Bilets'ka Oksana
Ph.D. of Culture Studies,
associated processor, associated professor
of the Foreign Philology Department,
Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts
bel_o@ukr.net

CULTURE AND COMMUNICATION

The aim of the article. The focus of cultural studies on language and cultural identity has a decisive influence on the formation of identity and its coexistence in the environment. In its turn, the culture can be studied as a system of values that are formed during communication in which language as cultural sign system is used as a means of communication. The **methodology** of the work is to use such techniques of the research as the study, analysis and synthesis in order to reveal the assumption about the similarity of languages to a closed-looped system. The research tries to prove that languages are what we might call the first science, which mankind have been studying. During a certain period of time people accumulate a huge stock of knowledge through communication, learn about the dynamics of the ecosystems, in which they coexist with local plants and animals. **Scientific novelty** of the research is to expand the relationship between the notions "culture" – "language" – "communication" as a form of consciousness that reflects a person's world, being the form of the human material and spiritual culture realization. **Conclusion.** Languages always realize through individuals "tied" to a particular area, the language and the territory being connected. Native speakers also always depend on the cultural context. As for example, different languages may include grammatical information about social status of the person.
Keywords: culture, language, communication, symbolism, universality, lexical structure, semantics, pragmatics.

Білецька Оксана Олександрівна, кандидат культурології, доцент, доцент кафедри іноземної філології Київського національного університету культури і мистецтв
Культура і комунікація
Мета роботи – проаналізувати взаємозв'язок культури і комунікації, позаяк культурна орієнтація на мову та ідентичність вирішально впливає на формування особистості та її існування в навколишньому середовищі. У свою чергу, культуру можна вивчати як систему значень, що виникають під час комунікації, в якій мова як знакова система культури використовується як засіб передачі повідомлень. **Методологія** дослідження полягає у використанні таких методів дослідження, як аналіз та узагальнення, зокрема для розкриття припущення про схожість мов на замкнуту систему; доведення, що мови є те, що ми могли б назвати першою наукою, яку людство вивчає в своєму житті. Протягом певного періоду часу носії мов через спілкування накопичують великий багаж знань, дізнаються про динаміку екосистем, в яких вони співіснують поряд із рослинами і тваринами. **Наукова новизна** полягає у розширенні уявлень про взаємозв'язок феноменів «культура» – «мова» – «комунікація» як форм свідомості, що відображають світогляд людини і є формами втілення матеріальної і духовної культури народу. **Висновки.** Мови завжди уособлюються через особистості, які «прив'язані» до певної місцевості, мови і територія існування яких пов'язані між собою. Носії мови також завжди залежать від культурного контексту.
Ключові слова: культура, мова, комунікація, символізм, універсальність, лексичний склад, семантика, прагматика.

Белецкая Оксана Александровна, кандидат культурологии, доцент, доцент кафедры иностранной филологии Киевского национального университета культуры и искусств
Культура и коммуникация
Цель работы – исследование взаимосвязи культуры и коммуникации. Культурная ориентация на язык и идентичность оказывает решающее влияние на формирование личности и ее сосуществование в окружающей среде. В свою очередь, культуру можно изучать как систему значений, возникающих во время коммуникации, в которой речь, будучи знаковой системой культуры, используется как средство передачи сообщений. **Методология** исследования заключается в использовании таких методов исследования, как анализ и обобщение, в частности с целью раскрытия предположения о сходстве языков с замкнутой системой, утверждения о том, что языки представляют собой то, что мы могли бы назвать первой наукой, которую человечество постигает в своей жизни. В течение определенного периода времени носители языков через общение накапливают огромный багаж знаний, познают динамику экосистем, в которых они сосуществуют вместе с растениями и животными. **Научная новизна** работы заключается в расширении представлений о взаимосвязи феноменов «культура» – «язык» – «коммуникация» как форм сознания, которые отражают мировоззрение человека и являются формами воплощения материальной и духовной культуры народа. **Выводы.** Языки всегда реализуют себя через личности, которые «привязаны» к определенной местности, языки и территории существование которых связаны между собой. Носители языка также всегда зависят от культурного контекста.
Ключевые слова: культура, язык, коммуникация, символизм, универсальность, лексический состав, семантика, прагматика.

The actuality of the article. The evolution of human cultures is associated with the evolution of the ability for verbal language in humans. Human cultures are constructed from an understanding of shared intentionality, and language facilitates the creation of shared intentionality. Humans are intentional agents, having the ability to infer intentions in others, and language aids in our ability to communicate intentions, and our beliefs about the intentions of others, to each other quickly and efficiently. These abilities come together to help humans to form human cultures.

