

## Concerning a Problem of Communication Postulates Inadequacy and Psychological Failures in a Process of Intercultural Communication

<sup>1</sup>Anar Shinbolatovna Tanirbergenova, <sup>2</sup>Zhainagul Zhanshaevna Kartbaeva and <sup>1</sup>Saltanat Kubeibekovna Akhtanova

<sup>1</sup>“Turan-Astana” University, 29 Y. Dukenuly St., Astana, 010000, Kazakhstan

<sup>2</sup>K. Zhubanov Aktobe Regional State University, 47-II-33, Aktobe St., Aktobe, 030000, Kazakhstan

**Abstract.** In this article, the problem of the socio-cultural and pragmatical bases of an interpersonal communication is reviewed; socio-cultural regulation of interaction between partners, representatives of various linguocultural communities which is lead by means of norms, communication postulates is identified. With this purpose, the fact that the speech actscultural scenarios are specific, e.g.the "refusal", "offer", "request", "requirement", "compliment", "criticism", "disagreement", "dispute" and have a national specificityis proved by means of analyzing and comparing speech acts in different cultures. Considerable divergences in their use as means of social control in intercultural situations are shown by analysis of an intercultural interaction between partners from positions of realisation and use of social (generatedby society) communicative postulates.

[Tanirbergenova A.Sh., Kartbaeva Zh. Zh., Akhtanova S.K. **Concerning a Problem of Communication Postulates Inadequacy and Psychological Failures in a Process of Intercultural Communication.** *Life Sci J* 2014;11(4s):185-192] (ISSN:1097-8135). <http://www.lifesciencesite.com>. 28

**Keywords:** behabitives, communicative postulates, communicative activity, intercultural communication, interpersonal communication, speech acts, national specificity, verbal and nonverbal behavior.

### Introduction.

The socio-cultural and pragmatical bases of an interpersonal communication includesocio-cultural regulation of interaction between partners, representatives of various linguocultural communities by means of norms, communication postulates,which are specific for each culture.

An interactionoftwo or more persons with each other proceeds underthe conditions of a social control based on the norms that regulate mutual communication and relations between people. The social control is a way to regulate the system;it provides the well-ordered interaction of the system's elements by means of normative regulation. The social regulation of a speech activity is carried out, firstly, by nonverbal activity (which is social by its nature), whileverbalcommunication proceeds within it's structure,and, secondly, by'social terms'of organised individuals, i.e. by the speech activity controlled by so-called ethical rules that regulate the social interaction between different persons [1,25].

The ethical rules developed within a certain society do not promote a regulation of an interculturalcommunication. For the intercultural dialogue the situation is completely different, becauseeach of its participants is a carrier of his own culture and base of realised or unconscious ideas about a meaning of various acts, actions (verbal and nonverbal), events, situations, etc. (that areboth thesubject and content of the communication), as well as abouta roleof the communication itself, its formal and structural characteristics.

National specificity of the intercultural communication act is caused by two aspects. The first is that the act of communication is regulated by certain rules which differfor different nations. The second is that the speech act is performed in the course of realisation of various sets of speech operations that are intended by ethnic communities to express identical actions. In ethnic societies communicative acts with a standard setof communicants (*father — son, husband — wife, mother — daughter, chief — subordinate, host — guest, insider — outsider, representative of the same ethnos — foreigner*) are regulated by nonidentical social rules. And it is natural, because each communicative act joins in wider social and cultural systems; it is regulated by certain social and cultural norms. The communicants' language behaviour during the communicative and separate speech acts is a display of society normativedirectives, which are obligatory for each member of the society to carry out and acquired by him/her in the course of socialisation. Therefore the language behaviour culture is a social characteristic of an individual. It is defined by a degree of conformity of an individual's actual language behaviour accepted in a certainlanguage community (language culture) to verbal communication norms, rules of a speech etiquette.

The communicative activity does really exist in speech acts (actions) which, depending on conditions, are usually performed by certain ways (operations). Social and historical experience and its national specificity, first of all, are embodied in these operations and their sets specific for various

linguocultural communities, therefore the same universal action — behaviour or stating — is original in each culture because it is determined by a socio-cultural experience of the individual.

The meaning inadequacy of partners' different actions leads to a communicative failure and dialogue barriers.

