

Course code: BO303P

Candidate number: 320319
Candidate name: Vicentiy Alexander

Culture Shock in the Context of Tolerance and Social Identity

Date: 17.05.2021

Total number of pages: 24

Abstract. Эта статья рассматривает феномен культурного шока с индивидуальных характеристики индивида, таких как уровень толерантности и социальная идентичность. Статья основана на результатах исследования, которое было проведено автором с привлечением русских и норвежских респондентов. Основными методами исследования являются метод «Культурный шок», «Социальная идентичность», «Интолерантность - Толерантность», которые были модифицированы автором для получения наилучшего результата с учетом исследовательских вопросов и ограничений исследования. В статье подробно описаны основные результаты исследования, а также приводится их краткая интерпретация.

Keywords: Культурный шок, взаимодействие культур, идентичность, культура, толерантность, border

Introduction

This work is devoted to the study of the cultural shock phenomenon. The subject of cultural shocks has an interdisciplinary nature. This theme fits into the problem of culture. And the problem of culture, in turn, is engaged in many different disciplines. These include general scientific disciplines such as culturology, philosophy of culture, sociology, sociology of culture, sociology of communication, communication theory and others. In addition, a number of applied disciplines, such as cross-cultural psychology, intercultural communication, social tolerance, psychological tolerance, and so on, also deal with this theme.

To understand what is a cultural shock, you must first determine what is culture. The word "culture" comes from the Latin "cultural" and means "processing and care of the land." The concept of "culture" is opposed to the Latin concept of "natura" - "primary matter", "element", that is, what needs to be transformed, cultivated. In modern science there are a large number of definitions of culture. A detailed examination of these definitions is beyond the scope of this study.

For the purposes of this study, we can confine ourselves to the following definition of culture. Culture is a sign-symbolic system, without mastering the language of which it is impossible to understand its content. In other words, each culture has its own special set of patterns, standards, ways of thinking, perception, comprehension and evaluation of objects, phenomena and processes surrounding natural and social reality. [1].

Culture, as a sign-symbolic system, is the basis of any society, because it is the connecting link between different individuals. Communication through a common culture allows us to speak not about the simple sum of individuals, but about society or about socium. Thus, socium is the

result of communication in the broadest sense of the word. This communication becomes possible on the basis of a common cultural codes or sign-symbolic system of members of the society.

If we consider the phenomenon of culture within the framework of the semiotic approach, then we will be able to define culture as a kind of "text" having its own structure and sign system. With the help of this text, information is transmitted inside the socium. The text of culture consists of a set of signs and symbols in which certain senses (values) and meanings are imbedded, understandable to the representatives of this culture.

A symbol is a key cultural phenomenon that in the sensually perceived form expresses, preserves and translates ideas, ideals and values that are fundamental in the development and functioning of culture. A sign is an object that is the representative (substitute, image) of some other object (thing, property, phenomenon or relation). The main difference between a sign and a symbol is that the sign, as a rule, is single-valued, and the symbol, on the contrary, can include many different meanings.

The process of communication between representatives of several cultures is called intercultural (or cross-cultural) communication. [2] By sending and receiving signs and symbols, individuals perform symbolic communication. Symbolic communication is the basis of socialization of man in society. With its help, the main ideas, values and concepts of culture are transmitted. It provides information communication between people of different epochs and cultures, makes possible the accumulation and transfer of socio-cultural experience, organization and coordination of people's joint activities. The common understanding of symbols facilitates interaction of individuals, allows to interpret the behavior of partners, to comprehend each other's intentions and adequately react to them.

Thus, in each culture, individuals are connected to each other by a common system of encoding and decoding information or "text." Culture forces us to interpret messages coming from the outside world in a certain way. Exactly these universally significant meanings of symbols unite people among themselves and allow them to identify themselves in ethnic, religious, political, professional, and other plans within the framework of the social structure. [1]

As a rule, representatives of one culture have a similar image of perception and evaluation of oneself and reality. It is easier for people to communicate in one culture than to go beyond its borders. The culture in which an individual is formed is for him a "native" culture, and all other cultures are "alien" ("other") for him. Differences between cultures lead to difficulties in communication. It can be argued that cultural differences between communicators are boundaries or barriers that need to be overcome in order to achieve mutual understanding.

An unfamiliar culture may have a specific set of "codes" that are alien to another culture. The process of understanding the "alien culture" is a decoding of "alien" codes and their translation

into codes of "native culture". In this context, cultural shock can be considered as a mismatch of cultural codes, when representatives of different cultures speak "different languages". In other words, they are in different, non-coincident sign-symbolic systems. They can not read the text of another's culture, because this text is "written" with the help of unfamiliar codes (symbols).

Cultural shock is the initial reaction to a collision with a inocultural (foreign culture) reality. The essence of culture shock is a situation of conflict between customary for the individual the values, norms, language, rules of behavior that are characteristic of his native cultural environment and those values, norms, language, rules of behavior that are characteristic of the cultural environment in which he found himself. [11]

The difference in the symbols of native and foreign cultures can be one of the bases of social categorization. Social categorization leads to a dichotomy of "us-them" ("friend or foe", "native - alien", "familiar - alien", etc.). The danger of this categorization is that it can lead to social conflicts, which, in fact, have cultural causes. The extreme form of such a conflict is the genocide of nations.

