

DOI: 10.7596/taksad.v9i1.2355

Citation: Korolyov, I., & Domylivska, L. (2020). Mentality and National Character as Semiotic Regulators of Communicative Behavior. *Journal of History Culture and Art Research*, 9(1), 354-364. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.7596/taksad.v9i1.2355>

Mentality and National Character as Semiotic Regulators of Communicative Behavior

Igor Korolyov¹, Liudmyla Domylivska²

Abstract

The article proposes the consideration of the concepts of mentality and national character from the perspective of cognitive semiotics, which are semiotic regulators of the process of communication between representatives of different linguistic cultures, in particular, national communicative behavior. Special attention is paid to highlighting the symbolic status of traditions, etiquette and ritual norms, stereotypes, ready-made thoughts, schemes for explaining phenomena and events, causal attribution mechanisms in the communicative consciousness of a national linguistic personality, which form the cognitive-semiotic component of the mentality and national character of representatives certain linguistic culture. The theme of the thesis is that national communicative behavior reflects centuries-old traditions of a particular ethnos, manifested in linguistic and cultural competence, as well as etiquette and ritual norms caused by knowledge and stereotypical representations of the cognitive base of interactants. The observance of traditions and etiquette and ritual norms in national communicative behavior causes the formation of national values of communication participants as representatives of a certain linguaculture, reflecting the cognitive-semiotic specificity of the mentality and national character of the individual people as main regulators of the communication process. As a result of the proposed cognitive-semiotic approach to the analysis of national communicative behavior, the opinion is expressed that in typical invariant monocultural and intercultural situations of communication, each interactant resorts to the formed and fixed in the own consciousness system of semiotypes for organizing the perception and decoding of information, providing it with some assessment and interpretation.

Keywords: Mentality, National character, Cognitive semiotics, National communicative behavior, Etiquette, Ritual norms.

1 Doctor habil. in Philology, Associate Professor, Senior Researcher, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Institute of Philology, Scientific and Research Department, Kyiv, Ukraine, 01601. E-mail: korolyovigor@gmail.com

2 PhD in Philology, Associate Professor, Acting Head of Department of Language Training, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Educational and Scientific Centre "Institute of Biology and Medicine", Kyiv, Ukraine, 01601. E-mail: ldomylivska@gmail.com

Introduction

In the age of globalization, intensification of inter-ethnic contacts, the interest of society in general and of the scientific community in particular to the ethnic features of communication, to the mentality and national character of peoples is growing (Althen, 1998; Foster, 2004; Kuzmickaitė, 1992; Korolyov, 2019; Korolyova, 2018; Lavaste, 2012; Lebedko, 1999; Levin, 1987; Oshchepkova, 2006; Papaurélytė-Klovienė, 2010; Pavlovskaya, 2007; Radevych-Vynnytskyi, 2006; Sergeeva, 2004; Tubbs, 1987; Vasko, 2019 and others).

There are many accumulated facts of manifestation of national specificity in the communication of a particular people, and their generalization and systematization for a certain ethnoculture are relevant, which can be seen as a description of communicative behavior (Korolyov, 2017). National communicative behavior in its most general form is defined as a *set of norms and traditions of communication of the people* (Sternin, 2003; Ter-Minasova, 2007), which, in the framework of cognitive semiotics, testifies to such regulators as mentality and national character.

The term "communicative behavior" in this meaning was first used by I. Sternin in 1989 in the work "About the concept of communicative behavior" (Sternin, 1996: 279–282). The description of the communicative behavior of a particular linguistic and cultural community acts as part of the regional geography, as it includes a description of the facts of etiquette and ritual norms, national traditions, etc. The communicative activity of a linguistic personality is determined by its communicative consciousness, which, by definition of I. Sternin, is a stable set of thought processes that ensures the communicative behavior of a nation, group, and personality (Sternin, 2003: 10). This explains the connection between semiotic regulators which exist in the communicative consciousness of the national linguistic personality – traditions, etiquette, rituals, stereotypes, ready thoughts, schemes of explanations of phenomena and events, mechanisms of causal attribution – with a mentality and national character.

The concepts of mentality and national character were chosen as *the object* of study, and the functional potential as semiotic regulators of national communicative behavior was chosen as *the subject*.

The purpose of this article is to consider the concepts of mentality and national character in the perspective of cognitive semiotics, which are symbolic regulators of the communication process of representatives of different linguistic cultures, in particular, national communicative behavior.

