Cognitive Mechanisms of Communicative Behaviour of Representatives of Various Linguistic Cultures of the East
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Abstract: Communicative behaviour is primarily based on the understanding of the ways a person interacts with other members of society and how much this reflects the cultural component of the communication process. This also includes the structure of discourse, which affects the communicative content of communication. The relevance of studying the specifics of organising discourse by representatives of oriental linguistic cultures is conditioned by the need to understand the deep cognitive mechanisms of their communicative behaviour in the context of the ever-increasing globalisation of the modern world. The novelty of the study is that it analyses some key factors that have a direct impact on the formation of communicative behaviour of carriers of the eastern mentality. The paper presents some deep aspects of the formation of a communicative culture in the traditions of the East, the study of which is of particular interest in the context of the growing need for successful intercultural communication. Communicative behaviour is analysed in the context of the correlation of language and culture, language and national mentality, language and consciousness. The practical significance of the study is determined by the need to form a global communicative space and structure the worldview aspect of intercultural interaction.
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INTRODUCTION

The concept of discourse is associated with communicative interaction, specified by socio-psychological contexts. The subject of communicative discourse analysis is the study of the organisation of combining the mental and verbal plans of sociocultural activity, the activities of the individual, which are conditioned by certain communicative goals; a set of problems of language as a tool/means of communication in the sociocultural continuum (Klimova et al. 2019). For communicative discourse analysis, emphasis is placed on the meanings that are constructed by the participants in communication (Jabeen 2014; Anamova et al. 2019; Kostruba 2019a).

Shifting the focus of attention in the analysis of communication from the perspective of information-code and inference models to the study of communication based on the interactive communication model is important for the communicative discourse approach, as this allows to explore the active interaction of discourse subjects as social interaction. The essence of the interaction of the speech and socio-psychological communication plans is revealed from the perspective of a communicative discourse approach, since the goal is conditioned by the inextricable need to satisfy social/psychological needs (Warwick and Vilhjalmsson 2005). The communicative discourse approach extends the conventional pragmatic dyad “sign – person”, transforming it into a triad “person – sign – person”, emphasising the relations between individuals established through the sign, and not the correlation between the sign and the person; combines non-speech reality with consciousness and language/speech, social and personal phenomenological worlds into a single series; postulates the achievement of the target assignment of language units, which involves the regulation of the behaviour of communicants (Krenn et al. 2011; Astapov et al. 2019; Kostruba 2019b; Kostruba 2020; Metecho and Sorokin 2018).

It should be noted that the language most universally implements communication, refers to phenomena that are determined by their functions, the basic ones of which are communicative and regulatory. Language is an entity that forms the speech-cognitive foundations of activity, objectivises its various aspects, intentions, directions. We agree with the opinion that today language/speech is defined as a symbolic
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weapon activity, implemented in the focus of social interaction, while the communicative function involves the use of signs that assume the presence of the achieved social effect. Understanding the regulatory function as a priority in discursive activity is conditioned by its inherent syncretism of the cognitive and communicative functions of the language (Tarnopolsky 2001; Bakhmat et al. 2019; Bulychev 2019a; Bulychev 2019b).

With that, the interpersonal function appears to be a kind of regulatory function that categorises reality based on the axiological guidelines of a certain linguistic and cultural community (Aytzhanova et al. 2015). The linguistic sign, in turn, acquires the properties of a prescriptive potential, which is manifested in the ability to embody the normative and regulatory impact on the communicant, in particular in the actual presentation of socially sanctioned needs (Conway et al. 2018). At the same time, upon defining interpersonal function, the authors describe it as the purposeful use of language to embody the ability to construct social and interpersonal relations of communicants (Vilhjálmsson 2009). The specific feature of interpersonal functions is manifested in the implementation of the regulatory influence “here and now”, in the on-line mode, while the addressee of the influence is identified with the relational dimension of communication and the relations of its partners. These functions allow participants in communication to interact with each other, exchange information; to influence the interlocutor, coordinate their actions. Starting the process of communication, a person chooses a position and exercises influence. The determining factor for the social impact of the speaker is their results and consequences, regardless of the success of the result achieved: planned or unexpected (Parladé and Iverson 2011; Bakhmat et al. 2020; Kostruba et al. 2020; Kozorez and Kruzhkov 2019; Sorokin et al. 2019a).

