O.B. TARNOPOLSKY,
Doctor of Pedagogy, Full Professor, Head of the Department of Applied Linguistics
and Methods of Foreign Language Teaching at Alfred Nobel University

M.R. KABANOVA,
Candidate of Philology, Associate Professor, Associate Professor of the Department
of Applied Linguistics and Methods of Foreign Language Teaching at Alfred Nobel University

O.O. MIKHLIK,
Senior Lecturer of the Department of English Philology and Translation
at Alfred Nobel University

UKRAINIAN-ENGLISH-GERMAN CULTURAL MATCHES AND MISMATCHES: GUIDELINES FOR TEACHING GERMAN CULTURE TO TERTIARY LINGUISTIC STUDENTS LEARNING GERMAN AS THE SECOND FOREIGN LANGUAGE AFTER ENGLISH AS THE FIRST ONE

Навчання будь-якої іноземної мови, особливо в мовних ЗВО, неможливе без навчання студентів комунікативної культури відповідної мовної спільноти. Це стосується як навчання першої іноземної мови у мовному ЗВО, так і навчання усіх інших іноземних мов (другої, третьої тощо), яких можуть і мають навчати на основі та беручи до уваги комунікативні культури мовно-соціо-культурних спільнот, у яких функціонує рідна мова студентів (L1) та іноземна мова, яку вони вивчали як першу (L2). Якщо навчають третьої іноземної мови, комунікативні культури L1, L2 та другої іноземної мови (L3) мають розглядатися як основа для порівнянь, навчання і т. д. У статті проаналізовано поняття комунікативної культури з точки зору методики навчання іноземних мов і продемонстровано, що ця культура складається із стандартів комунікативної поведінки, які поділяються на вербальні, невербальні та змішані стандарти і стандарти комунікативної поведінки «стилю життя». Наводяться приклади всіх чотирьох типів стандартів комунікативної поведінки, які було взято з типової комунікації в україно-, англо- та німецькомовній культурній спільноті. У статті також наведено докази того, що, коли німецька мова вивчається як друга іноземна (L3) у мовному ЗВО, німецької комунікативної культури потрібно навчати шляхом порівняння німецькомовних стандартів комунікативної поведінки (вербальних, невербальних, змішаних та «стилю життя») з відповідними україномовними та англомовними стандартами (L1 та L2). Знаходячи відповідності та невідповідності, порівнюючи, зіставляючи та протиставляючи стандарти комунікативної поведінки, які характерні для різних мовно-соціо-культурних спільнот, студенти не тільки краще усвідомлюють, розуміють та опановують комунікативну культуру, що відрізняє німецькомовну спільноту та носіїв німецької мови, – другої іноземної для них. Вони також навчаються краще розуміти комунікативну культуру спілкування своєю основною іноземною мовою (англійською – L2) і навіть комунікативну культуру спілкування рідною мовою (українською – L1), таким чином формуючи власне чітке уявлення про комунікативну культуру людського спілкування взагалі, що дуже важливо для студентів-філологів.

Ключові слова: німецька мова як друга іноземна, англійська мова як перша іноземна, українська мова як рідна, комунікативна культура, стандарти комунікативної поведінки, знаходження культурної відповідності та невідповідності.

Обучение любому иностранному языку, особенно в языковых вузах, невозможно без обучения студентов коммуникативной культуре соответствующего языкового сообщества. Это касается как обучения первому иностранному языку в названном типе высшего учебного заведения, так и обучения всем **последующим иностранным языкам (второму, третьему и т.д.), которым можно и нужно** обучать на основе и принимая во внимание коммуникативные культуры языко-социо-культурных сообществ, в которых функционирует родной язык студентов и первый известный им иностранный язык (а затем второй и т.д.). В статье анализируется понятие коммуникативной культуры с точки зрения методики преподавания иностранных языков и демонстрируется, что эта культура состоит из стандартов коммуникативного поведения, которые распределяются на стандарты вербальные, невербальные, смешанные и стандарты коммуникативного поведения «стиля жизни». Приводятся доказательства того, что, когда немецкий язык изучается как второй иностранный в языковом вузе, немецкой культуре следует обучать через сопоставление немецкоязычных стандартов коммуникативного поведения с украино- и англоязычными стандартами. Находя соответствия и несоответствия сопоставляемых стандартов, принадлежащих разным языко-социо-культурным общностям, студенты не только лучше понимают и осваивают коммуникативную культуру второго иностранного языка, относящегося к немецкоязычному языко-социо-культурному сообществу. Они также учатся лучше понимать коммуникативную культуру своего основного иностранного языка и даже родного языка, тем самым формируя для себя четкое представление о коммуникативной культуре человеческого общения вообще, что очень важно для студентов-филологов.