Methodology and background

In XIX – XXI centuries, besides philosophers, representatives of other scientific fields addressed the problem of the study of mentality and national character: psychologists (V. Vundt, S. Freud, G. G. Shpet), sociologists and historians (N. Danilevskyi, G. Le Bon), anthropologists, archaeologists and ethnographers (A. Afanasiev, F. Boas, R. Benedict, V. Dahl, P. Kireevskyi), cultural scientists, writers and philologists (N. Gogol, V. Vs. Ivanov, D. Likhachev, V. Ovchinnikov, A. Pavlovskaya, O. Potebnia, N. Trubetskoi, H. Steinthal) etc.

The question of national character, from the time of the Italian "first ethnologist" J. Vico, who turned to the study of this concept in the work "The New Science of the General Nature of Nations" (1725), was mainly the focus of philosophers (Ch. L. Montesquieu, D. Hume, J. G. Herder, J.-

J. Rousseau, I. Kant, G. W. Hegel, M. Lazarus, O. Spengler, A. J. Toynbee, K. Jaspers, I. Kon, E. Fromm, N. Berdyaev, E. Bagramov and others), who have variously referred to this subject of study as "the spirit of the people", "the soul of the people", "character", etc.

As A. Pavlovskaya points out, "the existence of differences between peoples was evident from ancient times, long before the appearance of what was called the term "nation". Characteristics of different ethnic groups can be found in the writings of ancient historians: Herodotus, Xenophon, Thucydides, Polybius, Titus Libya. Nestor in "The tale of bygone years", characterizing the tribes who lived in the territory of Rus', noted that "all these tribes had their customs, and the laws of their parents ... and each one had its luck." He also portrayed specific psychological portraits: meadows – "gentle and quiet", "shy", Drevlyans "lived like animals", etc." (cit. from: Pavlovskaya, 2007: 148).

Later N. Gogol wrote: "The word of the British will be answered by heart-wrenching and wise knowledge of life; the short-lived sparkle will shine and the short-lived word of the Frenchman will shatter; German thoughtfully invent his short-skinny not understandable by everyone: but there is no word that would be so buttery, smart, would break out from under the very heart, would be so boiling and trembling, as the Russian word" (Gogol, 2006: 129). With these vivid descriptions, the writer not only demonstrated the existence of idio-ethnic characteristics of different ethnic groups but also drew attention to their reflection in language/speech as relics of mentality.

Offering the consideration of the mentality and national character as semiotic regulators of national communicative behavior, we appeal to the provisions of cognitive semiotics (Alefirenko, 2007; Vasko, 2019) related to the notion of discursive thinking, which A. Luria suggested in his time, using the term "discursive" as a synonym for "speech". The scientist understands discursive consciousness as a mechanism that "allows one to delve into the meaning of things, to go beyond direct impression, to organize one's purposeful behavior, to disclose complex relationships and attitudes unavailable to direct perception, to pass information to another person" (Luria, 1998: 323).

Results and Discussion

In each linguaculture, the traditions and etiquette and ritual norms of national communicative behavior reflect the ethnocultural specificity manifested in their mentality and national character. Any violation of these rules may lead to misunderstanding, loss of incentive to communicate and refusal to engage in further interaction.

In a narrow sense, *the mentality* is interpreted as a stable mindset (Field, 1996: 8), as a concept closer to the origins of a "worldview" (Revel, 1993: 51). Each nation is characterized by a certain type of thinking that defines the national world-model (Gachev, 1995: 21). The mentality is also seen as a set of thoughts and ideas inherent in a particular linguistic and ethnic group, which determines the similarity/identity of this concept with the "world-model". Interpreting another related term "mentality", V. Kolesov defines it as an outlook in the categories of the mother tongue, which combines the intellectual, spiritual and volitional qualities of the national character in its typical manifestations (Kolesov, 2004: 14). In our opinion, the mentality in the narrow sense of the meaning of the notion is equal to the mentality.

For a broad understanding of the concept of mentality, the ways of behavior, perception, and the reaction of a particular ethnic group are considered relevant (Getts, 1993: 59). Thus, the concept of mentality combines both the ways of understanding the world and its results – images and

representations, ie the substantive side of the perception of the world. This also takes into account the behavioral side of the activities of the national linguistic personality: in addition to mental processes and their content, the notion of mentality also adds actions.

