There is a vast and growing literature on intercultural contact, especially on acculturation. It is about a process of change in attitudes, beliefs, identities and values that individuals experience over-time when they come into continuous and prolonged contact with people from a different culture. There are numerous and excellent reviews of this literature (Celenk & Van de Vijver, 2014; Ward & Szabo, 2019) . It looks at long term adaptation whereas the culture shock literature is more about immediate and short-term reactions to “the experience of the new”.The popularity and spread of the concept of culture shock remains today. Academic papers with the concept in the title are published regularly from many disciplines including sociology (Akarowha, 2018), clinical psychology (Cupsa, 2018) , cross-cultural psychology (Chen, Lin, & Sawangpattanakul, 2011; Goldstein & Keller, 2015) , management and organizational behavior (Kocak, 2014; Meisel, 2012) ; tourism (Moufakkir, 2013) and refugee studies (Slonin-Nevo & Regev, 2015). The literature has also begun to look at neglected groups like the spouses of sojourning people (De Verthelyn, 1995) .This whole research area is embedded in the bigger world of acculturation theory and research which is a multi-disciplinary enterprise and ever-advancing (Ward & Geeraert, 2016).The structure of this review is first to consider some definitions in

this area and then to briefly review two similar syndromes which produce reactions very similar to culture shock. There follows a discussion on possible explanations of culture shock followed by a discussion of how it is measured in the academic literature. The sixth section deals with the discussion of stages and phases in culture shock as well as culture shock with students in their educational sojourn. The penultimate section, before the conclusion, deals with practical implications of the research in this area.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

There is inevitably dispute and debate as to who conceived the concept of culture shock and precisely when this occurred. Dutton (2011) has written a very thoughtful paper tracing the origin of the concept to well before Oberg. Indeed, he notes a number of papers dating to as far back as 1929 who used the term specifically with regard to the immigrant experience. He notes that early researchers compared it to shell shock, but that Oberg was the first to look at the concept in depth. Moreover, he explains why Oberg was interested in the topic given that he was the child of Finish immigrants to Canada, and worked as an anthropologist in Alaska, Brazil, Ecuador, Peru and Uganda. It seems an area of research that is of particular interest to academic who have themselves been immigrants (Furnham, 2011). Over the years various researchers have tried to refine the definition of the term looking at very specific psychological factors or facets that make up the experience (Fitzpatrick, 2016; Smolina, 2012; Winkelman, 2003; Xia, 2009). It has been seen as a loss of one's culture, a marker of moving from one culture to another and as a re-socialisation in another culture. It comes as a "hurtful surprise" to many who travel for various reasons. It involves a dramatic new line of thinking (Meisel, 2012). It is usually a cross-cultural example of the many life challenges that requires adaptation. It is most often thought of as a function of moving from one country to another but people also talk of corporate culture shock (Furnham, 2011) or the experience of moving from rural to urban parts of the same country. According to Oberg (1966) : "Culture shock is precipitated by the anxiety that results from losing all our familiar signs and symbols of social intercourse. These signs or cues include the thousand and

one ways in which we orient ourselves to the situations of daily life: when to shake hands and what to say when we meet people, when and how to give tips, how to give orders to servants, how to make purchases, when to accept and when to refuse invitations, when to take statements seriously and when not. Now these cues which may be words, gestures, facial expressions, customs, or norms are acquired by all of us in the course of growing up and are as much a part of our culture as the language we speak or the beliefs we accept. All of us depend for our peace of mind and our efficiency on hundreds of these cues, most of which we are not consciously aware ...” (p. 179) Various attempts have been made to “unpack” the definition into discrete but related features (Ward et al., 2001)

- 1) “Strain due to the effort required to make necessary psychological adaptations.
 - 2) A sense of loss and feelings of deprivation in regard to friends, status, profession and possessions.
 - 3) Being rejected by/and or rejecting members of the new culture.
 - 4) Confusion in role, role expectations, values.
 - 5) Surprise, anxiety, even disgust and indignation after becoming aware of cultural differences.
 - 6) Feelings of impotence due to not being able to cope with the new environment.”
- (Furnham, 2011: p. 7)