Ключевые слова: немецкий язык как второй иностранный, английский язык как первый иностранный, украинский язык как родной, коммуникативная культура, стандарты коммуникативного поведения, нахождение культурного соответствия и несоответствия.

Problem statement. In the last few decades, foreign language teaching is becoming more and more culturally oriented, so that one of the most important skills to be developed by every foreign language student is considered to be the skill of *culturally appropriate target language communication* [5; 7]. Such communication is the one which proceeds in full accordance with the cultural norms of communication existing in a given target *speech community* [8], or *language and cultural community*, i.e. the community where some specific cultural norms function in communication, those norms being proper to that community only and finding reflection both in verbal and non-verbal peculiarities of communication in the language serving as the principal means of communication for the community in question. For a foreign language student acquiring the skill of culturally appropriate target language communication may be considered as gaining command of the target *communicative culture* whose specific features will be considered further in this article. But even now it should be mentioned that such a culture is quite peculiar for every speech community, so that with every new foreign language that is being learned new communicative culture features need to be acquired in parallel with the linguistic features of the new target foreign language.

When the first foreign language (L2) is acquired outside its natural environment (e.g., when English is taught and learned as a foreign language in Ukraine) some comparisons with the linguistic features of the students' mother tongue (L1) are inevitable. The same concerns the comparisons of some cultural features of L2 communication as compared to the communication in L1 because such linguistic and cultural comparisons help students to realize better the linguistic and cultural peculiarities of communication in the target language (L2) as opposed to the communication in their L1. In this way, they more consciously and deeply acquire those peculiarities, thus improving their L2 communication skill mastery.

The same holds true of the second foreign language (L3) acquisition which also needs linguistic and cultural comparisons with learners' L1 to improve L3 mastery. But in this case comparisons should embrace not only L1 and L3. They should also cover L2 (the first foreign language already known to students), especially in the area of cultural comparisons, because the more communicative cultural phenomena the learners can match, contrast, juxtapose, and oppose the deeper is their understanding and mastery of the peculiarities of the communicative culture proper to each of the compared languages and cultures.

This articles analyzes such acquisition of L3 communicative culture when the L3 is German and its communicative culture is acquired through comparisons with learners' L1 (Ukrainian) communicative culture and their L2 (the first foreign language – English) communicative culture.

Thus, a situation typical for foreign language teaching at linguistic tertiary schools is discussed when the second foreign language is being taught and learned on the basis of students' both mother tongue and their first foreign language.

Analysis of recent research and publications. Much attention is given in research and publications to teaching second foreign languages at tertiary linguistic schools. Probably the most prominent of those publications is the work by B. Lapidus [2] in which one of the main ideas is the one also advocated in our article – the necessity to compare the phenomena of the second foreign language (L3) being taught to the language peculiarities of not only the learners L1 but also of the first foreign language already known to them (L2). Regretfully, the author did not pay much attention to the cultural studies in the course of the second foreign language for tertiary linguistic students because at the time when his book was written culture-oriented foreign language learning was not considered to be of primary importance. But it has become of such importance later and, therefore, even on the basis of the book by B. Lapidus [2], it can be concluded that, if teaching L3 should be based on comparing it with L1 and L2, such comparisons should obligatorily include the cultural constituent of the L3 course, i.e. the comparisons of the L3 communicative culture with the communicative cultures of L1 and L2.

The question is what cultural phenomena should be taught in the L3 course and what phenomena of L3 communicative culture should be compared with the L1 and L2 communicative cultures. The answer can be found in today's ideas about the component parts of culture instruction in any foreign language course.

