МЕЖКУЛЬТУРНАЯ КОММУНИКАЦИЯ И СОПОСТАВИТЕЛЬНОЕ ИЗУЧЕНИЕ ЯЗЫКОВ

DICHOTOMIZATION AS A BASIS OF POSITIVE COMMUNICATION ANALYSIS IN AN INTERCULTURAL CONTEXT [1]

Olga A. Leontovich

Volgograd State Socio-Pedagogical University, Volgograd, Russia;
Pushkin State Russian Language Institute, Moscow, Russia

Abstract. The aim of the paper is to investigate the constituent features and mechanisms of positive communication and reveal their correlation with politeness. The study is based on a mixed-method research design including Positive Discourse Analysis, dichotomic division and conversational analysis, and is carried out on the material of the book *The Family* by Nina Fedorova (1940). The results indicate that the dichotomy *positive* vs *negative attitude* is basic for the study and implements the contrast between good and evil, ethical and unethical behaviour. The juxtaposition of *attraction* vs *disattraction* refers to the perception of an interlocutor as likable or unlikable. The dichotomy *activism* vs *passivism* reflects the willingness or unwillingness to interact, while *communication involvement* vs *alienation* is associated with the communicator's engagement in the interlocutor's affairs. The juxtaposition of *alterocentrism* vs *egocentrism* indicates whether a communicator is focused on one's own or other people's interests. The dichotomy *social support* vs *social indifference* is a reflection of empathy or its absence. In the dichotomy *constructive* vs *destructive communication* creative behaviour aimed at resolving a difficult situation is opposed to destructive actions leading to the deterioration or break-up of a relationship. One of the most important constituents of positive communication is congruency which denotes authenticity and correspondence of the person's genuine inner self with the image addressed to the outer world. Positive communication is intrinsically linked with, though not identical to, politeness. The latter does not act as an aim per se, but is rather a tool employed to make an interaction conflict-free, smooth and harmonious.

Key words: positive communication, politeness, dichotomies, attraction, communication involvement, alterocentrism, social support, constructive communication.

ДИХОТОМИЗАЦИЯ КАК ОСНОВА ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯ ПОЗИТИВНОЙ КОММУНИКАЦИИ В МЕЖКУЛЬТУРНОМ КОНТЕКСТЕ [1]

Ольга Аркадьевна Леонтович

Волгоградский государственный социально-педагогический университет, г. Волгоград, Россия;
Государственный институт русского языка им. А.С. Пушкина, г. Москва, Россия

Аннотация. Цель исследования – рассмотреть конститутивные признаки и механизмы позитивной коммуникации и их соотношение с вежливостью. Методика исследования включает позитивный дискурс-анализ (Positive Discourse Analysis), дихотомическое деление и конверсационный анализ. В качестве материала выступает книга Н. Фёдоровой «The Family» (1940). Полученные результаты показывают, что базовой для изучаемой проблемы является дихотомия *позитив – негатив*, отражающая противоречие между добром и злом, этичным и неэтичным поведением. Противопоставленность *аттракции* и *дезаттракции* соотносится с восприятием собеседника как привлекательного либо неприятного. Дихотомия *инициативность – пассивность* отражает готовность / неготовность к интеракции, в то время как *вовлеченность – отчужденность* ассоциируется со степенью участия в делах собеседника. В дихотомии *альтероцентризм – эгоцентризм* реализуется ориентация на себя или другого. Контраст между *социальной поддержкой* и *социальной индифферентностью* связан с эмпатией либо с равнодушием к проблемам адресата. *Конструктивная коммуникация* как созидательное поведение, направленное на разрешение проблем в интеракции, противопоставлена *деструктивной коммуникации*, исходом которой становится ухудшение либо разрыв взаимоотношений. Одна из важнейших составляющих коммуникации – это конгруэнтность, то есть аутентичность личности, соответствие между внутренней сущностью человека и коммуникативными проявлениями, обращенными к внешнему миру. Позитивная коммуникация непосредственно связана с вежливостью, но не тождественна ей. В отличие от позитивной коммуникации, вежливость, не будучи самоцелью, выступает как инструмент, используемый для гладкого, бесконфликтного и гармоничного общения.