A modern understanding of communication is based on interactive models. The interaction model of communication most fully explains the mechanism of interpretation of intention (Shawer 2013). Communication is a leading factor in the social organisation of society and an integral element of human life. However, the very concept of communication is defined ambiguously by researchers (Shi et al. 2010). In particular, the authors interpret communication as the exchange of information, messages between individuals, communication, a specific form of interaction of people in the process of their cognitive and labour activities, implemented with the help of a linguistic or other common system of symbols or signs, the optimal effect on the interlocutor during communication, exchange of ideas (Starovoyt et al. 2020). The authors emphasise that communication is understood as a purposeful, motivated, regulatory semiotic form of interaction, which is focused on the formation of universal pointers in the living space, and is based on the methods and conditions of actions necessary for a person to survive (Cadime et al. 2017). It is explained as a social process that reproduces a social structure and implements an integrating function in it (Lee and Lee 2015). Communication is divided into oral, written, formal, informal, interpersonal and mass, as well as verbal and non-verbal and serves as a general term for the designation of various types of interaction (Merl 2018; Barabanshchikov et al. 2016).

**MATERIALS AND METHODS**

Verbal communication is represented by the usual use of language, with the help of which the semantic side of information and its content are most fully transmitted. Non-verbal communication comprises the use of a system of non-verbal signs, which primarily includes proxemics and kinesics. Communication demonstrates a close connection with the processes of transcoding the verbal sphere, which is based on verbal symbols and signs and is embodied in listening, speaking, writing, reading, as well as in non-verbal aspects of communication. The main factors inherent in the general communication process include the following: initiator, addressee, means of broadcasting the message, the message itself, which ensures the active exchange of information between the interlocutors and the code/effect that it creates. The beginning of the communication process is the expression of a verbal or non-verbal message, which is encoded by the sender, transmitted through a signal, and decrypted by the recipient. Successful influence on the behaviour of other people constitutes the result of verbal contact (Kozorez et al. 2013; Prentkovskis et al. 2012; Pukhikal et al. 2016; Sorokin et al. 2019b).

Given that speech activity is considered as a consolidation of communication and generalisation, it appears appropriate to correlate this unity with the simultaneous implementation of several language functions in speech activity. The main functions include communicative and cognitive, with which correlate their derivative functions: fatal (contact-setting), information assimilation (conative), voluntary, preservation and transmission of the cultural traditions of the people,
national identity. The communicative function, considered separately from the unity of communication and generalisation, is equated to the function of behaviour regulation.

The regulatory function is recognised as the main function, and such an understanding of the regulatory function suggests that the language is of a sign nature and is interpreted as an instrument of influence on individual and collective consciousness, which aims to reorient the consciousness of the object according to the ideas and views of the subject of speech with respect to the desired and due. The regulatory function in speech activity is implemented by a set of functions:

- individually regulatory, which exercises selective influence on the behaviour of one person or group of people;
- collectively regulatory, which is designed for an undifferentiated, large audience, mass communication;
- self-regulatory, which allows you to plan your own behaviour.

The authors consider it appropriate to address the fact that language constitutes a system formed in such a way as to perform its function and achieve a specific purpose. That is, regulativity constitutes the factor that determines the use of the language and determines its nature in certain social, historical conditions (Fedotova et al. 2020; Barashkin and Samarin 2005).

Communication is a form of regulation. By sharing this opinion, the authors would like to emphasise that it is impossible to influence consciousness without transmitting the established, organised information (Kim and Lee 2017). Due to its iconic nature, the language saves and transmits information, which allows it to correspond to its function. However, the key task is not to state that the language implements the function of regulation, but to focus on the fact that the structure and functioning of the language are determined by the regulatory function of communication. Upon analysing the communicative behaviour of the representatives of the East in this paper, the authors rely on the work of G. Hofstede (1980), E. Hall and M. Hall (1990), W. Gudykunst and Y. Kim (1992), who proposed fruitful typologies of cultures and intercultural communication styles, which were further developed in studies of specialists from different scientific areas.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Communication analysis is based on a specific communication model. From the standpoint of an interactive communication model, information is defined as the core, integral part of communication. Thus, communication does not focus on the mechanical process of exchanging meanings, but is interpreted as an interactive process, verbal and nonverbal intersubjective, collective creative activity of developing common meanings, which allows to establish common orientations inherent for everyone in the living space. Another fundamental feature of the interactive model is the study of communication as a complex interaction of subjects, the culmination of which constitutes the development, creation of meanings in communication, and not their transmission, since the subjects exact bilateral influence on each other, mutually regulate their joint activities, as opposed to one-way impact of a subject on an object intended for passive perception (Golubina et al. 2018; Kalinsky et al. 2019; Krasilshchikov et al. 2014).

