У якості матеріалу дослідження взяті тексти інтерв'ю, інтерактивного спілкування представників різних музичних субкультур. Слід зауважити, що лексичні запозичення в музичному дискурсі більшою мірою виконують номінативну функцію, що викликано процесами глобалізації, але нас, насамперед, цікавить функціонування запозичень з урахуванням цілей, соціальних характеристик, інтенцій адресанта й позиції адресата. Певним чином адресант пропонує адресату декодувати інформацію й залучитися до своєї соціальної групи. Лексеми ж виступають посередником, який об'єднує комунікантів.

Висновками дослідження стало виявлення таких функціональних особливостей запозиченої лексики, як: демонстрація належності представників музичної субкультури до світу шоу-бізнесу, де підставою виступають прагматичні інтенції; наслідок американізації в сучасних умовах глобалізації світу та демонстрація певних ознак американської культури як характеристики музичного поняття; створення окремого простору, де реалізується прагнення учасників музичної комунікації передати через латинську графіку достовірне написання запозиченої лексики (це назви музичних груп, альбомів, лейблів, проектів, премій тощо) з метою уникнення неправильної вимови й наслідування закордонних засновників музичного явища, а також приналежності до цієї музики.

Дана тема бачиться перспективною для подальшого дослідження в плані вивчення мовної особистості дискурсу музичної субкультури.

Ключові слова: музичний дискурс, дискурс музичної субкультури, комунікація, лексичне запозичення, функціонування.

N. Malovana
A. Yusiuk

FACE SAVING ASPECTS IN INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION

The paper touches upon the aspects of saving face in intercultural communication. Eight basic strategies for conflict behaviour have been identified that depend on the nature and psychotype of the person. In addition, the main patterns for human behaviour in intercultural communication are established, the peculiarities of politeness are described on the examples of South Korea, Germany and Ukraine. Moreover, the main non-verbal signs are described and how they are perceived by the contextuality of the countries of the world. As a result, general rules are established that will help save face in case of arguing, fractions rows or conflicts.

Key words: saving face, face-saving strategy, intercultural communication, non-verbal features, behaviour in conflict situations.

Formulation of the problem. In the social space, the relationship between a person and the outside world is the basis of the life of everyone, since its development and, directly, activity depends not only on heredity, but also on the surrounding society. In modern conditions, globalization processes have penetrated into all spheres of human activity, leaving

no doubt that there is a need for interaction between representatives of different nations. This applies both to the macro level, for example, when conducting a business, an international trade, a political interaction between different countries of the world, conducting a scientific research, etc., and to the micro level, for example, when studying together with students from different parts of the world, travelling and resting abroad, and so on. Therefore, for any successful cooperation and interaction, knowledge and skills on the correct pattern of communication with different people are required. However, it is obvious that a communicative interaction is often accompanied by the emergence of disputes and conflict situations due to the fact that each person is an individual with certain views, beliefs, values, which together form a subjective picture of the world, but it may differ from representatives of other cultures. However, even in case of conflict, everyone has to be able to save their face, because otherwise there is a threat of loss of reputation and social defeat.

The **aim** of the work is to study and highlight the main aspects of face saving, taking into view intercultural features in the communication process, using the theoretical method.

Analysis of recent research and publications. A trigger for a conflict or misunderstanding can be a language barrier or a difference in cultures and communication styles. In this case, it is crucial: the knowledge of how to properly build intercultural communication, taking into account the peculiarities of the behavior of other nations, as well as the knowledge of face saving aspects, which are primarily aimed at preventing and resolving conflicts [4, p. 7–23].

Scientist S. Ting-Toomey, who has researched cross-cultural communication in the context of saving face, views conflict as a situation that requires active self-management or facework of two interrelated parties to the conflict [15, p. 325–330].

