

simple forms, while relatively complex concepts are generally expressed by relatively complex language structures. In other words, the complexity of language structures reflects the complexity of concepts, the different forms of verbs reflect the different degrees of conceptual complexity. The relatively complex “V + 一 + Quantifier” in the predicate part has become more complex in form than the bare pole verbs used alone. At the same time, it also reflects the conceptual complexity: in addition to the function of bare pole verbs to refer to action, it also adds the meaning of Quantifier, which leads to pragmatic differences.

Difference between “homogeneity” and “heterogeneity” on action. The zero form of the verb used in the sentence refers to the action, because there is no other additional content, it only refers to the action without emphasizing the starting point and ending point of the action, therefore, “V” indicates the constant of the action which is showing homogeneity in result.

If other components are added after the verb, then this relatively complex form represents the corresponding relatively complex concept. The verb “V” plus “一下” has an impact on the constant Quantifier of the action, making the Quantifier of the action have a certain degree of flexibility. For example, the process of the action can be long or short, and the number of actions can be more or less. Although the amount of action is relatively vague at this time, from the overall perspective of the action, the “V + 一下” language structure can still depict the starting point and ending point of the action on the time axis. Therefore, the “V” in the “V + 一下” structure has a certain “heterogeneity”.

Difference between “certainty” and “uncertainty” of tasks. As mentioned above, “V” represents the constant quantity of action, while “V + 一下” represents the state of action change. Reflected in the request sentence, “V” represents the “certainty” of the task, while “V + 一下” represents the “uncertainty” of the task.

Lu Fubo and Wu Ying believe that “V”’s non delay performance strengthens the decidedness of action and task determination, and prolongs the length of predicate movement at once [4, p. 40—45]. While limiting a small amount, it obviously has the effect of soothing tone and weakens the certainty of task.” For example:

11) 请随手关门。

11) Please, close the door behind you.

12) 请随手关一下门。

12) Please, close the door behind you.

In example 11, the speaker asks the hearer to do the action “close”, there is no limit on the amount of action, no other content is added, but the hearer is required to complete the action as required. Therefore, this request is beyond doubt and does not give the hearer room for negotiation. “Close the door” in example 12 vaguely depicts the amount of the verb “close” in example 11, which means that the listener has room to discount the enforceability of executing the discourse. This “room” can include at least two choices: one is the choice between off and off; second, the choice of the seriousness of closing the door. At this time, the speaker only highlights the delay of the sentence and ignores the certainty of the task. Because it prolongs the length of the predicate, it has the function of delaying the mood.

Conclusion. To sum up, the pragmatic meaning of “一下” is embodied in the “V + 一下” format, in which “一下” changes the constant of the verb and plays a role in soothing the tone.

References

1. *Leech, G. Semantics* / G. Leech. — Harmondsworth : Penguin, 1974. — P. 85.
2. *Grice, H. P. Logic and Conversation* / H. P. Grice // *Syntax and semantics 3: speech acts* / P. Cole, J. Morgan (eds.). — New York : Academic Press, 1975. — P. 22.
3. *Gao, P. Research on Grammaticalization of “一下”* / P. Gao // *Gansu Social Sciences*. — Lanzhou : Gansu academy of social sciences, 2008. — № 4. — P. 58—61.
4. *Lu, F. The pragmatic differences of V, V 一下, VV in the request sentence* / F. Lu, Y. Wu // *Language teaching and research*. — Beijing : Beijing language and culture university, 2005. — № 5. — P. 40—45.

UDC 378.14

Jianghui Song

Lanzhou University of Finance and Economics, Foreign Language School, the People’s Republic of China, maggiesjh@sina.com

CULTURAL SHOCK AS PROBLEM OR AS LEARNING/GROWTH?

This paper aims to clarify the misunderstanding of the function of cultural shock and highlight the growth perspective of it by summarizing the major research findings and outlining the research prospects in related disciplines. Having analyzed the positive and negative influence of cultural shock on a person’s adaptation and personal growth, the author concludes that cultural shock can be viewed upon as a trigger for cross-cultural adaptation process.

Key words: cultural shock; adaption; growth; self-awareness.