Ключевые слова: позитивная коммуникация, вежливость, дихотомия, аттрактивность, вовлеченность в общение, альтероцентризм, социальная поддержка, конструктивная коммуникация.

Introduction

A promise to teach somebody positive communication is as unfeasible as a promise to teach somebody to be happy. The aim of the present paper is much more modest – to show how dichotomization can be used to reveal the mechanisms and constituent features of positive communication and find out their correlation with politeness. The paper is based on the research framework previously developed as a result of a long-term observation and analysis of human behaviour [Leontovich (ed.), 2020].

Theoretical background

In spite of the existence of numerous publications devoted to different aspects of communication in Russia and abroad, positive communication remains under-researched from the theoretical point of view. Most of the works dealing with positive communication are textbooks and guidelines for students, teachers, spouses or parents containing practical advice about the way to establish and maintain a good relationship. One of the books outlining some of its theoretical aspects is "The Art of Positive Communication: Theory and Practice" [Mirivel, 2014], which discusses the connection of positive communication with cognition, ways to influence other people, establishment of interpersonal contact and achievement of a deeper understanding with an interlocutor. The monograph "The Positive Side of Interpersonal Communication" [Socha, Pitts (eds.), 2012] addresses the conceptual foundations of positive interpersonal communication, its correlation with the concepts of affection, closeness, support, health, wellness, the role of humour in optimizing relationships, etc. "The Routledge Handbook of Positive Communication" [Velázquez, Pulido (eds.), 2018] is built around the notions 'eudaimonia' (from Greek εὐδαιμονία – happiness, well-being) and 'hedonism' (from Greek ἡδονή – pleasure) referring to different spheres of human existence (family, romance, advertising, mass media, business, marketing, digital technologies, education) as sources of happiness and enjoyment.

A number of works make a contribution to the study of the linguistic aspect of the problem. A chapter in Shakhovsky's book [2016, pp. 346-390] is devoted to the ecology of positive communication defined as a research field dealing with the preservation of language and its sphere of existence. The author emphasises the significance of empathy, positive emotions and

ways of their expression, as well as the rationalization of emotions, tolerance and improvement of communicative competence. Other works that shed light on different aspects of positive communication discuss the linguistic expression of love [Vorkachev, 2007], happiness [Vorkachev, 2004; Yan Kai, Zhang Bin, 2023], veracity and sincerity [Panchenko, 2010], mitigation [Takhtarova, 2009], tolerance and tact [Ilyinova, 2013], although they are not focused on positive communication as the primary object of research. Acknowledging the undoubtful merits of those publications, it is, however, necessary to note that they do not provide a clear definition of positive communication, a description of its structure and mechanisms, which proves that it is necessary to continue the research of the topic.

This paper builds on our previous research where we define positive communication as an interaction based on positive emotions, aimed at mutual understanding and satisfying for all the parties involved [Leontovich (ed.), 2020, p. 32]. A survey carried out prior to this research among 200 Russian participants aged from 16 to 92 years old allowed us to identify the key features ascribed to a positive communicator by Russian respondents: optimism, positive attitude towards others, activism, leadership, individuality, harmony with oneself and intellect [Leontovich (ed.), 2020, pp. 35-38].

Positive communication is intrinsically linked with, though not identical to, politeness – the connection that we are going to discuss in this paper. Larina defines politeness as an ethnocultural system of strategies of behaviour aimed at harmonious conflict-free communication corresponding to the partners' expectations [Larina, 2009, p. 169]. A similar idea is expressed by Sharonov who believes that polite utterances are those favourable for the addressee and third parties. He indicates that the main aim of politeness is to maintain social equilibrium and good relationships between interactants [Sharonov (ed.), 2018, p. 58]. Alpatov [2018] points out the need to differentiate between etiquette and politeness: whereas the former does not leave a choice for the speaker, the latter is used when there is a choice [Alpatov, 2018].

Politeness theory includes such notions as 'positive face', 'positive politeness', 'pos-politeness' and 'positive impoliteness', which are not always directly related to positive communication. 'Positive face' "refers to the positive consistent self-image or 'personality'" associated with the desire to "be appreciated and approved of" [Brown, Levinson, 1987; Rhee, 2023, p. 41]. 'Positive politeness' is a means to avoid face-threatening speech acts [Brown, Levinson, 1987; Leech, Larina, 2014, p. 13], whereas 'pos-politeness' is an act serving an enhancement of face [Leech, Larina, 2014, p. 13]. Positive impoliteness does not contribute to positive communication but, on the contrary, damages positive face wants [Culpeper, 1996; 2005]. The borderline between politeness and impoliteness is thin; politeness can be transformed into impoliteness if for at least one participant the interaction is not comfortable, conflict-free or neutral [Bragina, 2018, p. 39].

