Л.В. Сергеева, Т.В. Куприна
Уральский федеральный университет имени первого Президента
России Б.Н. Ельцина
Екатеринбург, Россия

Межкультурные особенности образовательной среды в контексте классификации культур

В статье рассматриваются межкультурные особенности, которые необходимо учитывать при организации образовательного процесса. Рассматривается возможность конструктивного использования классификации культур, как основы создания благоприятных условий в образовательной среде.

Cross-cultural features of education environment in context of cultures' classification

The current time is characterized by ever-increasing migratory flows and the interaction of different cultures. Education environment is no exception. Universities are integrated, developing dynamically in order to adapt to rapidly and continuously changing conditions.

Moreover, taking into account the difficult demographic situation, it is necessary to reduce the negative effect of decreasing the total number of students in Russian universities until 2025. Presumably, it is possible due to the increase of foreign citizens. If the annual rate of increase of foreign citizens in Russian universities remains at current levels (4-5%) by comparison with the 2009/2010 academic year, by 2025 their number in higher education institutions of the Russian Federation will increase about twice: 76.6 thousand people – 2009/2010; 159.3 – 2024/2025 [2, p.88].

Therefore, in Russian universities it is necessary to take into account foreign students' cultures. For a deeper understanding of the subject we'd like to appeal to different classifications of cultures. There are several approaches: [1, p. 73-83]

1. Semiotic approach. According to the approach, culture is a system of signs through which the storage and retransmission of social

information are implemented, and the "axis of culture" is a natural language. According to the Lotman's concept [4], all cultures are differentiated into the cultures, focusing on the sources (mainly Eastern cultures) and cultures, focusing on end-use (e.g., the USA). If we consider such an option as the attitude to time, some (eastern) cultures are trying to make sense of this category in circular terms ("mythical time"), and Western ones consider time as a linear category ("historical time"). So, in this context, it is interesting to consider the category of the "geographical space". Different cultures are unequally placed in space, distinguishing between "theirs" and "foreign". For example, some "continental types of cultures" (the USA, Russia) can easily integrate new information but others, "island" ones (Japan, the UK), cannot.

2. Existential and cultural approach. In his research T.G. Gachev [3] has attributed to the field of the existential Cultural Studies and suggested differentiating cultures on the following criteria: space, time, nature, world model, archetypes-characters, horizontal / vertical dimension, understanding the origin of the world. For example, for the Germans time is more important, than the space while for the Russians it is v.v.

3. Cognitive-linguistic approach. In her work A. Wierzbicka also studies the impact of cultural differences on differences in thinking through the national language. The author argues that a successful communication between different cultures depends on the universality of the base set of semantic primitives, of which language can create an almost infinite number of concepts specific to a given culture.

The concept of cultural knowledge, developed by Australian scientists F. Sharifian [6], is of interest in terms of explaining the phenomena of the distribution of cultural knowledge. He argues that knowledge must be regarded not only as an individual asset, but as belonging to the peculiar cultural group as a whole. In fact, it is a collective experience. In fact, two people belonging to the same cultural group may have both common and different knowledge about any phenomenon that may complicate the understanding between them, as they treat incoming information to the wrong part of the pattern and accordingly, activate a different experience. Under our existing patterns we perceive incoming information and interpret it according to our experience and in accordance with it we behave in similar situations.

4. Operational approach. If we take into account R. Lewis's research, there is a classification of cultures on the specifics (nature) of activity, according to which all cultures are divided into:

- Cultures of a monoactive type;
- Cultures of a polyactive type;
- Cultures of a reactive type.

Representatives of a monoactive type of cultures (Western Europe, the United States) are mostly characterized by the objective discourse and rationalism. It is reflected in the linear perception of time, strict and clearly planned approach to activities. As a rule, representatives of a monoactive type of culture have an algorithm in their work, are good planners, often operate with facts, emotions are never a communicative dominant for them.

A polyactive type of cultures includes representatives of the Latin American countries, Romance group, representatives of some Arab and African nations. Communication with the representatives of this type is based on the information getting in the course of personal contacts with people. The emotional sphere in the process of communication often dominates. As a rule, the representatives of this type of culture are not punctual, disparagingly refer to all kinds of schedules and instructions, not always rationally spend their time (especially from the perspective of a monoactive type of culture), as in the polyactive socio-cultural discourse, time is not a linear value but perceived as a cyclic quantity.