КУЛЬТУРНЫЙ ШОК — ПРОБЛЕМА ИЛИ УСЛОВИЕ ОБУЧЕНИЯ/РОСТА?

Данная статья проясняет неправильное понимание функции культурного шока и освещает его с точки зрения личностного роста, обобщая основные результаты исследований и определяя перспективу дальнейших исследований в смежных областях науки. Проанализировав положительное и отрицательное влияние культурного шока на адаптацию и личностный рост человека, автор приходит к выводу, что культурный шок можно рассматривать как триггер процесса кросс-культурной адаптации.

Ключевые слова: культурный шок; адаптация; рост; самосознание.

Introduction. With the globalization of the world economy, it is imperative that people be sensitive to differences in intercultural communication. Countless people are on the move across cultural boundaries on the long-term or on the short-term basis, they inevitably encounter culture shock. In the process of adaptation to the new culture, some people regard it negative and choose to withdraw from the new culture and return home. Whereas, some people consider it positive and adapt appropriate coping strategies to integrate into the new culture. A multitude of researchers have focused on the difficulties and how to solve the problems ensued. While some other scholars highlight the learning or growing process in adaptation during culture shock. Therefore, it is necessary to explore the complex nature of the phenomenon manifests itself in the variety of existing conceptions and research findings to clarify the function of cultural shock in intercultural communication.

Main part. Basic understanding of cultural shock. Cultural shock is especial experience when a person encounters he or she moves in to a new. Cultural shock generally goes through five phases: excitement or initial euphoria, crisis or disenchantment, adjustment, acceptance, and reentry. Cultural shock has been visualized as being demonstrated by a U-curve. The top of the left side of the curve represents the positive beginning and the crisis stage starts down the left side to the base of the U curve. The adjustment stage begins at the base of the curve, then acceptance moves up the right side of the curve, and reentry into the original culture, which is at the top of the right side of the curve [1, p. 115—131]. Some investigators expand the U-curve theory into the W-curve theory, which explains the adaption of the reentry phase. It indicates that reentry actually forms a second U-curve, with a repetition of the stages experienced during initial adjustment to the foreign culture. By combing these two curves, a “W” is produced [2, p. 76].

The first stage is excitement with new culture, which is referred as the honeymoon, during which people’s enthusiasm for a new culture causes them to overlook minor problems. It can last only a few days or several months. The second phrase is crisis period, during which excitement has turned into disenchantment stages as more problems arise. This stage can last from a few weeks to several months. During the third stage, the adjustment phrase, a person begins to accept the new culture or return home. Those who stay will make adjustments in behavior to accommodate the new culture. In the fourth phrase, the acceptance or adaptation phrase, a person feels at home in new culture, becomes involved in the activities of the culture, cultivate friendships in the new culture, and feel comfortable in social situation with people from the host culture. The final phrase is reentry shock, which is as similar as the initial adjustment to a new culture. Reentry shock is experienced on returning to the home country and may follow the stage identified earlier: initial euphoria, crisis or disenchantment, adjustment, and adaptation.

Problem-oriented perspective. Many investigators have tended to view cultural shock a communication problem that involves the frustration of not understanding the verbal and nonverbal communication of the host culture, its customs, and its values systems. They consider adaptation experience mainly as difficulties in terms of the outcome they present, justifying their studies as scientific efforts to find ways to ease such trauma. Concern for the problematic nature of cross-cultural adaptation has been a driving force behind many researchers. This problem-oriented perspective of cross-cultural adaptation is most commonly-found in studies of cultural shock which almost mainly focus on individuals’ frustration responses to their new surroundings [3, p. 293—328]. Early studies examined the stress of isolation marginality. Taft [4, p. 121—153] identified four common reactions to cultural adaptation, namely, cultural fatigue as demonstrated by irritability, insomnia, and other psychosomatic disorders; a sense of loss stemming from being away from familiar environment; rejection by members of the new surroundings; a feeling of impotence arising from the inability to cope with a new society effectively. Zaharna [5, p. 501—525] expanded the discussion of cultural shock the concept of self-shock, focusing on the double-binding challenge of identity. Many subsequent researchers have analyzed acculturation strain and mental health clinical issues.