Communicative weightiness is inherent in action, inaction, speaking, silence, any form of behaviour. The main factor in the success of communication, its leading purpose in view of the interactive model, is interpretation. According to this position, the addressee not only considers the information sent by the addressee, but also interprets it factoring in the situation of communication, examining it through the lens of personal knowledge and experience, which allows them to derive meanings not embedded by the speaker in the message sent.

It is also important that in the last decades scientists have been interested in studying the influence of linguistic potential and the possibility of regulating the activities of people, which includes management of decision-making. The problem of speech influence is considered in such scientific areas as cognitology, sociology, discourse, psycholinguistics, pragmalinguistics, communicative linguistics, the theory of verbal communication, suggestive linguistics, neurolinguistic programming, stylistics, linguistics (Formalev et al. 2019a; Formalev et al. 2019b).

The phenomenon of speech exposure does not remain out of view of foreign researchers: the problems of scientific argument are studied in the philosophy of language, linguistic pragmatics, and theory of discourse; the problems of “propaganda”, “persuasion
technology” – in sociology, social psychology, theories of political and mass communication; the use of “business communication” attracted close attention of specialists focused on the practice of business communication; there are studies based on the analysis of persuasion techniques in advertising, product promotion (Galamandjuk et al. 2017; Galamandjuk et al. 2019; Kolotyrin et al. 2019).

Traditionally, speech influence is considered in a broad and narrow meaning. In a broad meaning, speech influence is understood as an informational change in the state of consciousness of an object, an expression of the recipient’s response to a speech stimulus, and a change in the structure of their beliefs. In the narrow meaning, speech influence involves purposefulness, intensity of influence, careful selection of both linguistic and paralinguistic means, which is conditioned by the speaker’s special intentions associated with an attempt to change the personal value of a particular object for the addressee, the emotional state of the recipient at the time of communication, to affect their actions and behaviour. Speech influence proceeds from understanding the needs of the communicant. Its task is to change the attitudes, interests, behaviour of the interlocutor in the direction necessary for the addressee, factoring in the communication situation, which occurs unobtrusively and correctly, often with great skill, dexterity, and cunning. Intermediate tasks of speech influence include removing the protective barrier of the addressee, imposing certain thoughts, images, emotions on them (Gernet et al. 2018; Starikov et al. 2011; Stepanchuk et al. 2017; Strogonova et al. 2019).

A successfully combined verbal and non-verbal impact ensures balance in relations with the addressee, which helps to achieve effective communication. The implementation of verbal speech exposure occurs with the participation of language means in order to produce a certain effect on the addressee. Mainstreaming of non-verbal speech exposure occurs with the use of non-verbal means (facial expressions, gestures, behaviour during a conversation, the appearance of the interlocutor, the distance between communicants), which reinforce and enhance speech.

According to E. Hall and M. Hall (1990), up to 80% of information can be transmitted non-verbally. Therefore, ignorance of the specifics of non-verbal communication between representatives of other, and especially eastern, linguacultural communities, is fraught with interruptions in intercultural communication. The authors consider the concept of the “level of contextual communication” inherent in a particular culture fruitful for the analysis of the role of the non-verbal component in communication. There are cultures with low and high levels of contextual communication. In low context cultures, the message contains the maximum transmitted information, in other words, the information is explicated to the fullest. These cultures include the USA, Germany, Switzerland, most European countries. High-context cultures include the countries of the East, primarily Japan and China, where the main attention in communication is paid not so much to the verbal side as to its implicated components. To achieve a full understanding in this case, knowledge of the entire context is necessary, not only situational, but also cultural and historical, philosophical, religious, etc., while the role of the ability to “read” non-verbal communication signals and to predict possible options for the development of a communication situation grows (Pushkina et al. 2020; Tashpulatov et al. 2020).

