

UDC 81'27:316.77

DOI <https://doi.org/10.24919/2308-4863/101-24>**Nataliia MINAILO,**orcid.org/0000-0002-4643-3309

PhD in Philology,

Lecturer at the Department of Foreign Languages and Intercultural Communication

Simon Kuznets Kharkiv National University of Economics

(Kharkiv, Ukraine) nataliya.minyaylo@hneu.net

LINGUISTIC AND PHILOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION IN A GLOBALISED WORLD

This article examines the linguistic and philological dimensions of intercultural communication in the context of globalisation. It argues that effective international interaction depends on the ability to interpret cultural meanings, understand national models of speech behaviour, decode communicative intentions appropriately, and consider the sociocultural context of speech activity. The relevance of the topic is determined by the active integration of Ukrainian society into European and global political, economic, educational and cultural spheres, a process that requires the expansion of international communication. The article clarifies the concept of intercultural communication and outlines the main contemporary approaches to its interpretation. It analyses the theoretical models that are fundamental to the study of intercultural communication, including P. Brown and S. Levinson's politeness theory, D. Sperber and D. Wilson's relevance theory, and E. Hall's model of high-context and low-context cultures. Attention is paid to the role of these models in achieving mutual understanding between communicants at different levels of interaction. The article also highlights the main changes in approaches to intercultural communication under the influence of globalisation.

The linguistic features of intercultural interaction and the mechanisms through which communicative strategies are implemented are identified. The philological aspects of text functioning as a carrier of cultural information are also examined, with particular attention to intertextual links and culturally marked codes embedded in the text. In the context of intercultural communication, language mediation is defined as an activity aimed at overcoming not only linguistic but also cultural barriers between peoples. The role of translation and intercultural competence in ensuring effective international communication is analysed. Linguistic and cultural gaps, as the most significant manifestations of linguistic and cultural asymmetry, are discussed, and their verbal and non-verbal manifestations are characterised. The article confirms that intercultural communication is a continuous process of recoding meanings between language, culture and text.

Key words: intercultural communication, globalisation, linguistic interference, translation mediation, English as a Lingua Franca (ELF).

Наталія МІНІЯЙЛО,orcid.org/0000-0002-4643-3309

доктор філософії з філології,

викладач кафедри іноземних мов та міжкультурної комунікації

Харківського національного економічного університету імені Семена Кузнеця

(Харків, Україна) nataliya.minyaylo@hneu.net

ЛІНГВІСТИЧНІ ТА ФІЛОЛОГІЧНІ АСПЕКТИ МІЖКУЛЬТУРНОЇ КОМУНІКАЦІЇ В УМОВАХ ГЛОБАЛІЗОВАНОГО СВІТУ

Стаття досліджує лінгвістичний і філологічний вимір міжкультурної комунікації крізь призму тотальної глобалізації. Вона доводить, що ефективна міжнародна взаємодія залежить від здатності інтерпретувати культурні смисли, розуміти особливості національних моделей мовленнєвої поведінки, адекватно декодувати комунікативні наміри співрозмовника та враховувати соціокультурний контекст мовленнєвої діяльності. Актуальність обраної теми зумовлена активною інтеграцією українського суспільства до європейського та світового політичного, економічного, освітнього та культурного простору, яку неможливо здійснити без розширення міжнародної комунікації. З'ясовано сутність поняття міжкультурної комунікації та окреслено основні сучасні підходи до його трактування. Проаналізовано базові для дослідження МК теоретичні моделі: теорію ввічливості П. Браун та С. Левінсона, прагматику Д. Спербера та Д. Вілсона, модель висококонтекстної та низькоконтекстної культури Е. Голла на різних комунікативних рівнях задля досягнення порозуміння між комунікантами. Показано основні зміни, що відбулися з уявленнями про міжкультурну комунікацію під впливом глобалізаційних процесів.

Визначено лінгвістичні особливості міжкультурної взаємодії та механізми реалізації комунікативних стратегій. Охарактеризовано філологічні аспекти функціонування тексту як носія культурної інформації, що

функціонує через систему інтертекстуальних зв'язків і кодів, які у ньому ущільнюються. В умовах міжкультурної комунікації мовну медіацію названо діяльністю, спрямованою на подолання не лише мовних, а й культурних бар'єрів між народами. Досліджено роль перекладу та міжкультурної компетентності у забезпеченні ефективної міжнародної комунікації. Представлено лінгвокультурні лакуни, які є найпоказовішими проявами мовно-культурної асиметрії та охарактеризовано їх вербальні та невербальні прояви. Підтверджено, що міжкультурна комунікація – це безперервний процес перекодування смислів між мовою, культурою і текстом.

Ключові слова: міжкультурна комунікація, глобалізація, мовна інтерференція, перекладацька медіація, *English as a Lingua Franca (ELF)*.