Growth-oriented perspective. On the other hand, many other investigators have focused the learning and growth-oriented nature of adaptation process. Investigators agree that all individuals entering a new and unfamiliar culture under some degree of new cultural learning, that is, the acquisition of the native cultural practices in wild ranging areas, particularly in area of direct relevance to the daily functioning of the resettles from attire and food habit to behavioral norms and cultural values. The re-socialization activities are the very essence of acculturation, consistent. The change in individuals whose primary learning has been in one culture and who take over traits from another culture. As new learning occurs, deculturation of some of the old cultural habits has to occur, at least in the sense that new responses are adopted in situations that previously would have inspired old ones. The act of acquiring something new is inevitably the losing of something old in much the same way as being someone else. As the interplay of acculturation and decultura-

tion continues, new comers undergo internal transformation, a state of the highest degree of acculturation and deculturation theoretically possible.

Substantial academic interest is both found in short-term and long-term adaptation. Studies of temporary sojourners began increasing in number during the 1960s, prompted by the Peace Corps movement, the increase in international student exchange programs, and multinational student exchange programs, and multinational trade during the postwar reconstruction period. Obviously, short-term adaptation studies have been predominantly influenced by practical concern of facilitating the temporary but often bewildering transition into a new environment. Extensive writings in this area describe the psychological difficulties in encountering unfamiliar environment during the overseas sojourn. Many studies have focused on culture shock or various physical and psychological responses and strategies of sojourners in an unfamiliar cultural environmental during the short-stay overseas. On the other hand, long-term adaptation has been investigated over the past several decades mainly in social psychology. These studies employed anthropological and sociological concept such as attitudes, frames of reference, social motivation, ego involvement, belief, reference groups, role expectations, and role behavior as key aspects of immigrants' assimilation in the new culture. Despite the differences in long and short term stay in new culture, common experiences of cross-cultural adaptation shared by everyone crossing cultures. Everyone is challenged by the unfamiliar environment. Some degree of new cultural learning and modification in old culture take place. Those theories maintain that adaptation is closely related with the individual's cumulative change, what really motivates to this change is not the length of time but the individual's communicative interface with the new environment. In cross-cultural adaptation theory, Kim [6, p. 170—193] describes the process and structure in which individuals adapt to a new and unfamiliar culture. The three primary assumptions underlying the theory discuss the complex and dynamic process of adaptation and highlight the importance communication plays in one's social environment.

For the patterns of the adaptation process, many scholars have proposed models. The existing models include such factors a psychological/personality characteristic, communication behaviors/skills, interpersonal relationship development/preference, mass media behaviors, job-related technical skill/effectiveness and demographic characteristics. Three core concept-anxiety, uncertainty, and mildness predicting the adaptation levels of sojourners who cross individualistic and collectivistic cultural boundaries. Other researchers have examined changing patterns of cultural identity. Among other psychological factors assessed in various studies are self-image, self-esteem, morale, social isolation/belonging, satisfaction. In addition, some investigators assessed cross-cultural adaptation in terms of linguistic acculturation, whereas others assessed patterns of interpersonal relationships involving individuals of host culture. Other scholars have identified a more broadly based set of factors in predicting adaption. Hawes and Kealey [7, p. 239—258] assessed behavioral variables including interpersonal skills, cultural identity, and realistic expectations the best predictors of effectiveness. Combing many of these and related concepts, Kim [8, p. 59—109] has proposed an integrative communication-based multidimensional model. At the core of this structural model is host communication competence, which can be viewed as the engine of the adaptation process. Three conditions of the host environment (host receptivity, host conformity pressure, and ethnic group strength, as well as factors of the individual's ethnic proximity to the dominant ethnicity of the environment, and the degree of the individual's ethnicity of the host environment, and the degree of openness, strength, and positivity of the individual's personality. These dimensions of factors are explained in this theory as facilitating one's intercultural transformation embodied in a person's fitness, psychological health, and intercultural identity development.