Methodology and material

The present study is based on a mixed-method research design that includes: 1) Positive Discourse Analysis (PDA); 2) dichotomic division; 3) conversational analysis.

Positive Discourse Analysis [Martin, 2004; Stibbe, 2017; Ponton, 2023] is based on a methodology similar to Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), but focused not so much on criticism of hidden ideologies as on positive uses of language, on "discourse that inspires, encourages, heartens" and "cheers us along" [Martin, 1999, pp. 51-52]. We employ it for a detailed investigation of multiple factors improving or hindering positive communication.

In order to investigate and classify the key features of positive communication, we use the principle of *dichotomic division* of the scope of notions basic for the research into subclasses, the members of which are mutually exclusive and logically incompatible. "A dichotomy is a jointly exhaustive division which possesses an ideal 'safety margin' – any new object from the scope of the divided notion cannot falsify a classification, and its logical character excludes mistakes possible during other forms of division. <...> In dichotomies one of the subordinate parts is always negatively marked" (translated by *O. L.*) [Novosyolov, 2010, pp. 674-675]. Such an approach provides an opportunity to reveal which of the notions under study are logically opposed to each other. For example, in answer to the question: "What is juxtaposed to *involvement in*

communication – alienation or *refusal to communicate*?" the addition of the negative morpheme (*non-involvement*) indicates the absence of involvement, i. e. *alienation*. Similarly, when making a choice between *social confrontation* and *social indifference* as notions opposed to *social support*, we choose the absence of support = *social indifference*. The drawback of dichotomization pointed out by logicians is the ambiguity of the negatively marked part of notions. Another potential problem is the fact that the notions involved in the sphere of positive communication are closely connected with ethical problems, the decision of which, as a rule, may be controversial and possesses a great degree of variability. However, those limitations can be overcome by means of analysing a significant bulk of material, as well as by public surveys.

We distinguish the following dichotomies: 1) *positive* vs *negative attitude*; 2) *attraction* vs *disattraction*; 3) *activism* vs *passivism*; 4) *communication involvement* vs *alienation*; 5) *alterocentrism* vs *egocentrism*; 6) *social support* vs *social indifference*; 7) *constructive communication* vs *destructive communication*. These dichotomies express the polarity of notions fundamental for the research. In all our dichotomies the first member refers to positive communication and the second one characterises the opposite type of communicative interaction. During the analysis we focus on the first (positive) member of each dichotomy, from time to time referring to the second one for comparison.

Conversational analysis is employed to distinguish between conventional uses of communication strategies and language patterns, including politeness and impoliteness markers, and the occasional meaning they acquire in particular contexts.

Though the significance of real-life experience cannot be underestimated, we believe it possible to use fictional discourse as research material, since it allows scholars to penetrate into the spheres which are usually hidden from an outsider, such as scenes of love, despair, family conflicts, etc. It also provides a profound explanation of people's motives and values guiding them in their actions. The material of the present research is the book "The Family" by Nina Fedorova (1940). It was first published in the US in English and was the tenth highest selling fiction

book in the United States in 1940; later it was also published in Russian. The action takes place in China in 1937, at the beginning of the war between China and Japan. The narrative is focused on the Family (written with a capital letter) of Russian aristocrats who survived a war, the October Revolution (1917), poverty, diseases, famine, fire, earthquake and finally found themselves in the Chinese city of Tianjin. The book was chosen as the research material because one of its central characters, Grandmother, a former aristocrat, manages to preserve her positive attitude under most difficult conditions and possesses all the features outlined in our previous survey [Leontovich (ed.), 2020]. The text demonstrates the basic features of positive communication expressed in the choice of verbal and nonverbal means, communicative strategies and the characters' behaviour. Since the action takes place in an intercultural context, the focus is on universal rather than culturally specific features of positive communication.

