

**INTERETHNIC AND INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATIONS:
EXTRA-LINGUISTIC ASPECT**

G.S. Suyunova, Doctor of Philology, Full Professor
O.K. Andryushchenko, Candidate of Philology, Associate Professor
Pavlodar State Pedagogical Institute, Kazakhstan

Authors compare the interethnic and intercultural communications in terms of extra-linguistic factors. These factors are the particular territorial dislocations (especially social dislocation), the civil status of communicators, the factor of ethnic background knowledge and awareness, chronological features. The content analysis of these features has revealed ontological independence of inter-ethnic communications.

Keywords: ethnic, communications, extra-linguistic, status, comparison.

Conference participants

Interethnic communication today is a priority target of the theory of intercultural communication. However, it should be noted that interethnic communication lacks homogeneity (uniformity), and uniqueness. In particular it is necessary to distinguish between interethnic intercourse in cross-cultural communication and in interethnic communication. Since in modern linguistics there is no clear differentiation between them, then their comparison will help in understanding the nature of these phenomena, and, above all, the issue of the status of inter-ethnic communication.

Thus one of the possible solutions to the problem of ontology and the status of inter-ethnic communication is a study in relation to the cross-cultural communication. It should be emphasized that this comparison has a completely different character than it was typical of the traditional comparative linguistics when comparing only the individual facts of different language systems. We've been talking about the need to confront the phenomenon of a large scale, playing great role both for the society and for science. «The development of linguistics requires a transition to a new level of comparisons - not the individual facts of the compared languages but of the communicative phenomena» [1].

A comparison of cross-cultural and inter-ethnic communication has great theoretical and practical potential. It expands the boundaries of comparative linguistics, traditionally limited the scope of comparative analysis of the structural and grammatical categories, phonetic features of two or more language systems, and includes a comparative analysis of not only the

individual communicative phenomena, but also holistic communication systems arising from the interaction of representatives of various ethnolinguocultural communities.

We noted above that the ethnic communication is complicated heterogeneous phenomenon which can be explained by its ontology: it arises as a result of the long interaction of several ethnic communicative systems in a multi-ethnic state. Interethnic communication is initially based on a comparison of the contact systems and therefore can only be understood through the comparison and identification of common and unique features of these systems. Its implementation would necessarily require a comparison of the various facts (linguistic, behavioral, cultural, etiquette, religious, etc.) of interacting ethnolinguocultural communities. In other words, inter-ethnic communication is borderline phenomenon that occurs in the interaction of several ethnolinguocultural communities and is based on a comparison to the regular framework of the «they have / you-have - we have».

The comparison of inter-ethnic and cross-cultural communication characterizes them as ontologically distinct phenomena. They are understood to be close but not identical phenomena. Intercultural communication is ethnolinguocultural interaction between the representatives of different communities who are the citizens of different states and members of different socio-cultural environment. Interethnic communication is defined as the communication of the representatives of different ethnic communities in situations of prolonged cohabitation in the same society and citizens of one state [2].

In general, inter-ethnic and intercultural communication is a model of «different ethnic groups - different microculture - one society - one state - one macroculture» for inter-ethnic communication and «different ethnic groups - different microculture - different macrocultures - different societies - different states» for intercultural communication.

The multidimensional nature of inter-ethnic and cross-cultural communication allows us to carry out multidisciplinary studies of these phenomena in order to identify their similarities and differences. For example, they can be compared with the social, linguistic, communicative, gender, psychological and other characteristics. There is no doubt that the list of possible aspects of the comparison of inter-ethnic and cross-cultural communication is not final.

In this article we consider some extra-linguistic factors, the content of which is different for inter-ethnic and cross-cultural communication. They are: features of territorial dislocation, especially social dislocation, the civil status of the communicators, the factor of ethnic background knowledge and awareness. A special place in this list takes the chronological indication. All extra-linguistic signs are labeled as their analysis reveals the specifics in terms of cross-cultural and inter-ethnic communication. This allows distinguishing between the compared phenomena as ontologically separate ones. Thus let's consider the extra-linguistic factors in inter-ethnic and cross-cultural communication.

1. Features of territorial location

This feature, in spite of its apparent simplicity and obviousness, requires careful consideration, as it is logically connected with other

social characteristics of inter-ethnic communication. This relationship we see in the following.

The representatives of different ethnic groups participating in the inter-ethnic communication are the citizens of one state, live in the same territory and are a part of a single society. This fact, in turn, contributes to regular mutual communication of different ethnolinguocultural communities and together with such signs of inter-ethnic communication as the duration and consistency of co-existence, contributes to the formation of general background knowledge.

Therefore, you can set the following logical chain: the territorial community - the long-term coexistence - a joint activity - development of common background knowledge.

The proximity determines the specific content of the archetype of the "chuzhoy" in terms of inter-ethnic communication. Other ethnic groups in this case are perceived as alien, as the representatives of the other cultures not like foreigners.

In cross-cultural communication a sign of equality is placed between "chuzhoy" and "inostranets" People of different ethnic groups in the latter case, separated from each other not only by ethnic attribute (as in the case of inter-ethnic communication), but also geographically and socially: «chuzhoy» here means someone who someone is in a different place, in a different country, who is not a citizen of your country, who does not live in the same social space and because of all these factors, there is little or not at all known to you. The words "inostranets", chuzhestranets" contain this particular context.

2. Features of social dislocation and the associated civil status of communicants

These factors clearly demonstrate the differences between ethnic and cross-cultural communication. The first is exercised by representatives of various ethnic groups who are citizens of one state, living in the same socio-cultural environment and participating in the formation of a unified macrocultures. Members of intercultural communication belong to different states / society.