As W. Von Humboldt observed, the mentality is a character of the people, which is reflected not only in language but also in literature, religion, spiritual life of the nation: "the character of the nation affects the character of language, which demonstrates the united spiritual energy of the people and embodies in the identity of the whole nation; language is not just a reflection of the ideas of a particular people, but also an expression of his vision of the world" (Humboldt, 2000: 348–349).

Thus, mentality is seen as a way of perceiving the world; world view, conditioned by the psychic characteristics of the nation, as well as the socio-historical conditions of its existence, which is understood as a global process associated with the formation and interpretation of the world-model (Postovalova, 1988: 20). The mentality manifests itself in images and representations, that is, in the ethnic model of the world, in different spheres of culture, as well as in the actions and communicative behavior of the national linguistic personality.

The mentality of a particular ethnic group can be discussed based on an analysis of the interrelated phenomena mentioned above, which explicitly or implicitly affect the processes of cognition (Gachev, 1995: 13). It should be noted that any formulated characteristics of the mentality of a particular ethnic group are not exhaustive and definitive, since it is necessary to take into account the various differentiations within the nation (age, gender, ethnic, social, status-role, etc.), and the influence of auto- and hetero-types. Thus, H. Pocheptsov noted that the mentality of the same socio-cultural groups of different linguistic communities has more similar characteristics than the mentality of different socio-cultural groups within one linguaculture (Pocheptsov, 1999: 119–120).

The mentality of the people is generally characterized by resilience, stability, and conservatism, although it may take on new characteristics in each particular era. Indisputable in this sense is the interconnection of culture and mentality, where the former, according to V. Teliya, acts as an agent, forming the latter (Teliya, 1999: 14–15). Certainly, the mentality of the people in a certain historical period depends on the mentality of previous generations, which is manifested in culture, and in this sense, it is defined and formed by culture. However, the mentality of the people in the modern period actively influences the further development of culture, which testifies to their interdependence. That is why one can not disagree with the opinion of E. V. Ivanova that the question of the primacy of one of them can hardly be considered correct from a scientific point of view (Ivanova, 2003: 261). In addition, as O. Kornilov emphasizes, mentality is determined by natural factors, external conditions of existence of the people and is not limited to the cultural framework: "it manifests itself in culture and influences culture, but the characteristic features of the mentality of the people depend not only on the peculiarities of national culture" (Kornilov, 2003: 217).

In our study, we understand mentality as a national way of thinking. The mentality is a broader concept, which includes the social, economic, political, spiritual and moral aspects of the social life of the ethnic group, which determine its national character and self-identification (Kravchenko, 2000). Therefore, we agree with I. Sternin's view that social, physical, and communicative behavior are determined, respectively, by both mentality and national character, although mentality undoubtedly plays a leading role in this (Sternin, 2003: 25).

Instead, the very fact of recognizing national characters throughout the study of this phenomenon is questioned by some researchers, since the danger of unnecessary generalization and stereotyping of national behavior patterns is noted above all (Allik et al., 2009; Stefanenko, 2003; Kon, 1968; Gachev, 1995 and others). The study of a national problem is complicated by many factors because it cannot be seen and felt to the touch, it cannot be investigated in a laboratory. National character is hidden and imperceptible, it can be seen concerning the world, behavior, ways of communication, preferences, and passions, lifestyle, traditions and habits (Pavlovskaya, 2007: 5), which is a cognitive-semiotic culture. The Lithuanian ethnolinguist A. Gudavicius holds the same opinion, beginning one of the sections of his work on the consideration of mentality and national character – "Tautos mentalitetas (tautinis charakteris)" (Gudavičius, 2000: 151). An analysis of the works of philosophers, culturologists, sociologists and philologists of different periods also shows that different interpretations of the concept of *national* or *national character* do not abolish the recognition that "tautoms būdingos psichinių savybių kompozicijos, vadinamos tautiniu charakteriu arba tautine individualybe, the composition of the psychic properties inherent in the people, called the character of the people or their personality, exist" (Žakaitis, 2011: 37 – cit. for: Likhachiova, 2017: 172).