Thus, cultural shock can serve as a marker for actualization the process of social categorization. Then the practical rationale for studying cultural shocks can be to discover or diagnose the contradictions between cultures. And then, on the basis of this knowledge, to implement concrete practical measures to eliminate or normalize the contradictions between all participants in intercultural interaction for the conflict-free resolution of these contradictions. For the purposes of this research, I used this definition as a basic definition of culture shock: Cultural shock - emotional or physical discomfort, disorientation of an individual caused by falling into a different cultural environment, a clash with another culture, an unfamiliar place. [10]

In this context, cultural shock allows us to determine the boundaries or points of contact of cultures that are constructed in the mind of the individual. Despite the fact that culture is a subjective thing that exists in the minds of people, it acquires an objective character in its consequences, which manifests itself in such negative phenomena as discrimination, isolation, extermination, genocide of any social group or groups.

Carrying out social categorization, people can use different grounds. There are many reasons for choosing these grounds, the main one of which, perhaps, is their personal life experience. In this sense, the grounds for social categorization and the categories categorized by respondents can differ substantially depending on the level of tolerance of the respondent. Therefore, for an adequate interpretation of the received data on the respondent's perception of a different culture or the definition of other social categories, the overall level of tolerance of the respondent must also be taken into account.

In this research I would like to explore in more detail the phenomenon of culture shock in people who have some (not very rich) experience with other cultures. I believe that such people, impressions from meeting with unusual manifestations of other cultures, can be more vivid than those who have the opportunity to interact often or for long with representatives of other cultures. For example, people with a rich experience of intercultural interaction include labor migrants, refugees and immigrants, students, immigrants who left for a permanent residence in another country several years ago, etc. In other words, they are people who lived side by side with representatives of another culture for a relatively long time, in order to acquire the ability to perceive the basic meanings of this culture and not to be shocked too often with unusual manifestations of another's culture.

For a better understanding of the primary data, I use additional techniques. One of these techniques has to do with how the respondent performs social categorization. The second technique has to do with measuring the respondent's overall level of tolerance.

In addition, based on the analysis of primary data from the research process, I hope to confirm some of the assumptions. In particular, the assumption is that due to globalization and the rapid development of mass media nowadays, people experience culture shock less and less frequently. And also the assumption that the strength of culture shock decreases in proportion to the respondent's awareness of the characteristics of another culture. I believe that this happens even when this awareness is purely theoretical. That is, even when it is not supported by real situations of interaction with other cultures.

Materials and methods

The purpose of the study is to examine respondents' perceptions of "another culture" by analyzing the descriptions of culture shock situations received from respondents. In order to more adequately interpret the descriptions of situations of culture shock received from respondents, I plan to determine how respondents carry out social categorization of the "friend or foe" ("us-them") type. Taking into account that culture shock is used in this research as an indicator of the meeting (or encounter or collision) of respondents with a non-native culture, the respondent's level of tolerance is a very important factor. Therefore, I also measure respondents' level of tolerance in the survey process. I believe that the subject matter and themes of a culture shock, as well as the respondent's reaction to a culture shock situation, can significantly depend on the respondent's level of tolerance.

I chose respondents who had relatively little experience in visiting other countries as the object of the study. I also divided respondents into two groups. The first group included Russian students who live in Russia. Representatives of this group are young people, they are financially dependent on their parents, they do not have completed higher education, and they have relatively little experience of visiting other countries. In the second group I included people of older age.

They are financially independent, have higher education, have more experience than respondents from the first group in visiting other countries.

The subject of the study is descriptions of situations of culture shock received from respondents. In addition to descriptions of culture shocks, I also tried to determine how respondents carry out social categorization of the type "friend or foe" (ie whom they consider "familiar" ("friend") and whom they consider "alien" ("foe")). In addition, I measured and calculated the level of tolerance of the respondents.

To study the cultural shocks based on the descriptions of the respondents, the soft methodology of the study is well suited. Since in the process of study a certain theoretical understanding of this phenomenon will be formed on the basis of the data received from the respondents. In this case, it is necessary to take into account that the subjective meanings and interpretations that respondents impart to objective phenomena determine the behavior of respondents and thereby contribute to the construction of a common social reality. [3] Given this interpretation of social reality, I chose inductive logic as the predominant logic of research. Inductive logic is more typical for qualitative research methods.

The main method of working with data in my study will be interpretation. That is, the identification of meanings from the unique texts received from the respondents and the description of these meanings, taking into account the context in such a way that the meanings become clear not only to the respondent. [4] The use of the so-called "mixed methods" research strategy allows the use of quantitative and qualitative methods in one study. This approach allows us to study the object of investigation more deeply. [5] Thus, it is possible to compensate for the shortcomings of various methods. And the results obtained with one method can be used to supplement or verify another method. The following is a description of the specific methods that I used in the study.

To develop the research tool (questionnaire), I used three different methods:

1. Qualitative method (technique) "Culture shock";
2. Qualitative method (technique) "Social identity";
3. Quantitative method (technique) "Intolerance - Tolerance" (INTOL).

