

Manukian T.

Student of Master's Degree Course

Kyiv National Economic University named after Vadym Hetman

APPLICABILITY AND CHALLENGES OF DOUBLE-SWING MODEL IN INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION

Abstract. *Intercultural communication is usually considered either as a «classic» transmission of messages between sender and a receiver, signifying Western pragmatic approach, or as a continuous flow sustained by contributions of each participant, understood via lenses of Eastern philosophical mysticism. The latter is arguably better at encompassing a complex nature of communication as was presented by Muneo Jay Yoshikawa's «double-swing» model. In spite of having the process of communication interpreted more accurately than its predecessors the model still showcases a few unresolved or problematic aspects in it.*

Key words: *intercultural communication, communication theory, dialogue, dynamic, East-West paradigm.*

Statement of the problem. In spite of significant advancements in communication technologies and more than three decades of active global cooperation of people from all over the world, there are still challenges caused by differences in cultural background. Researchers strive to develop new approaches and actualize the old ones with a vast number of papers published on the subject of intercultural communication. Naturally, when tackling a system as complex as communication, one has to resort to many different areas of knowledge (anthropology, psychology, linguistics, etc.) and that by itself creates diversity in research directions. Many theories were developed in a relatively short span of time with each author attempting to explain ever-lasting patterns that turn up regularly when studying a different aspect of intercultural communication — whether these take place on an interpersonal level or at large scales of cultural perception (and interaction) in general. On top of theories already in place, new extensions are constantly added, modifying the original in a way so that it is applicable to a broader set of the subjects. A regular review of the existing theories is, therefore, necessary to properly assess their relevance for the field.

Analysis of recent research and publications. Double-swing model of intercultural communication, as well as Asian perspective in general, has been extensively studied by researchers including, most notably by Clausen, Jensen, and Miike. Zaharna has also worked on adapting the concepts described in this paper in a more general theory of cultural identity.

The primary purpose of this paper is to revisit the concept of double-swing model, examine philosophical as well as cultural underpinnings of the model and, to a certain extent, the resulting Möbius integration philosophy and to discuss general applicability of this framework.

The key findings. Initially introduced in the late 80s double-swing model of intercultural communication stood out from its classic counterparts (Yoshikawa, 1987). Although the author's contributions were heavily influenced by the conclusions of his predecessors, he abandoned the key premise of linear communication process effectively substituting it with a notion of pendulation achieved by reciprocity and

reflection (Clausen, 2004: 108). Moreover, Yoshikawa's approach has shown promise in reconciling established Western communication theories with its non-Western counterparts, given the author's incorporation of Buber's concepts, who was a Western philosopher. Still, the way the double-swing model was formulated and outlined by the author, combining Buber's ideas with Buddhist concepts, preference to metaphors over categories signified key characteristics of non-Western approach (Miike, 2008).

Let us start with the core principle double-swing model was developed upon — the dialogical mode of encounter and communication. The author himself preferred explaining it by outlining its differences as opposed to other modes, so we can do just that. The modes of encounter and communication are the following:

- ethnocentric mode. The easiest to comprehend and recognize since it describes the most primitive and ineffective way of communication. It revolves around one participant and one participant only. Any kind of inherent uniqueness, difference or sign of cultural integrity, which are not attributed to that participant are readily dismissed. There is only one side that dominates the communication process while others are simply ignored. It is usually implied that one of the participants is much higher on the power ladder and can afford to strongarm others on a regular basis;

- control mode. This mode is employed by a participant with the very same aim in mind as for the previously described mode, however, it implies much more sophistication and subtlety. Usually, the power difference between the participants is negligible, so the dominant side should take up manipulative methods to succeed. In terms of intercultural communication, one has to be aware of cultural differences and be able and willing to exploit them for his/her benefit;

- dialectical mode. As the name suggests, here we usually consider a case where the participants are willing to collaborate to work out a compromise. So if there are two participants and one presents his thesis and the other one has, in turn, the antithesis, the expected outcome for that situation to have both sides agree upon some new solution (synthesis) which will transcend the existing differences between the participants. However, apart from consensus, the other outcomes are also possible, so the dialectical mode includes the case when of the sides prevailed at imposing his/her own way upon the other;

- dialogical mode. Finally, the dialogical mode represents a shift in intercultural encounter and communication mode paradigm having highlighted the relationship between participants on the same level as participants themselves. So now, whoever engages in intercultural communication assumes an interdependent state with the other while retaining his separate identity. The key paradox here is that both differences and similarities of each party are recognized and accepted by others without compromising the cultural integrity of the latter.