Essentially culture shock describes a dramatic adaptation challenge. There are many such challenges across the life span but for many culture shock remains dramatic, intense and unexpected. We have to learn to adapt to a very wide range of life events like moving house, school or country, getting married or divorced, the birth or death of a relative. Often similar factors predict how and to what extent an individual or group adapts to the change. Number of researchers have documented the various factors that may influence the acuteness and chronicity (severity) of culture shock including the degrees of control that travellers have, interpersonal factors (age, appearance, personality, language skills), biological factors (medical care; dietary restrictions), interpersonal factors (social networks; finances) spatio-temporal factors (place of visit; time spent) and geopolitical factors (political tensions, meteorological

and seismological factors (Stewart & Leggat, 1998). One question is how the academic literature on adaptation in general informs the culture shock literature especially examining those personal characteristics and situations that correlated with healthy vs unhealthy adaptation. Bochner (1982) attempted to classify individuals in terms of their psychological responses to the host country. He posited that there are four main ways in which people behave when in a new culture: “Passing”—rejecting the culture of origin and embracing the new culture. The original culture’s norms lose their salience and the new culture’s norms gain salience. This type of mind-set may be prevalent for migrants looking for employment that have come from war-torn countries and seek a new life. “Chauvinism”—rejection of the current culture and exaggerating the original. The original culture’s norms increase in salience and the new culture’s norms decrease in salience. This can cause an increased feeling of nationalism for the individual and can lead to racism, and as a society cause inter-group friction. This type of mind-set is increasingly rare, with people becoming more accepting of other cultures and religions. “Marginal”—hovering between the two cultures, the individual is not certain of who he/she is. Norms of both cultures are salient but are perceived as mutually incompatible. This leads to mental confusion for the individual, over compensation and conflict and for the society causes reform and social change. Again, this type of mind-set is increasingly rare, with integration into a foreign society being greatly eased. “Mediating”—synthesizing both cultures. This mind-set is most ideal as it can mediate between both cultures. Norms of both cultures are salient and are perceived as capable of being integrated. This leads to the individual growing personally and society exhibiting higher levels of inter-group harmony and cultural preservation. This is probably the most prevalent mind-set that can be. The first two responses attempt a sort of defense against shock. Those who try passing are agree to hide their origins, perhaps deny their own culture. The second group may seem to be arrogantly ignorant of the local culture. The ideal situation is where people become culturally “multi-lingual” able to move between cultures as easily as some change languages. The term culture shock soon took root in the popular imagination. There are well over 50 books with Culture Shock in the title,

many published by the Times of Singapore. They each deal with a specific country and have a unique selling point that they are all written by outsiders/foreigners who did not grow up in that country. They are essentially psychological guides to surviving and thriving in a new culture. The popular media has been full of references to culture shock for 50 years. Guides in how to mitigate the effects of culture shock are offered to all sorts of travellers. People recognise it immediately though they are surprised by it. There are many related definitions but they nearly all convey a similar meaning. The concepts quoted are: “disorientation”, “anxious confusion”, “disease”, “mental shock” or “transition shock”. It is agreed that culture shock is a disorientating experience of suddenly finding that the perspectives, behaviours and experience of an individual or group or whole society are not shared by others. However, it is also agreed that it is a ubiquitous and normal stage in any acculturative adaptive process that all “travellers” experience. Going to “strange places” and losing the power of easy communication can disrupt self-identity, world views and indeed all systems of acting, feeling and thinking. Indeed, the concept is so well known that there have been studies on “lay theories of culture shock”. Goldstein and Keller (2015) found that students tended to attribute culture shock to differences in the external environment (language, communication, and surroundings) rather than to internal affective or cognitive factors (poor stress management, identity confusion, or prejudice). “The tendency to attribute culture shock to internal causes was greater for those with higher levels of cultural competence, whereas low travel experience and interest in foreign language learning predicted the tendency to attribute culture shock to external causes” (p. 187). However, there are those who criticize the concept. A good example is Fitzpatrick (2017) who rejects what he calls the “billiard ball”, essentialist notion of cultures. He argues from a social constructivist perspective which sees the adjustment process of various types and levels. Like researchers of that persuasion he rejects the idea that cultures are distinct entities focusing on the “psychological, sociocultural and discursive nature of social interaction within a dialectic framework” (p. 292). While he describes the well-established success factors in overcoming culture shock, he focusses on how individuals construct and

negotiate meaning in their lives. He advocates taking the “culture” out of culture shock preferring the concept of context. Whilst this approach may be seen to correct the simple view that people from culture A will have problems in moving to Culture B, its highly individualistic approach looking at negotiated meanings makes it difficult to understand common experiences and processes. Many have listed the symptoms of culture shock (cognitive, emotional, physiological reactions) while other researchers have attempted to specify personal factors that seem to predict who and how much individuals suffer from culture shock like Openness, Neuroticism, language proficiency and tolerance for contradiction (Spencer-Rodgers, Williams, & Peng, 2010). There are many personal accounts and helpful advice procedures for people to develop better “emotional resilience” to move between cultures (Abarbanel, 2009; Azeez et al., 2004; Barrett, 2009; Bourne, 2009; Green, 2006). This includes what people in educational and work environments can, and should, do to lessen the experience of culture shock (Guy & Patton, 1996).

CONCLUSION

Culture shock has been studied in many groups including tourists (Court & King, 1979); students (Gaw, 2000; Sayers & Franklin, 2008, Willis, 2009; Hu, 2008) and working people (Guy & Patton, 1996). The costs of expatriate failure have encouraged researchers to try and understand causes as well as reduce the amount of culture shock that results (Pires, Stanton, & Ostefeld, 2006).