Results and discussion

Positive vs *negative attitude*

Being at first sight pretty obvious, this dichotomy is difficult for interpretation. The difference in perception of the same situation or object as positive or negative can to a certain extent be explained by cognitive complexity which has an individual basis. The notion of *cognitive complexity* introduced by the psychologist Bieri [1955] as part of the binary opposition 'complexity – simplicity', denotes a combination of mental structures and logical connections used by people during perception and interpretation. It correlates with their ability to communicate, differentiate, establish associations and express their own perceptions in speech. The analysis of positive communication shows that cognitive complexity contributes to the power of observation, attention towards nuances of meaning and intricate knowledge of human behaviour. On the other hand, it complicates perception, leading to multiple interpretations of positive communication and absence of uniformity of its social comprehension.

In the book under analysis, the Family are living in the least fashionable and therefore the cheapest part of the British concession in Tianjin,

not far from the "mysterious" Haihe River where they let rooms to lodgers in their modest boarding house. The book clearly illustrates the difference in the perception of life even between congenial people:

(1) ...The same course of life took a peculiar aspect for each member of the Family. It was a religious and philosophical problem for Granny, a hard exercise in housekeeping for Mother, a tragedy of constantly wounded ambition for Peter, a lyric rise and fall for Lida, and perpetual fun for Dima.

In the book, the differences in the characters' worldviews are conditioned by their different life experience. Unlike other Family members whose young years were full of deprivations during the revolution and after it, Granny had seen a prosperous life in a big mansion with columns, filled with the sounds of the harp and the piano. The harder is the drastic change in her life conditions. However, when life becomes difficult, her strong character, sense of dignity and philosophical attitude help her to take the responsibility of maintaining the Family's morale. Her positive manner of dealing with other people is based on the ability to find hope where others can see only pain and despair.

The extreme *negative attitude*, on the other hand, is represented by *naysayers* – people who see only negative aspects of things, deny everything and cannot suggest any steps to improve the situation. Here is a dialogue between Granny and Mrs. Rosa Isaak (a naysayer):

(2) "But how do you like China?" Granny tried again.
"Earthquake, a nice earthquake, I should wish for China."
"You liked Europe better?"
"Europe? You mean Germany? Smoke and fire, smoke and fire, I should like to see on the spot where Germany is now! <...>"
"Perhaps you had a rest when traveling. You have crossed many seas. Sometimes it is good for nerves – seeing places."
"Traveling? You make me laugh! Really, you do. In Europe everything is the same." <...>
"But other continents. Have you seen India? Is it not picturesque?"
"You are naïve, really you are. Everything which is not Europe is dirty – terribly old, ramshackle, and dirty."

Though Mrs. Isaak's utterances cannot be characterised as face-threatening for Granny, they are impolite as they hinder the smooth flow of conversation and devaluate all Granny's efforts to keep up the conversation. On the other hand, Granny's positive attitude encourages her to be polite even with unpleasant people, such as Mrs. Isaak or, in other situations, with her lodger Mrs. Parrish, a chronic alcoholic:

(3) Granny, assuming her job, approached Mrs. Parrish, greeted her in the courteous way of old times...

Attraction **vs** *disattraction*

The dichotomy reflects the division of communicators into those liked or disliked by others. Grandma attracts practically everyone, irrespective of their age, social standing and character, by her radiant face, benevolence and goodness of heart. The book shows her as a person who is on good terms with everybody, even difficult people, as the above-mentioned Mrs. Rosa Isaak and Mrs. Parrish, because she manages to adapt her strategies to everybody. In this case, we can see different vectors of attraction: positive people do not only attract their interlocutors, but are also ready to see the good in others. Politeness, on the other hand, does not necessarily presuppose attraction: it is possible to be polite with a person whom you don't like or are indifferent to.

Since the book is about the life of Russians in China, there are many situations of intercultural contacts when communicators do not know each other's language. However, in those circumstances Grandma skillfully uses nonverbal means, such as an amiable face expression, mimics, eye contact and gestures expressing agreement, approval or encouragement:

(4) When she for the first time appeared among the refugees in the back yard, she smiled to all, but approached the oldest among them – a very small and delicate woman. Granny could not speak Chinese well, yet she found words enough to say most courteously: "Is it not a very hot day, Honorable Oldest One?" And she bowed.
The old woman smiled a toothless smile and said something in answer, also bowing. Granny did not understand the answer, but this was of no importance. The chief thing was to manifest friendliness, and she saw that her attempt was successful.

