

CHAPTER «PHILOLOGICAL SCIENCES»

PRAGMATIC REGISTERS OF NATIONAL COOPERATIVE COMMUNICATIVE BEHAVIOUR OF UKRAINIANS, RUSSIANS, LITHUANIANS AND AMERICANS

Igor Korolyov¹

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30525/978-9934-588-38-9-38>

Abstract. The paper examines pragmatic registers of strategic-tactical implementation of the modes of politeness, neutrality, tolerance and familiarity in the national cooperative communicative behaviour of Ukrainians, Russians, Lithuanians and Americans (the USA). The phenomenon of national cooperative communicative behaviour of Ukrainians, Russians, Lithuanians and Americans was chosen as the object of research. The purpose of the proposed work is to identify and characterize the main pragmatic registers of national cooperative speech behaviour of representatives of two Slavic (Ukrainian and Russian), Baltic (Lithuanian) and American communicative cultures based on the mode-organization of a strategic-tactical repertoire of discursive space. Linguistic-cognitive, pragmatic, communicative and linguacultural aspects of national cooperative communicative behaviour of Ukrainians, Russians, Lithuanians and Americans are comprehensively considered based on the data material in the form of discursive situations (fragments) and discursive practices, selected according to the text and contextualized texts of American fiction in the second half of the XX – early XX centuries. As a result of the analysis, the pragmatic registers of the research object were characterized, in particular the mode-organization of cooperative communication was determined and a repertoire of communicative strategies and tactics was established, which contribute to non-confrontational, harmonious, successful (non)verbal interaction of

¹ Doctor of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor,
Senior Researcher of the Institute of Philology,
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Ukraine

interactants. The paper also reveals the essence of pragmatic objectification of explicit (conventional) Ukrainian, Russian, Lithuanian and American national cooperative communicative behaviour, which is realized, first of all, in verbal communication within etiquette and ritual discursive practices of *greeting, acquaintance, invitation, request, consent, praise / compliment, gratitude / appreciation, apology, sympathy / compassion / empathy / consolation, wish / desire, goodbye* by defining specificity the mode-organization (politeness, neutrality, tolerance and familiarity) and the establishment of a broad strategic tactical repertoire. The analysis of discursive situations has allowed to establish five types of universal communication strategies: solidarity; self-presentation; improving the status of the interlocutor; sincerity; creating a positive tone of communication, the successful implementation of which is ensured by the variable configuration of a broad tactical repertoire. Thus, based on the mode-organization and strategic tactical potential, the pragmatic registers of national cooperative communicative behaviour of Ukrainians, Russians, Lithuanians and Americans imply a synthesis of explicit (discursive practices, non-verbal somatic) and implicit (archetypal) (non)verbal interaction based on the principles of cooperation, solidarity, contractual capacity, etc., which makes it mandatory to have an incentive for further contact. The discursive space of Ukrainian, Russian, Lithuanian and American of national cooperative communicative behaviour is characterized by a variational and complex mode-organization (politeness + neutrality; neutrality + familiarity; neutrality + politeness + tolerance, etc.), which is achieved by a semiotic configuration of discursive practices (tactics) typical for a particular discursive situation (strategy).

1. Introduction

At the end of the 20th and the beginning of the 21st centuries, the linguistic research interests in the field of communicative studies was focused on the problems of various types of verbal and nonverbal communication in general and communicative behaviour in particular [4; 6; 8; 9; 10; 12; 13; 17; 20; 22; 24 etc.]. The latter, having a social nature, plays a significant role in the process of socialization of a language personality. It consists in the assimilation of socio-cultural norms, national value guidelines, in particular stereotypes of verbal (non-verbal) behaviour of the society, social group and community to which it belongs.

The cooperative type of communication has long been studied in the framework of linguistic pragmatics and linguistic communicative studies [4; 8; 12; 13; 20], ethno-psycholinguistics and linguacultural studies [6; 9; 10; 17; 22; 24], which resulted in the creation of certain systems and models of mode-organization of tactical register strategies aimed at achieving effective interaction and cooperation.

The topicality of the article is related to the need for tactical analysis strategies of (non)verbal forms of national cooperative communicative behaviour (hereinafter – the NCCB), which in our intelligence is based on a combination of linguistic-cognitive, pragmatic, communicative and linguacultural approaches. It includes finding out the repertoire of communicative strategies and tactics within the framework of cooperative macro-strategy cognitive strategy semiotic modes of politeness, neutrality, tolerance and familiarity.

The object of the study is the national cooperative communicative behaviour of Ukrainian, Russian, Lithuanian and American, and *the subject* is the clarification of the mode-organization of its tactical register strategies. The data material for analysis is discursive fragments selected from the texts of Ukrainian, Russian, Lithuanian and American fiction in the second half of the 20th and beginning of the 21st centuries.

The aim of the article is to highlight the pragmatic registers of the NCCB of Ukrainian, Russian, Lithuanian and American, primarily mode-organizations of cooperative communication and a repertoire of communicative strategies and tactics that contribute to the harmonious, successful interaction of interactants, indicating that the interlocutors carried out their communicative intentions, but the contact process is based on the cognitive and communicative category of cooperativity.

Objectives: 1) to describe the essence of strategy-tactical objectification of explicitly (conventional) cooperative communicative behaviour, which is realized primarily in verbal communication within the framework of etiquette and ritual discursive practices of congratulations, acquaintances, invitations, wishes, praise / compliment, thanks, apologies, comfort / empathy, requests, consent, farewell; 2) to determine the specifics of the mode-organization of cooperative communicative behaviour of Ukrainian, Russian, Lithuanian and American in certain discursive practices (hereinafter – DP); 3) to establish strategies of tactical repertoire of cooperative

communicative behaviour of Ukrainian, Russian, Lithuanian and American within the modes of politeness, neutrality, tolerance and familiarity. Moreover, the corresponding analysis involves taking into account, on the one hand, contextual signs that determine a particular discursive situation, in which one or several modes of national cooperative communicative behaviour are realized, and on the other hand, the psychology of interpersonal communication of communicants that (non)verbally interact with each other.