Problem statement. At the beginning of the twenty-first century, the world entered a new stage of development marked by an unprecedented intensity of intercultural contacts. Globalisation, the rapid development of information and communication technologies, the digitalisation of society, international academic and professional mobility, the expansion of cross-border cooperation and the growing role of the global information space have significantly changed the nature of human communication. Whereas interaction between representatives of different cultures was once largely sporadic, it has now become an everyday phenomenon encompassing almost all spheres of public life, including politics, the economy, education, science, business, diplomacy, the media, culture and interpersonal communication.

In these circumstances, intercultural communication is no longer merely a subject of specialised humanities research; it has become one of the key factors in the functioning of modern globalised society. The effectiveness of international interaction increasingly depends not only on proficiency in foreign languages, but also on the ability to interpret cultural meanings, understand the characteristics of national models of linguistic behaviour, accurately decode the communicative intentions of the interlocutor and consider the sociocultural context of linguistic use. For this reason, intercultural communication is now regarded as a complex, multidimensional process involving the interaction of linguistic, cultural, cognitive, social and pragmatic factors.

For Ukraine, this issue is of particular significance. The country's active integration into the European and global political, economic, educational and cultural spheres is accompanied by a significant expansion of international communication. Members of Ukrainian society are increasingly participating in international research projects, diplomatic negotiations, professional cooperation, academic programmes, cultural exchanges and digital communication. In this context, the success of such interaction is determined not only by the level of linguistic competence, but also by the development of intercultural competence, which involves the ability to interpret the linguistic and cultural characteristics of communication partners appropriately, avoid communication barriers and to ensure productive intercultural dialogue.

An analysis of recent studies and publications indicates that the theoretical aspects of intercultural communication are currently the subject of active scholarly discussion. This is not accidental: as O. Yefimova, S. Zhytska, N. Khymai and A. Braievskaya argue, globalisation and the informatisation of the language system play an important role in the transmission of knowledge, cultural values and intercultural communication (Yefimova et al., 2021).

O. Tsymbalysta, T. Dankevych and O. Kryvenko regard intercultural communication as an important prerequisite for effective interaction in a globalised world, as it promotes mutual understanding between representatives of different cultures and reduces the risk of conflicts arising from cultural stereotypes. Researchers examine the impact of cultural stereotypes on intercultural communication and identify ways to overcome them, through the development of intercultural competence, the study of foreign languages and the implementation of anti-stereotype education (Tsymbalysta et al., 2025).

V. Babina and I. Kudlai argue that the culture of every nation develops through interaction with other cultures, while intercultural communication serves as an important condition for mutual understanding, mutual enrichment and the preservation of cultural diversity in the context of globalisation. They analyse the theoretical and practical aspects of international cultural interaction and conclude that, despite the uneven nature of contemporary cultural dialogue, intercultural communication remains the foundation of peaceful cooperation between countries (Babina, Kudlai, 2023).

M. Yakibchuk focuses on the linguistic dimension of intercultural communication. She clarifies the concepts of 'communication' and 'intercultural communication' and highlights the linguistic differences that influence communication between representatives of different cultures. The researcher argues that foreign language learning helps stimulate students' learning activities and foster effective verbal intercultural interaction (Yakibchuk, 2019).

L. Liebidieva also examines the linguistic aspects of intercultural communication, focusing primarily on verbal and non-verbal markers of cultural information as a means of achieving communicative cooperation

between representatives of different cultures and preventing communicative conflicts (Liebiedieva, 2013).

V. Boichuk substantiates the relevance of intercultural communication in the context of globalisation, integration processes and multiculturalism, defining it as an integrative, socially conditioned phenomenon that encompasses verbal and non-verbal interaction between representatives of different cultures and ensures mutual understanding and effective cultural exchange (Boichuk, 2025).

The aim of the present study is to provide a comprehensive analysis of the specific nature of intercultural communication in a globalised world from linguistic and philological perspectives, and to demonstrate the mechanisms through which language, culture and communication interact with one another in the contemporary international arena. To achieve this aim, the following objectives are set:

- to clarify the concept of intercultural communication and outline the main contemporary approaches to its interpretation;
- to analyse the impact of globalisation on the development of intercultural communication;
- to identify the linguistic features of intercultural interaction and the mechanisms through which communicative strategies are implemented;
- to characterise the philological aspects of text functioning as a vehicle of cultural information;
- to examine the role of language mediation, translation and intercultural competence in ensuring effective international communication;
- to summarise the main trends in the development of intercultural communication in the context of digitalisation and the global information space.