Activism vs *passivism*

In this dichotomy, the readiness to act for the good of others and to communicate is juxtaposed to the behaviour of a person who either does not wish to interact or expects somebody else to start the interaction. Initiative requires mental and physical efforts, as well as good communication skills. In difficult situations, when other people are disheartened, Granny is the first to act:

(5) At four o'clock, when a gloomy quiet hung over the house, it dawned on Granny that nobody in the Family had eaten since morning. Hastily she went to the kitchen and, helped by Khan, she prepared a tray for Mrs. Parrish and sent Lida upstairs with it, gave Dima his portion, and then prepared food for Mr. Sung.

Activism also presupposes efforts to maintain communication, resolve a problem or take the first step towards reconciliation in a conflict. Politeness, on the other hand, does not necessarily require activism, though harmonious communication is balanced and implies equal contribution of all the parties involved. It is impolite to monopolise a conversation or, on the contrary, make your interlocutor do all the talking.

Communication involvement vs *alienation*

This dichotomy has a direct correspondence with the dialogic nature of communication as a source of shared meanings, which, being part and parcel of positive communication, suggests that friendliness and good will cause a positive response from the interlocutor. It is what in most cases happens in the book – Granny manages to find a common ground with everybody, including naysayers. The high degree of communicative involvement is expressed in active listening, attention towards the interlocutor and interested participation in a conversation.

Communicative involvement vs alienation to a certain extent correlate with positive and negative politeness (in Larina's terms – 'politeness of approaching' (вежливость сближения) and ''politeness of distancing' (вежливость дистан-цирования) [Larina, 2009, p. 15], but the aims are different. 'Involvement' as a constituent feature of positive communication is an attempt to partake in the interlocutors' affairs, share their problems and feelings, whereas 'politeness of approaching' deals with the reduction of interpersonal distance. 'Alienation', on the other hand, can be interpreted as unwelcome indifference hindering positive communication, while 'politeness of distancing' is an attempt to avoid face-threatening acts.

Alterocentrism vs *egocentrism*

This dichotomy reflects a person's orientation towards self or others. Granny has the ability to feel other people's sorrow as her own and can forget about her problems for the sake of others. The author emphasises her "unfailing compassion", as in the following episode describing Grandma's interaction with an old Japanese lady:

(6) She saw an old lady sitting motionless on the floor looking vacantly before her in just the same way as the Chinese gentleman. Grief and anxiety were expressed in exactly the same manner by these two representatives of the two hostile peoples. Granny coaxed the old lady to eat and drink. While doing that, she looked closely at that wrinkled face, and in those deep creases she read a long list of past sorrows.

Politeness, in its turn, presupposes respect towards an interlocutor, but does not necessarily require compassion.

Constructive communication vs *destructive communication*

Constructive communication aims to find a way out of difficult situations, whereas the participants of destructive communication are unable to solve problems in an interaction, which leads to communication failure and break-up of a relationship. Instead of giving in, a positive communicator actively seeks alternatives directed towards overcoming difficulties. Granny, who has mastered the art of communication and knows how to choose appropriate strategies, can quickly understand how to behave in any situation. When a well-dressed English gentleman unexpectedly stops near their boarding-house and asks if they have a room to let, she immediately reacts:

(7) Granny quickly re-adjusted the expression of her face from bewilderment to a smiling and dignified

welcome. She had received a fine education and spoke English perfectly. <...> In came the gentleman, and in half an hour's time an astonishing affair was concluded: their best room, with a balcony, was rented for an English lady for two months and paid for in advance.

Politeness or impoliteness on their own do not make communication constructive or destructive; they are rather a tool than a cause.

Social support vs *social indifference*

If it is impossible to solve a problem and improve the situation, there is at least an opportunity to provide psychological support. This brings us to the next dichotomy: social support vs social indifference (=absence of social support). Granny's sympathy without phony emotions is accompanied by nonverbal reactions and sympathetic silence; it is expressed with a kind word and even more often – a sympathetic look, nod, smile or bow. She chooses such strategies as persuasion, coaxing and comforting. It is notable that she never fusses, loses self-control, talks with excessive emotionality or raises her voice:

(8) Only Granny showed nothing of her emotions. The clearer the danger, the more composed she became. <...> She took the whole burden upon herself.