2. Pragmatic potential of national cooperative communicative behaviour

As it was defined in the previous works [15; 16; 17], the paradigm of national cooperative communicative behaviour is the linguopragmatic mode of politeness (hereinafter – MP), neutrality (hereinafter – MN), tolerance (hereinafter – MT) and familiarity (hereinafter – MF). The modal modifiers of communicative behaviour and one of the most effective ways of marking a particular mode or transition from one mode to another is (non)verbal, primarily language / speech epistemic (conventional) means. An important refinement in the pragmatic model of cooperative communicative behaviour was made by J. Austin. Recalling the so-called “dark side” of the politeness mode, he reflects on such communicative situations in which the speaker constructs the statement linguistically correct, from the point of view of the principles of politeness and cooperation, but the interlocutor incorrectly interprets his / her intention. That is why, in trying to implement cooperative macro-strategies, the interactant must take into account not only the maxims (P. Grice) and the postulates (J. Lich) of the principle of cooperation, but also non-verbal (kinetic, proxemic, visual, etc.) communication elements that uses the interlocutor, as well as the environment in which the communication situation occurs [3; 5, p. 37–38].

The modes and strategies of tactical pragmatic registers of the NCCB, based on the maxims and postulates of the principle of cooperation, include: 1) rationality – communicants behave in accordance with their own intentions; 2) openness – the interlocutors verbalize exactly what they think; 3) quantity – individuals say exactly as much as is necessary to achieve a communicative goal; 4) competence: if communicant 2 believes that communicant 1 believes in X, then communicator 2 must also believe in X; 5) openness of intent: if communicant 1 implies X, then he / she behaves as

if implies X; 6) strong cooperation: if interactant 1 seeks X, then interactant 2 also seeks X [1; 5, p. 37–38].

Harmonious, successful communication indicates the implementation of the communicative intentions of the interlocutors, because their speech behaviour was based on a cooperative macro strategy, the implementation of which, in turn, involves a complex mechanism and a complex of mode-organizations, the interaction of the corresponding repertoire of strategies and tactics. Therefore, highlighting the pragmatic potential of the NCCB of Ukrainian, Russian, Lithuanian and American, we should first of all pay attention to the semiotic mode-configuration of cooperative communication and the range of communicative strategies and tactics that contribute to the harmonious, successful interaction of the interactants, indicating that the interlocutors realized their intentions and the contact process is based on the cognitive-communicative category of cooperativity.

The communicative / discursive space of the NCCB depends on global and situational factors determined by everyday, national-mental, socio-cultural, psychological, moral and ethical factors. The presentation and functioning of its pragmacommunicative categories, i.e. modes, strategies and tactics, depends on the specifics of the slots of the NCCB script frame [16], in particular, from the sociopsychological, mental and cultural characteristics of communicants (educational and cultural level, mental and psychological state, emotional sphere, moral principles and beliefs, national value orientations, experience, motivation, etc.), as well as from such situational factors like: time and place of interaction; the specifics of (non)direct (direct, virtual, etc.) physical contact; sociocultural circumstances affecting both the NCCB of representatives of a particular language culture in particular, and the discursive space of their interaction in general [19].

The pragmatic registers (categories) of the NCCB are universal by nature, but the specifics of their verbalization and representation depends on the culture code (language and speech-behavioural), which is a system of signs of the material and spiritual world of a certain ethnic strength. The linguacultural code, in turn, is a linguistic means of implementing the cultural codes [23, p. 9]. The strategic tactical arsenal of the NCCB, which is implemented by a combination of (non)verbal components, can testify to the constants and value dominants of the language / communicative consciousness of the participants in the interaction. Corresponding trends

indicating the level of the NCCB code make it possible to make certain generalizations about the manifestation of the linguacultural code and the culture code in general.

The specificity of the mode-register of the NCCB provides for intermediate or transitional links between politeness, neutrality, tolerance and familiarity, because the definition of a specific clear type of mode of communication is possible in most cases at the level of a separate DP. At the same time it is not always sufficiently informative in a pragmatic aspect, it requires a situational context and accounting extralinguistic component.

The discursive space in the aspect of the pragmatic potential of the NCCB can be considered in at least two dimensions that are interconnected and provide for each other. So, we are talking about the narrow plane of the NCCB, when a separate DP, regardless of its type, etc., assumes the presence (explicitly or implicitly) of a particular mode (politeness, neutrality, tolerance, familiarity) by implementing certain tactical repertoire strategies. A suitable perspective of analysis has been demonstrated in previous works, where the cognitive-communicative category of cooperativity is considered in the so-called “narrow” plane, in the framework of which its pragmatic potential is considered exhausted, if it is limited to its implementation only within individual DPs [15; 16; 17; 18]. So, in everyday communication, this particular type of cooperative interaction is often pronounced, because representatives of any linguaculture, given the specifics of the modern ultra-fast pace of life, are forced to limit themselves to using compressed DPs. In this sense, contacts are equal to a discursive situation. The organization of the DP spectrum, established in previous studies [Ibid.], proves the expressed opinion, because partly the interactants successfully implement the pragmatic NCCB registers, resorting to the adoption of specific symbolic constructs of communicative consciousness: DPs of congratulations, wishes, invitations, farewell, etc. It meets all the criteria for successful cooperation, including the main one – an incentive for further interaction.

In the broad sense, the cognitive and communicative category of cooperativity can be considered successfully realized only in the situational dimension [18], when the NCCB is considered within the framework of the discursive space, explicated and implemented sequentially, using the appropriate chain, the discursive practice → discursive situation → discursive space. In our opinion, a successful attempt to analyse cooperative inter-

personal interaction, including the communicative behaviour of Ukrainian, Russian, Lithuanian and American, is possible at the level of discursive space only if the specifics of the NCCB are preliminarily covered in a narrow dimension. It involves clarifying tactical repertoire strategies within the modes of politeness, neutrality, tolerance and familiarity at the level of individual DPs and their situational combinatorics.