This theory is largely based on the research of American sociolinguists Penelope Brown and Stephen Levinson, who express a «saving face» as a form of politeness and a show of respect for another person's needs. Moreover, they argued that the individual's ideas about his own or someone else's «face» are emotionally coloured, and so that the «face» can be lost, saved or improved [3, p. 56–68]. Brown and Levinson use the concept of a «face» as proposed by Irving Hoffman, who in turn noted that «maintaining and saving a face» is a problem for managing one's own image. In his theory, a «face» is a metaphor for self-perception [5, p. 68–81].

Moreover, S. Ting-Toomey confirms the face as a metaphor for self-esteem and a personal image. She claims that such an interpretation came from two conceptualizations of the Chinese linguistic picture of the world: *lien* and *mianzi* (*mien-tzu*). *Lien* – is the person's internal moral state or internal «moral appearance», which concerns such characteristic problems as shame, honesty, neglect, and the question of honour. *Mien-tzu* – is an external social «face», which provides for features such as a social recognition and a social status, as well as authority, influence and power [16, p. 187–191].

It should be emphasized that despite numerous studies and efforts, scientists have failed to generally conceptualize face saving aspects and the behavior of a person in the situation of uncertainty and a low predictability of intercultural communication, since there is still no clear understanding of what psychological processes and mechanisms lie in the basis of an effective intercultural interaction [13, p. 10].

However, noone should underestimate the results of Western, especially North American, studies in this area. For example, given the main ontological, epistemological and axiological assumptions of self-management theories, in particular face saving, E. Hall argues that different perceptions of the world affect behaviour in conflict situations, but despite this, people by their very nature are able to negotiate and get out of difficult situations with their heads raised and their faces saved [7, p. 4]. In addition, West R.

and Turner L. argue that in order to save face not only in life but also in intercultural communications, it is necessary to put yourself in the place of the opposite side, to look at the situation from its point of view. It helps to look at things and situations from different angles, which makes a wider perception of the world, and this in turn positively affects the further ability to easily get out of the conflict and effective intercultural communication without losing «face»[18, p. 36–51].

Analysis and results of the study. Each person has two sides of his «I»: the first is known only to the person himself, the second is presented to the outside world, actually on this side, others define him / her as a person, or in other words – this is your «face». According to Face Negotiation Theory, a «face» is positioned as a self-esteem or public image that each person uses in the process of interacting with other people [11, p. 599–604]. Given the fact, that the culture to which a person belongs affects his behaviour, then in the course of a conflict situation, it tends to be reflected through a certain reaction. There are two types of such cultures: collectivistic and individualistic. Collectivists, in order to resolve the conflict, make concessions and show courtesy, while individualists – trying to prove their case and mostly, in the event of a conflict – are aggressive [14, p. 15–23]. Therefore, there are five main styles of behavior in conflict situations, on the basis of which can be determined how to save face [9, p. 309–325]:

1. *Dominating* – a situation in which, with the help of power and force, forces an opponent to surrender and retreat.

2. *Avoiding* – avoiding topics or conflict situations in general.

3. *Obliging* – a high level of interest on the one hand in resolving the conflict, that is, a low level of self-care and a high level of concern for others.

4. *Compromising* – mutual concessions to reach an interim agreement.

5. *Integrating* – closing decision, which includes high self-care and high care for another person, that is, a combination of cooperation and compromise.

To these basic models, S. Ting-Toomey added three more [17, p. 89–92].

1. *Emotional expression-articulating* – forming people's feelings in order to fight and control the conflict.

2. *Third party help* – resolving conflicts by attracting an additional help for communication management.

3. *Passive aggressive* – reaction to the conflict in a roundabout way, indirect charge.

In the event of a conflict, the «face» carries the threat of suffering, and thus, a person seeks or tries to save his «face». S. Ting-Toomey uses the concept of facework, which is the choice of patterns of communicative behavior that are used to express oneself, support one's own positive image, and also support or challenge the positive image of another person [16, p. 193–195].

This theory assumes that [17, p. 93–98]:

1. In all cultures, communication is based on the desire to save a «face» in the process of communication.

2. The concept of saving a «face» is especially problematic in a situation of uncertainty (requirement, complaint, conflict), when the identities of the communication participants are questioned or doubted.