The "Cultural shock" method

This method is the main method of obtaining data in my study. It allows to obtain descriptions of situations of cultural shocks in the form of short stories of respondents. When applying this method in practice, I made some changes to it, conditioned by the conditions of the study. First of all, these changes were caused by a small number of respondents. This method was developed by G. Bardiyer. The empirical study of cultural shock was originally designed by the author as a method of qualitative research, which involves the processing of respondents' answers

using the content analysis technique. The idea of creating the method was suggested by the works of M. Arkhipova, who studied situations related to various manifestations of cultural shock, using the method of in-depth interviews. [6] The final version of the research methodology was formed on the basis of the notion of cultural shock as a reflection of the cultural differences described in the book of C. Morris. [7]

The "Social Identity" method

The social identity of an individual is related to the individual's belonging to a particular social group and has an emotional and value significance for the individual. To determine the groups, each individual carries out (performs) the process of social categorization. Social categorization is one of the types of categorization, that is, a way of knowing by classifying and typifying the surrounding people. Social categorization can be understood as the ordering of the social environment in terms of the distribution of people into groups. [8]

In my research, I used a reduced version of the social identity method, developed by a team of authors, under the guidance of V. Yadov. This method is the basic methodology for studying social identity. [9]

In my case, the respondent is offered only three questions:

1. "Please complete the sentence: For me, " ours "(friends) are ...";
2. "Please complete the sentence: For me, " aliens "(foes) are ...";
3. We ask you to express the degree of your consent or disagreement with the following statement: "Understanding other cultures is important for the existence of society as a whole".

Respondents' answers helped to better understand who they refer to as "familiar" ("friend"), and whom they refer to as "alien" ("foe"). Also, the data collected by this method was used to determine the grounds on which respondents perform social categorization.

The "Intolerance - Tolerance" method (INTOL)

By intolerance is meant the manifestation of intolerance in the relationship and behavior of the individual when interacting with other people on the basis of a variety of characteristics. In particular, intolerance can be manifested in aggressiveness, hostility on the part of the subject in relation to the "other".

An intolerant attitude can be formed, for example, on the basis of such prerequisites as ethnocentrism, prejudice and negative stereotypes. Clear manifestations of intolerant behavior include discrimination, xenophobia, extremism and terrorism.

The measurement of tolerance settings in my study was carried out using the method of "Intolerance-Tolerance (INTOL)", developed by L.G. Pochebut. [6] This method was developed in accordance with the procedure proposed by Likert, and is designed to investigate the level of personal tolerance. In this case, tolerance is understood as an emotional state of the individual, in which the personal qualities or behavior of another person does not like him, are emotionally unacceptable. However, the individual shows patience and respect for the opinion of the other, remains stable in relation to unacceptable or manipulative influence. The method consists of 16 statements, half of which reveals a tolerant attitude, and the second half - an intolerant attitude. Thus, the method INTOL determines the ratio of intolerance - tolerance of the individual.

In this study, particular attention was paid to the importance of the respondent's INTOL index in the context of social identification and social categorization of the respondent. Tolerance is meaningful only in relation to groups of "others", "aliens", "foes", "strangers" and so on. That is, tolerance is meaningful only in relation to those groups of individuals with whom the individual does not identify his identity.

In practical application, in my research the way of processing and interpreting the data was slightly changed with respect to the original INTOL method. Such a need was due to the objective conditions of the study.

As a result of the mixing of the methods described above, the main research tool was created, which is a questionnaire.

Results

General information

Based on the analysis of the collected primary data, the following can be noted:

1. The return of questionnaires in the first group was higher than in the second group. In the first group, this indicator was 100%, while in the second group this indicator was about 80%;
2. The completeness of the questionnaire filling in the first group was higher than in the second group. In the first group, this indicator was 100%, while in the indicator group this figure was about 90%;
3. The number of detailed descriptions of situations of cultural shock (ie, stories) in the first group is much higher than in the second group. In the first group of three people, this indicator was 22 descriptions, while in the second group of five people this figure was only 6 descriptions;
4. The average age of respondents in the first group is 20 years. The average age of respondents in the second group is 40 years;

5. In the first group, the proportion of men among the respondents is 33%. In the second group, the proportion of men among the respondents is 100%;
6. The experience of visiting other countries in the first group is significantly lower than in the second group.

The analysis of the characteristics of the collected primary data could be continued. However, for my research this data should be enough.

Questionnaire coding

Before you start processing the data, you need to anonymize the data received from the respondents. For this, each questionnaire was coded according to the code structure below. In the future, when referring to any questionnaire, I will use its code, or part of the code.

The structure of the questionnaire code is as follows:

id, Gr #, M / F, A, C, N.

Abbreviations used:

id - unique identifier of the questionnaire;

Gr # - the group number;

M / F - the gender of the respondent (M - male, F - female);

A - the age of the respondent;

C - the country of residence of the respondent;

N - the nationality of the respondent.

If for some element of the code there is no information (the respondent did not answer the corresponding question), then on the place of this element of the code there will be a dash (-). Below is a table of the list of respondents coded using the code described above (Table 1).

Table 1. The coded list of respondents

№	Questionnaire code
1	1, I, Female, 19, Russia, Russian
2	2, I, Female, 19, Russia, Russian
3	3, I, Male, 22, Russia, Russian
4	4, II, Male, 30, Norway, -
5	5, II, Male, 50, Norway, Norwegian
6	6, II, Male, 63, Norway, Norwegian
7	7, II, Male, 27, Russia, Russian
8	8, II, Male, 32, Russia, Russian

Analysis of data using the method "Social Identity"

Respondents defined "friends" on various grounds. With a small number of respondents, it was not possible to identify any clearly expressed common features that would be inherent in the absolute majority of the definitions of "friends".

