



ETHNO-CULTURAL SPECIFICS OF COMMUNICATIVE MEANS OF COMMUNICATION

Khurshid Abdirakhmatovich Bobanov

Lecturer, Shahrizabz state pedagogical institute, Uzbekistan

Abstract. *The article provides a psychological analysis of the elements of communicative activity from the point of view of ethno-cultural differences. The possibilities of ethnopsychological specificity in the study of communication tools are considered. It emphasizes the need to activate psychological science in the study of ethno-cultural and cultural-psychological characteristics of people in order to improve intercultural communication as one of the most important realities of the modern multicultural world.*

Keywords: *communication, communication, ethnic culture, ethnic psychology, communication culture, means of communication.*

The culture of communication ensures the unity of ethnic culture and the ability of an ethnic group to self-produce. All this makes it relevant to study not only the individual mechanisms of the culture of communication of ethnic groups, but also those psychological stimuli that activate all possible means of communication. We refer to the internal psychological conditions of the implementation of communicative processes, which are viewed at different levels. First, it is the level of communication activated by material objects: sounds, images, objects of the material and spiritual world. Secondly, it is the level of communication, symbolizing the synthesis of objects of the surrounding reality, included in all possible social connections and relationships, and the process of interaction of people, i.e. the level at which the exchange of ways and means of life is carried out. And, finally, third, it is the level of communication that characterizes the internal activity of an individual or group, it is a kind of symptom of certain psychological states, value orientations of the individual or community.

Standards and attributes of communication as independent minimal elements of communication can actualize certain characteristics of interpersonal or intergroup relations. It can be any phrases and gestures exchanged by people of different ages and professions in different social situations (teacher with student, husband with wife, friends with each other, seller with buyer, etc.), in other words, it is all that is characterized by standard forms of communication, which are characteristic of a particular field life culture of communication. The ethnic specifics of essentially universal cultural signs are contained in the ways they are expressed, as well as in the features of evaluating and structuring specific situations of interaction. There are quite a lot of examples that indicate the ethnic identity of elementary units of communication, for example, in greeting or parting, during symbolic marriage rites, etc.



To an even greater extent, ethnic identity concerns the attributes of communication, with the only difference being that these are less independent units of communication. In fact, the attributes of communication are not so much acts of communication, but rather peculiar background signs of certain actions. This can include details of the external appearance provided for by specific situations, and all sorts of operations with objects that are characteristic of a particular ethnic community. Usually these are so-called signs of social symbolism, for example, rituals in the etiquette of behavior in different ethnic groups (in the customs adopted at meals, when entering or leaving a room, etc.). As E. A. Basin rightly notes, "the tendency to replace the instrumental goals of behavior with its ritual functions" is the main property of social and symbolic communication [1, p. 166].

Communication attributes are functionally bifurcated. On the one hand, the specificity of the attributes of communication in the exchange of cultural realities, in which objects, actions or processes retain their aesthetic functions. On the other hand, the attributes of communication perform, although not very actively, an incentive function. And indeed, the attributes of communication do not require an immediate response. As a rule, they are "taken into account" and taken into account in the future. Thus, the standards and attributes of communication are the simplest elements on the basis of which the culture of communication is built, these are the norms of communication, or rather, their materialized expressions. From the point of view of social psychology, the standards and attributes of communication correspond to images of communicative actions and attitudes that express the willingness and ability to transform these images into actions that meet the conditions and circumstances stipulated in the norms.

Standards and attributes of communication are the material used to build the most complex units that symbolize the two – way nature of human communication-dialogues.

It is important for today's science not only to study the structure of dialogues, but also to create a typology of such units. Certain steps have been taken in this direction, for example. Thus, A. R. Balayan suggests distinguishing between multi-modal interaction – polemics and single-modal interaction-unison [4]. B. F. Lomov distinguishes, however, on other grounds, three types of dialogues: "message – attitude to it", "question – answer", "motivation to action – execution" [2]. There are other classifications of dialogs, both substantive and formal.

Almost no effort was made to study the ethnic specifics of the dialogue. Meanwhile, it is much more pronounced here than in any other sphere of communication. Significant ethnic differences are observed in the degree of social determination (connectedness) of the action and reaction in the dialogue. Each culture contains a class of rigidly defined ritualized acts of information exchange, but in some ethnic groups it is broader and more diverse, while in others it is narrow and stingy. It is known that European cultures in this respect are significantly inferior to the cultures of the East.

The structure of dialogue as a means of communication can be simple or more complex, expressing a more or less complete interaction, and corresponds to the process during which.





contact between people is established, maintained, and terminated. Dialogue is the features of interaction perceived by the participants of communication and experienced by them. This is perhaps the most consistent feature of the dialog. All other characteristics of the dialog vary quite widely – place, time, duration, subject setting, content, structure, participants, etc. Even in its most strictly defined forms (for example, traditional or ritual), dialogue has a greater number of degrees of freedom.

National and cultural specifics are typical for all the variety of dialogues. However, this specificity is not always pronounced and requires special analysis of both standards and attributes, as well as other parts of the communication process. In other words, there are many nuances that were often left out of the interests of researchers. Even seemingly universal human responses, such as laughter or a smile, are included in the dialogue in accordance with specific cultural norms. So, the conventional smile of representatives of eastern cultures (Japanese, Indonesians, etc.) in Europe, most likely, would be perceived as a mockery. If the Japanese do not look the other person in the face and lower their eyes, this is their ethnically accepted rule of politeness. And for Europeans, the same thing would be a symptom of insincerity.