The most demonstrative in this regard is the Japanese language mentality, where a special place is occupied by non-verbal cultural patterns of silence (Jones 2011), regulated laughter, and regulated tears (Meshcheryakov 2012). According to experts, for the Japanese, the understatement of the situation constitutes a cultural value, since they consider understanding each other without words much more important than verbal communication. The ability to understand what the interlocutor thinks and feels is evidence of warm relations between people.

For Europeans, certain specific features of their behaviour, such as avoiding direct visual contact with the interlocutor, maintaining an impassive face in all situations to hide true feelings and emotions, differences in tactile components of communication, present a certain difficulty in communicating with representatives of oriental cultures. No less important is the ability to recognize the meaning of a smile on the face of a representative of oriental culture. As is known, a Japanese smile does not necessarily mean an expression of joy or pleasure. T. Gurevich (2006) writes: “A Japanese smile can be caused not by a good mood, humour, comic, or heart-felt situation, but by confusion or any discomfort, up to tragedy or anger experienced in the soul”.

It is safe to say that achievement of the set communicative goal and exercise of a certain verbal
impact on the “foreign cultural” interlocutor without knowledge and consideration of the non-verbal components of communication with representatives of oriental linguistic cultures will be problematic.

Thus, the authors adhere to a position based on the definition of speech impact as a person’s influence on another interlocutor or group of communicants, which occurs with the participation of the language in combination with non-verbal means that intensify it in order to perform the task set by the addresser, which is seen in changing the addressee’s reaction, their views, ideas, reasoning, intentions. Addressing not only linguistic, but also paralinguistic, extralinguistic, symbolic means in the process of verbal communication with representatives of other cultures will contribute to the earliest possible achievement of the addressee’s speech influence on the addressee (Sassykova et al. 2019; Sorokin and Novikov 2019; Timkina et al. 2019).

Speech influence is understood as the interdependence of the emotionally subjective and rational aspects in the communicative process of the influence of the addressee on the object. This gives grounds to agree that the addressee, by regulating the behaviour of the communicant, changes its rational component, citing strong evidence. The emotional impact causes certain emotions in the communication partner and contributes to the achievement of the necessary reaction, which leads to a change in their behaviour. There are two forms of speech impact on consciousness: open and hidden. An open speech impact directed at a person by means of speech is intended to convince them to consciously reach the opinion of the addresser or to make the decision the latter wants. The latent form of speech exposure is more complex.

The imposition of a certain vision of reality, the formation of the necessary attitude towards it, the emergence of the necessary emotional reaction at the addressee is achieved due to the hidden possibilities of the language – manipulation. Speech manipulation is one of the most powerful forms of disguised influence. The advantage of manipulation is that the object for which it is designed remains in the illusion of the independence of the committed actions and decisions made. The manipulative goal is more likely to remain hidden to the recipient when he has no doubt about the competence and goodwill of the addressee. We agree with the position of linguists who argue that linguistic manipulation is embodied through the purposeful and conscious use of certain features of linguistic expressions with the intention of implicitly influencing cognitive activity and behaviour of the addressee (Baymuratov et al. 2018; Belyavskii et al. 2019; Koryahin et al. 2019; Koryahin et al. 2018; Krasil’shchikov et al. 2013; Trusova et al. 2019a).

The linguistic manipulation in the communicative behaviour of representatives of oriental linguistic cultures can be traced on the example of the Iranian Taarof politeness system, which is a set of relations that encompasses all aspects of the social life of Iranians and is based on politeness, which, according to some Western scholars, has been elevated to the absolute. It should be noted that Iranian politeness manifests itself in rather hypertrophied, from the standpoint of Europeans, forms and is achieved through specific cultural schemes (Mazepova 2016; 2017; 2019). Of particular interest are the so-called imaginary invitations, offers, and refusals, the essence of which is that any offer made by the interlocutor, including a gift or an invitation to visit, must first be refused several times, and consent should follow only if the interlocutor continues to insist. Immediate acceptance of an invitation or some tempting offer can be regarded as a manifestation of impolite behaviour.