**3. Mode-organization of strategic-tactical registers
of national cooperative communicative behaviour of Ukrainians,
Russians, Lithuanians and Americans**

National cooperative communicative behaviour, which is realized within the discursive space by means of different types of DPs (in our study the types determined experimentally in the previous explorations [15; 16; 17]) that are determined by the cognitive-semiotic modes of politeness, neutrality, tolerance, familiarity. It involves a wide repertoire of communication strategies and tactics. The following examples of DPs with a strategic-tactical implementation of the modes of politeness, neutrality, tolerance and familiarity in the NCCB of representatives of the analysed linguistic cultures are to be considered.

In the texts of Ukrainian fiction prose it was possible to distinguish such fragments of discursive situations in which the NCCB of Ukrainians is realized by using the types of DP analysed in the proposed work. Let us turn to a pragmatic analysis of discursive situations, in which those DPs, in which, according to the results of the experiment, the most commonly realized cognitive and communicative categories of cooperativeness and politeness are represented first.

1. *Доброго дня! Ви забронювали у нас? На реценції готелю мені усміхнулась молода, повненька дівчина. Поруч із нею стояв юнак, що одразу із зацікавленням почав мене розглядати. – Ні, не бронювала. У вас є вільні номери? Мені потрібен одномісний, – промовила я. – Так, є, – кивнула дівчина. – На скільки бажаєте поселитись? – Поки що на добу. – Можна ваш документ? Я залізла в сумку і дістала звітти паспорт. – Яке у вас незвичайне ім'я! – захоплено промовила працівниця готелю, розгорнувши документ. – Дякую, мої батьки любили слухати цю музичну групу [27, р. 13–14]. Hereinafter, the pragmatic potential of the presented discursive situations will be presented schematically. DPs of*

greeting + request + praise / compliment + gratitude / appreciation = **MP** + **MN** + **MT** → (solidarity strategy → tactics of demonstrating willingness to cooperate → *Можна ваш документ?* + consent, support of the interlocutor → *Ні, не бронювала. У вас є вільні номери?* – [...] *Так, є, – кивнула дівчина* + tips + choosing a common communication code → *Мені потрібен одномісний*) + (sincerity strategy → tactics of demonstrating a (positive) emotional state → *Доброго дня!* [...] *На рецепції готелю мені усміхнулась молода, повненька дівчина* + gratitude → *Дякую, мої батьки любили слухати цю музичну групу*) + (a strategy for increasing the interlocutor status → tactics of demonstrating the interest of the interlocutor → *Ви забронювали у нас?* + compliment → *Яке у вас незвичайне ім'я!* + expression (attention, interest, sympathy, concern) to the interlocutor → *На скільки бажаєте поселитись?*) + (self-presentation strategy → restraint / modesty tactics → *Поки що на добу* [...] *Дякую, мої батьки любили слухати цю музичну групу*) + (strategy of creating a positive tone of communication → tactics of demonstrating a (positive) emotional state → *усміхнулась молода, повненька дівчина*).

2. “Шо вам, синочки?” – питається продавщиця. “Мамаша, мамаша, – говорить Вася Комуніст, нам водочки”. “Скільки?”, – питається продавщиця. “Два”, – говорить Вася. “Пузиря?” – діловито питається вона. “Ящика”, – каже Вася. “А Вам, синочки, по шістнадцять годков уже єсть?” Компанія дружно дістає студентські квитки з державною символікою своєї республіки. Після чого брами падають і водяру їм продають [32, р. 48–49]. **DPs of request + consent** = **MN** + **MF** → (solidarity strategy → tactics of demonstrating willingness to cooperate → *Шо вам, синочки?* + choosing a common communication code → *Мамаша, мамаша* + intimacy, rapprochement with the interlocutor) + (self-presentation strategy → self-characterization tactic → *А Вам, синочки, по шістнадцять годков уже єсть?*).

3. Мамо, привіт. – Енько! Сонечко, привіт! Ти де? – Деся в Україні, посміхнулась, чимчикуючи тротуаром вздовж сувенірних крамничок. – А ми з татом в Норвегії. Гей! Чому б тобі не приїхати сюди? На хвилину я замислилась. Не тому, що міркувала над пропозицією, а тому що пригадувала, коли я востаннє бачила батьків. – Я не знаю мови. А я люблю розуміти людей, коли вона говорять. – Зрозуміло... – на задньому фоні почулись якісь заклопотані строгі голоси. – Енько,

сонце, у нас тут дуже важлива зустріч... Не можу зараз говорити. – Добре, ма, дзвони, коли матимеш час. Тамові привіт. – Цілую тебе! Па-на! [27, p. 22]. DPs of greeting + invitation + wishe / desire + good-bye = **MP** + **MN** + **MF** → (solidarity strategy → tactics of demonstrating willingness to cooperate + agree, support the interlocutor → *Зрозуміло...* + choosing a common code of communication + intimacy, rapprochement with the interlocutor → *Енько! Сонечко, привіт! [...] Енько, сонце*) + (sincerity strategy → tactics of demonstrating a (positive) emotional state → *Добре, ма, дзвони, коли матимеш час* + warning of the interlocutor → *у нас тут дуже важлива зустріч... Не можу зараз говорити*) + (a strategy for increasing the interlocutor status → tactics of demonstrating the interest of the interlocutor → *Ти де?* + suggestion / development of a topic related to the interlocutor → *Чому б тобі не приїхати сюди?* + hyperbolization of positive emotional reaction → *Тамові привіт* + expression (attention, interest, sympathy, concern) to the interlocutor → *Мамо, привіт; Цілую тебе! Па-на!*) + (self-presentation strategy → self-characterization tactics + self-deprecation + self-irony → *Я не знаю мови. А я люблю розуміти людей, коли вона говорять*) + (strategy of creating a positive tone of communication → tactic of positive statement → *Енько! Сонечко, привіт!* + wish).