However, it can be noted that in many definitions of "friends" respondents used the concept of "trust" and concepts close to it in meaning.

"People you can trust ..." (1, I, Female, 19, Russia, Russian)

"... who can be trusted." (2, I, Female, 19, Russia, Russian)

It can also be noted that for "friends" there is a similarity in something (for example, interests, points of view, etc.):

"... communicate with them on certain topics without conflict." (1, I, Female, 19, Russia, Russian)

"... similar cultural traditions ..." (7, II, Male, 27, Russia, Russian)

"... those who speak Russian ..." (8, II, Male, 32, Russia, Russian)

As separate specific groups of "friends" we can distinguish the group "relatives" and the group "friends". In the first case, the blood relationship factor is actualized. In the second case we are talking about people with whom the respondent maintains close interpersonal relationships, but with whom he does not have a kinship relationship.

"Relatives, friends." (3, I, Male, 22, Russia, Russian)

Moreover, it can be noted that two respondents, in defining "friends" as distinctive features, indicated such common values as language, culture and norms of behavior in society:

"... similar cultural traditions and similar behavior in society ..." (7, II, Male, 27, Russia, Russian)

"... those who speak Russian ..." (8, II, Male, 32, Russia, Russian)

For the definitions of "foes", as well as for the definitions of "friends", it was not possible to identify any clearly expressed common features that would be inherent in the absolute majority of definitions.

However, it can be noted that in many cases, "foes" are defined as the direct opposite of "friends". For clarity, this dichotomy is presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Dichotomy of "friend or foe "

№	Questionnaire code	«Friend»	«Foe»
1	(1, I, Female, 19, Russia, Russian)	"... communicate with them on certain topics without conflict"	"... who are not in solidarity with me, there are no common themes with them."
2	(2, I, Female, 19, Russia, Russian)	"... you feel comfortable, who can be trusted."	"People who are far in spirit, with whom there is nothing in common, ... in the presence of whom you experience discomfort."
3	(3, I, Male, 22, Russia, Russian)	"Relatives, friends."	"Strangers to me people"
4	(5, II, Male, 50, Norway, Norwegian)	«known and mostly friendly to me	«unknown and uncertain on me»
5	(7, II, Male, 27, Russia, Russian)	"People with similar cultural traditions and similar behavior in society"	"... do not respect other people's traditions and impose their culture, behave defiantly"
6	(8, II, Male, 32, Russia, Russian)	"those who speak Russian"	" speak an unfamiliar language "

It can also be noted that in many definitions of "foe", the concept of a "stranger" is explicit or implicit. Perhaps this can be interpreted as some kind of suspense and a potential threat that a "foe" can carry. This may also indicate a low level of confidence in the "foe".

"... there is nothing in common ... " (2, I, Female, 19, Russia, Russian)

"... Strangers to me people ... " (3, I, Male, 22, Russia, Russian)

"... unknown and uncertain on me ... " (5, II, Male, 50, Norway, Norwegian)

"...a friend who I don` t know ... " (6, II, Male, 63, Norway, Norwegian)

"...speak an unfamiliar language ... " (8, II, Male, 32, Russia, Russian)

At the same time, it can be noted that specific groups of "foes" were not named in any definition. In addition, only two respondents, when defining "foes" as distinctive features, indicated such common values as language, culture and norms of behavior in society:

"... are hostile to the culture of other people, do not respect other people's traditions and impose their culture, behave defiantly ..." (7, II, Male, 27, Russia, Russian)

"...speak an unfamiliar language ... " (8, II, Male, 32, Russia, Russian)

If we try to generalize the definitions of "friends" and "enemies", then we can draw the following conclusion. "Friends" for the respondents are people who are close to them in spirit, interests, showing friendliness, with which respondents support interpersonal relationships in everyday life. When communicating with "friends", respondents feel comfort, trust and security. No threats with "friends" are associated.

Almost all the definitions of "foe" are given as a direct opposite to a previously defined "friend". That is, "foe" is a stranger with whom there is nothing, or little in common. When communicating with a "foe", respondents may feel disbelief and discomfort. In an explicit form, no threats from the "foe" are associated. However, the concept of a "stranger" may be associated with some connotations of suspense and a potential threat.

As in the case of the definition of "friends", and in the case of the definition of "foes", the respondents did not specify (identify) specific groups. This can be interpreted as the fact that respondents do not have stable objects of intolerance.

Analysis of data using the method "INTOL"

For each respondent, the index "INTOL" was calculated according to the corresponding method. The value of the index "INTOL" indicates the level of tolerance of the individual. The higher the index, the higher the tolerance level, and vice versa. The maximum possible value of the index "INTOL" is 32 points. The minimum possible value of the index "INTOL" is - (minus) 32 points. The results of the calculation of the index for all respondents are presented in the table 3.