For this reason, in terms of intercultural communication the status of the person - a representative of another state - is defined by the words «visiter», «poselenets». She is perceived as a foreigner by the citizens of the host country (clearly - in the first case) or for a long time the ethnocultural distance is preserved (if it has the status of a migrant).

3. Background knowledge and ethnic awareness.

This factor is closely related to the aforementioned factors. In the inter-ethnic communication people of different ethnic groups, different from each other ethnically and culturally, however, are combined by the territorial and social community, one civilian status. This allows them to build and to have general background knowledge. It's impossible in intercultural communication.

Every ethnic group and every society have their own bank of background knowledge, but in terms of inter-ethnic communication the common elements can appear because of the territorial and social community of people entering into these relationships.

Background knowledge is not language knowledge; they are presuppositional knowledge and belong to the deep level of consciousness. Background knowledge is the real backdrop for the unfolding picture of life in the ethnic group. Scientists believe that the "background knowledge is the basis for cross-cultural communication, as they involve the mutual knowledge of the realities of the representatives of two different linguocultural societies" [3:18].

The problem of general background knowledge is logically connected with the problem of ethnic awareness. Ethnopsychologists explain it as "knowledge about ethnic groups - their own and other people, their history, customs, particularities of culture" [4:176]. In terms of inter-ethnic communication the level of ethnic awareness, as well as general background knowledge, objectively appears higher than for cross-cultural communication.

The large size of the bank of general

background knowledge, the high degree of ethnic awareness inherent in interethnic communication lead to the absence (or minor degree) of a culture shock which can occur in situations of cross-cultural communication.

4. Chronological sign of inter-ethnic and cross-cultural communication.

The chronological framework of inter-ethnic intercourse is different for inter-ethnic and cross-cultural communication. In the first case they are characterized by the duration and the fact that time is unbounded; for the participants of inter-ethnic communication the chronological factor is not a primary or not recognized at all.

This factor is related to social factors such as territorial and social community of the participants of the inter-ethnic communication, contributing to the formation of their common ethnic background knowledge and awareness.

In turn, this circumstance entails higher than in cross-cultural communication, communicative comfort, reduces the risk of communicative stress and culture shock.

Intercultural communication is characterized by limited time frame for its implementation, until the establishment of the exact time frame. This can result in lack of knowledge of different ethnic cultures (or a lower level of ethnic awareness), which causes uncertainty in the success of communication, leading to discomfort and communicative stress. Such a psychological state of the participants of inter-ethnic communication can create their negative attitude to the communicative partner, which, in turn, can lead to communication failure.

Thus, a comparison of cross-cultural and inter-ethnic communication from the point of view of their extra-linguistic features allows seeing the features of comparable phenomena and coming to the following conclusions:

1. Realities of modern multi-ethnic states, including Kazakhstan, make us to distinguish between inter-ethnic intercourse in intercultural and interethnic communication as similar, close but not identical phenomena.

This leads to the need for a scientific comparison of cross-cultural and inter-ethnic communication and should help to identify their distinctive features to substantiate the ontological uniqueness of compared phenomena.

2. Intercultural and interethnic communication can be considered as proper ontological and linguistic phenomena. In this paper we compared them considering some extra-linguistic factors. The list of the latter is not final.

3. As a result of this comparison the following chain of interrelated concepts has been revealed: the occurrence of one society - being on the same territory - the duration of coexistence of ethnic groups - joint activities in various areas of social life - development of common bank

of knowledge - a higher level of ethnic awareness - a higher probability of successful communication interaction.

4. Each of the extra-linguistic factors is specific for cross-cultural and inter-ethnic communication. This allows us to draw the conclusion regarding the ontological independence of inter-ethnic communication.

References:

1. Yartseva V.N. Theory and practice of a comparative study of texts., Proceedings of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR. Literature and Language. T. 45. - 1986, No 6., pp. 493-500.
2. Suyunova G.S. Theoretical basis of inter-ethnic communication. - Pavlodar, 2007. - 167 p.

3. Isina G.I. Stereotypes and national language world. - Abstract ... Dr. Philology: 10.02.19 - Almaty., 2008 - 50 p.

4. Belinskaya E.P., Stefanenko T.G. Ethnic identity: the concept, formation, and measurement models., Ethnic socialization of teenager. - Moskva-Voronezh., 2000., pp. 75-107.

Information about authors:

1. Gulnara Suyunova - Doctor of Philology, Full Professor, Pavlodar State Pedagogical Institute; address: Kazakhstan, Pavlodar city; e-mail: kulyanda2009@mail.ru

2. Olga Andryushchenko - candidate of Philology, Associate Professor, Pavlodar State Pedagogical Institute; address: Kazakhstan, Pavlodar city; e-mail: kulyanda2009@mail.ru



INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY

OF SCIENTIFIC AND INNOVATIVE ANALYTICS OF THE IASHE

- DOCTORAL DYNAMIC SCIENTIFIC AND ANALYTICAL PROGRAMS
- ACADEMIC SCIENTIFIC AND ANALYTICAL PROGRAMS
- INTERNATIONAL ATTESTATION -BASED LEGALIZATION OF QUALIFICATIONS
- SCIENTIFIC AND ANALYTICAL PROGRAM OF THE EDUCATIONAL AND PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATION IMPROVEMENT
- DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONAL SCIENTIFIC AND ANALYTICAL PROGRAMS