3. Representatives of individualistic cultures pay more attention to their own «face», while representatives of collectivist cultures – on «face» of the opponent.

4. Cultures with a long distance from power are characterized by the advantage of a hierarchical structure, while cultures with a small distance from power prefer the system of equality of people.

5. The participant's concern about own «face» or the partner's «face» depends on cultural norms and individual characteristics, as well as on situational factors.

6. Caring for the «face» influences behaviour in group and intercultural conflict.

7. The main cause of intercultural conflict is a lack of understanding or lack of knowledge about another culture.

Considering the fact that intercultural conflict requires active management of the «face» of two interconnected participants, then according to this concept two focuses can be distinguished [7, p. 34–40]:

1. When trying to save face, efforts are directed to their own image and individualistic attitudes;

2. When trying to save face, efforts are directed to the image of another person and collectivist values.

For example, in individualistic cultures such as the United States, Germany, and the United Kingdom, personal rights, freedom, and the concept «do-it-yourself» are of great importance. In collectivist cultures such as Japan, Saudi Arabia and Colombia, more emphasis is placed on «we» versus «I». In this regard, in the framework of this theory, there are two strategies for an individual's behaviour in a conflict situation: one is aimed at supporting respect for oneself, and the other is at supporting respect for the other [10, p. 23–41].

From the point of view of the ways of expressing the principles of courtesy in different languages, they depend on the structure of the society in which these languages operate and on the models of social behaviour accepted in them [3, p. 14–21].

For example, in modern Korean, the politeness category has four degrees, which have a set of grammatical and lexical indicators: the official language; spoken language between equals; speech addressed to a subordinate (or younger in age), but not without importance; speech is addressed to the child and familiar. These degrees are used depending on who the person is talking to, and also reflect the relationship of one person to another. In German and Ukrainian there are two levels – the official («Sie / Ви») and informal or conversational («du / ти»), at the same time, the English-language culture is characterized by greater freedom, using «you» in both cases, the specific translation of which depends on the context and situation. Misunderstanding or incorrect use of appeals to a person in the process of intercultural communication may cause an aggressive reaction and hence a conflict situation, therefore, these cultural characteristics must be taken into view.

In addition, it should be noted that more than half of all transmitted verbally contains non-verbal features, that vary significantly depending on culture and country of origin. Cultures are divided into highly contextual and low contextual, focusing on the fact that difficulties in implementing intercultural communication arise not because of a language code or a set of characters, but through a context containing several meanings. Without context, the code is incomplete, imperfect, because it is only a part of the message being transmitted [6, p. 48–50].

Highly contextual cultures (China, Japan, South Korea, Greece, France, etc.) rely heavily on non-verbal communication, using elements such as behavior, reaction, appearance, hierarchy, status to convey the meaning of their statements. Representatives of this type are more restrained in emotions, that is, to them the open expression of negativity is atypical. For example, even in the most difficult situations, the Chinese and Japanese pretend that nothing has happened. This behavior is explained by a cohesive and stable cultural system [6, p. 51]. From a linguistic point of view, high contextuality is also expressed in writing, since, for example, one character can have several meanings, as well as its own writing history.

Low contextual cultures (America, England, Canada, Australia, Germany, etc.), on the contrary, use a sign or sound – letter code to convey a certain meaning

of the message, that means, that great importance is given to words, not context. Communication of representatives of these cultures is characterized by straightforwardness, openness, concreteness of the expression of their thoughts. Relationships usually begin and end quickly, and hierarchies are more «relaxed» [6, p. 52–56].

It is important to note that there is no «best» or «worst» culture, there are only intercultural differences. So non-verbal communication can take many forms.

Next, the main ones will be considered [2, p. 6–28]:

1. *Eye contact*. In many Asian cultures, avoiding eye contact is considered a sign of respect. However, in English and European cultures, eye contact is considered important for the transmission of equality between people.

2. *Touch*. In America, a handshake is considered acceptable to greet a stranger or other business partner. However, in France, with a greeting, it is customary to kiss on both cheeks. In North America, touching the heads of children is the norm. Yet in Asia this is considered extremely inappropriate, since the head is considered a sacred part of the body.