Table 3. The values of the INTOL index

№	Questionnaire code	INTOL index
1	1, I, Female, 19, Russia, Russian	14
2	2, I, Female, 19, Russia, Russian	14
3	3, I, Male, 22, Russia, Russian	11
4	4, II, Male, 30, Norway, -	13
5	5, II, Male, 50, Norway, Norwegian	13
6	6, II, Male, 63, Norway, Norwegian	9
7	7, II, Male, 27, Russia, Russian	6
8	8, II, Male, 32, Russia, Russian	4
9	The average value of the index "INTOL" for the entire sample	10,5
10	The average value of the index "INTOL" for the first group	13
11	The average value of the index "INTOL" for the second group	9

The data presented in Table 3 demonstrate that for all respondents the value of the "INTOL" index is above zero, which may indicate their tolerance in general. However, if we make a detailed analysis of the data for the respondents' subgroups, it is possible to notice significant differences between the values of the "INTOL" index between the first and second groups of respondents. In my opinion, this may be due to the age and gender characteristics of respondents from these groups. According to modern empirical studies in the field of tolerance, it can be argued that young people usually show a higher level of tolerance than older people. And women usually show a higher level of tolerance than men.

The results in Table 3 correlate well with other studies in the field of tolerance. The average age of the first group is 20 years, and the second group is 40 years old. In the first group, two respondents are women, in the second group there are no women. In addition, as a rule, modern young people are more open to accepting new ideas, norms, approaches to organizing life, etc. This can also be a factor that affects a high level of tolerance. On the other hand, because of their susceptibility to new ideas, young people often fall into the risk groups associated with the perception of various intolerant ideas, including extremist and nationalist ideas.

Respondents № 7 and № 8 showed the minimum values of the index "INTOL". They are Russians who live in Russia. None of them is going to emigrate. Perhaps such a low level of tolerance of these respondents can be related to their life experience. Judging by their age, they were born in the mid-eighties, early nineties. These and subsequent years were very difficult for the country (the collapse of the USSR, the difficult economic situation in Russia, etc.). Perhaps the reason for the low tolerance of these respondents is related to the difficult living conditions in childhood. On the other hand, this may be due to differences in the social experience of these respondents and the number of their social relations. With age, the number of social relations tends to increase. This could also affect some decrease in the level of tolerance. In addition, both respondents are men.

To find such a low value of the "INTOL" index in Russian adults was a surprise for me. Among other factors, I associate this with the more traditional upbringing and influence of Soviet and post-Soviet culture, when the image of a foreigner was closely related to the image of the "enemy". And almost all manifestations of tolerance not only did not find support in society, but were also actively blamed. It was also unexpected to find a relatively high value of the "INTOL" index for the respondent № 5. Given that this is a man at the age of 50, we could expect a lower level of tolerance.

I believe that one of the possible reasons may be a large experience of communication with representatives of other cultures of this respondent. In addition, this respondent would like to emigrate to another country. Perhaps, in this connection, he is more positive (tolerant) towards all possible manifestations of another culture. Since he is aware, and morally prepared to the fact that

he will often face a variety of cultural features in another country, in case he manages to emigrate. In general, the results of studying the data obtained with the INTOL method allowed to conclude that, in general, all respondents are tolerant.

Analysis of data using the method «Culture shock»

One of the most time-consuming and laborious stages of this study was the stage of analyzing the data obtained with the modified method "Culture shock".

In the process of analyzing descriptions of situations of cultural shock, I tried to find some general structure of this description, characteristic for all stories. This was a difficult task. Therefore, under the conditions of a small amount of data, I confined myself to a relatively simple structure for describing cultural shock. Based on this structure, the matrix of descriptions of cultural shock situations was compiled (Table 4).

Table 4 presents the matrix of descriptions of cultural shock situations received from respondents. In the process of qualitative analysis of cultural shock stories, their typification was carried out. In addition, the responses of respondents to the situation of cultural shock were determined. The reaction was recorded in the table only if it was unambiguously indicated by the respondent in the story, or if it was obvious in the analysis of the text and the syntax of the story. When analyzing the responses of respondents, I tried to achieve maximum objectivity.

Table 4. The matrix of descriptions of cultural shock situations

Questionnaire code	Situation №	Where did the situation occur?	What is the subject of cultural shock?	What was the respondent's reaction to the emergence of the situation of cultural shock? (only an explicit description)
1, I, Female, Russia, Russian	1	Finland. Excursion. A cafe. Dinner.	Food and dress preferences. Funny life events or confuses. A method of serving food "buffet" ("all you can eat"). You can take food yourself, of any kind and in any quantity. In Russia, a respondent with such a phenomenon as a "buffet" did not meet.	Shock.

	2	Ukraine. Mass (common for the villagers) feast and accompanying entertainment (songs, dances, etc.)	Types of interactions. Peculiarities of social behavior. The community of people - both familiar and unfamiliar. Participation in a mass, common for the villagers, feast and accompanying entertainment (songs, dances, etc.)	Expression of love for the people of Ukraine. The expression of regret that now the respondent can not visit Ukraine. The respondent likes the speech and language of Ukraine. It is impossible to skip. It's hard to sit still. Pleasure of involvement in the process. Ukrainians are a friendly people.
	3	Belarus. Passing through the country by car.	Relation to nature and the environment. Cleanliness in cities and along country tracks. The cities are very green, beautiful, bright, colorful. A small number of refuellings and shops along the country track. Cleanliness in cities and along country tracks in Belarus, in comparison with Russia. Well-equipped places for recreation along the country tracks.	Comparison of Belarus with Russia. The respondent did not like the small number of gas stations and shops along the country tracks. The respondent and his companions did not know much about the local currency - "zaychiki".
2, I, Female, 19, Russia, Russian	1	Norway. Festival of international youth movement Ten Sing.	Types of interactions. Organization and leisure of creative youth in Norway. (International Youth Movement Ten Sing) The church is engaged in the development and financing of youth projects.	Expression.
	2	Norway. Festival of international youth movement Ten Sing.	Types of interactions. The festival is held at night. The venue is strictly guarded. Strangers are not allowed. The exit of the participants is not welcome.	