All attempts to find credible concepts and approaches in the study of national character, including the methods of its research, have led to a controversial debate around this issue. According to I. Kon, a researcher of a national character, almost all the characteristics of this concept are extremely vague, subjective and partly arbitrary, which causes many scientists to be completely natural and substantiated objections to the national character (Kon, 1999). In this context, we must cite the critical views of the writer and critic P. Skosyrev in his work "Inheritance and Search": "It seems that something is said, but essentially nothing is said. In what words can one define the Russian national character? Impulsive, hot, good-natured, sincere, bold, incendiary, wide, straight? [...]. These positive and negative epithets have the right to claim all peoples. What, are Ukrainians less courageous and good-natured than Russians? They will point to Ukrainians' penchant for humor. But who will take away the penchant for humor from the Russians or the Kazakhs, the Turkmen? And here it is possible to exhaust all your imagination and ingenuity without defining in exact terms the national character of either Russian, Georgian, Ukrainian, Kazakh, Turkmen, or hundreds and hundreds of other peoples [...]" (Skosyrev, 1961: 18).

Difficulties in characterization of a national character are connected not only with terminological fuzziness (all peoples have a sense of humor, but their humor is qualitatively different, we notice these differences intuitively, but we can't always express them in clear terms), but also – and this is especially important – that they are part of the same practical process of social interaction that they claim to be generalized (Kon, 1999). On the one hand, the ultranationalist, chauvinistic, and ethnocentric ideas, which were quite vividly spread by their adherents in different states, led some scientists (works of European researchers of the period of the Second World War, American scientists in the 60's of the XX century) to deny the existence of national character and identity (by recognizing them as being good and bad, by recognizing the existence of weak and strong nations) they stood by the idea of equality of all races and nations. On the other hand, globalization of world processes, in particular political, cultural, economic contacts of representatives of different ethnic groups, has updated new interest in the problem of national character (Pavlovskaya, 2007: 5).

Psychologists define character as "a set of persistent individual personality traits that manifest themselves in their activities and communication, distinguishing typical behaviors for

her/him" (General Psychology, 1986: 419). If we are talking about the character of the whole nation, not the individual, the concept of national character is understood as a stable complex of values, attitudes, and behavioral forms specific for a particular culture (Oshchepkova, 2006: 286). In our opinion, the concept of the existence of a national character as a category, which is formed during the life of a person at the expense of national (group, family, personal, etc.) experience, is fully justified and substantiated.

We propose to follow the definition of I. Sternin, according to which the national character is psychological stereotypes of behavior of the people, while the national mentality is the national way of perception and understanding of reality, conditioned by a set of cognitive stereotypes of the nation (Sternin, 2003: 24–25). National character is formed in the historical development, manifesting itself in culture in general, and traditions and norms of communicative behavior in particular. Instead, as V. Oshchepkova rightly points out, the continuity in culture ensures the preservation of traditions and, accordingly, the stability of the elements of national character that are characteristic of it, although not all traditions remain unchanged in the process of cultural development, which causes certain transformations of national character (Oshchepkova, 2006: 286).

Particularly noticeable is the difference in mentality and national character when encountering other cultures – abroad or when communicating with foreigners in their home country. Inadvertently we notice that we are different, and not only in appearance and in the inner world since they are unique in every person; linguacultural shock does not arise when communicating with other people belonging to the native ethnic group. Such a condition is characteristic of a person who notices the different reactions of the communicants to the same phenomena and events, their different behavior in public places.

Considering communication obstacles in communication, O. Leontovich identifies a class of cultural factors that hinder mutual understanding: 1) differences of mentality and national character; 2) specifics of language world-model, taking into account the perception of time and space; 3) communicative asymmetry; 4) the effect of cultural stereotypes; 5) differences in value orientations; 6) the difference of cultural and linguistic norms; 7) inconsistency of presuppositions and background knowledge; 8) cultural and linguistic differences in connotations attributed to linguistic units; 9) unequal perception of humor; 10) branching of communication strategies; 11) specific forms and means of non-verbal communication in different cultures (Leontovich, 2005: 230–231).

Studying vocabulary alone cannot create a coherent model, which raises the question of the degree to which different levels of the linguistic system participate in expressing linguistic forms of the mentality of a particular national and cultural community. As B. Norman points out, "human society, which has developed its traditions of thinking and communication over centuries of communicative practice, naturally imposes them through the linguistic structures of its representative" (Norman, 1994: 222).

For example, if an American says: "*Let's have dinner together next week*", it does not indicate an invitation to lunch, but only expresses sympathy and desire for further cooperation and cooperation. Similarly, ordinary daily activities may have an additional symbolic meaning in a particular culture: for example, in Germany in the first half of the twentieth century, tea was considered a drink of the upper classes of society, and coffee was drunk by ordinary people, and therefore the phrase "I will drink coffee with you" in one of the dialogues of E. M. Remark's novel

"Three Comrades" should be understood as: "I am ready to give up the habit of the people of my social circle" (Shamne, 1999: 169).

