Transfer of Cultural Codes in Intercultural Communication: Information and Semantic Errors

Oksana Leontjeva
Independent scientist, Kyiv, Ukraine
dleonit@gmail.com

Abstract

One of the factors affecting the quality of intercultural communication is the correct transmission of the information and semantic component of the codes that implement the model of culture. Coming into contact with the codes of a foreign culture through the language, the communicant involuntarily makes mistakes when the codes are transformed into the system of codes of their own culture. As a result of this, there is a misunderstanding, and often a misunderstanding of cultural meanings, which leads to a certain conflict - hidden or explicit - in intercultural communication. We have singled out several such errors that have occurred occur during the transfer of information and its transformation - this is a code perception error, a decoding error, a mismatch error, a linking error resulting from a transient error, a replication error, and a transposition error with a violation of semantic integrity. All these errors occur in the individual cognitive system as a result of insufficient knowledge and understanding of a foreign culture and as a result of a discrepancy between the system of codes of one culture and the system of codes of another culture.

Key words: codes of culture, cognitive system, information and semantic errors, intercultural communication

Streszczenie

Transfer kodów kulturowych w komunikacji międzykulturowej

Jednym z czynników wpływających na jakość komunikacji międzykulturowej jest poprawna transmisja informacji i składnika semantycznego kodów realizujących model kultury. Wchodząc w kontakt z kodami obcej kultury poprzez język, komunikator mimowolnie popełnia błędy, gdy kody one przekształcane w system kodów własnej kultury. W efekcie dochodzi do niezrozumienia, a często niezrozumienia znaczeń kulturowych, co prowadzi do pewnego konfliktu – ukrytego lub jawnego – w komunikacji międzykulturowej. Wyróżniamy kilka takich błędów, które występują podczas transferu informacji i jej przekształcania - są to błąd percepcji kodu, błąd dekodowania, błąd niedopasowania, błąd połączenia wynikający z błędu przejściowego, błąd replikacji oraz błąd transpozycji z naruszeniem integralności semantycznej. Wszystkie te błędy powstają w indywidualnym systemie poznawczym na skutek niedostatecznej wiedzy i zrozumienia obcej kultury oraz na skutek rozbieżności między systemem kodów jednej kultury a systemem kodów innej.

1. Introduction

Understanding another culture is one of the most necessary conditions for the development of both civilization in general and individual cultures in particular. Intercultural communication becomes the only link in the multicultural space. It is also one of the problems of the global world. Intercultural communication should provide not only opportunities for communication, but also ensure mutual understanding between different cultures and groups. Man perceives the world through the prism of the culture of his birth. Often, a foreign culture seems alien and to some extent hostile if a person does not have high-level perceptual connections. He perceives badly or does not perceive - it means he does not understand. This is due to the fact that each culture forms its own value-semantic field, inherent only to it. The instrument of its expression is language, which, on the one hand, has become a way of its self-expression in space, and, on the other hand, a tool for its fullness and dynamism of development. Thanks to this dual nature, language retains the meanings and values of culture. Culture simultaneously acts as both a meaning-bearer and a meaning-expressor. The dual nature of language and culture allows them to persist in space and time. Each culture is represented in the civilizational polycultural space by codes produced and fixed by its language. The difference between the value-semantic fields of cultures and the instruments of their expression provokes the emergence of multiple distortions in the perception of codes, which lead to communicative errors. A deep understanding of the nature of such errors will help to avoid them and improve the quality and effectiveness of communication processes in a multicultural space.

The aim of the study was to identify the types of informational and semantic errors in the perception of the code of another culture (inocode) that arise in the cognitive system of a person as a carrier of culture, and to determine the factors that complicate the understanding of the semantic side of a foreign cultural code. This work will bring us closer to solving the problems of understanding the other in intercultural communication. For this, the concepts of the culture code are considered and its functionality is determined, which is implemented in the language system. The influence of the properties of the cognitive system on the perception of the inocode has been studied, a taxonomy of information-semantic errors has been carried out.

2. Culture and cognitive system

2.1 Theoretical justification

2.1.1 Cultures and language as a tool for expressing its codes

Culture, according to A. Karmin, is closely connected with a special way of the mind "to extract, understand and use information," and then encode it in special signs. As a result, an information environment arises: "the world of objects and phenomena that are signs in which various information is encoded. This environment is culture" (Karmin, 2006: 54). Consequently, this information environment is a kind of substratum in which signs-symbols that acquire meaning appear, which are necessary at each stage of the development of culture. It is the meanings of signs-symbols that each culture differs from. Combining meanings into a single semantic whole, it becomes a living organism. Language, as an operational tool that culture generates and uses for self-preservation, is also the bearer and exponent of its semantic integrity and is capable of forming a huge number of semantic variations. They become the background against which culture develops. Semantic variations, according to the needs of culture self-expression, its consolidation and full-fledged functioning in space, create semantic fields. Connecting with each other, the fields form persistent fixed semantic units, which become the basis for the formation of cultural codes. Culturologists believe that the cultural code is not a finite value. It consists of the past cultural experience of the society. V. Telia understands the code of culture as "the taxonomic substratum of its texts. This substrate is a set of cultivated ideas about the picture of the world of a particular society - about its natural objects, artifacts, phenomena, mentofacts and their spatio-temporal and qualitative-quantitative dimensions inherent in these entities" (Telia, 1999: 20-21) . V.V. Krasnykh defines the code of culture as a "grid" that culture "throws" on the surrounding world and which divides, categorizes, structures and evaluates it" (Krasnykh, 2002: 232). For Yu. Lotman, the cultural code is a system of images related to any area or cultural artifacts that act as a sign function (Lotman, 2000). N. Alefirenko notes that "the essence of the code of culture is determined by the ability to concentrate the content of the meanings and values of culture" (Alefirenko, 2012: 8) Under the code of culture, we understand the existential-philosophical strategy of the people expressed in a symbolic form and consider it as a semantic system. The cultural code makes it possible to identify culture and is a meta-level for the semiotic space. They "function as a way of storing and transmitting social memory" (Simbirtseva, 2016: 158). "The basic codes of culture, which are often difficult to identify and

reflect on, take much longer to mature, apparently more than one century; they change at an extremely slow pace" (Avanesova, Kuptsova, 2015: 35)