G. Grosh lists such spheres of intercultural uncertainty that interfere with communication: - nonverbal communication; verbal communication; symbolics; behavioural norms, customs, rituals; social institutes and social roles; attitude to time; cognitive style, mentality; systems of beliefs and values; image of the world and person developed in this linguoculture [2].

In the course of an intercultural interaction the communication can be hindered by the following aspects: 1) *inadequacy of communication postulates* (cultural scenarios and their differences in use of verbal means); 2) distinctions in communicative codes; 3) rules of decorum; 4) verbal discursive strategies; 5) language behaviour stereotypes; 6) forms of influence on the partner; 7) nonverbal discursive strategies of communicants.

The inadequacy of communication postulates that are understood as principles regulating the communication of people in the course of the speech act interferes with a full-fledged intercultural communication. The reasons that generate the distinctions in communication postulates of different nations are studied by such science as pragmatics. According to N.I. Formanovskaya, it is the pragmatical aspect of language that is connected with a person's attitude to language signs, with an expression of his directives, evaluations, emotions, intentions in a process of generation (and perception) of speech actions in statements and discourses [3, 93].

The communication postulates in pragmatics include the principles considered as the key rules of activity. The system of communication principles is a communicative code.

This communicative code represents a difficult system of principles regulating the language behaviour of both parties during the communicative act and based on a number of categories and criteria [4, 12]. M.K. Akosheva and K. K. Rakhimzhanov consider that the structure of the communicative code, except the principles regulating the speech communication, includes such base categories as the communicative purpose and communicative intention [5, 78].

One of the major principles of communication is a cooperation principle. According to P. H. Grice, communicants co-operate with each other in the course of an information interchange, complying with several communication maksim-postulates. The main principle of communication is a cooperation principle

that is saying: Your communicative contribution on the certain step of a dialogue should be such of what is demanded by a mutually accepted purpose (direction) of this dialogue [6].

The cooperative principle includes 4 maxims:

- The maxim of quantity of information;
- The maxim of quality of information;
- The maxim of relation;
- The maxim of manner;

The maxim of quantity of information is connected with an information dosage which is necessary for the act of communication.

- The postulates of this maxim are the following:

- make your contribution as informative as is required;

- do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

The maxim of quantity demands to give as much information as is required. In this respect Englishmen and Germans observe this maxim precisely, while the Kazakh and Russian people who are remarkable for their garrulousness speak long, with lengthiness in their speech. If there is a lot of information, the second partner specifies the message. Compare the following dialogues of Englishmen, Russians and Kazakhs;

#### **Dialogue No1:**

"He did so, squaring himself and resting his hands on his knees. His teeth and the whites of his eyes were high accents in the picture he presented for Troy.

'You ask for the illustration of *an incongruity*,' he said.

'You would be nice to paint. *Do you really feel incongruous? I mean is this sort of thing quite foreign to you?*'

'*Not altogether. No.*' (M. Leblanc, *The Giaconda Smile*; p.26).

In this dialogue the first communicant asks a short question hinting that he being an Afro-American looks incongruous among the white people. The second talker has understood the information. He in turn asks shortly hinting at the attitude of the Afro-American guy to this situation and receives the exact answer.

#### **Dialogue No2:**

"So all these are your grandchildren, aren't they?"

'Yeah!' The oldman's face beamed with joy. 'Those three,' he pointed with his beard, 'are the kids of my son Saken. Saken is a tractor operator. Now he is working in Meteyes. He'll come back home as soon as he finish with harvesting. Their mom's gone, died in

childbirth. These are Naken's kids. Naken went to fight at the frontline and his wife, my daughter-in-law, is on the farm now. She spends not much time at home. My trotis taking care of them alone. And this is Asker, the youngest one of mine, the reckling.” (G. Belger, *The House of the Wanderer*, p.26).

The Russian people can be very garrulous even in conversation with unfamiliar people: they can give a lot of information (about their acquaintances, friends and work), even if they are not asked about it and if this information is not interesting to their interlocutor [7,215].

The real speech communication never contains as much information as it is required. People can often answer a question either incompletely, or with a mention of some additional data which were not assumed by the question. The essence of the postulates is that the speaker should tend to give such a quantity of information as it is required by the interlocutor.

• The maxim of quality of information is concretized by following postulates:

- ♣ do not say what you believe to be false.
- ♣ do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

In intercultural communication interlocutors should give only the reasoned data, because the false data can complicate the communication and interrupt the dialogue. The foreign partner doesn't feel normal about being misguided.