National communicative behavior is certainly linked to the traditions, customs, stereotypes, myths, rituals, norms, but it is the traditions and customs of communication that are significant and open to others, formed in each specific linguistic culture during the formation and development of this ethnic group. Instead, stereotypes, as noted by V. Maslova, "exist at the level of hidden moods, mainly in the environment of "our people" (Maslova, 2001: 196).

Communicative traditions, which I. Sternin calls "etiquette traditions of communication," are rules that are not binding, but for whatever reason, they are accepted and desirable to be followed, because neglect is noticed by others, which may cause disapproving assessment, surprise, sympathy (Sternin, 1996: 26). We can add that non-observance of national communication traditions makes it impossible to implement a cooperative communicative macro strategy and, accordingly, a cooperative mode of communication, which causes a clear discontent of the interlocutor. Thus, in the context of communicative traditions, it is worth mentioning those that are universal for most linguistic cultures: to ask elderly people about their health, and to schoolchildren and students – about learning success; offer help to those who need it and more.

Etiquette and ritual norms, compared with transitions, have more categorical and regulatory character, which means they are mandatory for performance that is particularly relevant to national communicative behavior. Most researchers define them as norms of speech etiquette (Buhaeva, 2015: 294; Sternin, 1996: 26), although it is more appropriate, in our view, to differentiate them into social, etiquette and linguistic, because among the norms are the following: general (national), group (professional, youth, etc.), situational, personal (individual). Failure to follow the rules, especially the etiquette, attracts attention from the interlocutors, and in the worst case - causes them condemnation and appropriate reactions of removal, neglect, and partly confrontation and aggression. For most linguistic cultures, such norms of communicative behavior as greetings with acquaintances, gratitude for the help, apology for the guilt, the prohibition of using obscene (invective) vocabulary, etc. are universal. These etiquette-ritual norms are signs of every culture, that is, semiotic regulators of the communication process, reflecting the traditions of their observance in a particular society, environment, etc.

In national communicative behavior, each interactant operates in the form of thought and speech, consciously or unconsciously resorting to the communicative (social, etiquette, linguistic, etc.) norm as a mediator to achieve his or her own goal. Therefore, it is the presence of the etiquette-ritual norm that directly or indirectly determines the logic, style, boundaries, and forms of processes of understanding and perception of communicative interaction, as well as the thesaurus of communication, is a potential condition for successful implementation of cooperative communicative macro strategy. Various aspects of the norm, directed by the cooperative communicative mode, serve as a mediator, which allows regulating speech behavior, avoiding its conflicting nature and aggressive mode of communication.

The phenomenon of stereotypical national communicative behavior is closely related to the concept of speech etiquette, which functions and is implemented both in situations of intercultural communication and within certain linguistic cultures. Communicators' observance of the rules, principles, and norms of speech etiquette testifies to their upbringing, education, level of culture, etc. Etiquette in general and speech etiquette, in particular, provide predicted behavior of people according

to certain rules, the use of normative and usually cliché phrases, which allows all participants of the interaction to feel comfortable. Etiquette is a complex system of material (physical, speech) signs that indicate the speaker's attitude to the interlocutor, the interlocutor's assessment and at the same time to assess the person's self, his status and position relative to the interlocutor. Etiquette involves the exchange of these signs between people in the process of their social interaction (Formanovskaya, 1982: 4–5). The notion of etiquette combines appearance etiquette, speech etiquette, and etiquette, and is, therefore, a set of "good tone" rules that function in society and regulate people's behavior and communication. The behavior of people, which are determined by the relationship of the speakers and reflects polite relationships between people (Sternin, 1996: 3–4).

National communicative behavior is a broader concept than speech etiquette. The latter is mainly related to standard, normalized speech formulas in discursive situations that implement the politeness category; and national communicative behavior reflects a broader problematic of communication, above all, a deeper pragmatic orientation, manifested in different, more variant production and perception of certain or other communicative actions, in particular in a branched system of discursive space: family, collective, foreigners, etc. National communicative behavior describes not only polite, normalized, formalized communication, but also real communicative practice, which manifests itself in its polydiscursive nature and space. Thus, speech etiquette is a component of national communicative behavior, one of its essential, if necessary, elements.