Culture forms a value-semantic space, and codes are carriers and exponents of its content. "The essence of the code can be called the ability to concentrate the content of the meanings and values of culture. At the level of understanding, comprehension and interpretation, the culture code is "read" individually" (Simbirtseva, 2016: 158). Language as a tool for expressing codes becomes a sign-semantic phenomenon of culture. According to Yuri Lotman, language is the optimal means of expressing cultural meanings (Lotman, 2000: 487). The main task of the language is to replicate cultural codes into various forms of mental and linguistic activity, support them and prevent their replacement by foreign cultural codes due to interference with another foreign cultural semantic space. In addition, "in relation to the process of perception and interpretation of a foreign cultural text, it should be borne in mind that difficulties in understanding indicate its different quality for representatives of another culture. However, it is not culture itself that influences the result of understanding a foreign cultural text, but its manifestation, which is realized in the mind of the reader (Belyanin 1988: 30)

The process of maintaining the code and preventing its replacement by a foreign code becomes possible due to the formation of its own linguistic cultural background, within which semantic variability arises: "understanding a foreign cultural text is characterized by a high degree of polyvariance. The recipient understands the text due to the peculiarities of personal/linguistic consciousness, worldview, associations, etc." (Stepkin 2001: 34) In addition, the process of perception of a foreign cultural text is also associated with "the background of a person's communicative culture, his individual cognitive style, the level of development of cognitive and metacognitive competencies, the level of formation of subject, interdisciplinary knowledge and metasubject competencies (cognitive, communicative and regulatory), factors of value orientation and many other characteristics" (Korchazhkina, 2016: 27). Andrev Simpson notes that language influences how people perceive the world (Simpson, 2019).

The semantic variability of the language is multifaceted, it is a dynamic continuous process of the semantic system for the constant production of an infinite number of variations. "Semantic fields can contain the same language units with multiple meanings, intersect and be associated with other semantic fields" (Nekrasov 2009: 14). Consequently, the linguistic cultural background is dynamic and not stable. Only cultural codes are relatively stable. In practice, we have stable and fairly stable formed codes of culture and a dynamic, constantly changing linguistic cultural background, otherwise, on the one hand, we have semantic stability, but, on

the other hand, we cannot discount semantic cultural variability. In other words, culture, as a living organism, resides in an environment that is its linguistic background. Consequently, constant connections arise between the organism and the environment, since neither one nor the other can exist separately and be only in its own field of development. Culture as an organism adapts to the environment. But the language background as an environment can also affect the state of the body. Actually, we have the following picture: cultural codes, as it were, adjust to the linguistic cultural background. Therefore, the linguistic semantic variability and the semantic field of culture are in correlation with each other. These connections can be either persistent or fixed, or unstable or non-fixed. A stable connection occurs when the generated culture code and the language background or the variable semantic field of the language coincide. In this connection, the culture code correlates the meaning of the linguistic variational field and vice versa. As a rule, this connection is quite stable and is not subject to any changes, because it is regulated by a code fixed in the culture. This means that the meaning of the code and its content are correlated with each other.

If the linguistic background semantic variability does not coincide at a certain point in time with the existing code, then the connection is very weak or even impossible. The dynamics of such interaction shows that in this case the code becomes vulnerable, that is, its meaning does not fix the content from the side of the linguistic semantic background. According to Andrew Simpson, language variation and change is related to social structures and the expression of group and personal identities (Simpson, 2019). David Hyatt believes that language variation is associated with different ways of "being" (Hyatt, 2022). In this case, there are two options for code holders (a person, a society of this culture).

First, when in some way the meaning of the code coincides with several elements of the linguistic semantic field of a foreign culture, then content variability is possible in the code, since the content is borrowed from the field of a foreign culture. In this case, the code receives external influence, which over time can modify it, change its content and change its meaning. This is observed in cultures with weakly expressed or practically unformed basic semantic codes.

The second case reports what neuroscientists attribute to the workings of the brain and call it as brain distortions. Such distortions arise both in intercultural communication, when the speakers have insufficient linguocultural competence, and in intracultural communication. These distortions can be explained by the weak correlation that occurs between the meaning of the code and its content, that is, when the meaning is not supported or weakly supported by the

content. Therefore, according to scientists, with perfect contact compatibility (coincidence of the worldviews of both communicants and other important aspects), the error in the transmission of information is about 25%. We can explain this by the specifics of the work of the brain, in particular, thinking. From the moment of birth, a person is in the space of logic, that is, the brain is taught to work in a differentiated way, with clear or established information, so it processes a strong correlation almost without distortion, but when it comes to a weak correlation, distortions are inevitable, that is, the brain must work in different registers at the same time, which leads to distortions or the meaning of the code, or its content. In addition, the reality of communicants belonging to different cultures "should be decoded through those meaningful forms of language and culture that connect a person with the world of ideas, images and values of a given ethnocultural consciousness" (Alefirenko, 2020: 11). All the phenomena we have described are related to the functioning of the human cognitive system.

2.1.2 Cognitive system

Errors in intercultural communication arise as a result of the difference in the cognitive systems of communicants. The cognitive system is a rather complex complex that includes thinking, consciousness, memory and language, therefore, any of the errors does not belong to only one of the components of this complex, it is systemic, but manifests itself only through language as the only and effective way of transmitting information between communicants. A person as a social being is forced to constantly be in a communicative process - internal or external, because the communicative process is a way for a person to develop and gain new knowledge about himself and the world around him. The cognitive system is presented as a model for processing incoming information and acts as a process of cognition with a set of unique operations performed on the input information (Philosophical Encyclopedia). "The quality of functioning of a person's cognitive system is ensured by the level of development of his psycho-emotional sphere due to the interaction of higher mental functions," namely, logical memory, purposeful thinking, creative imagination, voluntary actions, speech, writing, counting, meaningful movements and perception processes (Vygotsky, 2016). In addition, according to Michael Polanyi, along with explicit, "central" thinking, there is also implicit, "peripheral" thinking, which cannot be clearly described in words and expressed in symbolic form, since it does not obey the laws of formal logic (Polanyi, 1969: 25-26).

The emotional component also affects the understanding of the code of a foreign culture. A person unconsciously attracts the emotional sphere into communication through "his mood,

experiences, expectations, feelings, intentions" (Korchazhkina, 2016: 28). And the last thing that seems very important is that the cognitive system includes not only all of the above, but, in our opinion, it covers (contains) all levels of a mental person - conscious, preconscious, repressed unconscious and fundamentally unconscious unconscious. Obviously, M. Polanyi's "peripheral" thinking is formed in the preconscious or even the unconscious. Regarding the codes of culture, in our opinion, they are, like the "peripheral" thinking of M. Polanyi, at the preconscious-unconscious levels and the cognitive system is able to "read" them.