Special attention should be paid to considering the dialog from the point of view of its subject matter and composition. Each national culture contains topics of communication dedicated to certain life situations. In addition, there are also forbidden topics. The compositional characteristics of dialogues also have ethno-cultural specifics. This applies to the volume, the different phases of the dialog, and the way they alternate. In many Eastern peoples, a conversation on a given topic is preceded by a rather long conversation on all sorts of abstract topics, the so-called phatic communication. As a rule, these are conversations about the weather, news, health, etc. The main information is pronounced as if by the way, most often-before parting. Phatic communication among Central Asians takes significantly longer than basic communication.

As for the text, it is also directly related to the ethnic culture of communication. It is the text, if it is understood broadly (more broadly than in linguistics), that is, in essence, a chain of communicative units with the help of which the cultural basis is realized. As a text, we can consider the functioning of traditional or ceremonial rituals described by scientists: a feast, a wedding, a funeral, etc. In addition, texts can be considered not only as a way of existence, but also as a way of objectifying communicative activity. In this case, another property of the text is manifested – to act as a metalanguage of communicative activity, i.e. as a means of describing communication. At the same time, the description of communicative activity is a necessary condition for the organization and self-organization of culture. In the culture of communication of ethnic groups, there are a huge variety of texts of this type: myths, epics, fairy tales, legends, proverbs, etc. In this regard, we can also talk about the secondary function of texts – the function of reproducing the culture of communication of an ethnic group, which allows us to consider the text as another, hierarchically more complex, unit of communication, through which all its other units are.





realized and receive semantic content, and self-organization of the culture of communication is carried out. Thus, the entire behavioral culture of an ethnic group can be represented as a system of texts.

All the considered units of communication, including texts, are linked by cultural signs. The culture of communication of an ethnic group appears in this case as a unity of historically formed signs characteristic of it and specific ways of using them in the course of social practice.


The scale of action of many phenomena of communication culture is largely determined by the specifics of the material in which they are embodied. The problem of the culture of communication of an ethnic group in this regard has become the object of a large number of studies relatively recently, although the real prerequisites for this existed before. It all started with an illustrative list of material carriers of communication proposed by the English social psychologist M. Argyle. The researcher identified several varieties of the so-called "social technique" of behavior or communication: touch, physical distance and posture, gestures, facial expressions, eye movements, non-linguistic aspects of speech, and speech itself [5, pp. 28-32].

Modern psychological science, thanks to the appearance of a classification of this kind, has gained a wide field for studying all possible aspects of communication and interaction of people in different cultures and ethnic groups. Today, studies of physiognomic reduction, causal attribution, kinesics, visualization, and other means of communication are considered classics of ethnic and cross-cultural psychology. Unfortunately, it is necessary to recognize the fact that most of these studies were conducted and are now being conducted by scientists from far and near abroad. The efforts of foreign, and in particular, American scientists have so far created socio-psychological concepts, theories and models for studying ethno-cultural variables (cognitive dissonance, frustration-aggression, attributive theories, etc.), but, as T. G. Stefanenko rightly notes, "in all such a priori universal conceptual systems, the absence of contextual, functional, and cultural variables is striking, including cultural variables, and even emphasizes the invariance of mechanisms and processes in all peoples, in all cultures " [3, p. 149].

Interest in the problems of communication in different cultures and ethnic groups is not only purely scientific – it is dictated by the realities of a real boom in the desire of individual ethnic groups to identify and demonstrate their own uniqueness, which distinguishes them from other ethnic groups. This means that, existing in a multi-ethnic space, a person should be able to build their relationships with "others" who have a different ethnicity. Thus, a person absolutely needs to know both his own ethnic space – "We", and the ethnic space of others – "They". Ethnopsychology as a science should adequately respond to such a request of a modern person-a representative of a certain ethnic group and a certain ethnic culture.

Conclusion. The ethno-cultural specifics of communicative means of communication require participants in cross-cultural communication not only to know the language, but also.





to have a deep understanding of cultural contexts. Successful cross-cultural interaction is possible if you respect differences, develop empathy and cultural adaptation skills. Successful cross-cultural interaction is not an innate skill, but the result of learning, introspection, and practice. In a globalized and multiethnic society, this skill is becoming essential for anyone who strives for effective communication, professional growth, and harmonious interaction with the world.

LITERATURE

1. Басин, Е.А. Социальный символизм (некоторые вопросы взаимодействия социальной структуры и культуры) / Е.А. Басин, В.М. Краснов // *Вопр. философии.* – 1971. – №10. – С. 165–172.
2. Ломов, Б.Ф. Методологические и теоретические проблемы психологии / Б.Ф. Ломов. – М.: Наука, 1984. – 444 с.
3. Стефаненко, Т.Г. Этнопсихология / Т.Г. Стефаненко. – М.: Институт психологии РАН, «Академический проект», 1999. – 320 с.
4. Этнознаковые функции культуры / Ю.В. Бромлей [и др.]; редкол.: Ю.В. Бромлей [и др.]. – М.: Наука, 1991. – 224 с.
5. Argyle, M. *The Psychology of Interpersonal Behavior* / M. Argyle. – London: Penguin, 1971. – 223 p.
6. Bobanov, Xurshid Abdirahmatovich. “SHAXSlararo munosabatlarni mustahkamlashda psixologik madaniyatning ahamiyati”. *Keyingi olimlar konferentsiyalari* . 2025.