One should always remember that if they make an interesting offer, there is a great possibility that it is not made out of sincere motives, but because of the system of ritual interactions that are imaginary by nature and adopted in Iranian society and sometimes not comprehended by the bearers of this culture. Wrapping the interlocutor in politeness and even flattery, while steadily achieving the goal and sometimes resorting to manipulation with the use of the components of the same courtesy system is a hallmark of Iranian communication (Makushkin 2019).

The Far East politeness systems, in particular inherent in Chinese and Japanese linguistic cultures, are no less indicative in this regard. Being aimed at “preserving the face” of communicants on the surface, these systems, when carefully analysed, also show signs of concealed manipulation (Gu 1990; Haugh and Hinze 2003; Kostruba 2018). In intercultural communication with representatives of these peoples, one needs to remember completely different cognitive mechanisms that govern their behaviour. It is necessary to realise that the ideas of paternalism in Chinese society and Confucian rules of behaviour that regulate not only family relations, but also communication in all spheres of social interaction of
people prevail to this day. The formation of the Japanese mentality and the formation of behavioural norms “occurred under the influence of a peculiar syncretism of Shintoism, Buddhism, Confucianism and, to some extent, Christian ideas” (Gurevich 2006). The ubiquitous influence of Islam, and especially its Shiite sense, prevalent in Iran, left its mark on the specifics of the communicative behaviour of the inhabitants of this country. According to some Iranian researchers, it is possible to discern certain features of the Zoroastrian worldview in it, which was inherent in the religion that existed in Iran before the Arab conquest (Bieliatynskyi et al. 2018; Kostruba and Hylia 2020; Krayushkina et al. 2016; Kurchatov et al. 2019; Trusova et al. 2019b).

For the majority of collectivist cultures, which include those investigated by the authors in this paper, the interests of the collective, group, society prevail over the individually personal interests of particular people. Thus, a striking feature of Japanese comfortable self-awareness is the desire to be similar to others and the psychological attitude to subordinate one's interests to the interests of the group (Gurevich 2006). Understanding personal happiness for the Japanese is inseparable from the complex of basic provisions of conventional Japanese morality – do-toku (lit. “path of virtue”). According to this system, a well-educated Japanese should possess the following qualities: 1) self-denial – suteki 捨て 身 (lit. “throw yourself away”) and the unselfishness of muyoku 無欲 (lit. “lack of desire”) associated with it; 2) mutual assistance and willingness to compromise – gojo-gojo: 互助 互 譜; 3) the standards of giri ninjō: 義理 人情 (approx. “duty of humanity”); 4) modesty and restraint – kenkyo 懐虚; 5) shame, shyness, delicacy – haji 恥; 6) the spirit of “sacrifice” – giseisin 犧牲 心 (Izotova 2011).

On the other hand, as the researchers note, there is a strict separation along the axis of "friend or foe" in the minds of the Japanese, which extends to moral issues and implies the existence of its various options. According to T. Gurevich (2006), “Japanese society actually acknowledges the existence of differing norms of behaviour and morality in their group and outside it. The morality of the Japanese is not based on personal conscience, because they do not even realise the freedom and personal choice of a person as moral values”. This suggests a morally-ambiguous, from the standpoint of Europeans, conclusion that “a lie is also acceptable”. As T. Sakaya (1992) observes, "justice is relative" with the Japanese.

The system of relations in the Chinese environment is also very stratified, the Chinese clearly distinguish between their “friends” and “foes”, their family members and strangers, older and younger, bosses and subordinates. There is a strict standard for everything, and it is impossible to cross the boundaries of the group in this regard. In communication with foreigners, the Chinese appear as very hospitable people, however, as A. Maslov (2010) notes, one can easily fall into a kind of “hospitality trap”, since the traditional mechanism of communication, which is sometimes not fully comprehended by the Chinese themselves, but is always extremely pragmatic, underlies the said communication.