Thus, the code of culture, "read" by the human cognitive system, passes through its entire structure and can "acquire" additional individual meanings, which will manifest itself in the semantic system of the language of the code carrier. Cultural codes are subject to some distortions or interpretations in the human cognitive system, which are associated with its psycho-emotional characteristics. With repeated repetition of such linguistically coded information, for example, in an artificial information space - the media, social networks, distorted codes are remembered. Paul Simpson also points to the influence of ideology on the human cognitive system. In his view, speakers and writers linguistically encode their beliefs, interests, and prejudices through the full range of media (Simpson, 1993). According to Alefirenko, it is necessary to correctly recognize the code of culture, "since the images of past cultural layers are erased over time, and the semantic fields of discursive thinking of contexts are expanding" (Alefirenko, 2020:19).

2.2. Deep semantic errors in the transmission of codes: factors of their occurrence

Intercultural communication unites the multicultural space and stimulates the development of each of the cultures represented in it, enriching each culture and emphasizing its original uniqueness. "The main goal of establishing effective intercultural communication is the process of identification and self-identification, building appropriate value systems." (Seregina 2020: 120) In addition, the communication process is always modeled. This happens in this way: one of the communicants transmits a message presented in verbal, as well as paraverbal and non-verbal codes. It enters the filter of another communicant, which is his cultural picture of the world. At the same time, the filter receives information through the contextual channel: from the sociocultural and situational contexts. The result is decoding and interpretation of the message, including inferences and hypotheses. "When creating a message, the information coming through the contextual channel is taken into account, and the background knowledge about the interlocutor is taken into account. The selection of relevant information for the

message and the choice of discursive strategies depend on this" (Pushina 2015: 30). "A foreign cultural text requires knowledge of a culturological plan corresponding to its non-linguistic basis, since the linguistic complexity of the text for the reader often lies in the difficulty of understanding the way of thinking of another people." (Ryabova, 2009: 116).

Any culture in a multicultural space is represented by its own set of codes and is identified in the human cognitive system according to them. A set of such codes creates a perceptually fixed image, which over time is stereotyped and formed into a complete integral unit. The cultural code defines a set of images that are associated with some set of stereotypes in the mind. Stereotyping is possible only with an active mental-verbal process, which is formed into a clear logical-sign system. But the stereotype is capable of constant modification when it is transmitted from person to person, so even within a homogeneous environment it will always be labile. On the one hand, such a modification is influenced by the background associated with the individual worldviews of the bearers of cultural stereotypes. But, on the other hand, the language itself also possesses semantic mobility, the units of which are capable of forming new combinations, aggravating the fixed meaning or introducing some difference into it. This should also include the ability of the language to the process of interchangeability of words, synonymy) and the identity of words (homonymy). Once fixed in a sign-symbol (language or ritual), the stereotype becomes stable and acts as an independent integral unit with a stable meaning.

Units with persistent meanings, which cover the communicative ways of human behavior, are recognized as a cultureme in the concept of Els Oksaar. The cultureme model proceeds from the possibility of a separate consideration of communicative ways of behavior: greetings, expressions of gratitude, emotions, silence - depending on the situation. Culturemes as "abstract units, realized in different ways in communicative acts" (Oksaar, 1988: 27-28) and ""behave as metaphorical models that motivate figurative expressions in the language - lexical or phraseological" (Pamies, 2017). The code of culture can be transformed in the process of development. He can be simplified, complicated, change the sign system, which also affects his perception of a communicant of a different culture. But all these features of the cultural code are somehow interpreted in the cognitive system of its carrier.

The cognitive system of communicants is also influenced by mega-codes of both old and new civilizational formations, namely the USA, Europe, China, Russia, Arab countries, etc. The meaning of the US mega-code is technology as a way of human bio-survival, for Europe the mega-code is humanity, for China - the state, for Russia - sincerity and the state, for the Arab countries - heritage and Islam, etc. Moreover, the mega-codes of the old civilizations are "wired"

into the unconscious, but the mega-codes of the new an intermediate state between the conscious and preconscious, so it is much easier to "read" them to the communicant's cognitive system.

The process of identifying a foreign code seems to be very complicated, therefore "intercultural communication is accompanied by a multitude of various errors, violations, deviations, misunderstandings, conflicts, etc." (Pushina 2015: 29). Among them, one can single out errors in code perception, decoding, a mismatch error, a linking error resulting from a transient error, a replication error, and a transposition error with a violation of semantic integrity. The transmission of codes is possible in various forms, both verbal and non-verbal. The communicative process in real time is "a set of specific signals that automatically evoke certain associations in the reader brought up in the traditions of a given culture" (Maslova 2001: 87).

2.2.1. Perceptual error

The code perception error that often occurs in the process of intercultural communication is manifested in the inability to adequately perceive information and respond correctly to it. It is considered a basic and one of the most serious mistakes that can nullify all further communication actions. The first stage in the perception of a foreign cultural code by a person becomes the threshold of perception, which takes into account all levels of perception - detection, discrimination, identification and identification. This is a perceptual threshold that is completely individual and can range from high to low. At a high threshold, the entire cognitive system of a person is involved in the process of perception at all levels of perception, that is, with the simultaneous inclusion of all perceptual processes, the human cognitive system becomes more susceptible to the perception of other knowledge. At a low threshold, only a part of the cognitive system is activated, the one in which similar stereotyped knowledge about the other is fixed, but received in its cultural environment. In this case, the susceptibility of the cognitive system decreases up to the complete non-perception or blocking of other knowledge. "The process of perception of reality through verbal communication is conditioned by knowledge structured in memory in the form of meanings of language units, images, ideas" (Nekrasov, 2009: 15).

The more developed a person's cognitive system, the more a person will be able to perceive a foreign cultural code as different from his basic code, that is, the probability of transferring the cultural stereotype of his culture to a foreign cultural code is small. Thus, the error in the perception of another code will either be negligible, or will be absent altogether. But with a poorly developed cognitive system, any external influence, which is a foreign cultural code, will

be perceived as atypical, that is, hostile. The moment of self-preservation of the cultural code includes the process of its blocking and its partial or complete non-perception. Consequently, the more developed a society is in terms of knowledge about the other (its culture, characteristics) and, accordingly, it is the cognitive system of each of its members that has a broader plan and is built not only on stereotypes, the more likely it is to avoid the error of perceiving a foreign cultural code. In addition, the codes may be similar and have a slight difference, but it is these differences that make another culture individual and unique.

As a consequence of the first error in the perception of the foreign code, the second error arises: the cognitive system of the perceiver of the foreign code is unable to catch these differences at any of the stages of perceptual connections and is not capable of correctly representing the other. This may be due to the fact that it is possible that a similarity model is triggered during perception, which is identified as similar or the same. This is possibly due to the acceleration of the result, when the cognitive system separates the familiar from the new information, but the person imposes the code stereotype of his culture on the foreign code, thus identifying two different codes as similar or the same. Having identified them as one, a person continues communication in the system of codes of his culture.

