

# СОЦИАЛНА ФИЛОСОФИЯ

## SOCIO-CULTURAL DEFINITION OF INTERCULTURAL DIALOGUE IN THE CONCEPT OF MARY DOUGLAS

**Natalia Kryvda**

Doctor of Science in Philosophy, Professor,  
Professor of the Department of Ukrainian Philosophy and Culture,  
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv  
*n.kryvda@britishmba.in.ua*  
ORCID 0000-0001-7429-7693

**Svetlana Storozhuk**

Doctor of Science in Philosophy, Professor,  
Professor of the Department of Ukrainian Philosophy and Culture,  
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv  
*svitlanastorozuk@gmail.com*  
ORCID 0000-0002-7947-6268

DOI: [https://doi.org/10.34017/1313-9703-2022-1\(19\)-2\(20\)-40-50](https://doi.org/10.34017/1313-9703-2022-1(19)-2(20)-40-50)

### Анотация

**Наталія Кривда, Светлана Сторожук. Социокультурното определение на междукulturния диалог в концепцията на Мери Дъглас.** Изследването има за цел да разкрие самобитността на типовете култури (общности), идентифицирани от Мери Дъглас, и да определи вътрешната готовност на техните представители за междукulturна комуникация. Авторите изхождат от преобладаващото в съвременния интелектуален дискурс недоволство от разделението на обществата на "отворени" и "затворени". По-специално те подчертават, че глобалната тенденция към отвореност на обществата трябваше да доведе до появата на кантианския гражданин на света, но доведе до повишаване нивото на културната нетърпимост и изостряне на междукulturните конфликти. Като се има предвид това, типологията на обществата, която концептуализирана в произведенията на К. Попър, се нуждае от значително преосмисляне, допълване и уточняване, един от вариантите на което е интелектуалното наследство на Мери Дъглас. Научните разработки на Мери Дъглас, в частност нейната концепция за "група и маркиране", могат да се превърнат в теоретична основа за изследване на проблемите и противоречията на междукulturната комуникация. Предложението от изследователката "културна карта" дава възможност да се определи степента на отвореността на представителите на определена културна среда към междукulturната комуникация, да се предвиди нейната ефективност и последици. Освен това, концепцията за групата и маркирането, разработена от изследователката, може да се превърне в плодотворна теоретична основа за проучване на културния интелект. Осмисляне на социалното структуриране и категоризация от гледна точка на подхода на Дюркем позволи на Мери Дъглас да покаже особеностите на формирането и поддържането на културните граници с помощта на ритуала и да формира оригинална "културна карта", подчертавайки четири типа социални общности с ясно изразена определена вътрешна структура. Последната подрежда социалния и културния опит на всеки член на обществото, определяйки особеностите на поведението му,

включително готовността за межкултурно взаимодействие. В трудовете на Мери Дъглас тя се проявява не само и не толкова като лично настроение на човека, а като специфична и предварително определена социална програма за взаимодействие с представителите на други културни среди, тоест своеобразна менталитетна директива. Тя описва характеристиките на личното поведение на всеки човек, с други думи, се превръща в схематизиран маркер за културната принадлежност на човека и по този начин улеснява разбирането на културните различия и мотивациите на човека в групата.

**Ключови думи:** отворени общества, затворени общества, йерархични общества, "мръсотия", маргинали, разколнически анклав, индивидуализирани общества, фаталистични общества, ритуал