Alder [9, p. 13—23] argued that cultural shock should be considered as transition shock, which leads to profound learning, growth, and self-awareness. Similarly, Ruben [10, p. 131—145] refuted the problem-oriented view in his study of Canadian technical advisers and their partners on two-year stay in Kenya. One of the most important findings is that the magnitude of culture shock was positively related to the individual's social and professional enhancement within the new surroundings. Alder embraced this point and he explained that culture shock is a transitional learning experience which moves from a stage of low self- and cultural awareness to a stage of high self- and cultural awareness. Many investigators have indirectly supported the U-curve and W-curve theory by documented research. They explained sojourners normally starts their cross-cultural adaptation process within optimism and elation in the host culture, followed by the subsequent experience in satisfaction and recovery [11, p. 301—317]. Problems, ongoing struggles, mindful thinking and negotiation and sequence of stress-adapt growth are all factors that need to be considered. Stressful situations provided the necessary impetus to adapt to the dissimilarities of their host culture and themselves. The learning/growth function of cultural shock has been validated by findings in studies of long term adaptation of immigrant. Investigators have documented a cumulative-progressive adaptation process that is generally upward-moving and linear. According to the length of residence, these studies indicated an incremental trend of psychological and social adaptation. Kim attempted to redefine the cumulative-progressive description. The three-pronged process model depicts the stress-adaptation-growth dynamic. It emphasizes the dialectic of stress and adaptation, which brings about a gradual psychological movement. The pattern of the dynamic process involves novelty and conformation, attachment, integration and disintegration, construction and destruction. Large and positive changes are found as occurring frequently during the initial stage of exposure.

Third space theory has indirectly supported the learning learning/growth perspective of culture shock as well. Recent research in foreign language education and intercultural communication has shown growing interest in concept as the third place or a culture of a third kind in language education. The notion of third space developed by cultural studies theorists and human geograpes. Definitions of theories of third space differ from one theory to another, but all these notions suggest in metaphorical language a concept that reflect new insights into each of these academic realms by challenging binary opposites such as here and there, self another, the present and the past, the local and the global, deep learning and surface. Theories of third space provides us with useful vocabulary to critique binary conceptions of

social phenomena and to analyze and problematize culture by turning all physical places, symbols, customs, ideals, etc. into lived zones of trans-cultures and trans-ideologies. Third space concept opens up new and productive ways of understanding of the dynamics of identity negotiation in relation to power language and individuality in intercultural interactions. Bhabha [12, p. 207—221] states that all form of culture are continually in a process of hybridity. He argues third space constitutes the discursive conditions of enunciation that ensure that meaning and symbols of culture have no unity or fixity; that even the same signs can be appropriated, translated, and read anew. Other researchers including Kramsch [13, p. 58—101] is attuned to third space. They maintain that third space suggest individual opportunist for change by virtue of being confronted with unfamiliar when learning a foreign or when living abroad. He holds the viewpoint that the opportunities for transformation are embedded in cultures in contact, but not enslaved in them. Therefore, this third place is located in somewhere different for each learner. Bhabha argues that third space displace histories and produce something different, something new and unrecognizable, a new area of negotiation of meaning and representation. Theorists in tertiary social-isolation [14, p. 35—55] maintain that exposure to otherness through learning a foreign language or studying abroad may enable individuals to extend their perspectives to see the world and reconcile their identities in third dimension: cognitive, moral and behavioral.

Some scholars maintain that relationship development in adaptation period in the new culture help people grow. Studies [15, p. 1—22] have suggested that intercultural communicators in initial interaction are less perceptive and less responsive than intercultural communicators, and they may need explicit message input and adaptive verbal strategies to increase interaction involvement and facilitate interaction. Appropriate communicative strategies leading to perceived accommodation and proper involvement may facilitate intercultural interaction beyond the initial encounter. Generally, communicators in initial intercultural encounters are likely to have higher levels of self-disclosure than in first meeting with a stranger from the same culture. In existing intercultural relationships, social penetration corresponds with intimate level of the relationship type and is comparable to similar intracultural relationships. Social penetration deepens as an intercultural relationship progresses from the initial encounter to acquaintance and to friendship. Frequency and intimacy of self-disclosure increase after the initial foundation for the relationship has been established. Positive relationship between self-disclosure and relationship intimacy has prompted Rohrich [16, p. 35—44] to suggest a creative use of self-disclosure: intercultural consciously self-disclose perceived aspects of differences in each other to increase understanding and preempt possible problems related to differences. Where expectations and role perceptions are immediately different, awareness and discussion of how communicators see themes would enable them to match impression with perceived self-image of their counterparts.

Conclusion. The function of cross-cultural adaptation has long drawn strong research interest among a wide range of disciplines. This paper has endeavors to summarize the pros and cons of cross-cultural adaptation process in cultural shock. From the above mentioned theories and research findings, it is safe to conclude that the advantages of cultural shock outweigh the disadvantages. Therefore, the learning/growth perspective should be highlighted. Because the process of the attempt of the summary is far from being cohesive, more attention should be given to the positive perspective of personal growth in adaptation period in cultural shock and more research need to be done to achieve a more profound and realistic understanding of what happens, and how it happens to individuals in an unfamiliar cultural context.

References

1. Davis, B. Culture shock and reserve culture shock: Developing coping skills / B. Davis, R. H. Krapels // Communication for a Global Society, 2005 NBEA Yearbook / ed. S. O'Brien. — Reston, VA : National Business Education Association, 2005. — P. 115—131.
2. Chaney, L. H. Intercultural Business Communication / L. H. Chaaney, J. S. Martin. — 6th ed. — PEARSON, 2014. — 321 p.
3. Anderson, L. A new look at an old construct: Cross-cultural adaptation / L. Anderson // International J. of Intercultural Relations. — Washington, 1994. — № 18 (3). — P. 293—328.
4. Taft, R. Coping with unfamiliar cultures / R. Taft // Studies across Cultural Psychology / ed. N. Warren. — London : Academic Press, 1977. — Vol. 1. — P. 121—153.
5. Zaharna, R. Self-shock: The double-binding challenge of identity / R. Zaharna // International J. of Intercultural Relations. — 1989. — № 13 (4). — P. 501—525.
6. Kim, Y. Y. Cross-cultural adaptation: An integrative theory / Y. Y. Kim // Intercultural communication theory / ed. R. L. Wiseman. — Thousand Oaks, CA : Sage, 1995. — P. 170—193.
7. Hawes, F. An empirical study of Canadian technical assistance / F. Hawes, D. Kealey // International J. of Intercultural Relations. — 1981. — № 5 (3). — P. 239—258.
8. Kim, Y. Y. Becoming intercultural: An integrative theory of communication and cross cultural adaptation / Y. Y. Kim. — Thousand Oaks, CA : Sage, 2001. — P. 59—109.
9. Alder, P. The transition experience: An alternative view of culture shock / P. Alder // J. of Humanistic Psychology. — 1975. — № 15 (4). — P. 13—23.
10. Ruben, B. A system-theoretic view / B. Ruben // International and intercultural communication annual: Intercultural communication theory / ed. W. Gudykunst. — Beverly Hills, CA : Sage, 1983. — Vol. 12. — P. 131—145.
11. Gaw, K. Reverse culture shock in students returning from overseas / K. Gaw // International J. of Intercultural Relations. — 2000. — № 14 (3). — P. 301—317.
12. Bhabha, H. The third space / H. Bhabha // Identity, Community, Culture, Difference / ed. J. Rutherford. — London : Lawrence & Wishart, 1990. — P. 207—221.
13. Kramsh, C. Context and Culture in Language Teaching / C. Kramsh. — Oxford : Oxford University Press, 1999. — 295 p.
14. Doye, P. Foreign language education as a contribution to tertiary socialization / P. Doye // Interculturelles und mehrsprachiges / ed. P. Doye. — Lehren und Lernen, Tübingen : Gunter Narr, 2008. — P. 35—55.
15. Chen, L. Verbal adaptive strategies in U.S. American dyadic conversations with U.S American or East-Asian partners / L. Chen // Communication Monographs. — 1997. — № 64. — P. 1—22.
16. Rohrich, B. F. Dual-culture marriage and communication / B. F. Rohrich // International J. of Intercultural Relations. — 1988. — № 12. — P. 35—44.