3	Norway. Festival of international youth movement Ten Sing.	Healthy lifestyle. Young people lead a healthy lifestyle.	
4	Norway. Festival of international youth movement Ten Sing.	Types of interactions. The leaders of the ten sing group are young volunteers, while in Russia they are adults with hourly pay.	Comparison with Russia.
5	Norway. Festival of international youth movement Ten Sing.	Types of interactions. In the middle of the youth festival there is a church service and dedication of young people to the church.	
6	Norway. Festival of international youth movement Ten Sing.	Manners. There are no chairs and armchairs at the festival. Everyone is sitting on the floor.	
1	Finland.	Relation to nature and the environment. Food and dress preferences. In Finland, a completely different attitude to nature. It's a bad tone to wear clothes made from a living being. Requirements for clothing are simpler - to make clothes comfortable and warm. Preference is given to the sporting style of clothing.	Comparison with Russia.
2	Finland.	Relation to nature and the environment. In apartments and houses there are several garbage cans for separate garbage collection.	Comparison with Russia, not in favor of Russia.
3	Finland.	Basic life things. There are almost no high-rise buildings in Finland. Finns dream of living in their own homes, where you are your own master.	

	4	Finland.	<p>Relation to nature and the environment.</p> <p>Cleanliness and tidiness. In Finland, good cleanliness is maintained. Finns take an active part in cleaning and gardening.</p>	Positive characteristics of Finland.
	5	Finland.	<p>Basic life things.</p> <p>Finns do not buy goods with a margin.</p>	
	1	Abkhazia..	<p>Basic life things.</p> <p>The legacy of war.</p> <p>The destroyed buildings left after the war with Georgia (1993-1994).</p> <p>For 20 years, no one has restored or destroyed these buildings.</p>	
	2	Abkhazia.	<p>Interpersonal distance. Types of interactions. Basic life things.</p> <p>There are no barriers to communication.</p> <p>Any local resident can come up and start a conversation on any topic.</p> <p>When traveling by public transport (minibus), the driver can easily stop by the store to buy food for himself for dinner.</p> <p>It's also perfectly normal that the driver can ask the passengers for advice on everyday problems (for example, what kind of sugar he should buy to make jam).</p>	
	3	Abkhazia.	<p>Basic life things. Types of thinking.</p> <p>It is not customary to skip pedestrians on the road.</p>	
	4	Abkhazia.	<p>Basic life things.</p> <p>There are almost no homes for the elderly (nursing home). In Abkhazia, it is considered a disgrace if parents live the rest of their lives in a shelter.</p>	Emotional characteristic.
3, I, Male, 22, Russia, Russian	1	Sweden. Stockholm.	<p>Relation to nature and the environment.</p> <p>Recycling garbage.</p> <p>In Sweden, everyone sorts their garbage.</p> <p>Sweden recycles waste from other countries for the needs of Sweden.</p>	<p>The respondent was very surprised.</p> <p>Comparison with Russia, not in favor of Russia.</p>

	2	Sweden. Stockholm.	<p>Food and dress preferences. Types of interactions. Interpersonal distance.</p> <p>Free food and drinks, attitude towards students.</p> <p>The teacher asked all students in the class, including the respondent, to call him by name.</p> <p>On the territory of the university, all machines with water, coffee, juices are free.</p> <p>There is a free lunch. This lunch is buffet style.</p>	The respondent was very surprised.
	3	Sweden. Stockholm.	<p>Relation to nature and the environment. Basic life things.</p> <p>Especially the respondent was surprised by the absence of homeless animals.</p> <p>It was very unusual to see the absence of "stray" animals.</p>	The respondent was especially surprised.
	4	Sweden. Stockholm.	<p>Healthy lifestyle. Basic life things.</p> <p>Healthy lifestyle.</p> <p>People run even at night.</p> <p>In Sweden, people are fans of a healthy lifestyle.</p> <p>Love for sports and healthy food.</p> <p>Especially popular is running.</p> <p>In Stockholm, marathons are very often held.</p> <p>For them, running is part of their life.</p> <p>Running people of different ages and even whole families.</p>	It was unusual for the respondent to observe the manifestations of local culture.
4, II, Male, 30, Norway, -	1	Norway.	<p>Types of interactions.</p> <p>Moving to Norway.</p> <p>Very silent and seemingly "cold" society.</p> <p>Features of the public transport system.</p> <p>You need to signal with your hand to stop the bus.</p> <p>Even if you are standing at a bus stop.</p>	Estimated judgment.