The aim of the article is to examine human cultures that have unique meaning and informational systems, being communicated across generations, to reveal that it is impossible to consider and understand human cultures without acknowledging the contribution that language makes to it.

The subject of the article is that human cultures exist precisely because of the ability to have language. Language helps us to create large social networks, larger than those found in nonhuman primates; to navigate those social networks quickly and efficiently; and to solve complex social coordination problems when they occur. Language is an incredibly important ability that allows us to do all of these tasks and activities. With the advent of language in humans, we are able to create meaning about the world around us in terms of symbols.

A country's flag, for instance, is a typically powerful symbol with the meaning, as the Bible or Koran. These cultural meanings are facilitated by language [4].

For this reason, language is a universal psychological ability in humans. All individuals have the capacity to develop language, and the vast majority of people all over the world indeed do so, with the exception of a very few individuals who are raised from childhood virtually in the total absence of other humans. All humans have an innate ability to acquire language, and although the exact mechanisms are not well understood, language acquisition does occur in all individuals.

All human societies have language, and language forms the basis for the creation and maintenance of human cultures. Now it is true that there are great differences among cultures in the type and use of language; some cultures, for example, have only an oral culture with no writing; many others is heavily dependent on written language. Regardless of these great differences, however, language is universal to all humans.

At the same time, while the ability to have language is universal to humans, each culture creates its own unique language. And in fact, language differences reflect important differences between cultures, and they also help to reinforce culture.

The Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, also referred to as linguistic relativity, suggests that speakers of different languages think differently, and that they do so because of the differences in their languages. Because different cultures typically have different languages, the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis is especially important for understanding cultural differences (and similarities) in thought and behaviour as a function of language [5].

The Sapir-Whorf hypothesis is important to verify, because if correct, it suggests that people of different cultures think differently, just by the very nature, structure, and function of their language. Their thought processes, their associations, their ways of interpreting the world – even the same events we perceive – may be different because they speak a different language and this language has helped shape their thought patterns. This hypothesis also suggests that people who speak more than one language may actually have different thought patterns when speaking different languages [4; 5].

Many studies have examined language–cognition issues since Edward Sapir and Benjamin Whorf first proposed their hypothesis in the 1950s. In one of the earliest language studies, Carroll and Casagrande [1] compared Navajo and English speakers. They examined the relationship between the system of shape classification in the Navajo language and the amount of attention children pay to shape when classifying objects. Similar to the Japanese language described earlier in this chapter, the Navajo language has the interesting grammatical feature that certain verbs of handling (for example, "to pick up," "to drop") require special linguistic forms depending on what kind of object is being handled. A total of 11 such linguistic forms describe different shapes – round spherical objects, round thin objects, long flexible things, and so forth. Noting how much more complex this linguistic feature is in Navajo than in English, Carroll and Casagrande suggested that such linguistic features might play a role in influencing cognitive processes [1].

At the same time, findings from other studies challenged the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis. For instance, Berlin and Kay [4] tested the claim that the continuous gradation of colour, which exists in nature is represented in language by a series of discrete categories.… There is nothing inherent, either in the spectrum or the human perception of it, which would compel its division in this way. The specific method of division is part of the structure of English. To test this claim, Berlin and Kay studied the distribution of colour terms in 20 languages. They asked international university students in the United States to list the "basic" colour terms in each of their native languages. They then asked these foreign students to identify from an array of glass colour chips the most typical or best examples of a basic colour term the researchers specified. Berlin and Kay found a limited number of basic colour terms in any language. They also found that the colour chips chosen as best examples of these basic terms tended to fall in clusters they termed focal points. In languages that had a basic term for bluish colours, the best example of the colour was found to be the same "focal blue" for speakers of all the languages. These findings suggested that people in different cultures perceive colours in much the same way despite radical differences in their languages [3; 4].

Berlin and Kay's findings were later confirmed by a series of experiments conducted by Rosch. In her experiments, Rosch [7] set out to test just how culturally universal these focal points were. She compared two languages that differ markedly in the number of basic colour terms: English, with multiple colour terms, and Dani, which has only two colour terms. Dani is the language spoken by a Stone Age tribe living in the highlands of Irian Jaya, Indonesian New Guinea.