Presentation of the main material. The current stage of human development is characterised by the expansion of international contacts, the digitalisation of the information space and the intensification of globalisation, all of which have increased the importance of intercultural communication. It is no longer merely a subject of linguistic or cultural studies but has acquired the status of an interdisciplinary scientific phenomenon that draws on linguistics, philology, sociology, psychology, anthropology, communication theory, cognitive science and pragmatics. Intercultural communication now plays a decisive role in international cooperation, diplomatic relations, educational and academic mobility, professional interaction, international business, and the activities of the media and digital platforms.

Several theoretical models can be regarded as fundamental to the study of intercultural communication:

1. P. Brown and S. Levinson's politeness theory: the strategic nature of linguistic mitigation (Brown,

Levinson, 1987). Brown and Levinson associate the speaker's social image with the concept of 'face', the preservation of which is a necessary condition for successful communication. Positive 'face' refers to the need to be recognised and accepted, whilst a negative 'face' refers to the desire for freedom of choice. Depending on the communicative situation, speakers employ strategies of positive and negative politeness. These strategies regulate the degree of directness in speech, the distance between interlocutors and the level of communicative intimacy. As A. Bolotnikova argues, in the context of multiculturalism, these strategies correlate with cultural norms of social and psychological distance and, depending on the situation, allow politeness to be interpreted either as an expression of closeness or as a sign of respect (Bolotnikova, 2019).

In practice, this model may be applied through the mitigation of commands, the use of indirect requests, euphemisms and modal constructions. For example: instead of the direct command *'Send me the report'*, in international business one might say *'Could you please send me the report when you have a moment?'*.

In the context of intercultural communication, politeness theory explains why the degree of directness in speech varies across different cultures, for example between English-speaking and East Asian communicative traditions.

2. D. Sperber and D. Wilson's relevance theory: relevance and the interpretation of meaning (Sperber, Wilson, 1995). In relevance theory, communication is viewed as a process of inference rather than merely the encoding and decoding of information. Therefore, the listener interprets not only the literal meaning of an utterance, but the meaning that appears most relevant in each cognitive context. Linguistic utterances may contain implicatures that must be inferred logically.

Example: the phrase *'It's cold in here'* may function not as a statement of fact, but as an indirect request to close the window.

This must be considered in international communication, since different cultures may rely on different 'models of inference', meaning that the same phrase can be interpreted in different ways.

3. E. Hall's model of high-context and low-context communication. According to Hall, time and personal space are important categories for intercultural communication and are shaped by social, national, ethnic, age-related factors, gender, as well as by the communicators themselves, the nature of their relationship. He used the term 'proxemics' to describe culturally acceptable norms governing the distance between interlocutors: intimate (for close people –

from 15 to 50 cm), personal (for communication with acquaintances – from 46 to 120 cm), social (for business negotiations and formal receptions – 120 to 400 cm) and public (for presentations and speeches to an audience – 400 to 750 cm). Hall established that the quality and effectiveness of non-verbal communication depend on all these factors (Hall, 1996).

Hall also proposed a distinction between high-*context culture* (meaning is conveyed through context, non-verbal cues and implication) and low-*context culture* (meaning is explicitly encoded in words). For example, Japan and China are generally associated with high-context communication, where much can be understood ‘between the lines’, whereas Germany and the USA are typically associated with low-context communication, where speakers tend to prefer direct verbal expression. In international communication, the proposed model helps to explain the cultural causes of communicative misunderstandings, which, according to O. Chepil, are often caused not by linguistic factors alone, but primarily by situational context (Chepil, 2020).

4. Hofstede’s cultural dimensions: a systemic model of cultural differences (Hofstede, 1980). I. Vilchansky describes this model as an analytical tool for understanding intercultural differences, knowledge of which is extremely useful in a globalised world (Vilchanskyi, 2023). In his theory, G. Hofstede described culture through a set of dimensions: power distance (an indicator of how a society views inequality), individualism/collectivism, uncertainty avoidance (indicating the extent to which a society demands structure (Hofstede, 1980)), masculinity/femininity (which takes into account established gender behaviour patterns), and long-term orientation (maintaining links with the past and readiness to meet future challenges).

These dimensions provide a framework for analysing cultural differences and their influence on communication. For example, Ukraine and many post-Soviet countries are often characterised by a relatively high degree of power distance, whilst the USA is associated with a high degree of individualism. It has also been shown that, in collectivist cultures, employees are less likely to express disagreement with their manager openly, which influences communication strategies, including the use of indirect forms of objection. In cross-cultural communication, knowledge of such characteristics makes it possible to predict communicative behaviour within organisations and business structures.

5. English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) by J. Jenkins: the new reality of global English. Jenkins describes English as a global language of communication among non-native speakers and formulates several key principles of her theory:

- there is no single ‘standard native speaker’ to serve as a benchmark;
- the main thing is mutual intelligibility, not conformity to native speakers’ norms;
- variations in pronunciation, grammar and vocabulary are permitted (Jenkins, 2008).