Typically, such errors occur: a) in closely related languages of the same language family, or b) in unrelated languages belonging to different language families. One of the most complex perceptual processes in languages of the same language family is the discovery process. For example, words that sound the same can have different meanings - the Serbian "живети у куни" (to live in a house) has a similar sound form in Russian "живете в куче," where "kyha [heap]" in Serbian means "house," in Russian "an accumulation or heap of something loose (heap of sand) or a heap of plurality (heap of books), in Ukrainian there was a graphic substitution according to the principle of similarity of the Serbian letter "h" to "п." In Ukrainian, "живете у купі," that is, you live together. Therefore, the Serbian "живете у куни" (to live in a house) in Russian means "to live in a pile of sand, sugar, stone, books ....," in Ukrainian it means "to live together." Or a variant of the Serbian "живети на куни" (live at home) in Russian "жить на куче" (for example, build a house on a pile of stones), in Ukrainian "жити на купі" has two meanings 1) on a compartment of stone, sand and etc., 2) a large family lives in a small living space. If the cognitive system is not included in the detection process due to insufficient knowledge of the language, culture and its codes, then the foreign code is not recognized.

In unrelated languages belonging to different language families, the perceptual connection of detection is quite effective, because one communicant hears a word from his language

environment with a representation of the full semantic set of all its connections, the other communicator uses it (hears it) as a borrowing supported by a bright fixed image. Usually the second stage of perceptual communication - discrimination - is the most vulnerable. For example, the English word "trash" also received the meaning of "low quality." The Ukrainian language borrowed only this meaning from English, which became slang and is used in different situations; "this is such a good trash" (in the sense of an achievement). Similarly, the word "crush," which in English means "crush, crush," in Ukrainian is used as "find your crush," that is, "make your choice or find the best for yourself." In this situation, two things are obvious - on the part of the native speaker - the destruction of the semantic set of all links existing in the language, as a result of which there is a partial or complete misunderstanding of the context of intercultural dialogue. On the part of the user of this word, the fact of the insufficiency of his cognitive system and the weak susceptibility of his own cultural codes (possibly due to their insufficiency) is obvious.

An identification error in perceptual communication can be observed both in one language family and in languages of different families. For example, the Polish word "dywan" corresponds to the meaning "carpet," the Farsi word "divan" corresponds to the meaning "collection of poems," the Russian word "диван" corresponds to the meaning "sofa." In all three languages, the sound of the word is the same.

An identification error in a perceptual connection may occur due to the presence of previous errors, or it can be independent, occurring independently of previous errors in the perceptual connection. Usually occurs in the assignment of a semantic category to a recognizable object. The English word "day" in Russian corresponds to the word "сутки," but in Russian there is also the word "день," which approximately coincides in sound with English "day," but means "daytime." Such an error can occur in case of insufficient knowledge of the language or in case of brain distortions, which is an absolutely natural biological process. These errors occur in two cases: 1) when the context is not clear. For example, Khrushchev's phrase "we will bury you" was perceived by the American side as a threat of the Third World War (it was said after the USSR tested a hydrogen bomb) in fact correlated with K. Marx's statement about "the proletariat as the gravedigger of capitalism." Second case when the expression itself has two or more situational values. This is especially true of communication between communicants with hieroglyphic writing and other forms of writing. The Japanese premier's line "Zensho shimasu" was taken as "I'll do my best" when it actually meant "no way."

The result of any disturbance in perceptual communication is a partial or complete

misunderstanding of the foreign code, or its replacement at this stage with the code of one's own culture.

2.2.2 Decoding error

A decoding error appears as a result of breaking the implicit connections within the cultural code, as well as in the explicit connections of the perceived foreign code, and occurs in several cases. The first case is closely related to the constancy of perception. Having made a mistake in perception, the listener accepted the foreign code as identical to his own cultural code, discarding the semantic background created by the language of the foreign culture. Inokod was identified with the existing code, therefore it was introduced into the semantic field of its culture. Consequently, the conditions of its functioning are perceived by him as identical. For example, in English, the meanings of the words "shore" and "coast" (translated into Russian as "берег") differ in relation to the boundary between land and water, considered from the side of the land or from the side of the water. The statement "We will soon reach the coast" implies a journey by land, and "We will soon reach the shore" - a journey by water. Capturing such nuances is due to the ability of a person to recognize ways of schematizing the world with the help of words (Nekrasov, 2009: 15).

In the second case, the error is a consequence of incorrect decoding of the variant-semantic background of the inocode. Usually we are talking about the decoding of synonymous series with different semantic contextual variations. The greater the semantic variability of the language field, the more decoding errors can be made. For example, the semantic range of the English word "rubbish" consists of 7 words, the semantic range of the similar Russian word "garbage" is 9 words. Each of the words included in the semantic series creates its own semantic series. Very often the usage situations are not interchangeable. This is due to the specifics of the semantic series, in which there is a dominant word and non-dominant words. Not all non-dominant words are meaningfully correlated with the word dominant. In the synonymic series, non-dominant words are presented, the meaning of which is slightly different from the meaning of the dominant word. Therefore, such words, if misread, change the meaning of the situation. Interchangeability results in a decoding error. Another situation related to decoding error occurs in languages of the same language family, in which words with different meanings, but with almost the same pronunciation. For example, the French word "demander" (просить) and the English "demand" (требовать). At one time, the mistake of imposing identical-sounding words and shifting meanings led to a political scandal and almost a break in relations between France

and the United States, but, fortunately, was quickly discovered. If the error in decoding synonymous rows is associated with insufficient knowledge of the language, or with a lack of understanding of the cultural code, then the error in decoding in the case of words that sound the same, but with different meanings, is primarily associated with brain distortions. Or a situation related to the interchangeability of semantic categories in non-closely related languages, which leads to a decoding error and misinterpretation of the message. In Russian, there are verbs and verbal nouns formed from the same word root. For example, "тошнота - тошнота." We can say: "Тошнота-то какая/ Меня уже тошнит" and "У меня тошнота/Меня тошнит." These two variants of phrases have different semantic functions. In the first variant, in this way we express our dissatisfaction with some situation, information, etc.; in the second case, we explain the objective state of our health. Both of these phrases will sound the same in English "I am sick," "I have nausea (kind of nausea)," which in Russian corresponds only to the second meaning. A. Wierzbicka notes that emotionality is embedded in the Russian language code; "Unlike English, Russian is exceptionally rich in "active" emotional verbs… most of which are completely untranslatable into English: радоваться, тосковать, скучать, грустить …." (Wierzbicka, 1996: 42). In English, however, there are "very few intransitive verbs," which "reflects an important feature of the Anglo-Saxon culture - a culture that usually views behavior that is unapproved as "emotional" with suspicion and embarrassment" (Wierzbicka, 1996: 41) In this, the author sees another manifestation of cultural difference: "the Anglo-Saxon culture is characterized by a disapproving attitude towards the unrestrained verbal flow of feelings, while Russian culture refers the verbal expression of emotions to one of the main functions of human speech" (Wierzbicka, 1996: 43).