In all the works on culture-oriented language studies (see, for instance, 1; 4) the difference between two cultures that can be taught to students is either implicitly or explicitly emphasized. This difference can be called the difference between the culture with a big 'C' and the culture with a small 'c.' The first of them (the culture with a big 'C') includes art, literature, political structure of the country, legislature, i.e. everything that is usually implied when speaking about the culture of a nation. It is certainly very good for students' intellectual development if they learn about the big 'C' culture of English- or German-speaking nations when they are learning English or German as their first or second foreign language at a tertiary linguistic school. But such learners' intellectual and cultural development is not the task of the practical course of English or German taught exclusively for communication purposes because the big 'C' culture does not influence ordinary communication very much, not being what was called above the "communicative culture."

The latter culture (culture with a small 'c') was best defined as far back as the 1950s by R. Lado [10] who, investigating the relations between language and culture and being interested only in those aspects of culture that directly influence communication in a given language (communicative culture), wrote that culture is a *patterned behavior*. Therefore, comparing two communicative cultures (e.g., Ukrainian and English) is comparing two types of patterned behavior, while in our case, when three types of communicative culture (Ukrainian, English, and German) are supposed to be compared, it means comparing three types of patterned behavior.

This view of communicative culture is shared by J. Corbett who wrote [6, p. 2] that:

"culture' is first of all a mental phenomenon: its basis is a variable set of normative beliefs, values and attitudes which are shared by certain groups. This socially-shared set of beliefs and values generates certain types of behaviour - including all sorts of linguistic behaviour ... . Linguistic behaviour is ... partly an act of affiliation to, or rejection of, a cultural group, and partly a way of directly or indirectly sustaining or questioning the beliefs of the community. Culture permeates every aspect of communication."

Teaching patterned behavior characteristic of the target language communicative culture certainly does not mean full affiliation to that culture and losing one's own national cultural identity. It is just an effective means of what D. Killick [9] calls "*crossing the cultural divide*". It develops what the same author calls the cross-cultural capability which is "*a widening and deepening of capabilities for interpersonal interaction. ... learning to see, to recognise and critically evaluate difference or otherness from an objective standpoint. These depend upon self-awareness of myself as a cultural being ...* " [9, p. 5].

In this way, comparing the German communicative culture in the university course of German as the second foreign language (L3) with the English-speaking nations' communicative cul-

tures (English as the first foreign language – L2) and the mother tongue communicative culture (Ukrainian as L1) means comparing three different sets of culturally conditioned patterned behaviors manifested in the communication of native Ukrainian-, English-, and German-speakers. The comparisons are made for students' better understanding and better acquisition of the cultural peculiarities of communication in all the three languages (including L1), so that they are able, when switching from one language to another, to do it in totally culturally appropriate (for a given target speech community [8]) manner.

In the works by O. Tarnopolsky [11] such sets of culturally conditioned patterned behaviors are considered as a *communicative etiquette* consisting of *communicative behavioral patterns*. It is those communicative behavioral patterns that are taught to students when we teach them communicative culture of whatever foreign language that they are acquiring. O. Tarnopolsky and N. Sklyarenko [3] classify those patterns as *verbal communicative behavioral patterns, non-verbal communicative behavioral patterns, mixed communicative behavioral patterns,* and *lifestyle communicative behavioral patterns* which should all be taught to tertiary linguistic students.

Purpose of the article. In accordance with everything said above, the purpose of this article is to demonstrate what is included in the sets of communicative behavioral patterns belonging to all the four mentioned types and how to teach them to university students learning German (L3) through comparison with the Ukrainian (L1) and English (L2) communicative behavioral patterns.

Principal material. As it has been already said, the first type of communicative behavioral patterns to be taught to university students of German as the second foreign language (in comparison with similar patterns from learners' L1 and L2) are the *verbal* ones. *Verbal communicative behavioral patterns are those culture specific verbal formulas (e.g., formulas of politeness) or more or less set verbal expressions that must obligatorily be used in the target language communication for that communication to be considered as culturally normative by native speakers in the target speech community*. A good example is the culturally normative way of politely disagreeing with your interlocutor. In the Ukrainian speech community telling him or her in the situation of disagreement: «*Ви неправі! Я абсолютно з Вами не згоден!*» is totally culturally acceptable and does not seem impolite. On the contrary, in the British speech community telling your interlocutor: "*You are wrong!*" is downright rude. Only a much more veiled and indirect (not categorical) formula of disagreement is acceptable, something like: "*I can agree with some of the pints you have made but, on the other hand, … .*"

However, this particular verbal communicative behavioral pattern in the German speech community is much closer to the corresponding pattern in the Ukrainian communicative culture than in the British one. For a native speaker of German direct and categorical disagreement: "*Sie haben nicht recht!*" is quite normative and not at all impolite. Also, the Germans are more inclined to cursing and strong words in everyday speech than the British are and are also closer to the Ukrainians in this respect.