For example: in an international IT team, the phrase ‘*I will do it tomorrow*’ might sound like ‘*I do tomorrow*’, and this is not a mistake if the meaning is clear. And in global companies (Google, IBM), simplified English is used to reduce communication barriers.

For intercultural communication, such statements challenge traditional assumptions about what constitutes ‘correct’ language in cross-cultural interaction.

Taken together, these theories demonstrate that intercultural communication is a multi-level phenomenon that explains the linguistic, cognitive and cultural mechanisms of interaction involved in achieving mutual understanding in a globalised world. As shown, globalisation does not alter the essence of intercultural communication (IC), but rather its scale, forms, intensity, participants and means of implementation. Whilst by the end of the twentieth century intercultural communication was largely associated with diplomacy, international trade or tourism, it has now become an everyday practice for millions of people. The main changes can be summarised as follows:

– **From occasional contact to everyday interaction.** A Ukrainian programmer works remotely as part of an international team, with colleagues based in Poland, Germany, India and the USA. Daily online meetings in English are an example of ongoing intercultural communication.

– **English has become a global lingua franca.** Today, participants in intercultural communication often do not use their interlocutor’s native language but communicate in English as a lingua franca.

– **The importance of intercultural competence has grown.** Whereas previously it was sufficient to know a foreign language, this is no longer enough. It is necessary to consider cultural norms, the characteristics of non-verbal behaviour, communication styles and the value systems of one’s partners.

– **The intensity of cultural exchange has increased.** Globalisation has contributed to the rapid spread of cultural products, traditions and behavioural patterns.

– **Intercultural communication has become a professional competence.** The modern labour market increasingly requires specialists capable of working in a multicultural environment.

– **The role of intercultural mediation has grown.** Modern intercultural communication involves not

only the transmission of information, but also the explanation of cultural characteristics to interlocutors.

The proliferation of intercultural contacts as a result of globalisation has brought to the fore the issue of linguistic support for effective interaction between representatives of different cultures. Whilst early theories of intercultural communication focused mainly on the description of cultural differences, contemporary research increasingly examines the linguistic mechanisms through which these differences are overcome in actual communication. For this reason, the linguistic aspect of intercultural communication is now regarded as one of the central areas of research in this field. Within this framework, researchers examine the processes in which lexical innovations act as sensitive markers of sociocultural change. The most significant of these are as follows:

– **The intensification of loanwords and processes of transnational internationalisation.** The current stage of linguistic interaction is characterised by the fact that loanwords (driven primarily by the expansion of English-language digital and corporate discourse) are rapidly losing their local, narrowly professional character and are becoming familiar internationalisms for everyone. As a result, terms such as ‘streaming’, ‘podcast’, ‘chatbot’, ‘hashtag’, ‘fake news’, ‘influencer’ and ‘meme’ have appeared in many languages around the world with identical meanings and virtually no phonetic or orthographic ‘losses’.

– **The phenomenon of linguistic hybridisation: interlanguages in transnational communities.** In transnational and online communities, hybrid systems emerge that facilitate predominantly slang-based communication. An example is, for instance, *Denglish* (Deutsch + English): in the contemporary German-speaking world, the degree of interference from Anglicisms has reached a threshold beyond which linguists are observing systemic shifts. Hybridisation manifests itself not only in calques such as ‘*Das ist cool*’, but also at the level of deep grammar. A characteristic example is the verb ‘*downloaden*’ (which is actively supplanting the native ‘*herunterladen*’), which, in the process of paradigmatic conjugation, completely replicates the German grammatical matrix for forming the perfect tense: ‘*ich habe gedownloadet*’. Communication in the border regions between the US and Mexico provides another example. In these regions, the linguistic hybrid *Spanglish* (Spanish + English) has emerged. As a result, instead of the Spanish ‘*devolver la llamada*’ or the English ‘*call back*’, speakers may use hybrid constructions influenced by English. Similarly, expressions such as ‘*vacumar el carpet*’ based on the English *to vacuum the carpet* rather than the Spanish ‘*pasar la aspira-*

dora por la alfombra’, illustrate the interaction of English and Spanish linguistic structures.

– **The deculturalisation and universalisation of English.** Modern English, as a tool for international communication, no longer belongs exclusively to its native speakers (the British or the Americans). It is becoming simplified and less idiomatic, while at the same time acquiring greater universality. For example, in international professional communication, culturally specific idioms such as ‘*it’s raining cats and dogs*’, ‘*hit the ground running*’ or ‘*break the ice*’ are often replaced by more transparent expressions such as ‘*it’s raining heavily*’, ‘*start immediately*’ and ‘*begin the conversation*’. These forms are more easily understood by speakers from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds and therefore reduce the risk of misunderstanding.