• The maxim of relation is assumed actually by only one postulate:

- ♣ be relevant.

This maxim warns that you should stay relevant during the conversation, otherwise the communication can interrupt. The subject drifts are frequent enough in Russian culture, which is shown in such Russian proverbs as: *Ya tebe pro Fomu, a ty mne pro Eremu* (I am talking about Foma, but you are talking about Erema). *V ogorode buzina, a v Kiyeye dyad'ka* (There is elder in the garden, and uncle in the Kiyev) - (Talking apples and oranges).

The maxim of manner assumes an assessment of the information transfer method and it is connected not with what is said, but with how it is said.

• The general postulate of this maxim is 'be clear', while the particular postulates are the following:

- ♣ Avoid obscurity of expression;
- ♣ avoid ambiguity;
- ♣ be brief;
- ♣ be orderly.

In the course of intercultural communication it is necessary to avoid the unclear expressions that can

lead to ambiguity and conflicts. For example: Afanasyevich approached Zhanyl — the girl that he liked for her cheerful affability — and started talking to her using broken Kazakh language:

“‘Aul, Kazakh zhigit bar?’

‘What did say?’ Zhanyl laughed looking back at other girls. ‘Did somebody understand?’

‘I think he asked if we have zhigits in our aul!’ supposed one of the girls.” (M. Auezov, *The Path of Abay*; pp. 180-181).

The term “cooperation” is usually understood in Russian culture as a transaction, “a favor for a favor”, like a service rendering, e.g.:

“‘There’s one thing,’ said Varangian, when he remained alone with Chertanov. ‘During our collective operation a cop was killed.’

‘One of ours?’ The major cocked up his ears.

‘I didn’t say: “one of ours”, I said: “a cop”. It was Kotlyar. He aligned himself with your “godson”. My men will give you proofs to prevent MCID from digging out too hard.

‘Listen, if you’re trying to fool me —’

‘Imp!’ exclaimed Varangian censoriously. ‘Do you really think I’m the kind of man who wastes the words?’

Chertanov smiled involuntarily. This man is a deep file.”

Or: “Cooperation”.

“‘Zhenya, please, call the police division and arrange for me a meeting with inspector Iskander Daudovich.’

‘No way!’ answered my friend at once.

‘Alexander Mikhaylovich will kill me, if he finds out about this.’

‘Okay,’ I agreed mildly. ‘Carry me home then.’

‘But what about your enema?’ My friend was totally dumbfounded.

‘What about calling the division?’

Torturous choice reflected at the man’s face. On the one hand he was afraid that the colonel will find out about the call and will tare his head off; on the other hand he wanted his adored Lisato be able to eat shrimps again. Guess, what he finally preferred?” (D. Dontsova. *Detectives*, p.83)

The politeness principle concerns to ethical and pragmatical categories. As an ethical category this principle is directed on the expression of such moral qualities of a person, as

- a. the observance of external communicative norms;

The expression of a benevolent attitude to the addressee.

b) as a pragmatical category this principle promotes the development of politeness postulates in the course of communication. G. Leech in his politeness maxims formulates thoughts and behaviour ethical standards. According to him, the politeness principle includes the following maxims:

1) *the tact maxim*: a) minimize the expression of beliefs which imply cost to other; b) maximize the expression of beliefs which imply benefit to other.

2) *the generosity maxim*: a) minimize the expression of beliefs that express or imply benefit to self; b) maximize the expression of beliefs that express or imply cost to self.

3) *the approbation maxim*: a) minimize the expression of beliefs which express dispraise of other; b) maximize the expression of beliefs which express approval of other.

4) *the modesty maxim*: a) minimize the expression of praise of self; b) maximize the expression of dispraise of self.

5) *the sympathy maxim*: a) minimize antipathy between self and other; maximize sympathy between self and other [8].

During an intercultural communication the politeness principle is not always observed in Russian, Kazakh and American cultures. In the speech of the Russian partner impoliteness can be shown in the following cases: 1) interruption of the talker; 2) use of rough expressions; 3) putting of a communicative pressure upon the interlocutor; 4) demonstration of an ethnic bias. Compare the following cases of an impolite behaviour in the situations of intercultural communication:

“Look, Rusty, "Rakuen" is behind the river, out of the borders of Settlement. I mean, legally it's our territory, but *whitemen don't live there, only the yellow-faced ones*. Therefore we usually don't go there. Sometimes Japs kill each other; it's quite a frequent thing —”

‘But what if Blagolepov was actually killed?’ interrupted the officer.” (B. Akunin. *The Diamond Chariot*, pp.114-115).