Thus, the dialogical mode cannot be accepted in any framework that deals with concepts of multipolarity and dominance, which are present even in the dialectical mode in a form of distributed power over some selected aspects in a resulting synthetic form of communication. One might struggle when trying to grasp what is meant by the introduction of dialogical mode and it might be helpful to elaborate on the subject. For one, it no longer treats communication as a discrete event or series of events with a distinct winner/loser. On the contrary, it poses communication as a continuous flow,

which can be studied and judged based on the dynamic results that reveal themselves over time. The author references Möbius strip as one of the ways to visualize the concept — there are no other edges to jump to, it either exists in unity or does not exist at all.

While the first three modes introduced earlier are relatively straightforward and intuitive, the dialogical mode requires more careful examination. Yoshikawa used an already existing conceptual framework while providing an explanation for the double-swing mode of communication — Buber's philosophy of dialogue. In the original paper (Yoshikawa, 1987), philosopher's gradual evolution of views was extensively covered, including fundamental division of the relationships into *I-It* and *I-Thou* types which signify relationships with separate objects and with the unified ones, accordingly. At that point, the whole idea becomes murky, bogged down by a number of vague and overcomplicated arguments. In order to understand the reasoning behind the double-swing model, it might be appropriate to limit the scope of Buber's philosophical worldview to the aforementioned concepts, which are most relevant to the subject at hand. First one is that no man can exist without a relationship as it constitutes an inseparable *I-Thou* part of every human. However, there is also an *I-It* counterpart which stands for our experience and things we do by ourselves (thus defining own uniqueness). The key to establishing a meaningful relationship is to prevent it from assuming any of those states i.e. be a «third» type.

However, relying heavily on philosophical arguments entails numerous risks originating from the inconsistencies at the core of the dialogue framework supported by both Yoshigawa and Buber. One of the limitations with this explanation is that it does not explain why the whole spectrum of relationships is reduced to only two categories (separation/unity, essentially), especially since Buber himself suffered from such criticism (Rosenzweig, 2013). The conception of *I-Thou*, in particular, was described as «rashly romantic and ecstatic», and sharply criticized for mistaking deep emotional stirrings for revelation (Kaufmann, 1983). The rationale behind selecting Buber's writings as a conceptual basis becomes clearer when the other core part of it is examined namely Buddhist perspective. It seems obvious that the dialogical thought is very much compatible with the Middle Way, a religious path of transcendence of paradox, as both rest on the notion of «inbetweenness» (Zaharna, 1989). This approach tackles the problem of lacking a definitive answer by questioning the need of finding one in the first place while simultaneously emphasizing the importance of seeking one. Kyoto School of philosophy is considered the main proponent of this idea through the *soku-hi* logic of *Not One, Not Two*. The concept is mirrored by a notion called *Kōan* as it is understood in Zen Buddhist philosophy — paradoxical relationship, which is supposed to supersede subject-object relationship established by Aristotle and widely accepted as essentially Western perspective.

Although one can argue that exploring the philosophical foundation of the double-swing model is unnecessary and redundant, understanding it is vital to point out two key implications made by Yoshigawa as well as Kyoto school in general. Firstly, that Eastern philosophical thought can host the intercultural communication between East and West within itself. Secondly, East in that regard is predominantly represented by Japanese cultural heritage due to its assumed uniqueness (the concept known as

nihonjin-ron) but in the same time incorporation, hence representativeness, of Indo-Sino-Japanese cultural threads. Naturally, these bold assumptions drew a lot of criticism, especially from Western theorists (Dale, 1986).

Conclusion. In conclusion, the philosophical background can be boiled down to the following — having a relationship with somebody provides us with more experience and opportunity enhancing our uniqueness as a result. Thus, although one's individuality is there (in our case, we can have a cultural predisposition for that), we are dependent upon others to sustain it. So, the outline for Yoshigawa's double-swing model can be described as:

- the actors are ongoing co-producers of the communication process;
- intercultural communication is continuous;
- difference and uniqueness are positive factors, not the ones to overcome;
- dialogical communication aims for the pluralistic and diverse world not homogenous society with a standardized approach and formal guidelines for actors to follow.