4. *Я вибачаюсь, ви не Дарина Гоцинська? Ну от прошу дуже. – А Ви, пробачте, хто? Знехотя вступає Адька – як контрабач у джаз-банді: – Павло Іванович з архіву... – В такому разі, я Дарина Анатоліївна! – Це я знаю, – каже він і дивиться на мене поглядом ситого кондора з високої скелі: важкі, зморшкуваті повіки напівприкривають недвижні опуклі очі – такі б очі східній красуні, млость і бархат, два агатові персні, а тут чорті-що, прорухувалася природа... І ледь-ледь налягаючим голосом, зовсім крихітку, тобто рівно настільки, щоб не уйшло непоміченим, повторює: – Знаю, що ви Анатоліївна* [31, p. 264–265]. DPs of acquaintance + request = **MP** + **MT** + **MF** → (solidarity strategy → tactics of demonstrating a willingness to cooperate → *В такому разі, я Дарина Анатоліївна* + choosing a common communication code → *Знаю, що ви Анатоліївна* + intimacy, rapprochement) + (sincerity strategy → tactics for demonstrating (positive) emotional state → *Ну от прошу дуже*) + (a strategy for increasing the interlocutor status → tactic of demonstrating the interest of the interlocutor → *Я вибачаюсь, ви не Дарина Гоцинська?*;

А Ви, пробачте, хто?) + (self-presentation strategy → self-characterization tactics → Це я знаю) + (strategy of creating a positive tone of communication → tactics of demonstrating a (positive) emotional state + joke → Знаю, що ви Анатоліївна).

5. *Ви Зося?.. Я не знаю, як по батькові. – Баба Зося, не треба по батькові. – Проходьте, це всі Ваші речі? У баби Зосі не було ні валізи, ні сумки. Тільки великий клунок з казенної лікарняної ковдри. – Все. Більше нічого нема. – За-а-рику, хто там? Хто там? – лунає голос, наче з діжки. – Зараз, мамо, зачекай хвилину, – кричить Захар Іванович, і тихіше до баби Зосі: – Може, щось лишилося у вас в лікарні? То я міг би підвезти на машині. – Оце все. – Гаразд. Зараз я проведу вас до Вашої кімнати. Ви можете відпочити, перевдягтися. А потім я вас поведу до мами [14, р. 43]. DPs of acquaintance + request + gratitude / appreciation = MP + MN + MT → (solidarity strategy → tactics of demonstrating willingness to cooperate → Може, щось лишилося у вас в лікарні? + consent, support of the interlocutor → Гаразд. Зараз я проведу вас до Вашої кімнати + choosing a common communication code → я міг би підвезти на машині + intimacy, rapprochement with the interlocutor → Ви Зося?) + (sincerity strategy → tactic of demonstration of (positive) emotional state) + (a strategy for increasing the interlocutor status → tactics of demonstrating the interest of the interlocutor → За-а-рику, хто там? Хто там? + suggestion / development of a topic related to the interlocutor → Проходьте, це всі Ваші речі? + expression (attention, interest, sympathy, concern) to the interlocutor → Я не знаю, як по батькові) + (self-presentation strategy → self-characterization tactic → Баба Зося, не треба по батькові) + (strategy of creating a positive tone of communication → tactics for demonstrating (positive) emotional state → Ви можете відпочити, перевдягтися. А потім я вас поведу до мами).*

Here are the examples of the implementation of the NCCB of Russians, which are isolated in the form of discursive situations from the texts of the Russian fiction prose.

1. *Вы к кому? – осведомился он, глядя на меня сверху вниз. – К Вырвизубу! – Фамилия? – Шубина. – Проходите. Вторая дверь направо. Не успела я и шагу сделать, как вторая дверь направо распахнулась, и оттуда высунулся весьма потертого вида мужчина в маленьких модных очках. – Мария Никитична? Вы поразительно точны! Прошу вас в мой кабинет! [...] Рад знакомству, много о вас*

слышал хорошего, и, надеюсь, мы найдем общий язык [30, p. 6]. DPs of acquaintance + greeting + invitation + praise / compliment = MN + MP → (solidarity strategy → tactics of demonstrating a willingness to cooperate → *проходите* + creating a community (groups, associations) → *Прошу вас в мой кабинет!* + a call to action → *мы найдем общий язык*) + (sincerity strategy → declarations of intent + hope → *надеюсь, мы найдем общий язык* + (a strategy for increasing the interlocutor status → tactics of demonstrating the interest of the interlocutor → *рад знакомству* + praise → *Вы поразительно точны!* + compliment → *много о вас слышал хорошего*) + (strategy of creating a positive tone of communication → tactics of positive statement → *Вы поразительно точны! Рад знакомству, много о вас слышал хорошего, и, надеюсь, мы найдем общий язык*).

2. *Когда он приходит вечером, я уже дописываю последнюю страницу рассказа, где “он”, счастливый и усталый, возвращается домой. – Сережа, я про тебя рассказ написал. Хочешь прочитать? – Хм... давай!* [26, p. 86]. DP of consent = MN + MT → (solidarity strategy → tactics of choosing a common communication code + creating a community (group, association) + demonstrating a willingness to cooperate → *Сережа, я про тебя рассказ написал. Хочешь прочитать?* + consent, support of the interlocutor → *Хм... давай!*) + (sincerity strategy → recognition / certification tactics → *Сережа, я про тебя рассказ написал*) + (interlocutor status improvement strategy → tactics of the proposal / development of a topic related to the interlocutor + demonstration of interest by the interlocutor → *Сережа, я про тебя рассказ написал. Хочешь прочитать?*) + (strategy of creating a positive tone of communication → tactics of positive statement → *Сережа, я про тебя рассказ написал*). The proposed example of the Russian NCCB confirms the idea that several communicative strategies and tactics can be cross-implemented within a single-type DP (consent as a response to a proposal), proving the likelihood of variability in pragmatic registers in the communicative consciousness. The mode of tolerance in this discursive fragment is expressed in the consent of one of the interlocutors to get acquainted with the result of *Another* creativity (*Хм... давай!*), despite being tired and late.