### Анотация

**Наталія Кривда, Світлана Сторожук. Соціокультурна визначеність міжкультурного діалогу в концепції Мері Дуглас.** Дослідження спрямоване на розкриття своєрідності виокремлених Мері Дуглас типів культур (спільнот) та визначення внутрішньої готовності їхніх представників до міжкультурної комунікації. Автори виходять з незадоволеності панівного в сучасному інтелектуальному дискурсі поділу суспільств на "відкриті" і "закриті". Зокрема, вони акцентують увагу на тому, що загальносвітова тенденція до відкритості суспільств мала би зумовити постання кантівського громадянина світу, натомість, призвела до зростання рівня культурної нетерпимості та загострення міжкультурних конфліктів. З огляду на це, концептуалізована в роботах К. Поппера типологія суспільств потребує істотного переосмислення, доповнення та уточнення, одним з варіантів якого став інтелектуальний доробок Мері Дуглас. Наукові напрацювання Мері Дуглас, зокрема її концепція "групи та розмітки" може стати теоретичним фундаментом дослідження проблем та суперечностей міжкультурної комунікації. Запропонована дослідницею "культурна карта" надає можливість визначити рівень відкритості представників певного культурного середовища до міжкультурної комунікації, прогнозувати її ефективність та наслідки. Крім того, розроблена дослідницею концепція "групи та розмітки" може стати плідною теоретичною основою вивчення "культурного інтелекту". Осмислення соціальної структуризації та категоризації з позицій дюркгеймівського підходу, надало можливість Мері Дуглас показати особливості формування та утримання культурних кордонів засобами ритуалу та сформувати оригінальну "культурну карту", виокремивши чотири крайні типи соціальних спільнот з чітко означеною внутрішньою структурою. Остання впорядковує соціальний та культурний досвід кожного члена спільноти, визначаючи особливості його поведінки, в тому числі й готовність до міжкультурної взаємодії. Остання, в роботах Мері Дуглас, проявляється не тільки і не стільки як особиста налаштованість людини, але як визначена і наперед задана соціальна програма взаємодії з представниками інших культурних середовищ, тобто своєрідна ментальна директива. Вона визначає особливості індивідуальної поведінки кожної людини, тобто, постає схематизованим маркером культурної приналежності людини, тим самим полегшує розуміння культурних відмінностей та мотивації людини в групі.

**Ключові слова:** відкриті суспільства, закриті суспільства, ієрархічні суспільства, "бруд", маргинали, розкольницький анклав, індивідуалізовані суспільства, фаталістичні суспільства, ритуал

### Abstract

**Natalia Kryvda, Svetlana Storozhuk. Socio-cultural definition of intercultural dialogue in the concept of Mary Douglas.** The research is aimed at uncovering the distinctiveness of the

culture types (or communities) identified by Mary Douglas, and at determining the extent of inner willingness for intercultural communication of the representatives of those culture types. The authors are motivated by the inadequacy of the prevailing in modern intellectual discourse division of societies into "open" and "closed" ones. In particular, they emphasize that the global tendency of societies towards openness should have led to an emergence of Kant's citizen of the world, but instead it led to an increase of cultural intolerance and an exacerbation of intercultural conflicts. In view of this, the typology of societies conceptualized in Karl Popper's works needs significant reexamination, expansion, and clarification; the intellectual work of Mary Douglas accomplishes this goal in its own way. Mary Douglas's scientific work, in particular her concept of "grid/group" can become a theoretical foundation for the study of problems and contradictions of intercultural communication. The "cultural map", proposed by the researcher, makes it possible to determine the level of openness of the representatives of a certain cultural environment to intercultural communication, and to predict its effectiveness and its consequences. In addition, the concept of "grid/group", developed by the researcher, can become a useful theoretical basis for the study of "cultural intelligence". Evaluation of social structuring and categorization from the standpoint of Durkheim's approach enabled Mary Douglas to demonstrate the particulars of formation and maintenance of cultural boundaries by means of ritual and to form an original "cultural map", identifying four extreme types of social communities with a clear internal structure. The latter organizes the social and cultural experience of each member of the community, determining the characteristics of his or her behavior, including the willingness for intercultural interaction. In the works of Mary Douglas, it manifests itself not only and not so much as an individual's personal mood, but as a specific and predetermined social program of interaction with representatives of other cultural environments, that is, a kind of mental directive. It determines the characteristics of individual behavior of each person; meaning, it becomes a schematic marker of a person's cultural affiliation, thus facilitating the understanding of cultural differences and motivation of a person in a group.

**Key words:** open societies, closed societies, hierarchical societies, "dirt", marginals, schismatic enclave, individualized societies, fatalistic societies, ritual

**Introduction.** The development of globalization processes has led to the expansion of interconnections among different civilizations, countries, peoples, and cultures. The opening of borders for a free exchange of socially significant information and for travel has led to a marked increase in intercultural interaction among governmental institutions, social groups, public movements, and research and educational institutions. An equally important role in strengthening intercultural interaction was played by tourism and labor migration. The latter most clearly demonstrated the need for a comprehensive study of the features and mechanisms of effective intercultural interaction. The ability to communicate with people from different cultures opens up plentiful opportunities for personal self-fulfillment and helps to overcome frustration when in a foreign cultural environment, all while helping to overcome intercultural conflicts in a globalized world.

It's worth noting that the problems of intercultural communication have attracted considerable attention from researchers since ancient times. However, it was only in the middle of the twentieth century that this topic grew particularly urgent, as the globalization laid the foundations for a radical change in modern social relations, which also attracted the attention of intellectual discourse. For some time it was based on a conceptual basis, which has its roots in A. Bergson's work "Two Sources of Morality and Religion", published in 1932. As is known, in this work the researcher identified the two types of societies, a "closed" and an "open" type, for the first time. According to his findings, closed societies are characterized by "static" morality and religion, as well as by close-knit internal connections and indifference to others. Representatives of such societies are always ready

for an attack and a defense, since they are guided only by "social instinct" (Bergson, 1994, p. 288, p. 32). That is why A. Bergson calls closed societies a "dead end" of social development, as they are doomed to eternally circle around, with their representatives unable to practice effective intercultural communication.

Unlike closed societies, open societies, according to A. Bergson, arise due to moral authorities who seek prosperity for all mankind, and, therefore, focus on a system of historically variable values ("dynamic" morality and religion). It is thanks to the members of open societies that social development takes place. According to A. Bergson, it is moving towards an international (universal) community devoid of antagonisms and built on the principles of ascetic humanism, which is known to be inextricably linked with the ideal of freedom and creative self-expression. Strictly speaking, according to A. Bergson, only members of an open society are capable of effective international communication that transcends cultural (usually ethnocultural) borders and forms a broad universal coalition based on humanism.

Without going into a deep and comprehensive analysis of the types of societies identified by A. Bergson, we will only point out the fact that his proposed typology was further developed in the works of the famous Austrian and British philosopher and sociologist K. Popper. In "Open Society and Its Enemies" (Popper, 1994), the thinker distanced himself from the religious mysticism proposed by A. Bergson, and showed that the separation of open and closed societies on a rationalistic basis makes it possible to carefully analyze the particulars of social development from the standpoint of social self-realization. In particular, K. Popper emphasized that closed societies resemble living organisms, as the basis for their association are semi-biological ties, such as blood kinship and the unity of life and work, of joy and danger. In closed societies all social institutions are sacred and are built on the basis of taboos, which, without the need for rational justification, define and regulate the life of the individual and society as a whole. Members of a closed society treat current regulations (taboos) with great piety and never doubt their truth (Popper, 1994, pp. 195 – 196).

Unlike closed societies, open societies are formed on the basis of free competition, which is manifested in the constant desire of their members to occupy privileged or most respectable social or economic niches. Members of open societies reject all sorts of authorities and are critical of taboos. This, according to K. Popper, often leads to open societies losing the features of a specific and real group. In most cases members of open societies do not meet with each other; the affairs are conducted by isolated individuals that communicate through a variety of print media (letters, telegrams, orders, written directives, etc.), due to which they may not have personal contacts. Of course, according to K. Popper, this does not mean that members of an open society have completely lost their human nature and do not need interpersonal communication. On the contrary, the scientist believes that the emergence of an open society has opened a new, much wider space for such communication. In contrast to members of a closed society who are limited by organic ties and are hostile to any manifestations of dissent, representatives of an open society form their communicative space based on their own beliefs, life guidelines and even on personal gain (Popper, 1994, pp. 196 – 199). In other words, members of an open society, losing the features of a "real group", become very flexible and can easily engage in intercultural communication.

Despite the rationality of many theoretical remarks made by K. Popper in "Open Society and its Enemies" (Popper, 1994), there is no reason to consider his conclusions about the absence of obstacles to intercultural communication in members of open societies as convincing. Although the globalization has significantly eroded the foundations of cultural identity (Giddens, 2004; Bauman, 2004; Huntington, 2003; Kryvda, 2016; Storozhuk, 2014; Hoyan et al., 2019), today there is no reason to say that identity has given up its place to a Kantian citizen of the world who has no obstacles to free communication. On the contrary, global changes in politics, economics and culture are accompanied by a constant separation of cultures and peoples, while generating in them a

desire for cultural self-affirmation and the preservation of their own cultural values. The range of their resistance is traditionally quite wide: there is a passive aversion to the values of other cultures, and an active opposition to their spread and establishment. That is why in our day we have witnessed numerous ethnoreligious conflicts, the strengthening of nationalist sentiments, and the intensification of regional fundamentalist movements. Contradictions that arise at the community level penetrate into the depths of public consciousness, thereby defining, and often significantly limiting, the space and opportunities for personal self-fulfillment in a globalized and, at the same time, culturally diverse world.

The fundamental need of man to preserve his cultural identity, combined with the constant desire for personal self-fulfillment in a multicultural world, has attracted the attention of researchers in recent decades. For example, in researching this problem, in 2003, Christopher Earley and Soon Ang, building off Howard Gardner's theory of multiple intelligences, introduced to the scientific community an original concept of "cultural intelligence" (CQ). Its semantic field was determined by a person's ability to function effectively and to interact in situations characterized by cultural diversity, without losing his or her own cultural identity. This ability, according to researchers, can not be the result solely of the cognitive sphere, but appears to be a multidimensional formation of a wide range of skills. Thus, appealing to the component theory of intelligence (Sternberg, Detterman, 1996), K. Earley and S. Ang identified four main components of cultural intelligence: 1) the metacognitive component of CQ, or the ability to acquire and interpret cultural knowledge and build strategies for acquiring knowledge about other cultures; 2) the cognitive component of CQ, or human knowledge of their own and other cultures; 3) the motivational component of CQ, or the ability and desire of a person to focus on the study and understanding of a particular cultural context, and, 4) the behavioral component of CQ, which is manifested as an ability to carry out verbal and nonverbal interactions with representatives of different cultures (Ang et al., 2004; Earley PC, & Ang S., 2003). To identify the level of cultural intelligence, Sun Ang and his colleagues developed and tested the Cultural Intelligence Scale (CQS), the sub-scales of which correspond to the four aforementioned components of CQ (Ang et al., 2007).

The emergence of this concept and the tool for measuring cultural intelligence in the setting of a shortage of viable theoretical and methodological developments in the field of intercultural communication has led to a rapid upsurge of research on this phenomenon. In this context the explorations of many foreign (Linn Van Dyne, 2012; Ryan, Deci, 2000) and Ukrainian researchers (Solodka, 2017; Zelenov, 2016; Yefymenko, 2017) can be mentioned. Despite the remarkable interest in the issues of formation of cultural intelligence, so far there is no reason to consider them resolved, in the light of the problems and conflicts that arise in the process of real interaction. To some extent, they are related to human openness to intercultural dialogue, which, according to the British researcher M. Douglas, is inextricably linked with collective ideas and the way of organizing the community.

Purpose. Given the above, the purpose of the article is to uncover the distinctiveness of the culture types (or communities) identified by Mary Douglas, and to determine the extent of inner willingness for intercultural communication of the representatives of those culture types.

Presentation of the main material. Turning to the realization of this goal, we consider it appropriate to emphasize that M. Douglas never aimed to study cultural intelligence. Moreover, her major works, *Purity and Danger* (Douglas, 2000), *Natural Symbolics: Explorations in Cosmology* (Douglas, 1973), were published in the 1960s and 1970s, long before the emergence of this concept. Nevertheless, they provide the insight into the origins of tolerance / intolerance towards the representatives of other cultures, the willingness or unwillingness to engage in an open dialogue with them, and the causes of persistent acute intercultural conflicts in a unified yet multicultural modern world. To some extent, it is due to the fact that the problem of defining group boundaries through

the prism of a binary opposition between “Ours” and “Strangers” (“us” and “them”) has invariably remained the alpha and the omega of M. Douglas’s scientific research. The conclusions drawn by the researcher in her works are based on Durkheimian standpoints; meaning, the researcher believes that both modern and primitive people have the same laws and rules of a schematic organization of their own experience. This theoretical basis has opened wide a way for them to find in primitive cultures those universal cognitive schemes and categories that organize the whole social experience and determine the collective phenomena of communities, while determining the openness and readiness of their members for intercultural dialogue. Interestingly, in contrast to K. Popper (1994) and A. Bergson (Bergson, 1994), M. Douglas carried out her typology of societies on the basis of the attitude of members of a particular cultural environment to cultural deviations, i.e. all that destroys the established order (Douglas, 2000, p. 71).

Given that Douglas called her work “Cleanliness and Danger”, while paying much attention to the coverage of the attitudes in different cultural environments to the “dirt”, we can assume that it is the main threat to the established order. However, in reality, this view is erroneous, because, as the researcher argues, in the process of studying the ritual practices of different peoples, “dirt” is an integral part of the internal differentiation of society. As a by-product of the formation of identity and social order, all those deviations that can undermine the foundations of the established order turn into “dirt”. The relentless cleaning of this “dirt” leads to the formation of an entire pile of undifferentiated garbage, which the community is trying to avoid; yet, this garbage, interestingly, does not pose any threat to the existence of the community. However, as soon as a person / community begins to look for undamaged things in this pile, their identity is restored and begins to threaten the order / identity (Douglas, 2000, pp. 236 – 238).

According to M. Douglas, rituals are among the main means of fighting the destructive power of “dirt”. They, as the researcher argues, appealing to the theoretical remarks of E. Durkheim, organize the experience, revealing to people their social self, thereby forming a social integrity. In other words, the ritual serves as a means of expressing meaningful social values and organizes the world, keeping people within the framework of their social roles. Ritual also reflects the idea of the singularity of space, the ideal social order, and the idea of “dirt” that can destroy the established world order (Douglas, 2000, pp. 103 – 114).

M. Douglas’s conclusions about the characteristics of ordering and differentiation of the social world by means of ritual do not cause any objections and in general seem quite well-reasoned. However, at the first glance, the theoretical generalizations made by the researcher in “Purity and Danger” seem unsuitable for the study of intercultural interaction, at least due to the fact that her main focus is on the formation of social boundaries and group values by means of ritual. However, thanks to this formulation of the problem, it becomes possible to explore the openness of group members to intercultural communication. In particular, when revealing the mechanism of preserving group unity, M. Douglas simultaneously draws attention to the problem of group boundaries and social uncertainty, represented by the image of the marginalized. In primitive, as well as in modern societies, they included people without a clearly defined social status. They, as the researcher shows in numerous empirical examples, are perceived by society as a source of danger, or a force capable of destroying the social order. The marginals themselves are not in the best position – they do not have defined social roles and a designated place in the existing social structure, and, therefore, they feel vulnerable. In addition, the marginal position of the marginalized can lead to antisocial behavior, the specifics of which are determined by externally imposed stereotypes and a constant contact with external (relative to the group) forces. They, as M. Douglas argues, can show aggressive behavior towards full members of the community, who, in turn, see the marginalized as a threat to the existence of an established order (Douglas, 2000, p. 147). Strictly speaking, that is why all measures against the destructive power of the marginalized are usually carried out not by

the marginalized themselves, but by those to whom they threaten their very existence.

Given that any uncertainty, marginality, or borderline situation is considered by a person as a source of danger, there is every reason to say that intercultural communication cannot take place without problems and contradictions. In contacts with representatives of other cultures, people, as M. Douglas argues, see a threat to their identity, and, therefore, make the contacts with apprehension. This, in turn, gives reason to doubt the possibility of building a truly "open society" (K. Popper), whose representatives easily enter into intercultural communication. Our assumption is fully confirmed not only by the relentless growing intolerance towards the representatives of other cultures, even among the most developed countries of the Western European world, but also by the frustration of those who had to migrate to a foreign environment (Heckmann, 2015).

Intolerance of people from foreign cultural backgrounds, migrants' frustration, and the ever-increasing need for self-fulfillment have actualized the study of the mechanisms of intercultural interaction. Often, as evidenced by the research above, it is seen as a personal ability or inner willingness to engage in intercultural dialogue. Without altogether refuting this point of view, it may be appropriate to emphasize that the theoretical remarks and conclusions drawn by M. Douglas clearly indicate that personal attitudes (or desires) are often insufficient for effective interaction in a multicultural space. As the researcher shows in her work "Natural Symbols", a person never manifests himself or herself as just a person, or Kant's citizen of the world, but only as a representative of a certain group. Accordingly, it is the way the group is organized, its values and worldview, that determine its readiness / unwillingness for a dialogue with representatives of other cultures.

A conventional topic of human freedom and a social designation of a person is presented in the intellectual work of M. Douglas in the original concept of "grid/group". The researcher, analyzing the primitive, and, along with them, the modern societies, built a special coordinate system in which the social (or, rather, the solidarity in its Durkheimian meaning) is defined in two dimensions: the "group", or the degree of participation / non-participation in a stable and limited social world, the action of which is manifested as a kind of coercion to solidarity, which the individual feels toward himself or shows in relation to others; and a "grid", i.e. the rules and methods of external pressure and interaction in general, which are fixed in the symbolic systems of each group.

Obviously, the "group", as a socio-cultural phenomenon that indicates the degree of involvement of the individual in a limited (physically and in the form of obligations to its members) social space does not cause any questions and contradictions. Instead, the concept of "grid" is somewhat contradictory and even complex. The researcher uses it to denote informal rules of group influence on the individual through ego-focused connections. Grid determines what is appropriate and desirable in relationships between people, grouped by gender, age, values, etc., thereby controlling their behavior. Due to this, the grid seems to set the social framework for the social classification of a person and paves for him or her clearly defined and controlled routes of social interaction, thus leaving him or her with a minimal space for personal choice.

As can be seen, M. Douglas's interpretation of the social in the coordinate system of "grid/group" forms the idea of solidarity as a relationship between the formal system of social control (in a broad sense) and the attitude toward it of the controlled and of the controlling, while at the same time allowing to predict the change of the type of social organization when changing its basic parameters. For example, in cases where there is a strong group and a strong grid, a conservative and hierarchical community is formed, whose members are cohesive and have a complex hierarchical structure. Such social organization is usually characterized by a high level of centralization and bureaucracy, so its representatives avoid intercultural interaction whenever possible, seeing it as a threat to their existence. Members of hierarchical societies are focused on gaining a privileged place in their own social environment, and, therefore, may be intolerant not only of dissent, but also of the representatives of other cultures.

The situation somewhat changes in cases where the grid, i.e. the external rules of community organization, is weakened, but group unity is maintained. Such communities, as M. Douglas argues, lose their defined internal structure, and, therefore, are prone to closing in and focusing on their own values even more than the societies with a strong grid are. In most cases, communities with strong group unity and weak grid arise in the process of internal contradictions that lead to the formation of a schismatic enclave within society. Such communities are usually closed to outsiders, who are perceived as a great threat, due to the fact that the representatives of the schismatic enclave lack a clearly defined system of rules for the classification of people. Meanwhile, this is the main reason why, in most cases, egalitarian ties are established within such a community.

In contrast to the xenophobic representatives of the schismatic enclave, or to the egalitarian community, the members of fatalistic communities do not have a clear position on the others. This is, in part, due to the fact that the system of rules that determines social structure is eclectic, while atomized subordination determines the place of each individual in the system of social relations. With this in mind, the attitude and readiness of members of fatalistic communities will always depend on their own place in the social hierarchy. In cases where such interaction opens the way to higher hierarchical positions, individuals who do not have a clearly defined place in the group and unambiguous rules of its structuring, have no obstacles to intercultural interaction and clarification of the rules of the "grid".

Selfishness and a desire for domination that manifest among the so-called social isolates under certain conditions can inspire intercultural communication, but it does not encourage them to engage in free and open competition. As shown by M. Douglas, it is manifested only in cases where the "grid" is significantly eroded and the influence of the group on the person is weakened, thus laying the foundations of free individualism. Its development leads to a person's loss of interest in the issues of group identity, furthered by the relentless search for personal gain. Strictly speaking, it is at this level that the tendency to form an open society, using K. Popper's terminology, can be seen; a society, members of which are losing their group distinction and the rules of social structuring, and, therefore, can easily interact with representatives of other peoples and cultures. Strictly speaking, active individualism in culture appears as a kind of cosmopolitanism devoid of a deep core of values (Douglas, 1973, pp. 54 – 68).

The identification of four main types of culture allowed M. Douglas to determine the specifics of the formation of group codons, and to show the origins of marginality, while revealing the social conditionality of the individual's personal readiness for intercultural communication. At the same time, perhaps unwillingly, the researcher, continuing the line of E. Durkheim's theoretical thinking, laid the foundations of a structural approach in anthropology. According to her concept, each person is a bearer of the cultural standards that were instilled in the process of one's upbringing. Usually, these standards determine a person's behavior and value priorities throughout his or her life. This, in turn, means that the external regulator of human behavior is not external prescriptions, but a historically formed type of culture. Social orientations established in culture determine the value priorities of the individual, while facilitating intercultural communication. After all, it is, indeed, the knowledge of cultural types and their impact on a person that makes it possible, on the one hand, to determine the prospects of intercultural interaction, and, on the other, to effectively manage a culturally diverse team, thereby demonstrating a high level of "cultural intelligence". It manifests itself not only (and not so much) through cognition (a deep knowledge of a certain culture), but also as an ability to correctly interpret the behavior of the representatives of a particular culture in order to achieve inner harmony within the group by satisfying the inner ambitions of each of the members.

**Conclusions.** The evaluation of social structuring and categorization from the standpoint of Durkheim's approach gave Mary Douglas the opportunity to demonstrate the particulars of formation and maintenance of cultural boundaries by means of ritual and to form an original "cultural

map”, identifying four extreme types of social communities with a clear internal structure. The latter organizes the social and cultural experience of each member of the community, determining the characteristics of his or her behavior, including the readiness for intercultural interaction. The latter, according to Mary Douglas, is manifested not only, and not so much, as a personal preparedness, but as a defined and predetermined social program of interaction with the representatives of other cultural environments, i.e. a kind of a mental directive. It determines the characteristics of individual behavior of each person; meaning, it becomes a schematic marker of a person's cultural affiliation, thus facilitating the understanding of cultural differences and motivation of a person in a group. This, in turn, gives grounds to claim that cultural intelligence requires not so much a vast knowledge of endless cultural differences, but merely a skill to interpret the internal markers of human behavior.

### Literature and references

- Ang S., Van Dyne L., Koh C., Ng, K.-Y., Templer K. J., Tay C., & Chandrasekar, N. A. (2007), "Cultural intelligence: Its measurement and effects on cultural judgment and decision making, cultural adaptation and task performance", *Management and Organization Review*, 2007, No. 3, pp. 335 – 371. doi:10.1111/j.1740- 8784.2007.00082.x.
- Ang, S., Van Dyne, L., & Koh, C. S. K. (2004), *The measurement of cultural intelligence: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management*, New Orleans, LA.
- Бауман, З. (2004), *Глобализация. Последствия для человека и общества*, Весь мир, Москва, 188 с.
- Бергсон, А. (1994), *Два источника морали и религии*, Канон, Москва, 384 с.
- Гидденс, Э. (2004), *Ускользающий мир. Как глобализация меняет нашу жизнь*, Весь Мир, Москва, 120 с.
- Дуглас, Мери (2000), *Чистота и опасность. Анализ представлений об Осквернении и табу*, Канон-Пресс-Ц, Кучково поле, Москва, 288 с.
- Douglas, Mary (1973), *Natural symbolics: explorations in cosmology*, Barrie and Jenkins, London, 183 p.
- Earley P. C., & Ang S. (2003), *Cultural intelligence: Individual interactions across cultures*, Stanford University Press, Palo Alto, CA, 400 p.
- Gardner, H. (1993), *Multiple intelligences: Theory in practice*, Basic Books, New York, NY, 320 p.
- Heckmann, F. (2015), *Integration von Migranten. Einwanderung und neue Nationenbildung*, Springer Fachmedien, Wiesbaden, 309 s.
- Hoyan I., Kryvda, N., Storozhuk Sv., Fedyk O. (2019), "Worldview and Ideological Priorities of Modern Society: Ukrainian and Euro-Atlantic Context", *Ideology and Education in Post-Soviet Countries*, No. 2(13), pp. 91 – 109.
- Єфименко, Т. М. (2017), "Культурний інтелект та критерії його розвитку", *Young Scientist*, No. 4.1 (44.1), pp. 17 – 20.
- Зеленов, Є. А. (2016), "Культурний інтелект як складова планетарного виховання студентської молоді", *Духовність особистості: методологія, теорія і практика*, Вип. 1, с. 24 – 34.
- Кривда Н. Ю., Сторожук С. В. (2016), "Культурна ідентичність як основа колективної єдності", *International education journal of innovative technologies in social science*, No. 4(8), Vol. 2, pp. 58 – 63. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.31435/rsglobal\\_ijitss/01062018/5710](https://doi.org/10.31435/rsglobal_ijitss/01062018/5710)
- Khmil, V., & Khmil, T. (2015), "Anthropological aspect of the nature of the state", *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*, No. 7, pp. 7 – 15. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.15802/ampr2015/43374>
- Поппер, К. (1994), *Відкрите суспільство та його вороги*, Том 1, Основи, Київ, 444 с.

- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000), "Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being", *American Psychology*, No. 55, pp. 68 – 78. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.68
- Солодка, А. К. (2017), "Концептуальні виміри культурного інтелекту", *Теоретико-методичні проблеми виховання дітей та учнівської молоді*, Вип. 21(2), с. 263 – 278.
- Сторожук, С. В. (2014), "Націоналізм: проблема визначення та інтерпретації", *Вісник Черкаського університету*, Серія: Філософія, № 31, с. 28 – 33.
- Хантингтон, С. (2003), *Столкновение цивилизаций*, Издательство АСТ, Москва, 603 с.
- Sternberg R.J., & Deterrnan D. K. (1986), *What is intelligence? Contemporary viewpoints on its nature and definition*, Ablex, Norwood, NJ, 173 p.
- Van Dyne L., Ang S., Ng K.-Y., Rockstuhl T., Tan M. L., & Koh C. (2012), "Sub-dimensions of the four factor model of cultural intelligence: Expanding the conceptualization and measurement of cultural intelligence (CQ)", *Social and Personal Psychology: Compass*, No. 6(4), pp. 295–313. doi:10.1111/j.1751-9004.2012.00429.x