To express support, Granny uses both verbal and non-verbal means. At difficult moments of life when her daughter feels absolutely broken and depressed:

(9) Granny's words would appeal to her sense of duty, courage, and heroism and she would get up and live again.

The author writes about her 'mild words', 'mild voice', 'gentle whispering', an encouraging touch: "She took Mrs. Parrish's arm", "Slowly she sat on the sofa, at Mother's side, and put her arm around Mother's waist".

Social support is not the same as flattery or indulgence. Granny sometimes uses strategies which theoretically can be interpreted as impoliteness, e. g. silencers and dismissals:

(10) "Well," said Granny, "I think this is about enough talking. We are all talking far too much."
(11) "Now you are saying silly things, Dima. Stop it. <...> You must think first, and then speak."

She is strict and does not use flattery or praise generously, as in a conversation with her teenage granddaughter:

(12) "What do you think, Granny, shall I be beautiful?"
Granny looked at her attentively.
"Well," she said, "you will never be as beautiful as your mother was. You will be all right."
"Only all right?"
"Let us say, pretty."

A question that naturally arises is: how does positive communication correlate with situations when there is a contradiction or disagreement between interlocutors? What should prevail: politeness, unwillingness to start a conflict or an honest expression of one's own opinion? Using gentle communicative strategies Granny, however, does not give up her convictions and firmly expresses her opinion. When her Chinese neighbour Khan asks her to advise whether he should take a second wife, she answers quite unambiguously:

(13) "I say no. Keep your money for your family."
"My family – country people. My wife workee fields. I am a town gentleman now. I go cinema, wantchee nice second wife come with me. Town education."
"And your first wife bore you children, now 'workee' fields. Shame. <...> Khan," Granny said solemnly and put away her knitting, "You talk bad talk. No kind. Take your wife to live with you in the town and no more of this second wife."

When necessary, she is firm and uses criticism or even threats:

(14) "I promise to give that room to you and to your first wife. Second wife – never. Then you go away."

However, in such cases Granny's politeness is expressed in the form of disclaimers used for mitigation and wish not to hurt the interlocutor. It is not remorse after she did something wrong – it is balanced discourse of a wise old lady, like in her conversation with the Chinese Khan where she refers to the Bible:

(15) But she wanted to explain, somehow, her decision, not to offend him too much. So she said: "You know that big book I read often? Must live how the book says. It says, 'no second wife in the house.'"

After she reprimands her daughter, she says:

(16) "Tania, l am sorry I was a bit hard on you. I know how painful it must be for you."

Summing up the analysis, it is necessary to note that a very important concept for the present research is *congruency* (a term introduced by humanistic psychologist C. Rogers) denoting authenticity and compliance of a person's inner self with the outer communicative expression. Congruency means that a person lives according to the principle: "To be and not to seem". This concept is closely connected with sincerity, openness and honesty.

Conclusion

The research model of the present study is based on dichotomization – the division of the volume of the concepts under study into mutually exclusive and logically incompatible subclasses. The dichotomy *positive* vs *negative attitude* is basic for the study and implements the contrast between good and evil, ethical and unethical behaviour. The juxtaposition of *attraction* vs *disattraction* refers to the perception of an interlocutor as likable or unlikable. The dichotomy *activism* vs *passivism* reflects the degree of readiness and willingness to interact, while *communication involvement* vs *alienation* is associated with the dialogical nature of communication acting as a source of shared meanings; a high degree of involvement shows that a person expresses interest and empathy towards the interlocutor. The juxtaposition of *alterocentrism* vs *egocentrism* indicates whether a communicator is focused on other people's interests or one's own self. The dichotomy *social support* vs *social indifference* reflects, on the one hand, the readiness to help the interlocutor with actions or kind words and, on the other, indifference towards other people's sorrows and troubles. In the dichotomy *constructive* vs *destructive communication* creative behaviour aimed at resolving a difficult situation is opposed to destructive actions leading to the deterioration or even break-up of a relationship.