– According to J. D. ten Thije, modern intercultural communication is not merely a matter of mastering a foreign language but also involves the ability of participants to construct meaning jointly in a context of cultural diversity. The scholar emphasises that speech acquires the character of intercultural mediation when communicators constantly adapt their utterances to the knowledge, expectations and cultural experience of their interlocutor (ten Thije J. D., 2003).

This approach shifts the focus from linguistic correctness to the pragmatic effectiveness of communication.

– A similar position is taken by K. Kramersch, who regards language as a space for the formation of cultural meanings. In her view, the meaning of a message is determined not only by the lexical content of linguistic units, but also by the cultural context, the communicative situation, background knowledge and the mutual expectations of the interlocutors (Kramersch, 1993).

Thus, the success of intercultural interaction depends on the ability to interpret not only what is said, but also what is implied.

A clear example is international business negotiations between representatives of Ukraine and Japan. Japanese communicative culture is characterised by indirect expressions, the avoidance of categorical refusals and a desire to maintain harmony between interlocutors. The phrase ‘It might be difficult’ may amount to a rejection of the proposed solution. If a Ukrainian partner interprets this phrase literally, they may mistakenly understand it as a suggestion to continue the discussion. Successful intercultural communication therefore requires attention to such pragmatic features, rather than only to the literal meaning of linguistic units.

Similar difficulties are also observed in digital communication. Typical means of expression, includ-

ing emojis, memes and abbreviations, may be interpreted differently depending on the cultural context. In English-speaking communication, 'OK' is a neutral affirmative response, whereas in other cultures it may be perceived as reluctance to continue the conversation. Similar differences may concern intonation, interpersonal distance, gestures, eye contact and speech tempo.

In intercultural communication, linguistic mechanisms are realised not only at the level of individual utterances, but also in texts as holistic sign structures that embody a community's cultural experience. Yuri Lotman defined culture as a semiosphere in which texts and meanings (cultural codes) constantly interact, thereby ensuring the continuity of cultural communication (Lotman, 2009).

The concept of intertextuality, conceptualised by J. Kristeva (Kristeva, 1980), is of particular importance for the philological dimension. It functions as a key element of contemporary global discourse under the influence of globalisation and the postmodern worldview. Intertextuality presupposes the ability to recognise cultural allusions, quotations, reminiscences and hidden meanings in texts, especially where these meanings are not immediately apparent outside a specific cultural tradition. The function of text as a carrier of code (cultural information) is also particularly evident in contemporary media and digital discourse.

For this reason, a defining characteristic of intercultural interaction in online discourse is its pronounced polycode nature, or creolisation. This involves the synthesis of verbal text, audiovisual elements, graphic hyperlinks and specific online slang. Transnational acronyms and abbreviations, such as ASAP, IMHO, TGIF, as well as emojis and pictograms, increasingly function as universal non-verbal markers. They compensate for the absence of direct visual contact and signal emotional connotations that can be understood by representatives of different linguistic and cultural backgrounds without additional translation.

In today's globalised communicative space, the effectiveness of intercultural interaction is determined not only by language proficiency, but also by a complex system of mediating mechanisms, amongst which language mediation, translation and intercultural competence play a central role. These three components function as interrelated elements of a single process that ensures not a literal transmission of information, but the harmonisation of culturally conditioned meanings.

In the context of intercultural communication, language mediation emerges as an activity aimed at overcoming not only linguistic but also cultural bar-

riers between participants in the interaction. Unlike the traditional view of translation as the reproduction of content in another language, mediation involves the active reinterpretation of an utterance in accordance with the cultural expectations of the recipient. In this process, linguistic forms are adapted, implicit meanings are clarified, and potentially conflicting or ambiguous elements of the message are neutralised.

Translation in the context of intercultural communication fulfils a much broader function than the simple transmission of a linguistic code. It acts as a mechanism for conveying cultural meanings embedded in linguistic units, discursive practices and textual structures. For this reason, contemporary translation studies regard translation as a process of cultural interpretation, although this process may sometimes involve the superimposition of non-specific codes, leading to intercultural misinterpretations and pragmatic errors.

The most common manifestation of this phenomenon at the lexical level is the occurrence of so-called false friends or interlingual homonyms. A clear example of lexical-semantic interference is the attempt to translate the Ukrainian adjective '*актуальний*', meaning '*relevant or topical*', with the English cognate '*actual*', which in fact means '*factual or real*'. In this case, the semantically appropriate equivalents should be '*relevant*' or '*current*'.