In the discursive space, a specific mode-organization of the NCCB in the implementation of the same DPs is possible, which, at the same time, may have unequivocal pragmatic potential: а) *Вечером Николай Иванович*

перечитывал в своей комнате оба письма... Потом бросил оба письма в стол и громко сказал: – А черт его знает – как? – Что ты? – спросила жена [...] – Нет, все в порядке. Поддай газеты, пожалуйста [26, p. 284]. DP of request = MN + MP → (sincerity strategy → tactics of recognition / acknowledgment + demonstration of (positive) emotional state → бросил оба письма в стол и громко сказал + doubt → А черт его знает – как?) + (interlocutor enhancement strategy → tactics of demonstration of interlocutor interest + suggestions / development of interlocutor topic → Что ты? – спросила жена) + (solidarity strategy → tactics of assurance → Нет, все в порядке + demonstration of willingness to cooperate → Поддай газеты, пожалуйста); б) Данила Явсевич заторопился открывать дверь в избу, и, когда в горнице Парасковья принялась спешно сдирать с дочери мокрую одежду, подвывая при этом, он сурово прикрикнул на оробевшего Кирьку: – Чего пялишься? Выдь отседова, покурим на улке [2, p. 417]. DP of request = MF → (sincerity strategy → tactic of demonstrating emotional state → заторопился открывать дверь) + (interlocutor enhancement strategy → tactics of demonstration of interlocutor interest + suggestions / development of interlocutor topic → Чего пялишься?) + (solidarity strategy → tactics of assurance → Нет, все в порядке + demonstration of willingness to cooperate → покурим на улке). In the above discursive situations, the stimulating speech actions are mediated by the DP of request: in the first context, the character utters the phrase accompanied by the etiquette DP *пожалуйста*, which actualizes the mode of politeness, and, in the second, the stimulating verbal actions are performed within the frame of the familiarity of spontaneity statements like: *чего пялишься? Выдь отседова*. It should be noted that in both cases the cooperative nature of communication is maintained and the NCCB is being implemented.

3. Кирюха, здорово! Есть у тебя какой-нибудь детективчик? – Что?! – не понял Кирюха [...] – Кирюха, я это, не чокнулся. Просто вечером почитать нечего. – Слышь, Гранкин, а деньги тебе уже не нужны? – тихо спросил Кирилл. – Нет. Да. Ну, в общем, они у меня почти есть. [...] А любовный роман тебе не сгодится? – спросил осторожно Кирилл. – У Наташки их пруд пруди. – Не, – вздохнул Гранкин. – Мне б детективчик на ночь. Для теоретической подготовки, – ляпнул он, но тут же заткнулся. – А может, придёшь вечером? – предложил Кирюха. – Наташка с девчонками к подружке на дачу

*с ночёвкой уехала. Посидим, выпьем, а?! – Не, Кирюха, – вздохнул Виталья, – я больше не пью. Кажется. – Покедова, – сказал он Кирюхе [...] [28, p. 48-49]. DPs of greeting + request + invitation + goodbye = **MF** + **MN** + **MT** → (solidarity strategy → intimacy, rapprochement with the interlocutor → Кирюха, здорово! [...] Слышь, Гранкин [...] + argumentation → Просто вечером почитать нечего [...] Не, Кирюха, – вздохнул Виталья, – я больше не пью + choosing a common communication code → Слышь, Гранкин, а деньги тебе уже не нужны? – тихо спросил Кирилл. – Нет. Да. Ну, в общем, они у меня почти есть + creating a community (group, group) + demonstrating a willingness to collaborate + a call to action → А может, придёшь вечером? – предложил Кирюха [...] Посидим, выпьем, а?! + opposing they-community → Наташка с девчонками к подружке на дачу с ночёвкой уехала + assurance → Кирюха, я это, не чокнулся) + (interlocutor strategy → proposal / topic development tactics for the interlocutor → Есть у тебя какой-нибудь детективчик? + showing respect (attention, interest, sympathy, concern) to the interlocutor → Слышь, Гранкин, а деньги тебе уже не нужны? – тихо спросил Кирилл [...] А любовный роман тебе не сгодится? – спросил осторожно Кирилл) + (sincerity strategy → declarations of intent → Мне б детективчик на ночь. Для теоретической подготовки; Посидим, выпьем, а?! [...] Покедова + hope → А любовный роман тебе не сгодится? – спросил осторожно Кирилл [...] А может, придёшь вечером [...] Посидим, выпьем, а?! + doubt → Не, Кирюха, – вздохнул Виталья, – я больше не пью. Кажется) + (a strategy for creating a positive communication tone → tactic of a positive statement → Нет. Да. Ну, в общем, они у меня почти есть) + (self-presentation strategy → self-characterization tactic → Кирюха, я это, не чокнулся [...] я больше не пью). In the presented discursive situation, the whole strategic strategy of non-institutional cooperative interaction in communication of close acquaintances is demonstrated, in which the mode of familiarity prevails. The mode of tolerance is represented in the cooperative communicative behaviour of Kirill, who shows tolerance and understanding to his friend's requests and comments, as evidenced by the pragmatic potential of his (non) verbal constituents.*

Let us demonstrate a repertoire of communication strategies and tactics, the functioning and implementation of which has been distinguished in the cooperative communicative behaviour of Lithuanians.