Positive communication is realised with the use of a wide scope of communication strategies, verbal and nonverbal means expressing positive intentionality, goodwill and considerate attitude towards others. The analysis allows us to conclude that the most important constituent of positive communication is the orientation towards the favourable development of the relationship between interlocutors. The means of positive communication include active listening, expression of empathy, respect, mindfulness and interest for other people. Congruency is one of the important constituents of positive communication and denotes authenticity and correspondence of the person's genuine inner self with the image addressed to the outer world.

Politeness does not act as an aim per se, like positive communication, but is rather a tool employed to make an interaction conflict-free, smooth and harmonious. Communicators can use politeness with people for whom they feel dislike or indifference; they can be superpolite to express irony or sarcasm. Politeness does not necessarily involve optimism, compassion and other positive emotions. Positive communication, on the other hand, always requires emotional efforts, the signals of which are sometimes difficult to identify, as they are not always expressed explicitly and can be nonverbal.

The framework of analysis presented in the paper provides an opportunity to conceptualise the notion of positive communication and can serve to study different aspects of discourse.

NOTE

REFERENCES

Alpatov V.M., 2018. Vezhlivost i etiket (na russkom i yaponskom materiale) [Politeness and Etiquette (On the Material of Russian and Japanese)]. Sharonov I.A., ed. *Vezhlivost i antivezhlivost v yazyke i kommunikatsii: materialy Mezhdunar. nauch. konf.* [Politeness and Antipoliteness in Language and Communication. Proceedings of an International Conference]. Moscow, Politicheskaya entsiklopediya Publ., pp. 7-12.

Bieri J., 1955. Cognitive Complexity–Simplicity and Predictive Behavior. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, no. 51, pp. 263-268. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1037/h0043308

Bragina N.G., 2018. Vezhlivost kak nevezhlivost: na styke raznykh kulturnykh norm i pravil [Politeness as Impoliteness: On the Junction of the Different Cultural Norms and Rules]. Sharonov I.A., ed. *Vezhlivost i antivezhlivost v yazyke i kommunikatsii: materialy Mezhdunar. nauch. konf.* [Politeness and Antipoliteness in Language and Communication. Proceedings of an International Conference]. Moscow, Polit. entsikl. Publ., pp. 38-44.

Brown P., Levinson S.,1987. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. 345 p.

Culpeper J., 1996. Towards an Anatomy of Impoliteness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 349-367. DOI: http://doi.org/ 10.1016/ 0378-2166(95)00014-3

Culpeper J., 2005. Impoliteness and Entertainment in the Television Quiz Show: The Weakest Link. *Journal of Politeness Research*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 35-72. DOI: http://doi.org/10.1515/jplr.2005.1.1.35

Ilyinova E.Yu., 2013. Pragmatika tolerantnosti i takta v sovremennoy publichnoy kommunikatsii [Pragmatics of Tolerance and Tact in Modern Public Communication]. Panchenko N.N., ed. *Chelovek v kommunikatsii: ot kategorizatsii emotsiy k emotivnoy lingvistike* [Personality in Communication: From Categorisation of Emotions to Emotive Linguistics]. Volgograd, Volgograd. nauch. izd-vo, pp. 206-215.

Larina T.V., 2009. *Kategoriya vezhlivosti i stil kommunikatsii: Sopostavlenie angliyskikh i russkikh lingvokulturnykh traditsiy* [Politeness and Communicative Styles: Comparative Analysis of English and Russian Language and Culture Traditions]. Moscow, Yazyki slavyanskikh kultur. 512 p.

Leech G., Larina T., 2014. Politeness: West and East. *Russian Journal of Linguistics*, no 4, pp. 9-34.

Leontovich O.A., ed., 2020. *Pozitivnaya kommunikatsiya* [Positive Communication]. Moscow, Gnozis Publ. 296 p.

Martin J.R., 1999. Grace: The Logogenesis of Freedom. *Discourse Studies*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 29-56. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445699001001003

Martin J., 2004. Positive Discourse Analysis: Solidarity and Change. *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses*, no. 49, pp. 179-200.

Mirivel J.C., 2014. *The Art of Positive Communication: Theory and Practice*. New York, Bern, Berlin, Bruxelles, Frankfurt am Main, Oxford, Wien. 190 p.