In the third case, an assumption error occurs during decoding. This error suggests that the listener admits that the semantic field of the foreign code does not correspond to the semantic field of his culture. This arises in the case of the similarity of semantic fields, in particular, the similarity in the use of synonymous constructions. The assumption works on the principle of inconsistency of correspondence, that is, when similar semantic variations (from the listener's point of view) of both fields - culture and foreign culture are superimposed on each other, but their semantic shades that differ from each other are not fixed. In the subsequent course of the communicative event, this shade can turn into the main semantic unit. A striking example of such an error is the words "Reboot (перегружать)" and "rebuild (перестраивать)," referring to the period of perestroika in the Soviet Union. The Americans perceived perestroika as a reboot, based on the cultural code of their civilization (technology), which implies the cleansing or

restoration of memory with the resumption of the device. The Russians, on the other hand, meant to build anew or to make alterations in the building, change the economic model and its further work in society. In this case, cleaning and rebuilding was perceived as assumptions of sameness (analogism), while semantic variations based on cultural codes were not taken into account at all. Fortunately, this did not lead to a conflict between countries in the short term, but this assumption, as analogous to different semantic variations, in the long term led to a clash of civilizations (military conflict in Ukraine). As a result, an error of assumption can lead to incomparability of the positions of representatives of the two cultures. It appears due to the immunity of the cognitive system to the codes of a foreign culture.

"The main difference between a word and its interpretation is that the word expresses its meaning, as a rule, not explicitly. Therefore, there remains a strong doubt that the paraphrase actually expresses the meaning. Most likely, it "explains it away" - in the sense that it takes it away with it forever, since the explicit, clearly formulated meaning by nature cannot be equal to the vaguely understood original one" (Paducheva, 1996: 17).

2.2.3. Mismatch error

Perception and decoding errors result in a mismatch error. This is a system error and concerns the inconsistency of language systems with each other. We are talking not so much about the inconsistency of the structure (the structures of languages differ slightly, since the structure of any language is subject to a logical law), but rather the inconsistency of the semantic parameters specified by this structure. Semantic parameters define the semantic blocks of the language. Naturally, the semantic blocks of one language do not correspond to the semantic blocks of another language. Therefore, interlingual gaps arise. Like non-equivalent words, gaps are noticeable only when comparing languages. In some cases, gaps are due to the difference in the respective cultures. For example, in English, in addition to the word "lawyer" - "lawyer, advocate," there are several more designations for the varieties of the legal profession: "attorney" - "authorized, attorney"; "barrister" – "a lawyer who has the right to speak in the highest courts"; "solicitor" – "solicitor (advises clients, including organizations and firms)"; "counsel" – "legal adviser"; "counsellor" – "advisers"; "advocate" – "high-ranking lawyer." In Russian, these designations correspond to one word - "юрист." On the contrary, two Russian words "девочка" and "девушка" correspond to one English word "girl" and one German word "Mädchen" (Zharkova 2011: 225-226).

According to T. van Dijk, the understanding of statements is based on more general

concepts, categories, rules, strategies that can be described in terms of "frame" (van Dijk 1989: 12). Frames organize communicative behavior and allow you to correctly interpret the statements and actions of other participants in communication. Knowledge of the world by a person, organized in the mind in the form of frames, provides adequate cognitive processing of standard situations. Since linguistic possibilities have semantic mobility and flexibility of linguistic meanings, semantic blocks can fix one or another meaning for some time. This time is uncertain. Therefore, in order to fix them, they must somehow move into the semantic space of culture, that is, enter into its codes, expanding or deepening them. But they can never be replaced by new semantic variations that arise every minute spontaneously or purposefully. In order to maintain the semantic stability of blocks, a person uses frames (knowledge systems), that is, certain pieces of the block, as it were, "drive" into frames and he begins to work with them. Firstly, it leads to different types of errors both within the culture itself and in the forms of its external manifestation. We purely theoretically divide linguistic information into semantic blocks, but in fact our understanding of the picture of the world through the brain is capable of isolating such blocks in any practical way. This means that they can change in any way, even between two carriers of the same culture. It is clear that the frames cannot be identical, they will differ. "There is a huge variety of such schema-frames, depending on cultural traditions, the field of human activity, specific "closed" situations, the motivations of the speaker, etc. A separate frame, as part of the surrounding reality, structures and clarifies the meaning of the word that will be used in communication at a certain place and at a certain point in time, and a word spoken at a different point in time and in a different place activates another frame, i.e. that part of experience and knowledge that lies outside the scope of verbal interaction" (Nekrasov 2009: 15). Thus, a mismatch error occurs within the culture itself. But it is corrected by the code of culture in its semantic space. Therefore, people are more likely to understand the images and meanings transmitted to each other.

Things are different with the manifestation of cultural codes in a multicultural space. A person perceives a foreign culture through its cliched semantic blocks that implement the situational model of the language. Situations are limited, but their meanings are not limited by frames, they simply cannot be introduced into any frames. It is possible to make cliché frames, but at the same time, the semantic mobility of the language of culture is preserved. Because the creation of meanings is a constant dynamic process. A representative of a foreign culture works with static blocks and cliché frames of another culture, while semantic variability is often excluded or not fixed, or weakly fixed. The speaker, transmitting the codes of his culture, is

mobile in the semantic field, but it is limited by the code of his culture. The listener is motionless in the semantic field of the code of another culture. He perceives the code as fixed meanings. The inconsistency arises in the mismatch of frames, that is, in the system of imposing frames on semantic blocks. The speaker imposes them in his own way. The listener does this systematically, according to previously acquired knowledge of both language and culture. Therefore, when he feels and understands the discrepancy between these frames, he tries to level it with the help of the semantic blocks of his culture. But the semantic space of one culture is not identical with the semantic space of another culture. Alignment occurs with the help of the meanings of the codes of one's culture. Since the process occurs subconsciously, the mismatch error is poorly understood and fixed by the listener.

2.2.4. Binding error. Transit error.

A bind error occurs due to a transient error. Transitivity is an intermediate process of transition from the semantic space of one culture to the semantic space of another culture or an intermediate state of transition from one code to another both within a culture and between cultural spaces. In addition, it ensures the distribution of the cultural code in the semantic system, namely, the framing of the semantic situational field created by the language. A transient error occurs in several cases.