3. *Gestures*. In the USA, the symbolic OK gesture is often used to show that everything is good or clear. In Japan, the same sign means «money». Argentines, Belgians, French, and Portuguese use it to mean «zero» or «nothing». At the same time, other countries of Eastern Europe consider this sign offensive.

4. *Paralinguistics*. As an emphasis, pitch range, volume or articulation. In the UK, for example, people use loud speech to convey anger, while in India they use it to attract attention. The Greeks use silence as a way to abandon things, while the Egyptians use it to give consent. Some cultures (for example, in Asia) are generally more sensitive to long silence than others.

There are other cultural barriers such as religion, political outlook, life priorities, age, and so on. However, intercultural communication is not only a barrier but also an opportunity for creativity, new perspectives and openness to new ideas and unity in the world. For effective communication, the causes of cultural barriers should be eliminated as much as possible in order to improve mutual understanding, and thus, more effectively save their own «face» in the process of conflict. At a practical level, understanding and accepting the fact, that an effective communication strategy begins with the realization that each culture is individual and has its own distinctive differences that should be taken into account in the process of communicative act. The ability to provide other social groups with knowledge about the characteristics of intercultural communication forms a respect for a foreign-speaking society, promotes positive interaction by finding a compromise or integration style of communication. Thus, the basic knowledge of cultural differences, their development and dissemination, in turn, is the key to effective intercultural communication [11, p. 605–608].

In addition to the above information, which comes down to the fact, that it is necessary to understand better cultural characteristics, it is possible to highlight some simple rules on how to prevent conflict, or if it is impossible, how to save face [12, p. 549–556]:

1. Set a friendly tone for the conversation.

2. Do not convince your opponent that you are right – it is useless. Instead, try to argue your position or to agree.

3. Disagreements themselves do not hurt people in the same way that they are expressed, so choose your words carefully.

4. Take a time out, at least for 20 minutes, and then return to the discussion with a cold mind.

5. Try to clearly understand what your opponent's claims are.

6. Be sure to ask again if you understood each other correctly. It happens that the argument has no grounds at all – the whole problem is that someone misunderstood someone.

7. Try to translate the conflict as a joke. It can quench a storm of emotions.

8. Try not to give in to emotions, but to approach the conflict carefully.

9. If you are wrong, admit it and apologize.

As Edward Hall noted in his great work, «culture is communication and communication is culture» [7, p. 39], that is the absolute truth, since it is extremely difficult to master this skill perfectly, however whoever succeeds in doing this, will be able to achieve their cherished goals.

Conclusion. To sum up, finding an approach and actions to preserve the face in intercultural communication depends on the nature and chosen strategy of human behavior, as different types have their own characteristics. Thus, there are individualistic and collectivist approaches, and among the possible strategies should be noted: aggression, third-party assistance, emotional expression, compromise, avoiding conflict.

In addition, an important criterion for the saving «face» is to understand the existence of cultural differences, so before someone shows a nonverbal sign, they need to clearly understand what it means for people from another culture. Also, an important factor in saving the «face» is the formation of tolerance, by increasing their own erudition: the development and dissemination of knowledge about the world.

In case of misunderstandings and conflicts, specific rules of communication are needed, namely compromise and integration, which will help mitigate or prevent possible loss of face. Among them are to take a short break during the conflict, change the tone of the conversation, do not give in to emotions, admit your own mistakes.

The **prospects** for further research are to introduce intercultural learning into a system of enterprises operating internationally for employees, with the aim of realizing cultural relativism and fostering intercultural tolerance, which are the main aspects of «face» saving, for further cooperation with foreign partners.

References

1. Akert R. Words and everything else : Verbal and nonverbal cues in social interpretation / R. Akert, D. Archer // Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. – 1977. – Vol. 35, Issue 6. – P. 443–449.