They tend to do several things at once and it is considered a criterion of full life. In communication they focus on the dominant of interpersonal relations, emotional intimacy, sympathy and eloquence, but often the representatives of this type of culture are autocratic decision-makers. Here a hierarchical position, status, reputation, origin and often material prosperity of a communicant are dominated.

A reactive type of cultures includes representatives of the countries of East and South-East Asia, including Japan, China, Taiwan and Singapore, as well as Turkey and Finland. For representatives of the cultural format the communication dominant is to achieve harmony in the relationships. However, the harmony in the relationships is not always directly proportional related to verbosity. For example, the Finns, as representatives of a reactive type of culture, in the process of communication are laconic and introverts. The behavioral model is based on humility, politeness and professionalism. The cognitive discourse operates on the principle of "monologue-pause-thinking-monologue." Pauses are perceived as a very important part of the business discussion without active non-verbal communication.

5. Contextual approach. E. Hall describes the spatial and temporal dominance in different cultures, as well as differentiates them according to the context of communication. The concept considers two time perception systems: monochronic and polychronic. The first is based on the tendency to divide the time into small segments and consistent implementation of planned affairs. The monochronic time is linear, so in this context they use such expressions like "spend time" and "save time". This perception of time is typical in North America, Germany and Switzerland. The polychronic perception of time, in terms of E. Hall, is a characteristic feature of high-context cultures where the dominant is the harmony of human relations. This type is characterized by unpunctuality and strict adherence to the time norms and frames. It is especially noticeable among representatives of Arab and Hispanic cultures.

6. System approach. In the Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck's model [5] there are 6 criteria of the culture assessment:

1). Attitude to the surroundings (this criterion is considered with 3 positions, "obey it", "harmony with it" or "attempt to dominate").

2). Attitude to time. Time is perceived differently in different cultures. This fact is noted in virtually each of classifications. Typically, researchers essentially divide time into "linear" and "cyclic".

3). Human nature. Depending on the perception of human nature in each culture there mainly used an autocratic or confidential approach.

4). Orientation of activities. In different cultures activities can be focused on actions and results (control). Residents of the United States are characterized by the focus on the action. They work hard, hoping for a career promotion and financial well-being. Latinos in their perception of the world are focused on entity. The French, British, Germans focused on control, rationality, logic of life.

5). Focus on responsibility. There are cultures with dominated "individual" responsibility (the USA) and cultures with dominated "collective" responsibility (China).

6). Concept of space. Cultures with "open" and "closed" workspaces.

Thus, dealing with different cultures knowledge of the cultural specificity should allow and help to select and use communication strategies as efficiently as possible.

Список литературы:

1. Жарков В.К. Педагогический конструктивизм в кросс-культурной среде / В.К. Жарков, Ю.В. Таратухина. – Москва: Янус-К, 2015. - 276 с.

2. Sergeeva L.V. Academic Mobility as Expansion Factor of Migratory Flows / L.V. Sergeeva // Cross - Cultural Studies: Education and Science (CCS&ES). – Vermont 05753, USA, 2016. – Vol. 7, Issue I. – P. 87-92.

3. Гачев Г.Д. Ментальности народов мира [Электронный ресурс] / Г.Д. Гачев. – Режим доступа: http://texts.news/filosofiya-sotsialnaya/mentalnosti-narodov-mira.html (дата обращения 28.01.2017).

4. Лотман Ю.М. Культура и взрыв [Электронный ресурс] / Ю.М. Лотман. – Режим доступа: http://yanko.lib.ru/books/cultur/lotman_semiosphera.htm#_Toc17488818 (дата обращения 28.01.2017).

5. Kluckhohn F.R. Variations in Value Orientations, Row and Peterson / F.R. Kluckhohn, F.L. Strodtbeck. - New York, 1960. – Режим доступа:http://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1040&context=orpc (дата обращения 27.01.2017).

6. Sharifian F. Distributed, Emergent Cultural Cognition, Conceptualisation, and Language / F. Sharifian. Body, Language, and Mind (Vol.2): Sociocultural Situatedness. Berlin; New York: Moutonde Gruyter, 2007. – Режим доступа: https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/050d/87fc38ed31eb2afb964039c5e99938f36904.pdf (дата обращения 27.01.2017).