Considering the above, the traditional role of the translator is changing. Acting as a mediator between cultural systems, the translator must choose appropriate strategies for rendering source texts. The most effective of these include the following:

– **Pragmatic adaptation, or the cultural substitution of realities.** This type of transformation is used when a literal translation of a culturally marked concept does not evoke the necessary associations in the recipient. For example, the American expression '*soccer mum*' refers to a sociocultural type of mother who is actively involved in the day-to-day logistics of her children's lives, including school, clubs, sport. A literal translation such as '*football mother*' may be semantically opaque. Therefore, in translation practice, descriptive or adaptive variants are used, such as '*a mother who is constantly driving her children to activities*' or the colloquial '*mum-taxi*'. Such a transformation allows the function of the concept to be preserved rather than its literal form.

– **Generalisation and specification as a balance of accuracy.** These operations allow the level of detail to be adjusted depending on the communicative purpose of the text. Specification moves from the broader to the narrower meaning. For example, in English, the word '*blue*' may cover both the colours '*blue*' and '*light blue*'. When translating into Slavic languages,

the translator must specify the shade depending on the context so as not to disrupt the visual image of the text. Generalisation is used when excessive detail is not relevant to the content. For example, the phrase '*high school graduation ceremony*' may be rendered simply as '*graduation*' if only the fact of the ceremonial completion of studies is important.

– **Antonymic translation as a strategy of naturalness.** For example, the English sing '*Keep off the grass*' literally means '*stay away from the grass*', but in the Ukrainian communicative tradition, the form '*Do not walk on the lawns*' sounds more natural. In this case, the grammatical structure changes, but the pragmatic meaning of the prohibition is fully preserved.

The most telling manifestation of linguistic and cultural asymmetry is the existence of linguistic and cultural gaps, where the target language lacks direct equivalents for a particular concept. Broadly speaking, such gaps may be divided into verbal and non-verbal ones, and communicative barriers most often arise at their intersection.

Verbal gaps may be understood as 'zones of untranslatability' of experience. They arise when a single word in one language encapsulates a complex cultural experience, whilst in another language this experience has no lexical equivalent and therefore requires a detailed description.

A clear example is the Dutch concept '*gezelligheid*', which goes far beyond the everyday meaning of '*cosiness*'. It encompasses an atmosphere of warmth, social closeness, emotional security and a sense of belonging. For this reason, translating this word inevitably involves some loss of meaning: instead of a single concept, another language requires a descriptive chain.

The German term *Schadenfreude* is similar in nature, denoting joy at another person's misfortune. What is important in this case is not only the emotional state itself, but also its cultural legitimisation as a named phenomenon. What may be described in other languages through several words and often carries a negative connotation takes on a clear conceptual form in the German tradition.

Another significant type of gap relates to socio-corporate practices. The Japanese concept of *nemawashi* ('*digging around the roots of a tree*') in a business context refers to the informal preparation of a decision through prior individual consultations with all participants in the process. In effect, it is a covert mechanism for reaching consensus before the official discussion takes place. In Western languages, there is no single word that captures both the process and the

social logic of such a practice, so the translation is always descriptive.

Non-verbal gaps are even more complex, as they operate at the level of automatic, often unconscious reactions. In intercultural communication, they frequently become a source of misunderstandings because participants rarely recognise their cultural origins. For instance, in Latin American or Middle Eastern cultures, the comfortable distance during business negotiations is much shorter (up to 50 cm), than in Anglo-Saxon or Northern European cultures (1–1.5 metres). An attempt by a Latin American interlocutor to move closer may therefore be perceived by a Swede or a Briton as a linguistic and cultural barrier, a sign of aggression or pressuring.

Conclusions. The research findings show that intercultural communication is a multi-layered and dynamic system of producing, transmitting and interpreting meanings, in which linguistic, cultural, cognitive and media-related factors interact. In the context of globalisation, it is shaped by the digitalisation of communication, the mobility of people and information, multilingualism, cultural contact and the dominance of global languages, primarily English. As a result, isolated cultures are increasingly giving way to constant cultural interaction.

At the linguistic level, meanings are encoded through utterances, linguistic choices and communicative strategies. Key mechanisms include politeness theory, such as mitigation and indirectness, pragmatic implicatures, and speech adaptation, including simplification, clarification and standardisation. At this level, language functions as a tool for encoding culturally determined content.

The cultural-cognitive level involves interpretation and presents a central component of intercultural communication. At this level, cultural models, contextuality, cognitive relevance, cultural scripts and stereotypes come into play. These factors may cause the same text to be interpreted differently, creating a risk of misunderstanding or reinterpretation of meaning.

At the textual, or philological, level, text functions as a carrier of cultural memory, a system of intertextual connections and a condensed code of culture. At the communicative-strategic level, adaptation takes place. To ensure successful communication, participants use strategies of politeness, clarification and paraphrasing, cultural neutralisation of speech and mediation of meaning to avoid all possible barriers. Thus, intercultural communication in a globalised world is a continuous process of recoding meanings between language, culture and text, and remains open to interpretation.