Thus, in the minds of most people, there are specific stereotyped ideas about different nations and peoples in general, and about their style and specificity of communication in particular. This is not accidental, because in national communicative behavior in universal communicative spheres and situations, representatives of each linguaculture usually use certain semiotic regulators – stereotypical schemes of speech actions, ideas, ready thoughts, schemes of explanations of phenomena and events, even though usually they don't note this.

A striking typical example of American stereotypical communicative behavior in the communicative sphere of "buying and selling" is described by R. Lewis: "The US is not accustomed to unassuming trade. Any American, entering the showroom, expects that the seller from the very first words will go on the attack on him. He hopes that he will be told about all the benefits of the car, both the main and minor, a good discount and personal concession, after which he makes a counter-attack with his demands, and finally after long and hard negotiations both parties proceed to the execution of the agreement without trusting each other but getting what they both want and agree with" (Lewis 1999, 241–242).

Thus, according to the researcher of professional speech behavior E. Harchenko, in modern Russia (as in Ukraine, Lithuania, etc. – I. K., L. D.), in the corresponding communicative sphere, the formation of new etiquette and ritual norms of interaction (sign regulators – I. K., L. D.), "characterized by the blending of different options: today, the behavior of salespeople are getting closer to the pushy American style" (Harchenko 2003, 166). Thus, the corresponding shifts are due to such semiotic regulators of national communicative behavior as the etiquette and ritual norms of Western marketing, as well as the traditions and stereotypes of American communicative culture. Instead, in those linguistic cultures where such a cognitive-semiotic model of communicative interaction between the seller and the buyer is only beginning to be introduced and functioning, its successful implementation is possible only concerning specific features of worldview, traditions, and norms, stereotypes, etc and therefore to mentality and national character.

For example, attempts to compare national communicative behavior of Ukrainians and Russians as representatives of Slavs and Lithuanians as representatives of the Baltic peoples make it necessary to take into account Lithuania's long ties with Poland (156 years of the United Polish-Lithuanian State – Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth), as well as the fact that Russians, Poles, Belarusians, and Ukrainians live in different proportions in some regions of modern Lithuania, in particular in the Vilnius region and the so-called Lithuania Minor (Mihalchenko, 1984: 51). It should also be noted that in all the post-Soviet Baltic countries (Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia), especially in their border territories, there are a large number of balts of neighboring nationalities (in the north of Lithuania – Latvians, in the south of Latvia – Lithuanians, etc.) (Foster, 2004: 206). The appropriate ethnic composition of the population is the macrostructure that determines the empirical material for a particular analysis.

It should be noted that Lithuanian cultural and communication norms are much closer to Slavic in general and Ukrainian in particular than to Anglo-Saxon, especially given the hypothesis of the existence of Baltic-Slavic ethnic and linguistic unity (Nepokupnyi, 1964; 1979). Describing the cultural specificity of the Baltic peoples, American researcher D. Foster notes such features of the Lithuanians, compared with the Latvians and Estonians, as openness, sincerity and talkativeness, which is expressed in the desire to express both positive and negative opinion, and therefore it is fair to speak about higher level of the straightforwardness and emotionality of their speech behavior (Foster, 2004: 208–209).

Conclusions

In conclusion, national communicative behavior reflects the centuries-old traditions of a particular ethnos, manifested in linguistic and cultural competence, as well as the etiquette and ritual norms caused by knowledge and stereotyped representations of the cognitive base. The degree of manifestation of semiotization of traditions and norms depends on the specifics of a particular communicative sphere and communication situation, the content of which is influenced by both national factors and specific individual characteristics of the interlocutors (gender, age, social status, professional affiliation, etc.). The observance of traditions and etiquette and ritual norms in national communicative behavior causes the formation of national values of communication participants as representatives of a certain linguaculture, reflecting the cognitive-semiotic specificity of the mentality and national character of the individual people. These provisions make it possible to clarify the definition of the concept of national communicative behavior as adherence to a set of traditions and norms in the communication of representatives of a specific linguaculture, who have common national-value orientations in achieving the goal of communication.