Culture shock is conceived as a serious, acute and sometimes chronic affective reaction to a new (social) environment. Furnham (2011) has noted there are other closely related “shocking” concepts. These include:

Invasion shock: this occurs in places where tourists or other visitors suddenly appear in large numbers in a particular setting and overwhelm the locals who become a minority in their own living space. Because the “invaders” retain their cultural morals (of dress, social interaction) they can surprise, frustrate and offend the locals. In this sense they have culture shock without actually going anywhere (Pyvis & Chapman 2005).

Reverse culture shock: this occurs when returning to one's home culture to find it different from that which was recalled. Thus, people can never go home again because it does not exist. It is about re-adjusted; re-aculturating and re-assimilating in the home culture (Gaw, 2000) . This has also been called Re-entry Shock and the topic of recent research (Gray & Savicki, 2015)

Re-professionalisation and Re-licencing shock: this occurs when trained professionals do not have their qualifications accepted by a host country and have to be retrained and accepted (Austin, 2007; Austin, Gregory, & Martin, 2007) .

Business Shock: this is the realisation that so many of the subtle business practices vary considerably from one culture to another (Balls, 2005; Pukthuanthong & Walker, 2007) .

Race culture shock: This concerns being a racial minority in an institution within ones country. Class and race specific styles of dress, speech etc can seriously shock people who do not expect them (Torres, 2009)

Culture Confusion: This is the term used by Moufakkir (2013) when examining the experience of tourists. He noted other semi-synonymous terms like positive disintegration; culture unrest; culture fluidity, hybridity and fatigue. There remains general agreement about the term however. It is a negative affective, behavioural and cognitive reaction to a new stimulus which is unexpected. It varies between individual in acuity and chronicity. Whilst it is agreed there is no simple definition of culture shock it needs the following components: It is unexpected and surprising; it is associated with a number of negative emotions; and it leads to an examination of, and attempts to integrate, different understandings of human behaviour. Hence culture may be defined as a sudden, unexpected, and surprising set of mainly negative emotions and cognitions associated with encountering a new environment.

REFERENCES:

[1]. Danilyuk A. Ya. "Theoretical and methodological foundations of integration in education." Rostov-on-Don, 1997.

[2]. Zagornaya L. P. "On the development of an integrated course "Foreign Language artistic development"//Foreign languages at school, 1992, No. 3–4.

- [3]. Pulbere A., Gukalenko O., Ustimenko S. "Integrated technologies
gii" // Higher education in Russia, 2004. - No. 1.
- [4]. Rachenko I. P. "Integrative Pedagogy". <http://bspu.ab.ru>
- [5]. Ashliman D.L. Folklore and fairy tales. Greenwood Press, 2004.89 p.
- [6]. Aryioki K. Methods of activating young students in English classes // Early teaching of the English language: theory and practice. - St. Petersburg: 2004. - P. 90-95
- [7]. Gudkova L.M. Poems and fairy tales in English lessons in elementary school. - M.: 2005. - P. 8-85.
- [8]. Kolesnikova I.L., Dolgina O.A. English-Russian terminological reference book on the methodology of teaching foreign languages. - St. Petersburg: 2001. - P. 77-127.
- [9]. Lyubchenko A.S. Non-standard English lessons at school. - Rostov-on-Don: 2007. - P. 23-64.
- [10]. Malkina N.A. Foreign Language Development Environment and Its Characteristics // Early English Language Teaching: Theory and Practice. - St. Petersburg: 2004. - P. 76
- [11]. Sedelnikova L.M., Ziman L.Ya. English Literary Tale: Textbook. - M.: 2009. - P. 18-76
- [12]. Sharipov, Shavkat (2020) "Symbiosis of civilizations as an important factor in the formation and development of scientific thinking in Uzbekistan," *Mental Enlightenment Scientific-Methodological Journal*: Vol. 2020:Iss.1,Article33.Availableat: <https://uzjournals.edu.uz/tziuj/vol2020/iss1/33>
- [13]. Sharipov, Shavkat and Rakhmonova, Gulrukh (2021) "Successive Development of the Creative Person in the Continuous Education," *Mental Enlightenment Scientific-Methodological Journal*: Vol. 2021 : Iss. 4 , Article 1. Available at: <https://uzjournals.edu.uz/tziuj/vol2021/iss4/1>
- [14]. Jabbarova, A. The Importance of Using Advanced Pedagogical Technologies in Teaching the Social Sciences. PROCEEDINGS E-BOOK, 40.

[15]. Anora, J. (2020). Methodology And Methods Of Cultural Linguistics. In International Engineering Journal For Research & Development, 5 (CONGRESS) (pp. 3-3).