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ

1. Бабіна В., Кудлай І. Міжкультурна комунікація як основа налагодження мирних відносин. *Acta de Historia & Politica: Saeculum*. 2023. Special Issue. С. 114–120. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.26693/ahpsxxi2023.si.114>.
2. Бойчук В. Дефінітивний аналіз феномену міжкультурної комунікації. *Науковий вісник Ужгородського університету. Сер. Педагогіка. Соціальна робота*. 2025. Вип. 2(51). С. 28–31. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24144/2524-0609.2022.51.28-31>.
3. Болотнікова А. Комунікативно-прагматична категорія ввічливості й поняття соціальної та психологічної дистанції. *Науковий вісник Міжнародного гуманітарного університету. Сер. Філологія*. 2019. № 38, т. 2. С. 63–65. URL: http://www.vestnik-philology.mgu.od.ua/archive/v38/part_2/18.pdf (дата звернення: 23.07.2026).
4. Вільчанський І. Крос-культурна комунікація за Хофстеде: дані замість припущень. *Про Бізнес-Аналіз Українською* : веб-сайт. 2023. URL: <https://www.ba.in.ua/2023/07/28/kros-kulturna-komunikaciya-za-hofstede-dani-zamist-prypushhen/> (дата звернення: 10.07.2026).
5. Єфімова О., Жицька С., Химай Н., Браєвська А. Міжкультурна комунікація в умовах глобалізаційних процесів у розвитку сучасного світу. *InterConf*. 2021. Вип. 42. С. 343–348. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51582/interconf.19-20.02.2021.031>.
6. Лебедева Л. Е. Міжкультурна комунікація: лінгвістичний аспект. *Філологічні студії. Науковий вісник Криворізького державного педагогічного університету*. 2013. Вип. 9. С. 246–252. URL: http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/PhSt_2013_9_39 (дата звернення: 23.07.2026).
7. Цимбаліста О., Данкевич Т., Кривенко О. Формування міжкультурної комунікації на заняттях з іноземної мови. *Сучасні дослідження з іноземної філології*. 2025. Вип. 1(27). С. 492–503. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32782/2617-3921.2025.27.492-506>.
8. Чепіль О. Я. Фактор ситуативного контексту трансакційної моделі у практиці міжкультурної бізнес-комунікації. *Наукові записки Національного університету «Острозька академія». Сер. Філологія*. 2020. Вип. 9. С. 254–256. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.25264/2519-2558-2020-9\(77\)-254-256](https://doi.org/10.25264/2519-2558-2020-9(77)-254-256).
9. Якібчук М. В. Лінгвістичні аспекти міжкультурної комунікації як елемент активізації навчальної діяльності студентів-іноземців. *Наукові записки Національного університету «Острозька академія». Сер. Філологія*. 2019. Вип. 5(73). С. 313–316. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.25264/2519-2558-2019-5\(73\)-313-316](https://doi.org/10.25264/2519-2558-2019-5(73)-313-316).
10. Brown P., Levinson S. C. *Politeness : Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1987. 345 p.
11. Hall E. T. *The Hidden Dimension*. Garden City, NY : Doubleday, 1996. 201 p.
12. Hofstede G. *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values*. Beverly Hills, CA : Sage Publications, 1980. 328 p.
13. Jenkins J. English as a Lingua Franca : *JACET 47th Annual Convention. Waseda University*. 11-13 September 2008. 47 p. URL: http://www.jacet.org/2008convention/JACET2008_keynote_jenkins.pdf (дата звернення: 10.07.2026).
14. Kramsch C. *Context and Culture in Language Teaching*. Oxford : Oxford University Press, 1993. 295 p.
15. Kristeva J. *Desire in Language : A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*. New York : Columbia University Press, 1980. 305 p.
16. Lotman Y. M. *Culture and Explosion*. Trans. M. Grishakova. Berlin & New York : Mouton de Gruyter, 2009. 195 p.
17. Sperber D., Wilson D. *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. 2nd ed. Oxford : Blackwell Publishers. 1995, 331 p.
18. ten Thije J. D. *International Classroom Communication : A Multimodal and Multilingual Perspective*. Utrecht : LOT, 2003.