1. *Kitą kartą pasikalbėsime, gerai? Manęs laukia. Labanakt.* – *Labanakt, jei jau taip sakai* [7, p. 48]. DPs of goodbye + wish / desire + consent = **MN + MP + MT** → (solidarity strategy → tactics of demonstrating a willingness to cooperate + a call to joint action + choosing a common communication code → *Kitą kartą pasikalbėsime, gerai?* + consent, support of the interlocutor → *jei jau taip sakai*) + (sincerity strategy → declarations of intent + hope → *Kitą kartą pasikalbėsime, gerai?* + argumentation → *Manęs laukia*) + (strategy of increasing the status of the interlocutor → tactics of demonstration of interest of the interlocutor + suggestions / development of the topic concerning the interlocutor + display of respect (attention, interest, sympathy, concern) to the interlocutor → *Kitą kartą pasikalbėsime, gerai?* [...] *Labanakt.* – *Labanakt, jei jau taip sakai*) + (strategy for creating a positive communication tone → wish tactics → *Labanakt.* – *Labanakt*). The mode of tolerance in the above discursive situation is that one of the interactants with understanding and tolerance refers to the termination of the conversation and agrees to continue it later. DP *Labanakt* is used by interlocutors to end contact by implementing a directly phatic function, but it also has a pragmatic desire for future interaction and communication.

2. *Galbūt. Aš jau turiu eiti, mama. Ačiū už pietus.* – *Paskambinsiu dėl dokumentų tvarkymo.* – *Gerai, mama.* – *Iki, Linut* [7, p. 65]. DPs of consent + goodbye + gratitude / appreciation = **MN + MP** → (solidarity strategy → consent tactics, interlocutor support → *Galbūt; Gerai, mama* + demonstrating a willingness to collaborate + a call to take action + a choice of a common communication code → *Paskambinsiu dėl dokumentų tvarkymo.* – *Gerai, mama*) + (sincerity strategy → tactics of declaration of intent + gratitude → *Aš jau turiu eiti, mama. Ačiū už pietus*) + (interlocutor enhancement strategy → tactics of demonstration of interlocutor interest + suggestions / development of interlocutor topic → *Paskambinsiu dėl dokumentų tvarkymo.* – *Gerai, mama*). In the above discursive situation, we can observe that one DP is realizing the versatile pragmatic potential of the NCCB, because it accumulates several strategic-tactical registers.

3. *Mergaitė nustebusi atsisuko į jį.* – *Kas tu toks, po galais?! – sušuko.* – *Cezaris. O tu? Dirbtinai nusikvatojusi mergaitė pareiškė:* – *Cezaris, ar ne? Tada aš Kleopatra!* – *Puiku. Tarkim, kad susipažinom,* – *santūriai linktelėjo vaikas* [11, p. 59]. DPs of acquaintance + consent = **MF + MN** → (interlocutor strategy → interlocutor demonstration tactics + suggestion

/ topic development → *Mergaitė nustebusi atsisuko į jį. – Kas tu toks, po galais?!)* + (solidarity strategy → tactics of choosing a common communication code → *Dirbtinai nusikvatojusi mergaitė pareiškė: Cezaris, ar ne? Tada aš Kleopatra!* + a call to action → *Tarkim, kad susipažinom* + consent, support of the interlocutor → *Puiku*) + (strategy of increasing the status of the interlocutor → tactics of hyperbolization of (positive) emotional reaction → *Cezaris, ar ne? Tada aš Kleopatra!*) + (self-presentation strategy → self-irony tactics → *Tada aš Kleopatra!* + restraint / modesty → *santūriai linktelėjo vaikinas*) + (a strategy for creating a positive tone of communication → joke tactics → *Cezaris [...] Cezaris, ar ne? Tada aš Kleopatra!* + positive statement → *Puiku. Tarkim, kad susipažinom*).

4. *Gal nori apie tai pakalbėti? Eime pas mus, padarysiu kavos. Paskui galėsi išplauti puodelį. – Ne, ačiū, kavos nenoriu, aš ir be jos gerai miegu! Labanakt!* [11, p. 120]. DPs of invitation + request + gratitude / appreciation + goodbye = MN + MP → (solidarity strategy → tactics of call to action + creation of community (groups, unions)) → *Gal nori apie tai pakalbėti? Eime pas mus, padarysiu kavos* + advice → *Paskui galėsi išplauti puodelį* + assurances + thanks → *Ne, ačiū, kavos nenoriu* + argumentation → *aš ir be jos gerai miegu!* + (sincerity strategy → recognition / certification tactics → *Ne, ačiū, kavos nenoriu, aš ir be jos gerai miegu!* + declarations of intention → *Eime pas mus, padarysiu kavos. Paskui galėsi išplauti puodelį; Labanakt!*) + (self-presentation strategy → self-irony tactics → *aš ir be jos gerai miegu!*) + (a strategy for creating a positive tone of communication → tactics of joke → *aš ir be jos gerai miegu!* + wish / desire → *Labanakt!*). In the example of cooperative interaction the DP *aš ir be jos gerai miegu! – I sleep well and without coffee!* is characterized by both political tactics and several strategies.

5. *Jaunuoliai susižvalgė, abu pasijuto šiek tiek nejaukiai. – Susipažink, Mykolai, čia Kotryna! – pristatė Cezaris. – Kotryna... Gražus vardas, šventas. Ir panelytė graži* [11, p. 197]. DPs of acquaintance + praise / compliment = MN + MF → (solidarity strategy → community tactics (groups, unions)) → *Susipažink, Mykolai, čia Kotryna!* – *pristatė Cezaris* + assurance → *Kotryna... Gražus vardas, šventas. Ir panelytė graži*) + (self-presentation strategy → tactics of reducing one's status → *Jaunuoliai susižvalgė, abu pasijuto šiek tiek nejaukiai* + restraint / modesty → *Jaunuoliai susižvalgė, abu pasijuto šiek tiek nejaukiai*) + (sincerity strategy → recognition / cer-

tification tactics → *Kotryna... Gražus vardas, šventas. Ir panelytė graži*) + (interlocutor strategy → suggestion / topic development tactics for the interlocutor + compliment → *Kotryna... Gražus vardas, šventas. Ir panelytė graži*) + (strategy of creating a positive tone of communication → tactics of positive statement → *Kotryna... Gražus vardas, šventas. Ir panelytė graži*).