This formulation of the problem necessitates a deeper understanding of the process and mechanisms of stereotyping, and, more broadly, the semiotization of national communicative behavior and their reflection in the minds of the speakers. In typical invariant monocultural and intercultural situations, each interactant resorts to a system of semiotic regulators formed and fixed in his or her mind, in particular stereotypes, traditions, and etiquette and ritual norms, to organize the perception and decoding of information, providing and interpreting it. Having come to specific conclusions, the communicator accordingly builds on their basis their speech behavior, because the system of its stereotypes can remain unchanged and be adjusted depending on how much the partner in communication confirms or refutes the established stereotypes.

References

- Alefirenko, N. F. (2007). Cognitive semiology: origins, formation and development prospects. *Izvestiya Yuzhnogo federalnogo universiteta. Filologicheskie nauki*, 1–2, 143–152.
- Allik, J., Mottus, R., Realo, A., Pullman, H., Trifonova, A., McCrae, R., Meshcheryakov, B. (2009). How National Character is Constructed: Personality Traits Attributed to the Typical Russian. *Psychological Journal of International University of Nature, Society and Human "Dubna"*, 1. Available from: http://psych.ut.ee/~jyri/en/RCPS3_Published-version2009.pdf [Access May 15, 2016]
- Althen, G. (1988). *American Ways*. Yarmouth, Maine: Intercultural Press.
- Buhaeva, R. V. (2015). *Ethnocultural stereotypes of verbal communication (based on the material of the Buryat language)*: Thesis. Moscow.
- Fild, D. (1996). The history of mentality in foreign historical literature. *Mentalitet i agrarnoe razvitie Rossii (XIX–XX vv.)*. Moscow, 7–22.
- Formanovskaya, N. I. (1982). *Russian speech etiquette: linguistic and methodological aspects*. Moscow: Russkiy yazyk.
- Foster, D. (2004). *Europos šalių etiketas*. Vilnius: "Algarvė".
- Gachev, G. D. (1995). *National images of the world. Cosmo-Psycho-Logos*. Moscow: Progress-Kultura.
- A.V. Petrovsky, A. V. Brushlinsky, V. P. Zinchenko and others; Ed. A. V. Petrovsky. (1986). *General psychology: textbook*. Moscow: Prosveshcheniye.
- Getts, G. V. (1993). Learning Mentalities: A Perspective from Germany. *Spory o glavnom*, 58–64.
- Gogol, N. V. (2006). *Dead Souls*. Harkov: Book Club "Klub Semeynogo Dosuga".
- Gudavičius, A. (2000). *Etnoligvistika*. Šiauliai: Šiaulių universitetas.
- Harchenko, E. V. (2003). *Speech Behavior Models in Professional Communication*. Chelyabinsk.
- Humboldt, von W. (2000). *Selected Works on Linguistics*. Moscow: Progress.
- Ivanova, E. V. (2003). *Proverbial conceptualization of the world (based on English and Russian proverbs)*: Thesis. St. Petersburg.
- Kolesov, V. V. (2004). *Language and mentality*. St. Petersburg: Peterburgskoe vostokovedenie.
- Kon, I. S. (1968). National character – myth or reality? *Inostrannaya literatura*, 9, 215–229.
- Kon, I. S. (1999). *Sociological psychology*. Voronezh: MODEK. Available from: http://scepis.net/library/id_903.html [Access September 26, 2016].
- Kornilov, O. A. (2003). *Linguistic models of the world as derivatives of national mentalities*. Moscow: CheRo.
- Korolyov, I. (2017). National Cooperative Communicative Behaviour: Epistemes, Meta-Language, Tools. *Res Humanitariae*, 21, 127–142.
- Korolyov, I. (2019). Cognitive and communicative category of cooperativity: ontological and gnoseological status. *Logos*, 98, 83–93.
- Korolyova A. (2018). Reconstruction of Early Migration Routes of Homo Populations. *Logos*, 94, 159–166.
- Kravchenko, A. H. (2000). *Mentality as an object of social and philosophical research*: Thesis' Abstract. Kyiv.
- Kuzmickaitė L. (1992). Etniniai stereotipai. *Filosofija, sociologija*, 3 (9), 56–58.
- Lavaste, L. (2012). *Mes. Lietuviai. Vadovėlis, kaip suprasti lietuvius ir jais naudotis*. Vilnius: Tyto alba.
- Lebedko, M. (1999). *Cultural Bumps: Overcoming Misunderstandings in Cross-Cultural Communication*. Vladivostok: Far Eastern State University Press.
- Leontovich, O. A. (2005). *Russians and Americans: Paradoxes of Intercultural Communication*. Moscow: Gnozis.