Firstly, the transition from the code of one culture to the code of another culture was not carried out directly, but with the involvement of the code of one's own culture, which seems similar to the foreign code (similarity in situational and semantic nuances is possible). This code became optional, but by resorting to it, the speaker or listener made a mistake that blocked work with part of the semantic content of the inocode. In closely related or unrelated languages, there are words similar in sound, but completely different in meaning. This is interlingual homonymy. For example, Here are some of them: artist - artist, consonant Russian word - артист (singer, musician, theater figure); book - book, consonant Russian word - бук (tree); boy - boy, бой (something broken); box - box, бокс (sport); bread - bread, бред (nonsense); capital - capital, капитал (money); clever - smart, клевер (plant); look - look, лук (vegetable); magazine - magazine, магазин (commercial enterprise), bread [bred] Eng. and Tibetan bred - to be afraid and others. This can be demonstrated with this example: "Do you watch this magazine?" - Will you watch this magazine? But if a transient error has occurred, then a semantic variant is possible for the communicant with the foreign code "Do you look at this store?", that is, you want to see a trading enterprise or you want to go to this trading enterprise.

Secondly, incorrect framing of the semantic situational field of a foreign culture. This arises from the assumption of the first error, namely, the additional code used was erroneously or unconsciously framed and became a completely separate and independent frame. This frame may have expanded to include some or all of the core code and become dominant. In communication, this is manifested by the fact that a person doubts which form-reaction to choose, that is, which word is best suited for the correct response to the code. It's about word choice. This process happens instantly - a minute or less. Otherwise, the frame of a part of the additional code was attached to the main code, while the semantic blocks within the code were redistributed. Such a semantic redistribution made both codes similar - one's own culture and another culture. Although initially there was a certain difference between them. For example, this is often due to the homonymy of semantic structures and the fact that the situation is incomplete, that is, not spoken out. For the bearer of the cultural code, the situation is understandable; it may be phonetically incomplete, but complete in meaning. For a communicant with a foreign code, the situation must be spoken out in full in order to avoid semantic homonymy. For example, (1) We raised the sail [seil] and went to the open sea [si:] - We raised the sail and went to the open sea. (2) I see [si:] you have a seasonal sale [seil] - I see you have a seasonal sale. Such constructions will be clear to a communicant with a foreign code. But very often, in intercultural communication, communicants are in their own semantic field and do not correct the communication environment, that is, they do not take into account the presence of a communicant with a foreign code. A transitory error will occur if the phrase sounds like this: I see you have a sale, because it contains semantic homonymy: I see you have a sail (1) or I see you have a sale (2). But languages with hieroglyphic writing are much more difficult for communicants, in which homonymy is quite common, it is very diverse - one-syllable, two-syllable and even three-syllable (Chinese). Although this linguistic reality is fixed in writing, it is indistinguishable by ear. In addition, communicants create a discourse, which means that the flow of information transfer is very fast and often there is no time to search for the correct interpretation of the meanings of the inocode in the cognitive system.

Binding is a tactical process for the formation of the integrity of the perception of inocode. Binding error as a tactical error is the consequence of a transient error. Linking is closely related to decoding and is one of its last steps. This is a soft or malleable connection of the decoded elements of the inocode into a common holistic representation expressed in communicative actions. This error occurs in cases where a part of the code is not fully recognized or is incorrect, that is, it does not correspond to the basic foreign code. It occurs due to the listener's lack of

knowledge of a foreign culture or due to a weak relationship between the two semantic fields. This can be explained by the weakness of the listener's cognitive system for recognizing meanings. If meanings are not constructed in a cognitive system, then it lacks, in whole or in part, the tools for recognizing meanings. If there are not enough recognition tools, then this also leads to a linking error. Therefore, the expression "He (she) does not catch the meanings" is a clear demonstration of the linking error. For example, in Russian and German, the terms "people" and "Volk" refer to the sphere of state law, i.e. "German people" means subjects of the German Empire, and "Russian people" - respectively, the Russian Empire. At the same time, the terms "nation" and "Nation" are ethnographic. In English and French, the situation is opposite: nation in both languages denotes statehood, while people/ peuple are ethnographic terms" (Porkhomovskiy 2016: 264).

2.2.5. Replication error

In order to preserve or consolidate the meaning in a certain frame, the variations of the semantic field must be replicated. Replication is a necessary process to give a share of semantic staticity, otherwise, with the help of replication, the foreign code is, as it were, "caught." What does it mean? During replication, a "backbone" of meaning is created. It is the repeated variations that create such a semantic skeleton (base) for understanding the inocode. Without such a skeleton (base), the final disclosure of its meaning is impossible. Replication errors are associated with the sensitivity of the cognitive system to the variability of semantic fields. Exactly what level of sensitivity does the listener's cognitive system produce to the semantic variations, first of all, of the semantic space of one's own culture and its linguistic background, and what is important is how high its sensitivity to the semantic space of a foreign culture is. Sensitivity affects semantic modeling and is linked to inocode framing processes. For example, in Russian there are two words "anxious" (to become anxious, agitated or make oneself difficult) and "to worry" (to worry, worry about something, suffer because of something). The situations of their use are different: to worry about children, to worry about a mistake made. In English, both of these verbs are conveyed by one verb "worry," in Polish also by one verb "martwi się." Mom is worried about the children. I'm worried about the mistake I made - in English: Mother worries about children. I am worried about mistake; in Polish: Martwie się o pomyłke. Matka martwie się o dzieci; in Chinese, Mama danhin haizi. Wo danhin yige cuowu. It follows from this that in both proposed situations the semantic field of the Russian language is variable, in contrast to Polish, English and Chinese. Insufficient knowledge of foreign codes of another culture leads

to a lack of sensitivity of the cognitive system to the meanings of another culture. The replication error will lead to emotional tension between the communicants. For example, the cognitive system of a communicant with an American or British cultural code did not catch such semantic variability: to worry is a state of uncertainty, to worry is a strong sensation or impression, and the communicant uses one word instead of another, according to his cultural code. At the level of emotions, as already mentioned above (see Wierzbicka 1996), the cognitive system of an American or a British person is insensitive to their subtleties, so it will be immune to the subtleties of the emotional coloring of the code of a foreign culture.