Still, one has to point out that in spite of the ever-encompassing nature of the double-swing model and undoubted descriptive capacity, it provides no method to establish such flow for any given instance of intercultural communication between individuals. The Eastern approach to intercultural communication can potentially resolve this by building upon the existing framework guidelines of nudging participants on communication towards the dialogical mode of engagement.

References

1. Yoshikawa, M. The 'Double Swing' Model of Intercultural Communication between the East and West. In D. L. Kincaid (ed.), *Communication Theory: Eastern and Western Perspectives*. San Diego, Calif.: Academic Press, 1987.
2. Clausen L. *Intercultural Organizational Communication: Five Corporate Cases in Japan*, Copenhagen Business School Press DK.
3. Jensen, I. (2004). The practice of intercultural communication. *Journal of Intercultural Communication*.
4. Zaharna R.S. Self-Shock: The Double-binding Challenge of Identity, *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 13 (1989), pp. 501–526.
5. Clause, L. Intercultural encounters in the global transmission of news. The perception and production of cultural images. In Blasco, Maribel, and Jan Gustafsson. *Intercultural Alternatives: Critical Perspectives on Intercultural Encounters in Theory and Practice*. Denmark: Copenhagen Business School Press, 2004.
6. Miike, Y. 2008. Toward an alternative metatheory of human communication: An Asiatic version. In Molefi, Miike, Yin (eds.). *The global intercultural communication reader*, pp. 57–72. New York, NY: Routledge.
7. Rosenzweig, F. *Der Mensch und Sein Werk: Briefe und Tagebücher* Springer Netherlands 2013, pp. 824–5
8. Bloch, Jochanan / Gordon, Hayyim (ed.), 1983, Martin Buber. Bilanz seines Denkens, Freiburg i. B. Kaufmann, Walter, 1983. Bubers Fehlschläge und sein Triumph in Bloch [1983], p. 22.

9. Dale, Peter, 1986, *The Myth of Japanese Uniqueness*, New York: St. Martin's Press.

Mykholap C.

Student of Master's Degree Course

Kyiv National Economic University named after Vadym Hetman

EXTREME CULTURAL ATTITUDES AMONG UKRAINIAN YOUNGSTERS

Abstract. *This article defines the current trends in the manifestations of racism and xenophobia among young people. Due to the current trends of international migration, Ukraine receives many foreigners every year, which raises the problem of their rejection by some citizens, who manifest racism and xenophobia. The study of this problem and the implementation of measures to combat it should become an integral part of the state policy in Ukraine.*

Key words: *xenophobia, racism, youth state policy, index of xenophobia, tolerance, anti-racism.*

Statement of the problem. The new shameful phenomenon of modern life, which many countries, including Ukraine, faced, have become crimes committed because of racism and ethnic hostility. This issue requires careful attention from the authorities, public organizations, local administrations and educational institutions, since the problem of the growth of xenophobia and racism is becoming more relevant every year. Some believe that racism and xenophobia are inherent to people as feelings of fear or hostility to someone else. However, xenophobia is spontaneous, but racism involves some coherent set of views. Racism nowadays recruits new adherents, especially young people.

Purpose of the research. The purpose of this article is to investigate the level of manifestation of racism and xenophobia among Ukrainian youngsters and specify the ways to overcome it.

The key findings. Crimes committed because of racism and xenophobia are a new phenomenon for the Ukrainian community. It is necessary to pay attention to the following disturbing tendencies in our country:

- increase in hate crimes (increase in the number of attacks on people of other ethnic groups, religious or social groups);
- growth of migrant phobia: propaganda (including official) prejudices against migrants as «threats to the well-being and security of the state»;
- an increase in the number of local conflicts and collisions on an ethnic basis;
- substitution of the concepts of «antifascism» and «patriotism» by nationalism, including radical.

Xenophobia is often confused with racism; however, despite the common points, there are differences between these phenomena.

The term *xenophobia* is typically used to denote a phobic attitude towards foreigners or strangers, or even of the unknown. Racism in general is described as a form of xenophobia.

There are two types of xenophobia: