

MENTAL ENLIGHTENMENT SCIENTIFIC – METHODOLOGICAL JOURNAL



MENTAL ENLIGHTENMENT SCIENTIFIC – METHODOLOGICAL JOURNAL

<http://mentaljournal-jspu.uz/index.php/mesmj/index>



TRAINING APPLICATIONS OF THE MODEL

Khasankhon Omonov

Jizzakh State Pedagogical University

Jizzakh, Uzbekistan

E-mail: omonov@mail.ru

ABOUT ARTICLE

Key words: training, application, model, integration, sensitivity, propensity, denigration.

Received: 04.01.24

Accepted: 06.01.24

Published: 08.01.24

Abstract: The remainder of this article will outline how the model can be used to diagnose the "level of sensitivity" of individuals and groups and how, given that level, developmental training activities might be selected and sequenced.

INTRODUCTION

People with a low degree of sensitivity are more likely to either not see differences at all or to notice differences using a wide range of categories. The former is exemplified by the assertion that is occasionally made, claiming that Tokyo (or any other foreign locale) is not at all different from, say, New York. They both have a lot of automobiles and buildings, the individual may respond when questioned on what basis this conclusion was reached. This response demonstrates a selective perception that hinders the recognition of things outside of preconceived categories. Students (and others) who ask the typical "dumb questions" that irritate tourists and international students are another example of limited categories in action.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The typical misunderstanding of Koreans, Chinese, and Japanese or the presumption of similarity between Gulf State Arabs and Iranians illustrate the usage of broad categories for detecting difference. Apart from the fact that this irritates tourists from certain regions, it also shows that categories for these (and likely other) cultural differences are not well-discriminated. Wide categories use a straightforward American/Foreigner dichotomy as its extreme form.

This level of sensitivity can also be determined by how a person behaves when faced with a difference. Young children or adults could guffaw or otherwise display embarrassment. Students in high school may additionally remark, "That's weird," or similar phrases. Adults typically display

meticulous politeness, as if cultural diversity were a disadvantage that should be disregarded in public. In each of these situations, the observed conduct is more likely to be a sign of Denial than of the more overtly unfavorable assessment linked to Defense.

Strategies for development. The greatest method for growth at this stage of sensitivity (and only at this time) appears to be engaging in "cultural awareness" activities. These typically take the shape of "Lesico Night" parties or other similar gatherings when music, dancing, cuisine, and costumes are on display. According to this paradigm, the goal of these actions is to further differentiate the broad categories used to describe cultural diversity. It should be underlined that little more may be anticipated from such functions than this. Despite the fact that they are occasionally praised for making significant contributions to cross-cultural awareness.

In the denigration stage of this stage, it is simple to diagnose individuals and perhaps entire communities. Open declarations of animosity toward one particular culture should be interpreted as a defense degree of sensitivity. Defense should be anticipated in those who have recently emerged from denial, as the model predicts. Statements of hostility may be covered up in a normal intercultural workshop or classroom context by demands for proof that one particular group is "really" problematic. It is not unusual to see a combination of denial and disparaging defense, in which one culture is singled out as "bad" while other cultures are just disregarded. Group pressure may intensify the disparagement and deter more sensitive people from engaging in the conversation.

A propensity to "retreat" to Denial prevents progress through the denigration stage of Defense. The next anticipated behavior is a kind of Defense if the trainer is successful in getting through Denial. However, overt animosity may appear less "sensitive" than the earlier action of merely disregarding difference. As a result, the trainer and maybe the client themselves might be persuaded to revert to artificialities, such as countless "Mexico nights."

Strong "reversed" words of denigration are hard to counter because of the perceived reliability of the source. For instance, it is unwise to pivot to highlighting the superiority of foreign visitors once a well-traveled American group member has started disparaging the behavior of "typical" American tourists. One strategy that has been successful in this situation is to "spread around" the criticism by pointing out that tourists from other cultures also display insensitivity, and then change the focus to some generally positive aspects of tourists in general (such as curiosity, the advantages of straightforward cross-cultural contact, etc.). The inoculation, however, is the most effective reversal treatment. This method entails identifying the potential existence of reversal attitudes before the group expresses any such views.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Diagnose. Statements like "In other cultures you just have to be yourself" or "You'll get along just fine with good common sense" are the most overt examples of the reduction of difference. The

earlier statement reveals a viewpoint that cultural diversity is largely cosmetic and that, if one is honest, their "basic humanity" will come through. The last assertion assumes that all cultures value logic in a comparable way. In addition to these signs of physical universalism, trainers could come across phrases like "There are some things that are true everywhere." more Americans, especially those who are more technically minded, are empiricists, which means they are more likely to exhibit physical universalism. This tendency is made worse by the value placed on uniqueness and directness in the North.

The credibility of minimization can occasionally be compared to that of the defensive phase's reversal. It is typically a role filled by more intelligent pupils, those with foreign experience (especially businesspeople), and "internationalists." According to the model, minimization may help these people maintain a form of "enlightened ethnocentrism" that sounds interculturally sensitive while allowing them to avoid the feeling of incompetence that could come from dealing with cultural unexplained.

Developing Techniques. The transition to the following stage signifies a significant conceptual shift from dependence on absolute principles of some kind to an acknowledgment of non absolute relativism. This stage is separated from the next by a "paradigmatic barrier." This transition seems to be best tackled indirectly for Westerners. At this stage, simulations, accounts of personal experience, and other examples of significant cultural disparities in the perception of behavior are effective. For intercultural communication to go beyond the minimization standstill, it must be demonstrated that awareness of these differences has concrete practical importance. Even if this is done well, it's possible that students will still feel a little lost and confused as they try to understand the consequences of relativity.

Adaptation. Diagnosis. The capacity to purposefully change frame of reference, or to empathize, is a sign of adaptation. This ability usually shows itself in the form of the ability to come up with pertinent inquiries on cultural differences. For instance, an American may ask an empathetic inquiry to learn more about the status gap between a Japanese person and a Japanese person when assessing a communication issue between the two. (Take note that this is not a "natural" issue for Americans.) People who have adapted well can also score well on cultural assimilator tests (Fiedler et al., 1971), which call for cognitive operating in a new cultural context.

Many persons who are pluralistic (bicultural or multicultural) are able to practice purposeful empathy, either with other people who share their internalized frames of reference or even with people from different cultural backgrounds. Houeler, as was already said, being a pluralist does not entitle one to automatic adaptation. It is challenging to refute an ethnocentric statement made by a bicultural individual, which is why pluralists who are not ethnocentric pose the same credibility issue to trainers as do participants in reversed defense or minimization. Even more troublingly, these people may

oppose any attempts to view their arduously acquired skills as components of a trainable developmental process.

A claim of empathy that is really based on Minimization is another "false indication" of adaptation. "I can get along with anyone in the world," or "All you have to do is just listen to they are saying" are examples of statements that may betray this circumstance. When questioned, this form of "empathy" is typically traceable to an underlying universalism premise.

Integration. Diagnosis. Lack of strong cultural identification along with highly developed levels of acceptance and adaptation are the two most blatant signs of difference assimilation. These factors exclude those who assert they lack culture when their assertion is more a result of marginalization than a lack of cultural self-awareness. At this point, a person's capacity to uphold a "healthy" self-concept may differ. Those who are greatly troubled by their lack of cultural identity and who could continually feel a sense of alienation and anomie represent one extreme. On the opposite end of the spectrum are people who seem completely comfortable with a self-constructed identity and who are adaptable to a variety of circumstances. In both scenarios (as well as those in between).

Strategies for development. At this stage of intercultural sensitivity, the issue of ethics requires the most developmental work. People who have successfully integrated differences may find it challenging to develop an ethical framework that will direct their decisions and behavior. These people always face a multitude of options since no one cultural system of ethics can be acknowledged as entire. Getting trained in Perry's (1970) "ethical scheme" or another meta-ethical paradigm is beneficial for creating tools. I have a strong personal ethic.

At the acceptance stage, individuals admit that differences actually exist, are significant, and require respect. At this point, a person ultimately transitions from ethnocentrism to ethnorelativism.

A deeper regard for cultural differences in values, including an acceptance of many universal perspectives that underpin most variances in behavior, occurs after the first respect for cultural differences in behavior, including an acceptance of verbal and non-verbal behavior. Cross-cultural awareness increases when people start to perceive their own behavior in a cultural perspective.

CONCLUSION

As people use their own understanding of cultural differences to strengthen their interactions with others from diverse cultures, this stage of adaptation is characterized by behavioral change. They frequently decide to act in ways that are more suited for civilizations other than their own. By now, they have mastered the abilities necessary to function well in the new cultural setting, to view the world with less prejudice, and to actively alter their behavior in order to communicate more effectively in a different culture. They are beginning to actively appreciate the advantages of cultural

variety and have grown more accepting of the many beliefs and ideals held by people from other cultures.

At this level of integration, a lot of people identify as multiculturalists in viewpoint and behavior. They frequently socialize with people from new cultures that are distinct from their own and feel at ease in a wide range of cultural settings. When an organization reaches this level, it is well-positioned to thrive in a globalized world.

REFERENCES

1. Cogan, Jenny, Flecker, Mary. *Dyslexia in Secondary School. A Practical Handbook for Teachers, Parents & Students*. London: Whurr Publishers Ltd, 2004.
2. Fergusson, Roselind. *The Penguin Dictionary of English Synonyms & Antonyms*. London: Clays Ltd, St Ives plc, 1992.
3. Ganshow, Leonore, and Schneider, Elke. "At-risk students and the study of a foreign language in school." *Fact Sheet* 25, 2005.
4. Harmer, James. *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. Harlow: Longman, 2001.
5. Hill, Leslie Alexander. *Elementary Stories for Reproduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977.
6. Jones, Susan. *Five Guidelines for Learning to Spell and Six Ways to Practice Spelling*. LD OnLine. 4 March 2006 < http://www.ldonline.org/ld_indepth/teaching_techniques/spelling_studyin-g.html >
7. Krashen, Stephen, D. *Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning*. Pergamon Press Inc., 1981.
8. Lokerson, Jean. *Learning Disabilities: Glossary of Some Important Terms*. ED352780, 1992, Education Resources Information Center. 4 March 2006 < <http://www.eric.ed.gov> >.
9. Redman, Stuart, Ellis, Robert with Viney, Brigit. *A Way with Words. Resource Pack 1*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
10. Reed, B., Railsback, J.: *Strategies and Resources for Mainstream Teachers of English Language Learners*. Portland: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, May 2003.
11. Schneider, Elke, and Crombie, Margaret. *Dyslexia and Foreign Language Learning*. London: David Fulton Publishers, 2003.
12. Tough, Joan. "Young children learning languages." *Teaching English to Children from Practice to Principle*. Ed. Christopher Brumfit, Joyne Moon and Ray Tongue. London: Nelson, 1984. 213-227.
13. Townend, Janet. *Principles of Teaching – The DI Literacy Programme*. The Dyslexia Institute. 4 March 2006 < http://www.dyslexia-inst.org.uk/articles/prin_teach.htm >.
14. Wadlington, Elizabeth, Jacob Shirley and Bailey Sandra. "Teaching Students with Dyslexia in the Regular Classroom." *Childhood Education*, Fall 1996, 1-5p, Gale Group
15. Krashen, SD (2004). *The power of reading*. London: Heinemann.