- Levin, D. R., Buxter, J., McNulty, P. (1987). *The Culture Puzzle: Cross-Cultural Communication for English As A Second Language*. Englewood Cliffs. N. J.: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Lewis, R. D. (1999). *Business cultures in international business. From clash to understanding*. Moscow: Delo.
- Likhachiova, A. B. (2017). *Russian communicative culture and its verbal manifestations: in comparison with Lithuanian and other communicative cultures*. Vilnius: Vilniaus Universiteto Leidykla.
- Luria, A. R. (1998). *Language and consciousness*. Rostov-on-Don: Phoenix.
- Maslova, V. A. (2001). *Linguaculturology*. Moscow: Academy.
- Mihalchenko, V. Yu. (1984). *Problems of functioning and interaction of the Lithuanian and Russian languages*. Vilnius: Mokslas.
- Nepokupnyi, A. P. (1979). *Baltic relatives of the Slavs*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka.
- Nepokupnyi, A. P. (1964). *Areal aspects of the Baltic-Slavic linguistic relations*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka.
- Norman, B. Yu. (1994). *The grammar of the speaker*. St. Petersburg.
- Oshchepkova, V. V. (2006). *Language and culture of Great Britain, the USA, Canada, Australia, New Zealand*. Moscow; St. Petersburg: GLOSSA / KARO.
- Papaurėlytė-Klovienė, S. (2010). Kaimyninių tautų atstovai ir jų nacionalinio charakterio specifika lietuvių kalbos pasaulėvaizdyje. *Lietuvių kalba*. Vilnius: Vilniaus Universiteto Leidykla, 4. Available from: <http://www.lietuviukalba.lt/index.php/lietuviu-kalba/article/view/27>.
- Pavlovskaya, A. V. (2007). *Features of the national character of Italians, British, Germans, Norwegians and Finns, Americans, Icelanders*. Moscow: M. V. Lomonosov Moscow State University.
- Pocheptsov, H. H. (1999). *Communication theory*. Kyiv: Kyivskyy universytet.
- Postovalova, V. I. (1988). The model of the world in human life. *Rol chelovecheskogo faktora v yazyke. Yazyk i kartina mira*, 8–69.
- Radevych-Vynnytskyi, Y. K. (2006). *Etiquette and culture of communication*. Kyiv: Znannia.
- Revel, J. (1993). History of Mentality: A Review Experience. *Disputes about the main thing: articles*, 51–58.
- Sergeeva, A. V. (2007). *Russians: stereotypes of behavior, traditions, mentality*. Moscow: Nauka; Flinta.
- Shamne, N. L. (1999). *Actual problems of intercultural communication*. Volgograd: VolGU.
- Skosyrev, P. G. (1961). *Inheritance and searches: articles, essays, notes*. Moscow: Sov. Pisatel.
- Stefanenko, T. (2003). National character or mentality? *Ethnic psychology*. St. Petersburg: Rech, 154–157.
- Sternin, I. A. (1989). About the concept of communicative behavior. *Kommunikativ-funktionale Sprachbetrachtung*, Halle, 279–282.
- Sternin, I. A. (1996). *Russian speech etiquette*. Voronezh: VOIPKPRO.
- Sternin, I. A., Larina, T. V., Sternina, M. A. (2003). *Essay on English communicative behavior*. Voronezh: Istoki.
- Teliya, V. N. (1999). Basic postulates of linguaculturology. *Abstracts of II International Conference "Philology and Culture": in 3 part*. Tambov: Izd-vo TGU im. G. R. Derzhavina, 3, 14–15.
- Ter-Minasova, S. G. (2007). *War and the world of languages and cultures: issues of theory and practice of interlanguage and intercultural communication*. Moscow: AST; Astrel; Chranitel.
- Tubbs, S., Moss, S. (1987). *Human Communication*. New York: Random House.
- Vasko, R. (2019). Semiotic and Culturological Passportization of Numeric Phraseosymbols. *Logos*, 98, 94–103.
- Žakaitis, P. (2011). Psichologiniai lietuvių etninio savitumo vertinimai. Tiltai. Klaipėda: Klaipėdos universitetas, 3, 29–43. Available from: <http://etalpykla.lituanistikadb.lt/fedora/objects/LT-LDB-0001:J.04~2011~136717/6222729/datastreams/DS.002.0.01.ARTIC/content>