Certain communication tactics that describe their indirect communicative style (the term of W. Gudykunst and Y. Kim (1992)) can be regarded as a manifestation of manipulation by representatives of eastern linguistic cultures. If a direct communicative style presupposes the most complete formulation and open expression of thoughts and intentions (it is typical for such cultures as American, German, Israeli, etc.), then the indirect communicative style inherent in the eastern cultures under consideration is described by an indirect expression of thoughts, their formulation with the help of hints, the frequent use of non-verbal means of communication. This style is inherent in all high-context cultures, whose representatives almost never use the word “no” to refuse the interlocutor, can remain silent and even agree with them, but subsequently fail to do what they promised, that is, from a European standpoint, deceive their partner. However, it must be remembered that in such cultures, direct rejection is a gross manifest of disrespect for the interlocutor, and the word “no”, in their opinion, destroys the atmosphere of positive communication. Sometimes refusal can be veiled with the help of communicative tactics of self-abasement and deliberate exaltation of the interlocutor’s status. With that, they resort to the expression of uncertainty, using the modality of uncertainty by employing the words “maybe”, “perhaps”, “probably”, etc. (Voiskovskii et al. 2016; Zykova et al. 2021).

Therefore, in each specific situation of communication with representatives of oriental cultures, it appears extremely important to consider the presence of the totality of verbal, non-verbal, and extra-linguistic factors as components of discourse.

A modern understanding of discourse is based on the recognition of the need to consider the
communicative and cognitive aspects of speech activity in aggregate, since they are closely related. According to the principles of the cognitive-communicative scientific paradigm, based on the continuity of thought and communication processes, recognition of the active role of both communicants and the interpretation of meanings as constructed by the speaker and listener in a particular situation, discourse is understood as an integral phenomenon, mental communicative activity that takes place in a broad sociocultural context. Discourse is described by continuity and dialogicity, is a combination of process and result; it constitutes an activity that combines linguistic and extralinguistic plans; text in a situation of real interaction, communication. The object and subject of the study of discourse lies in the multifaceted cognitive-communicative-linguistic subject-cognitive field, which is determined by three aspects: linguistic, cognitive (transfer and construction of ideas and beliefs), and socio-pragmatic (interaction of communicants in socio-cultural situations and contexts) (Bogaevskaya et al. 2020; Kostruba and Vasylyeva 2020).

The process of creating a discourse is accompanied by a constant change in the model of the current space or context of discourse by the communicants, and the models themselves are based on semantics and a collective understanding of the presuppositions of discourse. Discourse is considered in close combination with the concept of context, the entire semiotic space, the various plans of which influence the generation and perception of speech. Such an understanding of discourse equates it with an understanding of the communicative situation.

Discourse is interpreted as a communicative event (a complex unity of the linguistic form with meaning and action) created by the participants in communication; an event that involves not only the language in its actual use, but also the mental processes that necessarily accompany the process of developing communication. Furthermore, it is defined as a statement that involves the presence of communicants (addresser and addressee), the intention of the addressee to influence their partner, organised speech activity that has a connection with a non-linguistic sphere: sociological, ideological, cultural, sometimes with something unconscious, unspoken.

The authors shall consider certain features of the organisation of discourse by representatives of oriental linguistic cultures as exemplified by the analysis of their courtesy systems.

Politeness as an object of scientific interest is traditionally correlated with the culture of speech and speech etiquette. Recently, however, there has been a tendency to highlight politeness as a separate scientific issue, in which representatives of the most diverse humanities express their interest. As is known, one of the most widespread concepts of politeness is the one based on the concept of speech maxims and associated with the names of P. Grice (1975) and J. Leech (1983). An impetus for the study of politeness in an intercultural aspect was the monograph by P. Brown and S. Levinson (1987), in which an attempt was made to define strategies universal for all linguistic cultures of the world. However, at present it is generally acknowledged that politeness, despite the universality of the category itself, is relative in nature, since its specific manifestations in various linguistic cultures are marked by bright national and cultural specifics. According to the definition of T. Larina (2009), politeness is “a universal communicative category, which is a complex system of nationally specific strategies aimed at harmonious, conflict-free communication and corresponding to the expectations of partners; politeness is the observance of an optimal balance, a balance between distance and intimacy, between formality and familiarity, which is situational and culturally variable”.