	2	Iran.	<p>Types of interactions. Basic life things.</p> <p>Visiting Iran.</p> <p>Noisy.</p> <p>At times being observed.</p> <p>Offers to get free things or services should not be taken literally.</p> <p>It's just part of the "game" in the local culture.</p>	<p>Noisy.</p> <p>Estimated judgment.</p>
	3	Kirkenes. Consulate.	<p>Types of interactions.</p> <p>Visiting Russia.</p> <p>Open-minded, straight in your face.</p> <p>Applying for a visa.</p> <p>The employee refused to accept documents doubled up.</p>	<p>Estimated judgment.</p>
5, II, Male, 50, Norway, Norwegian	1	<p>Border between West and East Berlin.</p> <p>Train journey.</p> <p>During the Cold War.</p>	<p>Types of interactions. Basic life things.</p> <p>Photographing soldiers in former East Berlin and getting a fee and losing the film.</p> <p>Train journey.</p> <p>During the Cold War.</p> <p>Border between West and East Berlin.</p> <p>During the Cold War.</p> <p>Respondent took some pictures of soldiers.</p> <p>Some soldiers came into my cabin and asked my camera, took cut the film and gave me a fee.</p>	
	2	<p>Kirkenes.</p> <p>Sea beach.</p> <p>Winter time.</p>	<p>Funny life events or confuses.</p> <p>Nude bathing in public, while others used bathing suits.</p> <p>Respondent joining group to take a bath in the sea.</p> <p>It was very cold.</p> <p>All participants took off their clothes in different cars and ran to the sea.</p> <p>Respondent was the only one without a bathing cloths.</p>	<p>Cultural shock.</p>

	3	Greek Island.	Food and dress preferences. Ordering food without setting potatoes and salad. Just a fish. The respondent ordered a fish on a Greek Island. And got a fish. No potatoes, no vegetables, only fish. The respondent did not know that potatoes and vegetables should be ordered separately.	
6, II, Male, 63, Norway, Norwegian	1		It is difficult to typify. To be embraced.	
	2		It is difficult to typify. To be humiliated.	
	3		It is difficult to typify. To oppressed.	
7, II, Male, 27, Russia, Russian	1		Food and dress preferences. Dislike of the "strange" cuisine.	Dislike.
	2		Interpersonal distance. Excessive distancing or excessive convergence.	
	3		Basic life things. Types of interactions. The difference in judgment. (In Finland, a friend can "inform" to his friend.)	
8, II, Male, 32, Russia, Russian	1		Types of interactions. Imposing of services (for a tip). That is, they first offer help, and then call the price.	Feeling that you were deceived. Anger.
	2		Food and dress preferences. Manners. Eating in unsanitary conditions. At the same time, food is not fast food.	Disgust. Incomprehension.

Based on the analysis of Table 4, I calculated how many times each theme was actualized in describing the situations of cultural shock. This information is presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Frequency of actualization of various themes of cultural shock

№	Possible themes are:	How many times it was found
----------	-----------------------------	------------------------------------

1	<i>Food and dress preferences;</i>	6
2	Manners;	2
3	Personal space;	0
4	Expression of feelings;	0
5	Interpersonal distance;	3
6	Types of interactions;	13
7	Types of thinking;	1
8	Problem solving styles;	0
9	Funny life events or confuses;	2
10	Basic life things, and on;	11
11	<i>Relation to nature and the environment</i>	6
12	Healthy lifestyle	2
13	It is difficult to typify.	3

According to the frequency of actualization, the theme "Types of interactions" (13) was on the first place, the theme "Basic life things (11)" was on the second place, and the third place was divided between two themes: "Food and dress preferences" (6) and "Relation to nature and the environment" (6). The list of topics presented in Table 5 is incomplete. It can be replenished in the future when analyzing new descriptions of cultural shock.

The obtained frequency distribution of the actualization of the cultural shocks themes of can be interpreted as follows. Most situations of cultural shock describe short-term contact of respondents with an "alien" culture. This leads to the fact that in most cases, respondents experience and describe cultural shocks associated with the manifestations of culture on the everyday (food, clothing, manners, basic life manifestations, etc.) and conventional (personal space, interpersonal distance, forms of expression of feelings, typical forms of relationships and interactions, styles of thinking, problem solving, public behavior, etc.) levels.

At the same time, almost none of the respondents described the situation of cultural shock associated with the spiritual sphere of social relations (values, worldview, ethics, aesthetics, etc.). In my opinion, the most likely reason for this is that cultural shocks associated with the spiritual realm are usually experienced by people with a deeper immersion in "alien" culture. For example, students with long-term studies abroad, emigrants, refugees, etc. In the framework of this study, the majority of respondents described the situations of cultural shock that arose during excursions or other short trips.

Conclusions

Almost all respondents showed the ability to social categorization within the framework of the dichotomy "friend or foe". In a large number of cases, respondents referred to "friends" the relatives, friends or people who are somewhat similar to the respondents themselves. In many definitions of "friends", respondents used the concept of "trust" and related concepts. The "foe" was most often defined as the opposite of "friend." To describe the "foe" respondents used the concept of "stranger" or similar in meaning concepts. However, none of the respondents named any specific groups as "friends" or "foes". This can serve as a basis to assert that respondents do not have stable objects of intolerance.

As for the level of tolerance of respondents, it can be noted that all respondents showed a level of tolerance above the arithmetic mean. As expected, the indicator of the level of tolerance in the first group of respondents was significantly higher than the indicator of the level of tolerance in the second group of respondents. In general, the results obtained are in good agreement with the data of other empirical studies in the field of tolerance.