Novosyolov M.M., 2010. Dikhotomiya [Dichotomy]. Stepin V.S., Gusejnov A.A., Semigin G.Yu., eds. *Novaya filosofskaya entsiklopediya. V 4 t. T. 1. A–D* [New Philosophical Encyclopedia. In 4 Vols. Vol. 1. A–D]. Moscow, Mysl Publ., pp. 674-675.

Panchenko N.N., 2010. *Dostovernost kak kommunikativnaya kategoriya* [Veracity as a Communicative Category]. Volgograd, Peremena Publ. 322 p.

Ponton D.M., 2023. The meaning of Welcome. Positive Migration Discourse. *Russian Journal of Linguistics*, vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 134-151. DOI: 10.22363/2687-0088-33319

Rhee S., 2023. Politeness and Impoliteness in Social Network Service Communication in Korea. *Russian Journal of Linguistics*, vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 39-66. DOI: 10.22363/2687-0088-32031

Shakhovsky V.I., 2016. *Dissonans ekologichnosti v kommunikativnom kruge: chelovek, yazyk, emotsii* [Dissonance of Ecology in a Communicative Circle: People, Language, Emotions]. Volgograd, Polikarpov I. L. Publ. 504 p.

Sharonov I.A., ed., 2018. *Vezhlivost i antivezhlivost v yazyke i kommunikatsii: materialy Mezhdunar. nauch. konf.* [Politeness and Antipoliteness in Language and Communication. Proceedings of an International Conference]. Moscow, Polit. entsikl. Publ. 318 p.

Socha T.J., Pitts M.J., eds., 2012. *The Positive Side of Interpersonal Communication*. New York, Bern, Berlin, Bruxelles, Frankfurt am Main, Oxford, Peter Lang Publishing Inc. 355 p.

Stibbe, A., 2017. Positive Discourse Analysis: Rethinking Human Ecological Relationships. *The Routledge Handbook of Ecolinguistics*. Routledge, London. URL: https://core.ac.uk/ download/pdf/81669939.pdf

Takhtarova S.S., 2009. *Mitigatsiya kak kommunikativnaya kategoriya: kognitivno-diskursivnyy i etnokulturnyy aspekty* [Mitigation as a Communicative Category: Cognitive, Discursive and Ethnocultural Aspects]. Volgograd, Volgograd. nauch. izd-vo. 408 p.

Velázquez J.A.M., Pulido C.M., eds., 2018. *The Routledge Handbook of Positive Communication. Contributions of an Emerging Community of Research on Communication for Happiness and Social Change*. New York, London, Routledge. 434 p.

Vorkachev S.G., 2004. *Schastye kak lingvokulturnyy contsept* [Happiness as a Linguacultural Concept]. Moscow, Gnozis Publ. 192 p.

Vorkachev S.G., 2007. *Lyubov kak lingvokulturnyj contsept* [Love as a Linguacultural Concept]. Moscow, Gnozis Publ. 288 p.

Yan Kai, Zhang Bin, 2023. Predstavlenie o schastye v yazykovom soznanii nositeley russkoy kultury: psikholingvisticheskiy aspekt [The Concept of Happiness in the Linguistic Consciousness of Native Russian Speakers: Psycholinguistic Aspect]. *Vestnik Volgogradskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Seriya 2. Yazykoznaniye* [Science

SOURCE

Fedorova N. *The Family*. S.l., Little Brown, 1940. 346 p.

Information About the Author

Olga A. Leontovich, Doctor of Science (Philology), Professor, Department of Intercultural Communication and Translation, Volgograd State Socio-Pedagogical University, Prosp. Lenina, 27, 400005 Volgograd, Russia; Chief Researcher, Laboratory of Philological Studies, Research Department, Pushkin State Russian Language Institute, Academica Volgina St, 6, 117485 Moscow, Russia, olgaleo@list.ru, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0972-4609

Информация об авторе

Ольга Аркадьевна Леонтович, доктор филологических наук, профессор кафедры межкультурной коммуникации и перевода, Волгоградский государственный социально-педагогический университет, просп. Ленина, 27, 400005 г. Волгоград, Россия; главный научный сотрудник лаборатории филологических исследований департамента научной деятельности, Государственный институт русского языка им. А.С. Пушкина, ул. Академика Волгина, 6, 117485 г. Москва, Россия, olgaleo@list.ru, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0972-4609