Researchers that study the category of politeness in a cross-cultural aspect have repeatedly criticised the theory of P. Brown and S. Levinson for its “Western-centrality” (for example: Gu 1990; Haugh and Hinze 2003; Ide 1989; Koutlaki 2002; Matsumoto 1988). As is known, P. Brown and S. Levinson (1987) propose to consider politeness as “face preservation”. With that, they distinguish two aspects of this concept: “Negative Face” and “Positive Face”. The positive aspect of the person, in their opinion, is related to the desire of the individual to be acclaimed by a certain group of other people, while the negative aspect is the desire of each person to have freedom of action and prevent outsiders from interfering in their lives. According to some eastern scholars, such a cultural conceptualisation of the “face”, showing signs of “western individualism”, can be opposed by a conceptualisation marked by the nature of “eastern collectivism” and focused primarily on a certain group, family, and society, and not on the personality of a separate individual. In particular, regarding the Japanese concept of “face”, J. Matsumoto (1988) notes: “The most important thing for a Japanese is not his personal territory, but their status in relation to others in the group, and how these others perceive that person”.
It must be understood that communication registers in Japanese language are subject to a strict hierarchy of social relations in Japanese society. In other words, formal, informal, and polite neutral situations of interpersonal communication cannot do without communicators applying a ranked system of politeness, depending on the position of the speaker and the recipient in the hierarchy of society. The tendency to consolidate human social functions from two points of view – hierarchy and belonging to a certain group – is an inherent feature of Japanese speech behaviour (Ponomarova 2016; Borschchew et al. 2019; Trusova et al. 2020a; Trusova et al. 2020b).

In this context, the following types of hierarchical social relations can be distinguished in the Japanese language: 恩恵 関係 (expression of respect for those who owe something), 先行 関係 (expression of respect for senior colleagues, predecessors), 利害 関係 (relationship of mutual interest), 上下 関係 (relationships between higher and lower ranking people), 親疎 関係 (close and distant relationships: choosing the type of speech behaviour when communicating with friends, neighbours, acquaintances, unfamiliar people and strangers) (Komissarov 2017).

Depending on the communicative situation of communication, as well as in accordance with the hierarchy of social relations when communicating in Japanese, it is necessary to use a certain style of speech. It should be noted that foreigners will automatically be considered by the Japanese in accordance with the horizontal system of relations as “strangers” and they will talk with them in a neutral polite style in conditions of informal communication, in an official situation the conversation will take place in a deliberately suave style with the use of lexical and grammatical constructions of respectfully polite and dismissively respectful polite speech, since here the rules of the vertical system of relations between people come into effect (Ponomarova 2016; Bulychev and Rabinskiy 2019; Bulychev et al. 2019; Trusova et al. 2018).

The Iranian cultural scheme of the “face” has its own specifics, but, like the Japanese one, it is mainstreamed in the context of the group, and especially the family to which the individual belongs. As S. Koutlaki (2002) notes, “the nuclear family is an all-important unit of social organisation in Iranian society, not only as the minute component of the social edifice, but also as a frame of all kinds of support for its members. Thus, people are seen as belonging to a family rather than standing as individuals, although this does not by any means entail any loss of their individuality: they are known both as members of a family and as individuals in their own right”. The common responsibility of all family members is to provide, if necessary, emotional, financial and all kinds of other support to all its members, and the main priority is to maintain the honour and good reputation of the entire family. As noted by W. Beeman (1986), family members “must be able to further each other’s interests and provide for the survival of the family as a whole. For this reason it is to the advantage of the family to have great diversity in its membership in terms of occupations, interests, political connections, life styles and so forth”.

One of the most representative cultural patterns of the “face” in Iranian linguistic culture is the āberu (Persian āb “water” + ru “face”) scheme – “dignity, honour”. It can be argued that for Iranians, āberu is a fundamental principle, standard and benchmark in all aspects of social life. As M. O’Shea (2000) observes, “āber, or honour, is a powerful social force. All Iranians measure themselves to a great extent by the honour they accumulate through their actions and social interrelations”. It is interesting to note that, according to the observation of F. Sharifian (2007), āberu of the family is formed not only by the socially significant actions of its members, but also by the property accumulated by them. That is, what a person owns, their property acts as the source of their āberu.