One colour term, mili, was found to include both "dark" and "cold" colours (for example, black, green, and blue), while the second colour term, mola, included both "light" and "warm" colours (for example, white, red, and yellow). Rosch also explored the relationship between language and memory. She argued that if the Whorfian position were correct, Dani's lack of a rich colour lexicon would inhibit Dani speakers' ability to discriminate and

remember colours. As it happened, Dani speakers did not confuse colour categories any more than did speakers of English. Nor did Dani speakers perform differently from English speakers on memory tasks [3].

Berlin and Kay also examined 78 languages and found that 11 basic colour terms form a universal hierarchy. Some languages, such as English and German, use all 11 terms; others, such as Dani (New Guinea), use as few as two.

Other studies have challenged the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis and the idea of linguistic relativity .In a review concerning the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, Pinker [6] concluded that many of the earlier studies claiming linguistic relativity were severely flawed. He then pointed to the fact that we can think without words and language, suggesting that language does not necessarily determine our thoughts. He cited evidence of deaf children, who clearly think while lacking a language, but soon invent one; of isolated adults who grew up without language but still could engage in abstract thinking; how babies, who have no words, can still do very simple forms of arithmetic; and how thought is not just made up of words and language, but is also visual and nonverbal.

Perhaps the best way to make sense of this area of study comes from an analysis of the basic Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, published by Fishman years ago. Many studies of the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis read as if it were only one hypothesis; actually, there are several different Sapir-Whorf hypotheses. Fishman published a comprehensive breakdown of the most important ways the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis has been discussed. In his description, these different approaches are ordered in increasing levels of complexity.

Two factors determine the level at which a given version of the hypothesis might fall. The first factor relates to the particular aspect of language that is of interest – for example, the lexicon or the grammar. The second factor relates to the cognitive behaviour of the speakers of a given language – for example, cultural themes or non-linguistic data such as a decision-making task. Of the four levels, Level 1 is the least complex; Level 4 is the most complex. Levels 3 and 4 are actually closer to Whorf's original ideas in that they concern the grammar or syntax of language as opposed to its lexicon.

Scientific novelty. In order to examine the relationship between culture and language, it is useful first to identify the basic structure and features of language. There are five critical features of all languages:

1. The lexicon, or vocabulary, refers to the words contained in a language.

2. The syntax and grammar of a language refer to the system of rules governing word forms and how words should be strung together to form meaningful utterances.

3. Phonology refers to the system of rules governing how words should sound (pronunciation) in a given language.

4. Semantics refers to what words mean.

5. Pragmatics refers to the system of rules governing how language is used and understood in given social contexts.

There are two other useful concepts to understand the structure of language. Phonemes are the smallest and most basic units of sound in a language, and every culture creates its own set of phonemes that are required to vocalize words. Phonemes form the base of a language hierarchy in which language gains in complexity as sounds gain meaning, which in turn produces words, which are strung together in phrases and, finally, sentences. The inability to distinguish phonemes is often the basis of ethnic/cultural humour, and can be used to make judgments of ethnic/cultural identity, and or in-group versus out-group.

Morphemes are the smallest and most basic units of meaning in a language. Each culture has its own set of morphemes in its language.

All humans have the universal ability to acquire language. Although the precise mechanisms by which language acquisition occurs are still unknown, it appears that all human infants are born with the ability to make the same range of sounds.

Thus, human infants produce the same range of phonemes across cultures. Through interactions with others, infants' sound production is then shaped and reinforced so that certain sounds are encouraged while certain other sounds are discouraged.

These elemental sounds become associated with meanings (morphemes), and gradually are combined into words (lexicons) and sentences. In fact, the ability to create almost an infinite number of meaningful expressions from a finite set of elemental sounds is one of the characteristics that differentiates humans from non-human animals [2].

Culture, therefore, influences language acquisition from a very early stage, helping to shape the phonemes and morphemes of a language and the creation of words. Culture provides the rules by which words are said (phonology), and strung together to form meaningful statements (syntax and grammar). Culture also provides the rules by which meaning is derived from words and statements (semantics), and the rules by which language is used in different social contexts (pragmatics). The influence of culture on language, therefore, is pervasive. Through the use of language, an individual is transformed into an agent of the culture. The feelings, associations, connotations, and nuances of language both influence and are influenced by the culture. Over time, an individual embodies the very essence of culture via language, and in using the language, he or she reinforces that language's concepts of culture.