The speech acts cultural scenarios are specific, e.g. the "refusal", "offer", "request", "requirement", "compliment", "criticism", "disagreement", "dispute" have a national specificity. According to A. Vezhbitskaya, the cultural scenarios have the following characteristic features: 1) the distinctions in the language use in different cultures are not reduced to the distinctions in lexicon and grammar; 2) the distinctions in the use of a verbal code in a defined linguoculture are systematic and deeply implanted; 3) the distinctions in functioning of a verbal code in the linguoculture are connected with cultural values and, in one way or another, reflect the valuable

hierarchies inherent to the corresponding culture; 4) the verbal code usage strategies— speech strategies— represent the external expression of the latent system of cultural rules or scenarios [9,159].

Let's compare some speech acts in different cultures, e.g.: the "request" which is defined as the act serving for the realization of a requestive intention and appearing in the addressee motivation to the action performance on behalf of the speaker.

The national specificity of the "request" speech act is demonstrated by the fact that typical components of this act don't coincide in different languages. In English language, according to E. Rittel, the "request" includes five typical components: 1) the beginning of conversation, 2) the compellation, 3) the request to request ("Can I ask you something?"), 4) the request motivation, 5) the request itself. The speech atypical components are not equivalent: the speech act core is the request itself. The beginning of conversation and the compellation present the phatic communication, while the request to request and the motivation are additional components of the request itself. The additional components are usually realised in the conditions that can complicate the communication in case of different status of communicants, insufficient knowing of a person, complicated personal relations, etc.

The Spanish language communicants expressing the "request" are more polite, when they apply to the partner of the opposite sex. The request compellation to elder people usually includes the detailed substantiation of the request, the valid vocative form (e.g. Sir), the valid form of the beginning of conversation (usually in the form of change) and the polite appearance of the request to request (Could you do me a favour and / receive the package for my mother?). The compellation of elder people to the younger ones is characterised by politeness, but of a lesser degree. The compellation of people to their coevals usually contains a minimum of additional request components.

The comparative analysis of the "request" in Russian, English and Kazakh languages shows that, despite the coincidence of the request basic indicators, lexical and syntactic forms of its expression in different languages, as well as the request modifiers, differ inter se. Compare: 1) the request direct indicator (the first person performative verb with a complement— the 2nd person pronoun specifying the listener — and a verbal complement specifying the action necessary for a speaker and predicated to a listener): in English — *to request, to ask*; in Russian — *prosit'*; in Kazakh — *sura, otin*; 2) the conventional indicator (the 2<sup>nd</sup> person imperative verb specifying the action necessary for a speaker (*go close the window, kattyrak soileniz (speak louder)*); 3) the

indirectly conventional indicator (the general question containing a verb specifying the action necessary for a speaker and predicated to a listener). In English and Russian it contains the future tense verb; in Kazakh the special form of the 1<sup>st</sup> person imperative mood is used; 4) the indirect implicit-presuppositional indicator, including: a) the joint action indirect indicator specifying the consolidation of a speaker with a listener in realization of an action in the future, which is predicated by a speaker to himself/herself and to a listener, thereby applying to a listener with the request to perform the specified action; b) the permission request indirect indicator specifying the performance of an action which is the subject to the permission in the future that a speaker predicate to himself: in Russian and English it is the question containing the 1<sup>st</sup> person future tense verb; in Kazakh it is the statement with the 1<sup>st</sup> person imperative verb [10].

N.I. Formanovskaya states that in Russian the request embodiment in the form of the imperative statement with the imperative verb core is frequency: *Sdelayte eto, pojaluista (Do it, please)*. This imperative is accompanied by expressions actualizing the polite deviations between *I and would*, namely:

Esli vam ne trudno/Ne sochтите za trud...  
(Could you possibly...)

Esli vas ne zatrudnit...(Can/May I trouble you for...)

Sdelayte odoljenіye (Could you do me a favour and...)

Ne otkazhite v luybeznosti (Would you please...)

Okazhite luybeznost' (Would you kindly...)

Bud'te dobry/luybezni (Would you be so kind...)

Pojaluista (Please), etc. [3].