According to the developed method of establishing a strategic and tactical repertoire, we will demonstrate the implementation of cooperative macrostrategy on the examples of NCCB characters from the discourse of the American fiction.

1. *My phone ring, making me jump. Before I can even say hello, I hear Minny. She working late tonight. – Miss Hilly sending Miss Walters to the old lady home. I got to find myself a new job. And you know when she going? Next week. – Oh no, Minny. – I been looking, call ten ladies today. Not even a speck a interest. – I am sorry to say I ain't surprised. – I ask Miss Leefolt first thing tomorrow do she know anybody need help* [29, p. 12]. DPs of apology + sympathy / compassion / empathy / consolation = **MP + MT** → (solidarity strategy → tactics of demonstrating a willingness to cooperate → *I ask Miss Leefolt first thing tomorrow do she know anybody need help* + request for consolation, support from the interlocutor → *Miss Hilly sending Miss Walters to the old lady home. I got to find myself a new job. And you know when she going? Next week. I been looking, call ten ladies today. Not even a speck a interest* + emotional support → *I am sorry to say I ain't surprised. I ask Miss Leefolt first thing tomorrow do she know anybody need help*) + (sincerity strategy → a tactic for demonstrating a (positive) emotional state → *Oh no, Minny* + intent declarations + promises → *I ask Miss Leefolt first thing tomorrow do she know anybody need help*) + (interlocutor status improvement strategy → tactic of demonstrating interest by the interlocutor → *Before I can even say hello, I hear Minny. ...Miss Hilly sending Miss Walters to the old lady home. I got to find myself a new job. And you know when she going? Next week*).

2. *Like she a record player going too slow. – I'm sorry. I wish I could a called you earlier so you could pick up that phone. – You done what you can. Nothing nobody can do for me now. – I be praying for you. – Thank you, – she say, and then her voice break down. – And I thank you for trying to help me* [29, p. 17]. DPs of apology + gratitude / appreciation + sympathy / compassion / empathy / consolation = **MP + MT** → (solidarity strategy → tactics of demonstrating willingness to cooperate emotional

support) → *I'm sorry. I wish I could a called you earlier so you could pick up that phone... I be praying for you + choosing a common communication code* → *You done what you can. Nothing nobody can do for me now*) + (sincerity strategy → intentionality tactics + recognition / acknowledgment → *I'm sorry. I wish I could a called you earlier so you could pick up that phone... I be praying for you + gratitude + demonstration of a (positive) emotional state* → *Thank you, – she say, and then her voice break down*) + (interlocutor strategy → gratitude tactics → *And I thank you for trying to help me*). In the above discursive situation, within the modes of politeness and tolerance, the tactic of gratitude, which, however, is used by different interactants, implements different strategies of the NCCB.

3. *He hardly ever listened to you when you said something. – I flunked you in history because you knew absolutely nothing. – I know that, sir. Boy, I know it. You couldn't help it. – Absolutely nothing, – he said over again* [25, p. 3]. DP of consent = **MP** + **MT** → (solidarity strategy → consent tactics, interlocutor support + argumentation → *I know that, sir. Boy, I know it. You couldn't help it + assurance* → *Absolutely nothing, – he said over again*) + (sincerity strategy → recognition / certification tactics → *I flunked you in history because you knew absolutely nothing. – I know that, sir. Boy, I know it [...]* Absolutely nothing) + (self-presentation strategy → tactics of reducing one's status → *Boy, I know it. You couldn't help it*).

4. *Holden! – Mrs. Spencer said. – How lovely to see you! Come in, dear! Are you frozen to death? – I think she was glad to see me. She liked me. At least, I think she did* [25, p. 3] DPs of greeting + acquaintance = **MP** + **MF** + **MT** → (solidarity strategy → тактики creating a community (groups, associations) + expression (attention, interest, sympathy, concern) to the interlocutor → *How lovely to see you! Come in, dear [...]* Are you frozen to death? + intimacy, rapprochement with the interlocutor → *Come in, dear!* + (sincerity strategy → tactics of demonstrating a (positive) emotional state → *How lovely to see you!* + a call for frankness → *Are you frozen to death?* + hope → *I think she was glad to see me*) + (strategy of increasing the status of the interlocutor → tactics demonstrating a willingness to cooperate + suggestions / development of interlocutor topic → *Are you frozen to death? – I think she was glad to see me. She liked me. At least, I think she did*) + (a strategy for creating a positive communication tone → tactic of a positive statement → *She liked me. At least, I think she did*).

5. *Bit by bit, I told him the day's misfortunes. And she said you taught me all wrong, so we can't ever read any more, ever. Please don't send me back, please sir. – Atticus stood up and walked to the end of the porch* [21, p. 30]. DP of request = **MN + MT** → (solidarity strategy → tactics of counteracting community + argumentation) → *and she said you taught me all wrong, so we can't ever read any more, ever*) + (strategy of increasing the status of the interlocutor → tactics of requesting consolation, support from the interlocutor + showing respect (attention, interest, sympathy, concern) to the interlocutor → *Please don't send me back, please sir*).

Thus, the discursive space of Ukrainian, Russian, Lithuanian and American of cooperative communicative behaviour is characterized by a variational and complex mode-organization (politeness + neutrality, neutrality + familiarity, neutrality + politeness + tolerance, etc.), which is achieved through the combination of a repertoire that is realized through discursive practices (tactics) and acts / situations (strategies).