2. Bellugi U. The Signs of Language / U. Bellugi, E. Klima. – Cambridge : Harvard University Press, 1979. – 417 p.

3. Brown P. Universals in language usage : Politeness phenomenon / P. Brown, S. Levinson // Questions and politeness : Strategies in social interaction. – Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1978. – P. 56–311.

4. Deardoff D. K. Intercultural competence in the 21st century : Perspectives, issues, application / D. K. Deardoff // Creating Cultural Synergies : Multidisciplinary Perspectives on Interculturality and Interreligiosity / Ed. by B. Breninger, Th. Kaltenbacher. – Cambridge : Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2012 – P. 7–23.

5. Goffman E. The Nature of Deference and Demeanor // Goffman E. Interaction ritual: essays on face-to-face interaction / E. Goffman. – Oxford, England : Aldine, 1967. – P. 47–97.

6. Hall E. T. Beyond Culture / E. T. Hall. – New York : Anchor Books, 1989. – P. 48–56.

7. Hall E. T. The silent language / E. T. Hall. – Garden City ; New York : Doubleday, 1959. – 240 p.

8. Hopkins A. Face Management Theory : Modern Conceptualizations and Future Directions, in : Inquiries Journal. – 2015. – Vol. 7, № 4. – P. 1– 6.

9. Kilmann R. Developing a forced-choice measure of conflict-handling behavior : The 'Mode' Instrument / R. Kilmann, K. Thomas // Educational and Psychological Measurement. – 1977. – Vol. 37, Issue 2. – P. 309–325.

10. Littlejohn S. W. Theories of Human Communication / S. W. Littlejohn, K. A. Foss. – 9th ed. – Belmont : Wadsworth Cengage Learning, 2008. – 395 p.

11. Oetzel J. Face concerns in interpersonal conflict : A cross-cultural empirical test of the face negotiation theory / J. Oetzel, S. Ting-Toomey // Communication Research. – 2003. – Vol. 30, Issue 6. – P. 599–608.

12. Sapir E. The unconscious patterning of behavior in society // Sapir E. Selected Writings of Edward Sapir in Language, Culture, and Personality / E. Sapir, ed. By D. G. Mandelbaum. – Berkeley ; Los Angeles : University of California Press ; London : Cambridge University Press, 1949. – P. 549–556.

13. Soldatova G. U. Reflection upon multiplicity of choice in psychology of intercultural communication / G. U. Soldatova, L. A. Shaigerova // Психологические исследования. – 2015. – Т. 8, № 40. – С. 10.

14. Sosik J. Work-Group Characteristics and Performance in Collectivistic and Individualistic Cultures / J. Sosik, D. Jung // The Journal of Social Psychology. – 2002. – Vol. 142, Issue 1. – P. 15–23.

15. Ting-Toomey S. Conflict Facework Theory / S. Ting-Toomey // The Sage Encyclopedia of intercultural Competence / ed. J. M. Bennett. – Los Angeles: Sage Publications, 2015. – P. 325–330.

16. Ting-Toomey S. Facework competence in intercultural conflict : An updated face negotiation theory / S. Ting-Toomey, A. Kurogi // International Journal of Intercultural Relations. – 1998. – Vol. 22, Issue 2. – P. 187–195.

17. Ting-Toomey S. The Matrix of Face An Updated Face Negotiation Theory / S. Ting-Toomey // Theorizing about intercultural communication / ed. by W. Gudykunst // Thousand Oaks : Sage 2005. – P. 71–98.

18. West R. L. Introducing communication theory : Analysis and application / R. L. West, L. H. Turner. – 4th ed. – New York : McGraw-Hill, 2010. – 533 p.

Submitted May 09th, 2020.

