# CULTURAL DIMENSIONS IN INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION

**Torebay Gulfairuz Shynybekkyzy**
*gul_super@inbox.ru*
1st year master student in "Foreign Languages: Two Foreign Languages"
L.N.Gumilyov ENU, Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan
Supervisor – G.M. Gauriyeva

The definition of culture was given repeatedly. It can be defined as follows: Culture is collective programming of consciousness which differs representatives of one group or type of people from others. Mostly the notion of culture is used in relation to tribes or ethnic groups (in anthropology), in relation to nations (in political science, sociology and management) and in relation to organizations (in sociology and management).

American anthropologist Edward T. Hall classified cultures according to the method of communication into two contexts: high context (most of the information is transmitted implicitly) and low context (almost everything is explicitly reported) [1].

American sociologists Tolcott Parsons and Edward Shils proposed to define all human actions by five typical variables:

- affectivity (satisfaction of need) vs. affective neutrality (restraint against natural impulses);
- self-orientation vs. community-orientation;
- universalism (based on generally accepted standards) vs. particularism (taking into account specific relationships);
- attribution (assessment of other people according to who they are) vs. achievements (assessment of people according to their actions);
- specificity (restriction of relations with other only certain areas) vs. diffuseness (lack of any limitations to nature of the relationship) [2, 77].

American anthropologists Florence Kluckhohn and Fred Strodtbeck conducted research in five small communities in the southwestern United States. They were Spanish Americans, Mormons, Navaho, Texans, and Indians. The difference between these communities was based on the following parameters of value orientation.

- assessment of human nature (bad - mixed - good type);
- human attitude to the natural environment (subjugation - harmony – mastery);
- orientation in time (focus on the past - present – future);
- attitude to activities (existence - existence in becoming – action);
- relations between people (hierarchy of positions - collaterality- individualism) [3, 12].

Dutch scientist Gert Hofstede published the work "The consequences of culture" in 1980 and "Measurement of national cultures in fifty countries and three regions" in 1983, in which he developed a system for organizing and identifying cultures based on his proposed sets of indicators defining cultural characteristics of different nations. The work of G. Hofstede was one of the first large studies in the field of cultural indicators, based on the identification of quantitative index. The main objective of this study was to identify the presence of universal cultural categories that cover social communities and countries.

G. Hofstede carried out a large research project to study the differences between national cultures in the activities of multinational corporations in 64 countries. He surveyed more than 160,000 managers and employees of organizations about their satisfaction with their work, colleagues, management, about the perception of problems arising in the process of work, about life goals, beliefs and professional preferences.

New factors revealed common problems that people faced in relevant societies, and these problems were:

- dependence on superior;
- needs for rules and predictability, which is also associated with nervous tension;
- the balance between personal goals and company dependence;
- the balance between personal values (the need for material resources and career growth) and social values (cooperation and a pleasant life environment) [4,7].

He discovered highly significant differences in the behavior of managers and specialists from different countries. He found that most differences in work values and attitudes are explained by national culture, profession, also age and gender. Based on the results of the research, the scientist identified five value measurements for the classification of cultures that characterize managers and specialists and the organization as a whole.

➢ Individualism/collectivism
➢ Power distance
➢ Uncertainty avoidance
➢ Masculinity/femininity
➢ Short/long term orientation [4,8].

*Power distance* means to measure a degree to which power, prestige, wealth are evenly distributed in a culture. Some people are more powerful than others, some people have more wealth or more political influence than others. Power is not equally distributed as much as we would like it to be. Put simply, people in some cultures accept a higher degree of unequally distributed power than do people in other cultures. For instance, Australia is low power distance country while Asian countries such as Malay are at the high power distance side. People in high distance countries tend to believe that power and authority are the means of life. Leaders are expected to solve all problems as well as to make important decisions. Subordinates will just obey with their leaders rather than try to find their own solutions in dealing with conflicts.

| Australia | Asian countries |
|---|---|
| Low power distance | High power distance |
| Society does not emphasize on people's status, | The willingness to accept a difference in power |

| power or wealth | over other members of a culture |
|---|---|
| Expects that all should have equal rights | Inequality in power is considered the norm |

Table 1. Differences between Higher and Lower Power Distance societies

*Individualism/collectivism* indicates the degree to which individuals are integrated into groups. In individualist culture significance is on self-expression and individual thinking. The social behavior is guided by one's personal attitude and motivation, associated with private property, individual ownership. In collectivist culture you are part of a whole society to which you are responsible for maintaining order. For instance, Kazakhstan is a collectivistic country where strong family relationship, respect for elders, allegiance to friends, relatives and colleagues, mercy for someone in need are greatly valued. Historically Kazakhs prefer collectivist culture and there are many proverbs about the significance of living in group with others not alone. " Juz tengen bolgansha, juz dosyn bolsyn", "Kop tukirse kol", "Kopshilikten bereke ketpes, Berekeli jerden mereke ketpes" are proverbs which show life is impossible without having people around you.

| **Individualism** | **Collectivism** |
|---|---|
| Independent control | Relational with group |
| Goals for oneself | Sense of belonging |
| Competitions with others | Harmony with others |
| Promoting self-expression, individual thinking, personal choice | Promoting adherence to norms, respect for authority and elders, group agreement |

Table 2. Differences between Collectivist and Individualist Cultures

*Masculinity and femininity* shows the distribution of roles between men and women. Femininity relates to societies where social gender roles are not clearly defined and can intersect, that is, what a woman does can be done by a man. Both of them should be modest, attentive, gentle, should worry about ecology around themselves. The Kazakh society shows characteristics of both masculine and feminine cultures, but masculine quality may be a bit more dominant [5, 7].

Thus, cultural dimension proposed by G. Hofstede, contributes a better understanding and analysis of the national mentality and national character of certain nations representatives. Using the results of the cross-cultural dimension conducted by Hofstede, we can study and analyze the value system of various cultures and peoples. This allows us to better understand and realize the picture of the world, the mentalities of the different nations, their cultural and spiritual values which favor effective communication in a multilingual world.

**Literature**

1. Hall, E. T. Beyond culture. Garden City, NY: Anchor. 1976.
2. Parsons, T. & Shils, E. A. Toward a general theory of action. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. 1951.
3. Kluckhohn, C. Universal categories of culture. In S. Tax (Ed.), Anthropology today: Selections. 1962. P.304
4. Geert Hofstede. Dimensionalizing Cultures: The Hofstede Model in Context Universities of Maastricht and Tilburg, The Netherlands.2011.P.26. Retrieved from https://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1014&context=orpc
5. Yusuf Yaylaci, Aibarsha Islam. Teaching Across Cultures: Considerations for International Language Teachers in Kazakhstan. Almaty.2013. P. 12