It should not be considered as signs of greater closeness of German cultural communicative norms to the Ukrainian ones or even of greater closeness of German and Ukrainian mentalities in comparison with the British one since with a number of other patterns it often can be and is vice versa. It only shows that if a learner of German as the second foreign language is put into a situation where he or she compares a similar communicative behavioral pattern in three speech communities communicating in three different languages, he or she will get a much clearer idea about the variety of forms of that pattern functioning in three different cultures – thus better realizing and appropriating the pattern itself not for communication in German only (as L3) but also in English (L2) and his or her own mother tongue (L1). It means students' developing generalized ideas about communicative cultures in different speech communities. Therefore, the more opportunities a student of Philology gets of comparing verbal communicative behavioral patterns from as many different language and cultural communities as possible, the better impact is made on his or her acquisition of all the target languages and cultures that he or she is studying.

The same holds true of *non-verbal communicative behavioral patterns*. They are *standard culture specific non-verbal features of communication delivering socially and culturally determined messages by purely non-verbal means in a given language and in a given speech community*. A very characteristic non-verbal communicative behavioral pattern is the so-called "*comfort zone*"

or "*body bubble*," i.e. a normative distance between interlocutors in communication if they are not people close to each other, like close friends or relatives [7]. It is known that in more Northern cultures, like the British, the Scandinavians, the Germans, this distance is greater (up to 1/1.5 meters) than in Southern cultures, like the Italians or the Spanish, where it is much shorter (50/70 cm).

A characteristic non-verbal communicative behavioral pattern distinguishing the cultures of German-speaking and English-speaking nations is the pattern often demonstrated in business negotiations. For an American to take off his jackets and roll up the sleeves of his shirt means that for him all the preliminaries are over and he is eager to get down to business. For a German, the meaning of this pattern is absolutely opposite – the desire to stop talking business and relax for a while. The Ukrainians do not have a definite non-verbal communicative behavioral pattern for similar situations, so when working on it in the course of German as a second foreign language after English, this fact should also be emphasized while comparing the opposition of German and English communicative behavioral etiquette in such cases.

The identical approach may be followed when working with *mixed communicative behavioral patterns* which are simply a combination of verbal and non-verbal ones. For instance, verbal greetings in English-speaking cultures should, in normal circumstances, be accompanied with a smile, which are not obligatory in German- and Ukrainian-speaking communicative cultures. Another example is the fact that both the British and the Ukrainians prefer at the very start of business negotiations to be engaged in some "small talk" at least for a couple of minutes before beginning to discuss business matters. Starting with them at once may be considered not quite polite. On the contrary, the Germans believe such "small talk" to be a waste of time which sometimes generates a feeling of annoyance (a non-verbal reaction) followed by a verbal one: "*Zur Sache*! (*Down to business*!)." Again, such a pattern should be taught in comparing, contrasting, juxtaposing, and opposing all the three communicative cultures with which the students are working.

The same concerns *lifestyle communicative behavioral patterns*. They are those using which an individual contacts representatives of a whole social institution as an outsider – a user of services of that institution. For this person the officials of the institution with whom he or she is in contact represent the institution as a whole – and are hardly viewed as individuals. Examples of this kind may be the communication of a customer and a shop assistant, of a client and a teller at the bank, of a taxi driver and a passenger. Such kinds of communicative contacts embrace practically everything that the economists refer to as the tertiary sector – all kinds of services, health care, leisure, tourism, and so on. That is why communication in such situations – whether verbal or non-verbal – and behavior in them are most highly standardized, and communicative behavioral patterns in such situations are probably the most standardized of all the patterns. Thus, lifestyle communicative behavioral patterns " *… may be defined as standardized patterns used by individuals to obtain specific services from social institutions designed for rendering such services in communication with either human or mechanical representatives of these institutions*" [3, p. 23]. Such patterns are also culture-specific. For instance, from their quoted definition it is clear that students being taught any foreign language should learn lifestyle communicative behavioral patterns of using public transport in the given target language and cultural community. But such patterns depend on the kind of public transport to be used. In this respect, one the most spread means of public transport in English-speaking cities is the bus while in German-speaking cities it is much more often the tram. In Ukraine, tram and bus services are quite balanced in what concerns the number of people riding them. Therefore, in the course of German as a second foreign language after English students should be taught lifestyle communicative behavioral patterns of using trams in German-speaking cities in opposition to the rarity of that means of transport in English-speaking cities (unlike buses) and in comparison with the regulations of riding trams in Ukraine.