2.2.6. Transposition error

With the final recognition of the foreign culture code, when its components are decoded and it becomes necessary to combine them into one semantic whole, transposition errors occur, which lead to a violation of the perception of the foreign code as a complete semantic whole. They can be both superficial and deep. Superficial errors can be corrected with a clarifying question or clarification. But deep transpositional violations lead to not understanding the inocode and, consequently, to the wrong choice of a communicative strategy in relation to it. Since we are talking about the semantic systems of different languages and their different ways of semantic construction within the semantic space of culture, then, on the one hand, the superficial manifestation of this error is associated with an incorrectly chosen grammatical structure for conveying meaning. This can lead to its distortion and partial or complete misunderstanding of the inocode. On the other hand, the degree of equivalence used for decoding depends on the correct or incorrect movement by the listener of semantic equivalents within the inocode. The higher the degree of equivalence, the higher the semantic integrity. A low degree of equivalence will indicate that the listener has no understanding of the foreign code and is able to freely interpret it within the framework of his own desires or goals that he is trying to achieve in the process of communicative activity.

Deep transposition links all the modular elements of the "read" semantic field of the inocode into one image or its representation. That is, we are talking about the presentation of the presented new image, which arose with the help of the transposition of semantic modules. Several semantic modules combined together create a single frame field that nominates the meaning. An error can occur in the process of semantic nomination, when the meaning of the modules is incorrectly defined or they are incorrectly combined into a frame. The inocode image consists of frames assembled with the help of transposition. The error occurs when the process

of "assembling" frames is violated. In the first case, one of the many frames is simply "lost." In the second case, the "assembly" technology is violated. By assembly technology, we mean models of sequences of connecting frames into an image.

An example of the first case - a superficial manifestation - of a transposition error is a phrase that is very often used by native English speakers: "I've went to that restaurant a few time." The strange thing here is the use of the verb went instead of gone. In fact, the correct phrase should sound like this: "I've gone to that restaurant a few times." This error originated in the field of culture, but it is also unintentionally used in intercultural communication. For speakers of languages of the Indo-European family, such a mistake will not have consequences for understanding the meaning of the statement; for representatives of other language families, in particular the Sino-Tibetan, such a seemingly completely "harmless" replacement can lead to a misunderstanding of the situational meaning.

A deep error in violation of the process of "assembly" of frames occurs in the case of: a) "substitution" of the meaning of one or more of the modules with a similar meaning, but which can be used in a different situation. An example of such a "substitution" is Jimmy Carter's speech before the Poles. Errors in the "assembly" of modules were associated with a) synonymy, for example, the neutral word "desires" with emotional coloring was used in the meaning of passion between a man and a woman (for example, "he resisted public desires for choice in education") But the translator chose an emotional component module, not its logical one. There is an explanation for this: American culture is inherently logical, everything is subject to logic; Polish culture, being part of the Slavic cultural area, is more sensual - emotional and rational have a certain balance. Another example from the same speech: "when I left the United State" was perceived as "leaving the country forever," because one of the synonyms for the word "leave" is the word "quit," that is, "leave forever."

The situation is much more complicated with other language families, for example, Sino-Tibetan, whose languages are spoken by over 1 billion 300 million people. These languages have completely homonymous roots, the meaning of the word is determined by the prefix. For example, classical Tibetan: r-na (ear), s-na (nose). For this group of languages, the situation is quite typical when the same affix serves to transform a nominal stem into a verb stem and vice versa, while changing the meaning of the word: "dhron" - to transmit, "dhrons" - transmitted, records; "em" - drink, "ems" – drink, "rem" - forest, "srem" - to be wooded, dense. Or the phrases: "teks ga j? nhaj?" - The supreme lord will harm us, and "Teks pe nhaj? gaj?" "The Supreme Overlord will not harm us. The same applies to the Chinese language, in which 4

homonymous ones are distinguished, but depending on the tone, they can be combined with only one type of roots, while creating a different meaning. For example, the word "tja": the first tone means "house," the second tone (attached to the root of the word) means "family" or "group"; the third tone (attached to the root of the word) means "holidays" and the fourth tone (attached to the root words) means "driving." In different contexts, the word "driving" will have different meanings - as a separate word "driving some kind of vehicle" and as "behaving" in the semantic bundle home - family - holidays - feeling of oneself.

A transposition error will inevitably occur if even one of the errors described above occurs, whether replication or linking, or any other.

3. Discussion

Over the course of 5 years, communicants who represented different cultures were observed, in particular American, Arabic (Jordan, Saudi Arabia, Palestine, Yemen, Egypt, Libya, UAE), German, Persian (Iran, Afghanistan), Turkish, Slavic (Poland, Bulgaria, Serbia, Russia, Belarus), Chinese, Korean, Azerbaijani, Georgian, Turkmen, African (Congo, Nigeria). The observation was conducted among students and representatives of the diplomatic corps. The purpose of this observation was the perception of codes of a foreign culture by communicants of different cultural groups and areas. In particular, it was studied how representatives of the above-mentioned cultures perceived the codes of Russian culture and how representatives of different cultures perceived each other's cultural codes within a cultural group (Arab countries, African countries, Iran-Afghanistan) and within areas (Georgia, Azerbaijan), and between cultural groups and areas. On the other hand, the study dealt with the perception of culture codes within the same language family and between cultures belonging to different language families. Based on observations and clearly fixed records (all participants received corrective questions), a taxonomy of information-semantic errors was created. It is assumed that this is not the latest version, for its deepening and expansion it is necessary to be in different cultural environments - monocultural and multicultural with a dominant culture. All observations were made in the Ukrainian cultural environment (biological location), but in the Russian cultural environment (mental location). The study showed that all errors that occur are associated with a violation of perceptual connections in the cognitive system. At the same time, both deep perceptual connections fixed in memory and new perceptual connections that are consciously or unconsciously violated due to insufficiently formed elements of the cognitive system are violated. The insufficiency of the cognitive system is explained by the weakly expressed

empirical relationship between the components of cognitive knowledge and the predominance of stereotyped ideas. The considered information-semantic errors of the code formed the taxonomic core from which new research in the field of intercultural communication will develop. Today, errors in the presentation of information, errors in "reading" cultures remain unexplored (for example, in Arab culture they never say no, in this culture refusal is expressed through the construction "you need to think, you need to find out ....," but in the Slavic environment this is perceived as almost consent), cultural background reading errors (e.g., a Chinese traditional wedding is in red, which denotes joy, and in Anglo-Saxon culture, red symbolizes passion), linguistic background reading errors (e.g., phraseological constructions and figurative expressions), and other. Questions about the influence of the mega-codes of civilizations on the basic cultural codes of groups located in the area of civilization, the interaction of culture codes between different monocultural spaces, the interaction of culture codes within a polycultural space, and many other issues remain debatable. An important question is the influence of cultural codes on the formation of elements of the cognitive system - their sufficiency or insufficiency for understanding the foreign code.