REFERENCES

1. Babina V., Kudlai I. (2023) Mizhkulturna komunikatsiia yak osnova nalahodzhennia myrnykh vidnosyn. [Intercultural communication as a basis for establishing peaceful relations] *Acta de Historia & Politica: Saeculum*, Special Issue. 114-120. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.26693/ahpsxxi2023.si.114>. [in Ukrainian].
2. Boichuk V. (2025) Definityvnyi analiz fenomenu mizhkulturnoi komunikatsii. [Definitional analysis of the phenomenon of intercultural communication] *Naukovyi visnyk Uzhhorodskoho universytetu. Ser. Pedahohika. Sotsialna robota*, 2(51). 28-31. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24144/2524-0609.2022.51.28-31>. [in Ukrainian].
3. Bolotnikova A. (2019) Komunikatyvno-prahmatychna katehoriia vvichlyvosti y poniattia sotsialnoi ta psykhologichnoi dystantsii. [The communicative-pragmatic category of politeness and the concepts of social and psychological distance] *Naukovyi visnyk Mizhnarodnoho humanitarnoho universytetu. Ser.: Filolohiia*, 38(2). 63-65. URL: http://www.vestnik-philology.mgu.od.ua/archive/v38/part_2/18.pdf. [in Ukrainian].
4. Vilchanskyi I. (2023) Kros-kulturna komunikatsiia za Khofstede: dani zamist prypushchen. [Cross-cultural communication according to Hofstede: data instead of assumptions] *Pro Biznes-Analiz Ukrainskou: website*. URL: <https://www.ba.in.ua/2023/07/28/kros-kulturna-komunikaciya-za-hofstede-dani-zamist-prypushhen/>. [in Ukrainian].
5. Yefimova O., Zhytska S., Khymai N., Braievska A. (2021) Mizhkulturna komunikatsiia v umovakh hlobalizatsiinykh protsesiv u rozvytku suchasnogo svitu. [Intercultural communication in the context of globalisation processes in the development of the modern world] *InterConf*, 42. 343-348. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24144/2524-0609.2022.51.28-31>. [in Ukrainian].
6. Liebedieva L. E. (2013) Mizhkulturna komunikatsiia: linhvistychnyi aspekt. [Intercultural communication: the linguistic aspect] *Filolohichni studii. Naukovyi visnyk Kryvorizkoho derzhavnoho pedahohichnoho universytetu*, 9. 246-252. URL: http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/PhSt_2013_9_39 [in Ukrainian].
7. Tsymbalysta O., Dankevych T., Kryvenko O. (2025) Formuvannia mizhkulturnoi komunikatsii na zaniattiakh z inozemnoi movy. [Development of intercultural communication in foreign language classes] *Suchasni doslidzhennia z inozemnoi filolohii*, 1(27). 492-503. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32782/2617-3921.2025.27.492-506>. [in Ukrainian].

8. Chepil O. Ya. (2020) Faktor sytuatyvnoho kontekstu transaktsiinoi modeli u praktytsi mizhkulturnoi biznes-komunikatsii. [The situational context factor of the transactional model in intercultural business communication practice] Naukovi zapysky Natsionalnoho universytetu «Ostrozka akademiia». Ser.: Filolohiia, 9. 254-256. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.25264/2519-2558-2020-9\(77\)-254-256](https://doi.org/10.25264/2519-2558-2020-9(77)-254-256). [in Ukrainian].
9. Yakibchuk M. V. (2019) Linhvistychni aspekty mizhkulturnoi komunikatsii yak element aktyvizatsii navchalnoi diialnosti studentiv-inozemtsiv. [Linguistic aspects of intercultural communication as an element of enhancing the educational activities of international students] Naukovi zapysky Natsionalnoho universytetu «Ostrozka akademiia». Ser. Filolohiia, 5(73). 313-316. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.25264/2519-2558-2019-5\(73\)-313-316](https://doi.org/10.25264/2519-2558-2019-5(73)-313-316). [in Ukrainian].
10. Brown P., Levinson S. C. (1987) Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 345 p.
11. Hall E. T. (1996) The Hidden Dimension. Garden City, NY: Doubleday. 201 p.
12. Hofstede G. (1980) Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications. 328 p.
13. Jenkins J. (2008) English as a Lingua Franca. JACET 47th Annual Convention. Waseda University. URL: http://www.jacet.org/2008convention/JACET2008_keynote_jenkins.pdf.
14. Kramsch C. (1993) Context and Culture in Language Teaching. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 295 p.
15. Kristeva J. (1980) Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art. New York: Columbia University Press. 305 p.
16. Lotman Y. M. (2009) Culture and Explosion. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 195 p.
17. Sperber D., Wilson D. (1995) Relevance: Communication and Cognition. 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers. 331 p.
18. ten Thije J. D. (2003) International Classroom Communication: A Multimodal and Multilingual Perspective. Utrecht: LOT.

Дата першого надходження статті до видання: 27.07.2026

Дата прийняття статті до друку після рецензування: 13.08.2026

Дата публікації (оприлюднення) статті: 02.09.2026

Стаття поширюється на умовах
ліцензії відкритого доступу (CC BY 4.0)