Н. В. Мальована
А. М. Юсюк

АСПЕКТИ ЗБЕРЕЖЕННЯ ОБЛИЧЧЯ У МІЖКУЛЬТУРНІЙ КОМУНІКАЦІЇ

У соціальному просторі відносини між людьми є основою життя кожного, оскільки її розвиток та, безпосередньо, діяльність залежать не лише від спадковості, але й від оточення. У сучасних умовах взаємодія відбувається при здійсненні бізнесу, міжнародної торгівлі, політичної діяльності між різними країнами світу, проведенням наукових досліджень тощо. Тому для успішної співпраці та взаємодії потрібні знання та вміння щодо правильної побудови спілкування з різними людьми. Однак очевидно, що комунікативна взаємодія часто супроводжується виникненням суперечок та конфліктних ситуацій через те, що кожна людина – це особа з певними поглядами, переконаннями, цінностями, які разом утворюють суб'єктивну картину світу, яка може відрізнятися від представників інших культур. Однак, навіть у випадку конфлікту, кожен може зберегти своє обличчя, бо в іншому випадку існує загроза втрати репутації та соціальної поразки. Дана стаття присвячена аналізу аспектів збереження обличчя у міжкультурній комунікації, а також встановленню основних

стратегій поведінки людини при конфлікті. Так, на основі попередніх досліджень було ідентифіковано 8 стратегій поведінки, які залежать від характеру і психотипу людини. В залежності від яких, підбираються відповідні стратегії збереження обличчя. Окрім цього, у даній статті встановлено загальні патерни поведінки людини в міжкультурній комунікації, які допоможуть зберегти обличчя при спілкуванні з представниками різних націй. В залежності від підходу до збереження обличчя при міжкультурній комунікації виділяються дві категорії держав світу, а саме з індивідуалістичним або колективістським підходами. Так, у Німеччині, Великій Британії та інших індивідуалістичних країнах треба враховувати більшу свободу людей, та той факт, що вони сподіваються тільки на себе. Японія, Саудівська Аравія та інші колективістські держав у свою чергу віддають перевагу «ми», а не «я». Окрім цього, було описано особливості ввічливості на прикладі Південної Кореї, Німеччини та України, а також основні невербальні знаки та як вони сприймаються згідно з контекстуальністю країн світу. Високо контекстуальні держави, такі як Японія, Греція, Франція, Китай віддають перевагу невербальним знакам перед словами, в той час як Німеччина, США, Англія, Австралія, які належать до категорії низько контекстуальних країн, покладаються на слова, а не на невербальні прояви. Наприкінці статті було встановлено загальні правила, які допоможуть зберегти обличчя вже при виниклому конфлікті. Серед яких можна виділити: зробити невелику паузу у разі виникнення конфлікту, змінити тон розмови, не піддаватися емоціям, визнавати власні помилки.

У підсумку було встановлено, що кожна нація має свої відмінності та підходи при збереженні обличчя, тому при взаємодії з представниками різних культур потрібно брати до уваги їх особливості, а для цього потрібно розвивати ерудицію і проявляти толерантність.

Ключові слова: збереження обличчя, стратегії збереження обличчя, міжкультурна комунікація, невербальні знаки, поведінка в конфліктних ситуаціях.

УДК 811.112.2'42:7.038.6

M. Marchenko

LINGUOSTILISTISCHE ZÜGE DES IDIOSTILS VON H. M. ENZENSBERGER ALS MARKER DER POSTMEDERNE

Im angeführten Artikel wird die poetische Rede der Postmoderne anhand des Idiostils untersucht. In dieser Rede werden verwickelte Inhalte angekoppelt, die dann explizit und implizit verbalisiert sind. Dadurch entsteht ein Hypertext, der inhaltlich und sprachlich zu intensiv und emotiv dem Empfänger vermittelt wird. In diesem Zusammenhang lässt der Idiosti zu erforschen, wie diese poetische Rede der Postmoderne sprachlich kodiert wird und welche Prozesse vom Empfänger in Gang zu setzen wären. Im Grunde dieser Forschung liegt der Idiostil vom Repräsentanten der deutschen Postmoderne und nämlich H. M. Enzensberger. In seinem Idiostil ist die sprachliche Verkörperung der postmodernen Inhalte in der poetischen Rede anschaulich dargestellt.

Schlüsselwörter: Postmoderne, poetische Rede, Idiostil, Hypertext, Empfänger, Textproduzent, Kommunikation, Umweltwahrnehmung, Periode, Apodosis, Protasis