Just the above described comparative method of teaching different types of communicative behavioral patterns in the course of German as the second foreign language can lead to the best awareness and acquisition of such patterns by learners not only in the target German-speaking communicative culture but also in the two other communicative cultures (English and Ukrainian) being analyzed in the course of such comparisons.

Conclusions and further research directions. Everything said in this article proves that every foreign language course is supposed to include teaching target speech community culture. But it is not the culture with a big 'C'. What is meant is the small 'c' culture, or communicative culture that consists of communicative behavioral patterns determining what kind of communicative behavior should be followed in different communicative situations in the target language and cultural community. It is those communicative behavioral patterns, which can be classified into four types (verbal, nonverbal, mixed, and "lifestyle" ones), that should be taught to every foreign language student. It is equally important to make learners acquire them not only when the first foreign language is taught but also when they are gaining command of the second, third, etc. foreign language. The paper discusses the case of a course of German as a second foreign language after English taught to students of tertiary linguistic schools and shows how to teach German communicative behavioral patterns in such a course. It is demonstrated that they absolutely must be taught in comparison, contrast, opposition, and juxtaposition to comparable Ukrainian (students' mother tongue) and English (learners' first foreign language) communicative behavioral patterns. In the process of such comparisons, contrasts, oppositions, and juxtapositions not the "either … or" mode but the mode of "both … and" should be followed. It means the absolute necessity of comparing the communicative behavioral patterns from the new foreign language being learned to similar known patterns *not from only one but from all the previously acquired languages*. This is *the most general conclusion* that can be drawn from the material in the article. The *further research directions* lie in studying the methods of teaching communicative behavioral patterns in courses of other foreign languages, besides German, being learned as the second, the third, etc. ones after some other foreign language(s) acquired before them.

Bibliography

1. Верещагин Е.М. Язык и культура: Лингвострановедение в преподавании русского языка как иностранного / Е.М. Верещагин, В.Г. Костомаров; 4-изд., перераб. и доп. – М.: Русский язык, 1990. – 270 с.

2. Лапидус Б.А. Обучение второму иностранному языку как специальности / Б.А. Лапидус. – М.: Высшая школа, 1980. – 176 с.

3. Тарнопольський О.Б. Lifestyle communicative behavioral patterns in the USA / О.Б. Тарнопольський, Н.К. Скляренко; 2-ге вид., випр. і доп. – К.: ІНКОС, 2003. – 208 с.

4. Тер-Минасова С.Г. Язык и межкультурная коммуникация / С.Г. Тер-Минасова. – М.: Слово, 2000. – 624 с.

5. Byram M. Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence / M. Byram. – Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1997. – 124 p.

6. Corbett J. 'Chewing the fat' is a cultural issue / J. Corbett. // IATEFL Issues. – 1999. – No.148. – P. 2–3.

7. Damen L. Culture learning: The fifth dimension in the language classroom / L. Damen. – Reading (MA): Addison Wesley, 1987. – 406 p.

8. Hymes D.H. On communicative competence / D.H. Hymes. – Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1971. – 213 p.

9. Killick D. Culture and capability: Crossing the divide / D. Killick. //*IATEFL Issues*. – 1999. – No.148. – P.4–7.

10. Lado R. Linguistics Across Cultures: Applied Linguistics for Language Teachers / R. Lado. – Ann Arbor (MI): University of Michigan Press, 1957. – 141 p.

11. Tarnopolsky O. Teaching etiquette communicative behavioral patterns to students of English as a foreign language / O. Tarnopolsky. // Atlantis. – 2001. – Vol. XXIII, Num. 2. – P. 105–117.

,