On the basis of analysis of the descriptions of cultural shock situations, interesting conclusions were also obtained. The matrix of descriptions of cultural shock situations was created. As a result of the analysis of the situations of cultural shock, its structure was proposed. When structuring the descriptions of cultural shock situations, several elements were singled out. In particular, they include the following:

1. Where did the situation occur? Description of the environment, location, external factors, etc. (tourist trip, border, consulate, etc.)
2. What is the subject of cultural shock? That is, what phenomenon, object or difference in the "alien" culture led to cultural shock (purity, attitude to animals, food by the buffet system, etc.)
3. What were the consequences of the cultural shock for the respondent? Have there been any significant consequences of this situation of cultural shock for the respondent at all? Has anything changed in his life or in relation to a "alien" or his own culture? Were there any other consequences that he realized some time later? It is assumed that the situations of cultural shock may not have any significant consequences for the respondent.
4. What was the respondent's reaction to the emergence of the situation of cultural shock? It is assumed that there can be three main types of reaction:
 - Emotional. That is, reaction at the level of sensations - fear, delight, joy, etc. ;
 - Behavioral. Can be expressed both in verbal form, and in non-verbal form. Examples of verbal form can be verbal quarrels, words of condemnation, censure

or praise, etc. Examples of the non-verbal form of respondent's reaction to getting into the situation of cultural shock may be some active actions. For example, a respondent can use force (engage in a fight or start defending himself), escape, hide, get into a shelter, seek help, call the police, etc.

- Rational (cognitive). For example, it could be a change of opinion about the representatives of another culture, the formation or destruction of some stereotypes about an "alien" culture, etc.

In addition, data on the most actualized topics of cultural shock were collected. The list of themes received is incomplete, however, it can be replenished and become the basis of a database used by other researchers in the analysis of new descriptions of cultural shocks. Since most of the described situations of cultural shock were associated with short-term and superficial contact of respondents with an "alien" culture, their histories were associated with manifestations of "alien" culture at the everyday and conventional levels. At the same time, there were almost no descriptions of cultural shocks that are related to the spiritual sphere, which requires a deeper immersion in "alien" culture. Despite the relatively small amount of empirical data, the use of a qualitative method for processing them gave, in my opinion, a good result that could not be expected from a quantitative method for such a sample.

Also, it can be noted that most respondents preferred not to express their reaction explicitly. At the same time, the prevailing response of respondents can be defined as "surprise, without negative coloring."

One of the important results of the study can be considered that assumption about the relationship between the level of tolerance of the respondent and the descriptions of situations of cultural shock was confirmed. This relationship can be clearly traced if you compare the data in Table 3 and Table 4. Thus, 100% of respondents, for whom the value of the index "INTOL" was above the average for the sample, gave detailed descriptions of the situations of cultural shock. That is, these respondents wrote not only the names of situations of cultural shock, but also wrote short stories describing the essence of what happened to them. On the contrary, 100% of respondents, for whom the value of the "INTOL" index was below the average for the sample, gave only brief names of the situations of cultural shock. None of them described the situation in more detail.

It should also be noted that respondents with the maximum value of the index "INTOL", gave the greatest number of descriptions of situations ((1, I, Female, 19, Russia, Russian) и (2, I, Female, 19, Russia, Russian)). On average, there are nine stories per respondent. While the respondent with the minimum value of the index "INTOL", gave only two names of situations.

From the writing of stories revealing the essence of the situations that occurred, the respondent abstained altogether.

As a whole, I evaluate the results of the conducted research positively. The analysis of the results of primary data allowed me to gain new knowledge about such phenomena as "cultural shock," "culture," and "intercultural communication." Also, it was possible to confirm the assumptions made at the initial stage of the research.

The analysis of the data did not reveal vivid manifestations of ethnocentrism among the respondents. As the prevailing tendency, I can call cultural relativism.

I tend to associate a relatively high level of respondents' tolerance and a small force of cultural shocks with globalization and with the development of the mass media and communication. Distances in the modern world are shrinking. Communication is becoming more accessible. Access to huge amounts of diverse information can be easily obtained from almost anywhere in the world. A modern person who lives in a world literally stuffed with information, there are fewer reasons for surprise and thrill. In general, in my opinion, the ability of a modern civilized person to wonder at something is gradually weakening. The same thing happens with his ability to experience strong emotions.

References

1. Ten. Yu.P. Culturology and intercultural communication. Rostov on Don: Phoenix. 2007.
2. Van DerL. Intercultural communication within multicultural schools: educational management insights//Education. Winter. 1997, p. 142
3. Dudina V.I. Smirnova E.E. Methodology and methods of sociological research. St. Petersburg State University. St. Petersburg: Publishing house of St. Petersburg State University, 2014. - 388 p.
4. Yadov V. A. Strategy of sociological research. Description, explanation, understanding of social reality. M.: Omega-L, 2012
5. Morgan D. L. Integrating Qualitative and Quantitative Methods. Portland State University: Sage, 2014
6. Pochebut L.G. Cross-cultural and ethnic psychology. St. Petersburg, 2012
7. Morris C. G. Psychology. New York. 1993
8. Tajfel H., Experiment in intergroup discrimination. Scientific American, 1970. Vol. 223
9. Yadov V. A. Social identification. Psychology of self-consciousness. Samara, 2000
10. Pedersen P. B. The five stages of culture shock: Critical incidents around the world. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1995.
11. Flanagan J. The critical incident technique. Psychological Bulletin, №51, 1954. pp. 327–358