### References

- Ang S., Van Dyne L., Koh C., Ng, K.-Y., Templer K. J., Tay C., & Chandrasekar, N. A. (2007), "Cultural intelligence: Its measurement and effects on cultural judgment and decision making, cultural adaptation and task performance", *Management and Organization Review*, 2007, No. 3, pp. 335 – 371. doi:10.1111/j.1740-8784.2007.00082.x.
- Ang, S., Van Dyne, L., & Koh, C. S. K. (2004), *The measurement of cultural intelligence: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management*, New Orleans, LA.
- Bauman, Z. (2004), *Globalization. Consequences for man and society [Globalizatsiya. Posledstviya dlya cheloveka i obshchestva]*, Ves mir, Moscow, 188 p. [in Russian].
- Bergson, A. (1994), *The Two Sources of Morality and Religion [Dva istochnika morali i religii]*, Kanon, Moscow [in Russian]
- Giddens, A. (2004), *Runaway World: How Globalisation Is Reshaping Our Lives [Uskol'zayushchii mir. Kak globalizatsiya menyaet nashu zhizn]*, Ves mir, Moscow [in Russian]
- Douglas, Mary (1973), *Natural symbolics: explorations in cosmology*, Barrie and Jenkins, London, 183 p.
- Earley P. C., & Ang S. (2003), *Cultural intelligence: Individual interactions across cultures*, Stanford University Press, Palo Alto, CA, 400 p.
- Gardner, H. (1993), *Multiple intelligences: Theory in practice*, Basic Books, New York, NY, 320 p.
- Heckmann, F. (2015), *Integration von Migranten. Einwanderung und neue Nationenbildung*, Springer Fachmedien, Wiesbaden, 309 s.
- Hoyan I., Kryvda, N., Storozhuk Sv., Fedyk O. (2019), "Worldview and Ideological Priorities of Modern Society: Ukrainian and Euro-Atlantic Context", *Ideology and Education in Post-Soviet Countries*, No. 2(13), pp. 91 – 109.
- Yefymenko, T. M. (2017), "The cultural intelligence and criteria for development" ["Kul'turny`j intelekt ta kry`teriyyi jogo rozvy`tku"], *Young Scientist*, No. 4.1 (44.1), pp. 17 – 20.
- Zelenov, Ye. A. (2016), "Cultural intelligence as a component of planetary education of student youth" ["Kul'turny`j intelekt yak skladova planetarnogo vy`xovannya students` koyi molodi"], *Spirituality of a personality: methodology, theory and practice*, No. 1, pp. 24 – 34.
- Kryvda, N. Yu., Storozhuk S. V. (2016), "Cultural identity as the basis of collective unity" ["Kul'turna identy`chnist` yak osnova kolekty`vnoyi yednosti"], *International education journal of innovative technologies in social science*, No. 4(8), Vol. 2, pp. 58 – 63. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9004.2012.00429.x>

- org/10.31435/rsglobal\_ijitss/01062018/5710 [in Ukrainian]
- Khmil, V., & Khmil, T. (2015), "Anthropological aspect of the nature of the state", *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*, No. 7, pp. 7 – 15. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.15802/ampr2015/43374>
- Popper, K. R. (1994), *The Open Society and Its Enemies* [Vidkry'te suspil' stvo ta jogo vorogy]. Vol. 1, Osnovy, Kyiv [in Ukrainian].
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000), "Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being", *American Psychology*, No. 55, pp. 68 – 78. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.68
- Solodka, A. K. (2017), "Conceptual dimensions of cultural intelligence" ["Konceptual`ni vy`miry` kul`turnogo intelektu"], *Theoretical and methodological problems of raising children and students*, No. 21(2), pp. 263 – 278 [in Ukrainian]
- Storozhuk, S. V. (2014), "Nationalism: the problem of definition and interpretation" ["Nacionalizm: problema vy`znachennya ta interpretaciyi"], *Cherkasy University Bulletin, Series: Philosophy*, No. 31, pp. 28 – 33 [in Ukrainian]
- Huntington, S. (2003), *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order* [Stolknovenie tsivilizatsij], AST, Moscow [in Russian]
- Sternberg R.J., & Detterman D. K. (1986), *What is intelligence? Contemporary viewpoints on its nature and definition*, Ablex, Norwood, NJ, 173 p.
- Van Dyne L., Ang S., Ng K.-Y., Rockstuhl T., Tan M. L., & Koh C. (2012), "Sub-dimensions of the four factor model of cultural intelligence: Expanding the conceptualization and measurement of cultural intelligence (CQ)", *Social and Personal Psychology: Compass*, No. 6(4), pp. 295–313. doi:10.1111/j.1751-9004.2012.00429.x

© **Natalia Kryvda, Svetlana Storozhuk**