The "request" speech act in Russian is formed by interrogative structures. The interrogative form of the request reduces the stress on the addressee by masking the incitement for a notification and thus reduces the request categoriality. The first group of questions is the I-oriented expressions directed on possibilities of the addressee: "Can I ask you to do it?". The second group is the "enquiry" about the partner's possibilities: "Could you do it, please?". The third group is the "enquiry" about the partner's difficulties: "Isn't it difficult for you to do it?" [3, 325-328].

The differences basically concern the indirectly conventional request modifiers. The Russian language is characterized by the greatest number of indirectly conventional request modifiers (except the permission request) and their combinations. There are 18 lexical and syntactical modifiers and 4 grammatical modifiers in it, which form about 40 combinations. English has 13 lexical and syntactical modifiers and 3

grammatical modifiers, which form about 30 combinations. Kazakh has 12 lexical and syntactical modifiers and 5 grammatical modifiers, which also form about 30 combinations [11].

In psychology the "request" is characterised as one of the kinds of inadequate stress on a person. The partner can be stressed intentionally or unintentionally (when a person stresses others just by the fact of his/her presence). According to E.V. Sidorenko, the intentional stress is usually made for some purpose, while the unintentional stress has only the reason (for example, a person's charm) [12].

The "request" as the act of an unintentional stress should be realised in the polite form, be non-imperative, because the imperative request can push the partner away from you, make him unwilling to continue an intercultural communication. Therefore the imperative request expressions are unacceptable in a situation of an intercultural interaction between partners; it is necessary to ask the partner's favor politely, to get his/her consent in a polite form.

Among the imperative stress forms we can mention an interdiction considered as the stress form at which a person is not allowed to do something. The "interdiction" is perceived by an other partner as a compulsion, coercion over his personality. Therefore it leads to an internal resistance of the person to the proposed orders and interdictions, because the person does not wish to be an obedient toy in hands of another person [13].

In Russian and Kazakh cultures the interdiction is usually realized in the imperative form, like an order: "don't touch", "don't speak", "don't smoke", etc. E.g.:

"Pushkin, keep your mouth shut, is that clear?"

'But I —'

'Keep your mouth shut! The investigation is officially closed.'" (F.S. Neznansky, *The Deadly Triangle*; p.92).

"But when he tried to ask about this, Malykhin cried out with a rigid, bossy voice: 'Stop talking!'" (V. Arkhipenko, *Search for the Connection*; p.67).

Compare also:

Russian:

Ne kurit' [Don't smoke];

Ne sorit' [Don't litter];

Po gazonam ne hodit' [Don't walk at the lawns];

Kupaniye zapresheno [Swimming here is forbidden];

Ne vlezay, ub'et [Danger! Do not get in];

Ne prislonyat'sya [Don't lean upon this];

Ne zhodit' [Don't enter];

Postoronnim vnod zapreshen[No admittance except on business];

Net vyhoda[No exit].

In English the interdiction is realized not in the imperative, but in the streamlined form; the interdiction is usually followed by an explanation:

No smoking;

It is illegal to smoke in this station;

No smoking except in designated areas;

No entrance;

Do not exit any time;

Keep out;

Fire door. Do not block.

No parking.

In English the interdiction is preceded by the caution which is considered to be a softer stress. The caution is combined with a clarification of how a person should act in public places. S.G.Ter-Minasova states that “in the English-speaking countries a person’s rights and duties of behaviour in a society are explained to him/her cherishingly and in details (Russian language nowadays is only beginning to develop in this regard)”.

English language:

There is a ... penalty for deliberate misuse;

Trespassing will be prosecuted;

Obstructing the door can be dangerous;

Anyone interfering with the driver of this bus will be prosecuted;

Tow-away area.

Russian:

Ostorozhno—zlaya sobaka![Beware of the dog!]

Ostorozhno—okrasheno![Caution!Painted]

The control orientation, aspiration to dominate and affect the others is shown in a manipulative stress used to exert the communicative and psychological pressure on the interlocutor.

The basic means of a manipulative stress are: 1) the stress multi-vector; the latent character of the manipulative stress is provided by solving several problems at once (the distraction of addressee’s attention, the reduction of addressee’s criticality, the increase of manipulator’s status in addressee’s eyes, the isolation of an addressee from other people); 2) the psychological pressure (the initiative interception, the introduction of manipulator’s own theme; the reduction of time for decision-making, the self-advertising, the appeal to those who present, etc.); 3) the use of weaknesses (when the manipulative stress is performed by actualisation of the interlocutor’s interests and needs and is based on his/her fears, business or slowness); 3) the exploitation of personal qualities (the imitation of decision-making process by an interlocutor himself/herself).