The core of the āberu concept is the individual’s desire to look worthy in the eyes of other people and worry about “what people say.” The Persian concept of harf-e mardom (lit. “the word of people”) is one of the key concepts in the Iranian system of education. From the very childhood, the child is constantly reminded of the importance of what other people will think about it, how they will appreciate its appearance, the way it expresses its thoughts, behaviour. According to Iranian researchers, the word ‘mardom’ (people) in Iranian culture has acquired a metaphorical meaning and it “indicate to what extent the striving for negating individuality and achieving conformity has been profound in Iranian society” (Ahmadi and Ahmadi 1998).

All of the above suggests that the hypothesis put forward by P. Brown and S. Levinson (1897) about the universal nature of the politeness category and the presence of two aspects of the “face” in it – positive
and negative – does not find confirmation in the analysis of eastern politeness systems. A “negative face”, which is associated with an individual’s desire to have freedom of action and prevent other people from interfering in their life is, most likely, a specific kind of Western, essentially individualistic politeness system that is not acceptable for carriers of an oriental mentality that is collectivist in spirit.

Thus, behavioural models and the choice of certain speech strategies for organising discourse by representatives of oriental linguistic cultures are determined by their membership in the group. Moreover, the opposition “friend or foe” is important in this process, which permeates their entire worldview and determines the choice of linguistic means in each specific communication situation. In the context of Japanese culture, researchers introduced the concepts of horizontal and vertical relations. The horizontal system of relations governs communication with “strangers”, and the vertical system of relations governs communication with “strangers” (Evdokimenkov et al. 2019a; Evdokimenkov et al. 2019b).

The specified opposition is even more mainstreamed in intercultural communication. It should be noted that when dealing with foreigners, the Japanese will automatically qualify them as “strangers” and, in accordance with the horizontal system of relations, will talk to them in a neutrally polite style in an informal environment and in a deliberately suave style in an official situation. In this case, the conversation will occur with the use of lexical and grammatical constructions of respectfully polite and dismissively respectful polite speech, since the rules of the vertical system of relations between people come into effect (Ponomareva 2016).

Thus, as the analysis showed, the eastern politeness systems that we examined are described by characteristic national and cultural features. It can be stated that the distinction proposed by researchers, between a positive and a negative face, which is inherent in Western individualistic cultures, does not find its application in the East. Instead, we observe the prevailing role of the group within which each specific carrier of the corresponding linguistic mentality lives and acts. One of the most important cognitive mechanisms for the formation of communicative behaviour in the East is the differentiation of participants in communication based on “friend or foe” attribute, which is implemented both within society and in intercultural communication. Obviously, knowledge of such cognitive and communicative features of the organisation of discourse by representatives of oriental linguistic cultures is absolutely necessary for successful intercultural communication with them.

CONCLUSIONS

Discourse in modern linguistics is understood as the implementation of the language system in certain formal and semantic structures, determined by various socio-temporal factors. On the one hand, discourse constitutes situations, objects of cognition, people as subjects of cognition, and on the other hand, it is itself formed by these parameters. Discourse does not reproduce reality, but actively creates it, representing the entire set of subjective, sociocultural meanings.

From the standpoint of a cognitive activity approach, discourse is described as a process, a communicative event, the social interaction of communicants, which is carried out with the use of natural language. The concept of discourse is based on its understanding of the type of communicative activity, the interactive phenomenon of the speech flow, which differs in manifestation forms and is regulated by the participants’ use of communicative strategies and tactics. At the same time, the discourse synthesises cognitive, linguistic, and extralinguistic (social, mental, psychological) factors, which are determined by a certain circle of life forms subordinate to the subject of communication. Fixed forms of mental experience – mental structures – constitute the basis of the discourse.

The analysis carried out based on Oriental politeness systems suggests that the communicative behaviour of representatives of Oriental linguistic cultures is described by a bright ethnic specificity. The cognitive mechanisms that underlie the processes of communication in these countries are rooted in antiquity and are determined by a combination of historical, religious, socio-psychological factors. One of such mechanisms is the identification of communication participants along the “friend or foe” axis. With that, the distinction between “friend” and “foe” takes place both in monocultural and multicultural communication. Obviously, in the context of intercultural communication with representatives of oriental linguistic cultures, achievement of the planned result is not possible without consideration of the entire set of cognitive mechanisms of communicative behaviour of these representatives, as well as verbal,
non-verbal, and extra-linguistic factors of discourse organisation.
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