And llanguages differ in many ways across cultures. This complex system of self-other referents occurs in many other languages as well and reflects important cultural differences. In different cultures, language, mannerisms, and other aspects of behaviour must be modified according to the relationship and context under which the communication is occurring. The most important dimensions along which behaviour and language are

differentiated are often status and group orientation. All aspects of behaviour differ depending on whether one person is higher or lower in status than the other person in the conversation. Also, behaviour and language differ depending on whether the other person is a member of your in-group or not. Thus, the choice of appropriate self- and other-referents in these languages reflects important aspects of those cultures. For this reason, it is generally easy to identify the status relationship between individuals in how they use the self-other referent system.

Counting systems provide another example of how culture influences the structure of a language. In the Japanese language, for example, as in many languages, different words are used to denote different things being counted. For some reason, some cultures found it important to describe their physical world differently when counting objects in that world.

Many languages base their number system on a base 10 system, with unique words for the numbers one through ten. Eleven is often counted 10-1, twelve is 10-2, twenty is 2-10, etc. In English, however, numbers 1 through 19 are unique, and an additive system similar to other languages starts at 20 [4].

When considering cultural differences in lexicons, one cannot help but notice that different cultures have words for things that do not exist in some languages. These are very interesting, especially if we understand language as a system, created by cultures to slice up and partition their environments. If a word exists in a language, therefore, that does not exist in others, then that concept was important enough in that culture to have justified having its own word to refer to it. Thus, it's not the concept that does or does not exist; it's that the word that represents the concept may or may not exist across cultures.

Culture affects not only the language lexicons, but also pragmatics – that is, the rules governing how language is used and understood in different social contexts. In many languages, for instance, it is common to drop first- and second-person pronouns (I/we and you) from sentences; this occurs more frequently in collectivistic cultures, and it is thought that meaning can be inferred from the context in such cultures much more than in individualistic cultures [3], which require very direct statements.

There are cultural variations in how people of different cultures speak to others depending on their relationship, as well as in how people of different cultures give apologies, give personal narratives, self-disclose, give compliments, and give criticism. Many of these cultural differences in pragmatics can be summarized in terms of communication style. Some languages are very direct others very indirect. Some languages are very succinct and precise; others very elaborate and extended. Some cultures are very contextual, that is, important meanings are conveyed in the context within which language occurs, or in the way in which it is delivered, relative to the actual content of the speech [4].

Consequently, some cultures are high-context cultures with high-context languages, whiles others are low-context. Some languages have specific forms for honorific speech, which are specific language forms that denote status differences among interactants, conferring higher status to others while at the same time acknowledging one's lower status when appropriate, and vice versa.

The relationship between language and thought processes is particularly important to the cross-cultural study of language because each culture is associated with a given language as a vehicle for its expression.

Conclusion. Language loops into the so-called real world. Humans are good observers, and one of the reasons to preserve endangered languages is that they represent what we might call the first science, and their speakers possess vast stores of knowledge, built up over time, about the dynamics of the ecosystems they inhabit along with the local plants and animals with which they share that ecosystem. Because languages are always embodied in individuals who are embedded in places, languages and landscapes are connected. Speakers are also always embedded in cultural contexts as different languages might include grammatical information about social status.

Cultural practices emerge and develop in particular settings, just as linguistic structures both support and are supported by cultural practices. Syntactic and grammatical differences between languages provide some evidence for the claim that language influences cognition. Perhaps stronger evidence will be found in future studies of how the pragmatic systems of different languages influence speakers' thought processes.

References

1. Anderesen J. T., Carter Ph. M. (2016). Languages in the world : how history, culture, and politics shape language. The Atrium: Southern Gate, Chichester, West Sussex [in English].

2. Carroll J. B., Casagrande, J. B. (1958). The function of language classifications in behavior. In E. E. Maccoby, T. M. Newcomb, E. L. Hartley (Eds.), Readings in social psychology, 18–31 [in English].

3. Fitch W. T., Hauser, M. D. (2004). Computational constraints of syntactic processing in a nonhuman primate. Science, 303, 377–380 [in English].

4. Matsumoto D., Juang L. (2013). Culture and Psychology. 5th Edition.
San Francisco State University, Belmont: Wadsworth Cengage Learning [in English].

5. Moore Jerry D. (2009). "Edward Sapir: Culture, Language, and the Individual" in Visions of Culture: an Introduction to Anthropological Theories and Theorists, Walnut Creek, California: Altamira [in English].

6. Pinker S. (1995). The language instinct: How the mind creates language. New York: HarperCollins [in English].

7. Rosch E. (1978). Principles of categorization. In E. Rosch & B. B. Lloyd (Eds.), Cognition and categorization. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 28–48 [in English].