4. Conclusions

1. The errors considered in the work that occur in the process of intercultural communication, namely: a code perception error, a decoding error, a mismatch error, a linking error resulting from a transient error, a replication error and a transposition error with a violation of semantic integrity, are associated with a lack of perceptual and empirical connections within the cognitive system.

2. Cultures are able to create certain semantic fields for understanding each other's codes. These fields are "read" by the cognitive systems of the communicants.

3. Cultures that are in close contact (country borders) form transitional semantic fields in which it is possible to "smooth out" the semantic difference in the content of culture codes. It becomes not very noticeable, which makes it easier to perceive the code and understand it. Perceptual and empirical connections in such a semantic field are clear and persistent.

4. Cultures that are not in close contact form transient associative fields (cultures of the same language family, for example, Slavic), in which the basic semantic substrate is common, which also helps to more successfully perceive the other code, but leads to some kind of semantic "confusion." Perceptual and empirical connections in such a field are fuzzy, but tend to be ordered.

5. Cultures belonging to different language families, when in contact with each other, do not create any semantic fields. The perception of cultural codes depends only on the flexibility of the cognitive systems of communicants and the plasticity of their brains. In such a model, perceptual and empirical connections are unbalanced - either the perceptual connection or the empirical connection dominates.

References

Алефиренко, Николай [Alefirenko, Nikolay] (2012) *Лингвокультурология: ценностно-смысловое пространство языка.* Москва: Флинта: Наука.

Алефиренко, Николай [Alefirenko, Nikolay] (2020) "Код культуры в двуязычной картине мира"; 7-20. Retrieved from: https://www.uhk.cz/file/edee/pedagogicka-fakulta/pdf/pracoviste-fakulty/katedra-ruskeho-jazyka-a-literatury/philologia-rossica/philologia-rossica-2/3-studie/1.pdf.

Аванесова, Галина, Ирина Купцова [Avanesova, Galina, Irina Kuptsova] (2015) "Коды культуры: понимание сущности, функциональная роль в культурной практике". *В мире науки и искусства: вопросы филологии, искусствоведения и культурологии.* 4 (47); 28-37.

Белянин, Валерий [Belyanin, Valery] (2003) *Психолингвистика.* Москва: Флинта.

Дейк ван, Теон. А. [Dijk van, Teun A.] (1989) *Язык. Познание. Коммуникация.* Москва: Прогресс.

Hyatt, David, Hugh Escott, Robin Bone (2022) "'Addressing' Language Deficit: Valuing Children's Variational Repertories". *Literacy*, 56 (3); 212-224.

Кармин, Анатолий С. [Karmin, Anatoly S.] (2006) "Философия культуры в информационном обществе: проблемы и перспективы". *Вопросы философии,* 2; 52-60.

Корчажкина, Ольга [Korchazhkina, Olga] (2016) "Естественная когнитивная система Homo Cognitionis: в поисках алгоритма человеческого мышления". *Проблемы искусственного интеллекта,* 2(3); 25-38.

Красных, Виктория [Krasnykh, Victoria] (2002) *Этнопсихолингвистика и лингвокультурология.* Москва: Гнозис.

Ларина, Татьяна, Владимир Озюменко, Динбар Ишанкулова [Larina, Tatyana, Vladimir Ozyumenko, Dilbar Ishankulova] (2011) "О позитивном мышлении представителей англосаксонской культуры и его отражение в языке и коммуникации". *Вопросы*

психолингвистики, 13; 52-63.

Лотман, Юрий [Lotman Yuri] (1996) *Внутри мыслящих миров. Человек — текст — семиосфера — история.* Москва: Языки русской культуры.

Маслова, Валентина [Maslova, Valentina] (2001) *Лингвокультурология*. Москва: Академия.

Некрасов, Сергей, Наталия Молчанова [Nekrasov, Sergey, Natalia Molchanova] (2009) "Значение теории фреймов в современной науке'. *Nomothetika,* 16 (71); 13-17.

Oksaar, Else (1998) *Kulturemtheorie: ein Beitrag zur Sprachverwendungsforschung.* Göttingen

Падучева, Елена [Paducheva, Elena] (1996) "Феномен Анны Вежбицкой" /В кн: Вежбицкая А. *Язык. Культура. Познание*. Москва:Русские словари; 5-32.

Pamies, Antonio (2017) "The Concept of Cultureme from a Lexicographical Point of View'". *Open Linguistics,* 3 (1); 100-114.

Философская энциклопедия [Philosophical encyclopedia] *Когнитивная система*. Retrieved from: https//dic.academic.ru.

Polanyi, Michael (1969) *Knowing and Being.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press

Пархомовский, Виктор [Porhomovsky, Victor] (2016) "Этничность в межкультурной коммуникации". *Вопросы психолингвистики*, 3 (29); 258-268.

Пушилина, Наталия, Наталия Моханкова, Елена Широких [Pushilina, Natalia, Natalia Mokhankova, Elena Shirokikh] (2015) "Коммуникативные неудачи в межкультурной коммуникации: причины, типология, стратегии минимизации*". Вестник Удмуртского университета*, 6; 28-34.

Рябова, Марина [Ryabova, Marina] (2009) "Характер ассимиляции культурных смыслов при переводе". *Вестник Челябинского государственного университета*, 10 (148); 114-120.

Серёгина, Татьяна [Seryogina, Tatyana] (2020) "Модели межкультурной коммуникации". *Власть*, 1; 119-124.

Симбирцева, Наталья [Simbirtseva, Natalia] (2016) "Код культуры как культурологическая категория". *Знание. Понимание. Умение*, 1; 157-167.

Simpson, Andrew (2019) *Language and Society*. Oxford University Press.

Simpson, Paul (1993) *Language, Ideology and Point of View*. London: Routledge.

Стёпкин, Игорь [Styopkin, Igor] (2001) *Речевое воздействие: проблема понимания инокультурного текста.* Москва: МГЛУ.

Телия, Вероника [Telia, Veronica] (1999) „Первоочередные задачи и методологические

проблемы исследования фразеологического состава языка в контексте культуры". *Фразеология в контексте культуры*; 13-24.

Выготский, Лев [Vygotsky, Lev] (2016) *История развития высших психических функций.* Москва: Юрайт.

Вежбицкая, Анна [Wierzbicka, Anna] (1996) *Язык. Культура. Познание*. Москва: Языки русской культуры.

Жаркова, Татьяна [Zharkova, Tatyana] (2011) "Лакуны в межкультурной коммуникации". *Актуальные проблемы филологии и педагогической лингвистики,* 13; 225-227.