In the course of an intercultural communication partners can perform the manipulative stress upon each other in case of accentuation of the importance or fact of belonging to the dominating nation due to the language prestigiousness. The first partner influenced by an ethnic bias tries to raise his/her communicative status. The communicative pressure from the first partner is expressed in a negative estimation of the second partner’s actions, contempt to him/her, disregard of his/her dignity by use of the discredit strategy, e.g.: “I’m leaving twelve and a half million dollars for you! After all it’s such an enormous amount of money — especially in your *poor Russia*.” (A. and S.Svaridov, *The Plot of Heavens*; p.334)

The manipulative stress upon a communicant speaking another language is also preformed in case of an menace expressed in the partner’s language, e.g.: “I’ll talk to you,” cried out the sergeant-major vainly, in a raised voice. He approached closely to the riding dzhigit and asked him menacingly *in Kazakh*:

‘What are you doing here at night, bastards? Are you hunting for Cossack horses?’

‘Oi-boi, ataman! What horses?’ exclaimed the dzhigit — also in Kazakh.” (I.Shukhov, *The Bitter Line*; p.17-5).

In Russian culture the manipulative stress upon the behaviour of other partner is usually performed by means of the partner’s behaviour control. According to J.E. Prokhorov and I. A. Sternin, “Russians quite often in various situations try to control the behaviour of surrounding people (both known and unknown to them): youngsters are constantly tutored by adults about what they should and shouldn’t do; acquaintances are advised what is better for them to do; strangers and foreigners are subjected to remarks, certain demands and warnings about the wrong behaviour, etc.” [7,199]

L. Richmond states that Russians seem to be obliged to tamper with the others’ private life. Elderly Russians can rebuke young men and women that are absolutely unknown to them for their mistakes appealing to them with such non-personified words as *young man or girl*. Elderly women in the streets can voluntarily give advice to young mothers on how to take care of babies [7,199].

The regulativity of Russian communication can be demonstrated by the realised possibility to admonish and instruct strangers: *Remove your bag! Move aside! Take away your hand! Pass forward, etc.*

Another distinctive feature of the Russian communication is the tradition to warn strangers about troubles that they can be subjected to: *You have a thread hanging on your clothes. Your loaf is falling down from your bag. Your face seems to be*

*frozen. Put your child on your knees, he will get tired to stand like that, etc.*

The regulativity of Russian communication can also be demonstrated by an intervention. The non-intervention which is understood as inadmissibility of non-authorised intrusion into the interlocutor's private life doesn't exist in Russian communicative culture. Actually every Russian can start talking to anyone and interfere with anyone's business. This displays the collectivism and collegiality of the Russian mentality [7,201]. Representatives of the Russian culture consider it necessary to interfere with private life of everyone, while the non-interference is condemned.

In the course of an intercultural communication it is also necessary to consider the specificity of an etiquette as a complex of verbal and nonverbal behaviour. It is the verbal communication component which is least correlated with the social nature of communicative activity; it forms some kind of a formal behavioural framework within which this activity is developed. On the other hand, the etiquette is an activity, because it provides the reproduction of the complete communicative act in a form of behaviours—statements that realize the etiquette formulas and stabilize certain speech behaviour. Behaviours are a complex of the speech operations directed on the realisation of verbal or nonverbal etiquette behaviour. N.I. Formanovskaya considers that the speech etiquette should be understood as “socially set and nationally specific regulating rules of language (communicative) behaviour in situations of making, maintaining and finishing contact between communicants according to their status role and personal relations in formal and informal conditions of communication.” [3,390]

Let's look how the etiquette behaviour — an appeal in different languages — is realized in the course of an intercultural communication. The appeal is the universal category that exists in every language and can be shown in form of index appeals, regulative appeals, appellative appeals and expressive appeals. Many appeal formulas, despite the partitioning specificity in structures of different languages, are inadequate; for example, in Kazakh the originality of ethical appeals is reached with the help of special flexions joint to the names of elder, respected people.

One of characteristics of Russian language is a tendency to use the “familiar applies” (applying by name and patronymic or with designation of the families: dedushka, ded[grandfather], babushka, baba [grandmother], tyoty[aunt], dyadya[uncle]) at all levels.

Another contacting means is greeting. Greeting is a behaviour or use of the etiquette contacting formulas. According to Albert Sheferlen, its basic moments are: 1) the orientation (eyes and

face); 2) the kinesic movement which is called “eyebrow flash”; 3) the verbal formula of a greeting; 4) the greeting gesture with using of palm [14].

The comparison of Russian, Kazakh and American greetings shows their specificity. In Russian the most frequently used greetings for different meeting situations are the following: *Hi! Hello! How are you?* In Kazakh the following etiquette formulas are used: *How are you? How do you do?*

In Kazakh culture the greeting etiquette is quite specific, which is expressed in: 1) designation of the age in a greeting formula: *Assalaumagaleikum, aksakal!* 2) asking about the partner's state of health, his belonging to a certain clan (family tree), revealing of data on his occupation or degree of kinship. For example: *How are you? How is your family? How are your relatives?*

Special kind of greetings is also used in Kazakh, when the elder person is greeted with special etiquette formulas: *hello grandmother!*

In American English speech etiquette greetings are used to make a contact with an interlocutor; they “express the desire to begin a conversation and serve for the cancellation of time — of when and how the conversation was formed.”

Thus, greeting “*How do you do?*” is connected with an acquaintance situation. The formal greeting “*How do you do?*” is used only in an acquaintance situation, after two persons getting acquainted with each other with the assistance of a third party are left alone. This greeting does not require the long, detailed answer; in this regard *how do you do* is similar to the time reflecting greetings (Good morning, Good afternoon, Good evening) of a neutral style, that can be used in relation to any person. However B. Brown and M. Ford state that these greetings are more formal than *Hello* or *Hi*. They specify that *Good morning* is usually used in case of applying of a subordinate to a person of higher standing [15].

Informal *Hello* is used both in formal and informal conditions (when applying to friends, family, familiar and unfamiliar people, in telephone conversations, in shop, etc.). The same form is used in an acquaintance situation.

American greeting *Hi* (the reduced form from *How are you*) is widespread among youth. It is also used when applying to familiar and unfamiliar persons equal on age and social status.

Thus, the analysis of an intercultural interaction between partners from positions of realisation and use of social (generated by society) communicative postulates shows that there are considerable divergences in their use as means of social control in intercultural situations.

**Corresponding Author:**

Dr. Tanirbergenova, "Turan-Astana" University, 29 Y. Dukenuly St., Astana, 010000, Kazakhstan.

**References**

1. Tarasov E.F. Sociolinguistic issues of verbal communication// Fundamentals of the speech activity theory. – M., 1974.
2. Crosh H. Methoden interkulturellen Lehrens und Lernens / H. Crosh, A. Crob, W.R. Lernen. – Saarbrücken, 2000.
3. Formanovskaya N.I. Verbal interaction: communication and pragmatics. – M.: Publishing house «Ikar», 2007.
4. Kluyev E.V. Verbal interaction. The success of verbal interaction. –M.: Ripol classic, 2002.
5. Akosheva M.K., Rikhimzhanov K.Kh. Understanding and interpretation of speech in inter personal communication. – Pavlodar: Kereku, 2011.
6. Grice G.P. Logic and speech communication//New in foreign linguistics. Series XVI. – M.: Progress, 1985.
7. Prohorov Y.B., Sternin I. A. Russian: communicative consciousness. – M.: Flinta; Nauka, 2011.
8. Leech C.N. Principles of pragmatic. – N.Y. 1983.
9. Vezhbitskaya A. Comparison of cultures through lexis. –M.: Languages of Slavic culture, 2001.
10. Kuschegalinova A.K. Pragmatic functions of speech verbs (based on Kazakh, English and Russian languages). Author. diss. Candidate of Philology Sciences. - Almaty, 2008.
11. Kuschegalinova A.K. Pragmatic functions of speech verbs (based on Kazakh, English and Russian languages). Author. diss. Candidate of Philology Sciences. - Almaty, 2008.
12. Sidorenko E.V. Personal influence and opposition to others' influence // Psychological problems of personal fulfillment. – Spb: publishing house of SpbSU, 1997.
13. Ilyin E.P. Psychology of communication and interpersonal relations. – Spb.: Piter, 2011.
14. Schefflen A.E. Schefflen A body Language and social order Communication as behavioral control Prentice-Hall, Englewood cliffs N.Y.
15. Brown R., Ford M. Adress in American English //Language in Culture and Society. – N.Y.: Harber, 1964.

23/02/2014