4. Conclusions

The representatives of the Ukrainian, Russian, Lithuanian and American communication cultures, who are able to find optimal and effective ways for successful interaction and constructive cooperation, to be interested in solving issues of importance for all participants of communication, and to produce an incentive for further communication, are characteristic and individual, the complex functioning of DP of *greeting, acquaintance, invitation, request, consent, praise / compliment, gratitude / appreciation, apology, sympathy / compassion / empathy / consolation, wish / desire, goodbye*. Success in implementing cooperative macrostrategy in their cooperative communicative behaviour depends on the successful selection and combination of cognitively semiotic modes of politeness, neutrality, tolerance and familiarity, which, in turn, are determined by a specific set of communicative strategies. Thus, five types of communication strategies relevant to the implementation of the NCCB were identified: solidarity; self-presentation; improving the status of the interlocutor; sincerity; the creation of a positive tone of communication, the successful implementation of which through a diverse tactical repertoire (to be defined further) provides a mode-configuration (politeness, neutrality, tolerance and familiarity) of the NCCB of Ukrainians, Russians, Lithuanians and Americans.

The established strategic and tactical repertoire, which is an instrument of the modes of politeness, neutrality, tolerance and familiarity in the NCCB of Ukrainians, Russians, Lithuanians and Americans, is not exhaustive and definitive, because there is a certain cognitive, semantic, and feminine variability of combinations of pragmatic components in the communicative consciousness of speakers. The potential of an incentive for further interaction of the interlocutors, which is one of the main components of the implementation of the cognitive and communicative category of cooperativity, is not always truly positive, like in the intentions of the interactants, which also affects the pragmatic registers, in particular the strategic tactical, the NCCB of linguaculture. In our further research it will require more detailed study and analysis of its (non)verbal representatives and identification of linguacultural specificity.

References:

1. Asher N., Lascarides A. (2013). Strategic Conversation. *Semantics & Pragmatics*. MIT, vol. 6, Art. 2. Cambridge, pp. 1–62.
2. Astafyev V.P. (1984). Rasskazy [The Stories]. Moskva: Sov. Rossiya. 1984. (in Russian)
3. Austin J.P.M. (1987). The Dark Side of Politeness: A Pragmatic Analysis of Non-Cooperative Communication (PhD Thesis), University of Canterbury.
4. Bacevych F.S. (2003). Narysy z komunikatyvnoji linghivistyky [Essays on Communicative Linguistics]. Lviv: Vyd. centr Ljvivsjkogho nacionaljnogho universytetu. (in Ukrainian)
5. Belozerova A.V. (2016). Yazykovaya reprezentatsiya kommunikativnogo povedeniya initsiatora konflikta v angloyazychnom khudozhestvennom tekste (gendernyy aspekt) [Language Representation of the Communicative Behavior of the Initiator of the Conflict in the English Fiction (Gender Aspect)] (PhD Thesis). Nizhniy Novgorod: Nizhegorodskiy gosudarstvennyy lingvisticheskiy universitet imeni N.A. Dobrolyubova. (in Russian)
6. Dridze T.M. (1996). Sotsialnaya kommunikatsiya kak tekstovaya deyatelnost v semiosotsiopsikhologii [Social communication as a textual activity in semi-sociopsychology]. *Obshchestvennyye nauki i sovremennost*. № 3, pp. 145–152. (in Russian)
7. Ežerinytė I. (2017). Verksnių klubas. Vilnius: Dominicuas Lituanus.
8. Formanovskaya N.I. (1982). Russkiy rechevoy etiket: lingvisticheskiy i metodicheskiy aspekty [Russian Speech Etiquette: Linguistic and Methodological Aspects]. Moskva: Russkiy yazyk. (in Russian)
9. Foster D. (2004). Europos šalių etiketas. Vilnius: Algarvė”.
10. Glushak V.M. (2009). Lingvopragmaticheskiy aspekt rechevogo povedeniya kommunikantov v situatsiyakh povsednevnogo obshcheniya (na materiale nemetskogo

yazyka) [Linguopragmatic Aspect of Speech Behavior of Communicants in Everyday Communication Situations (in German Language)] (Doctor of Science Thesis). Moskva: Moskovskiy gosudarstvennyy lingvisticheskiy universitet. (in Russian)

11. Gudonytė K. (2017). *Drugeliai virš bedugnės*. Vilnius: Tyto alba.

12. Issers O.S. (2002). *Kommunikativnyye strategii i taktiki russkoy rechi* [Communicative Strategies and Tactics of Russian Speech]. Moskva: Editorial URSS. (in Russian)

13. *Kommunikativnoye povedeniye* [Communicative Behavior] [Ed. I.A. Sternin] (2007). Voronezh: Izd-vo "Istoki", vyp. 27. Russkoye. litovskoye. estonskoye i latyshskoye kommunikativnoye povedeniye. (in Russian)

14. Kononenko Je. (2002). *Zrada. ZRADA made in Ukraine* [Treason. MADE made in Ukraine]. Lviv: Kaljvarija. (in Ukrainian)

15. Korolyov I.R. (2016). *Semiotychni modusy vvichlyvosti, tolerantnosti ta familijarnosti nacionaljnoji kooperatyvnoji komunikatyvnoji povedinky* [Semiotic Modes of Politeness, Tolerance and Familiarity of National Cooperative Communicative Behavior]. *Problemy semantyky slova, rechennja ta tekstu*. Kyiv: Loghos, vyp. 37, pp. 62–73. (in Ukrainian)

16. Korolyov I. (2018a). *Fremymovo-stsenarnaya semioticheskaya model nacionalnogo kooperativnogo kommunikativnogo povedeniya ukrainsev. russkikh. litovtsev i amerikantsev* [Frame-Scenario Semiotic Model of National Cooperative Communicative Behavior of Ukrainians, Russians, Lithuanians and Americans]. *Res Humanitariae*, vol. 23, pp. 218–234. (in Russian)

17. Korolyov I.R. (2018b). *Nacionaljna kooperatyvna komunikatyvna povedinka: vid koghnitsiji do dyskursu* [National Cooperative Communicative Behavior: from Cognition to Discourse]. Kyiv: VPC "Kyjivsjkyj universytet". (in Ukrainian)

18. Korolyov I. (2019). *Cognitive and communicative category of cooperativity: ontological and gnoseological status*. *Logos*, № 98, pp. 83–93.

19. Koshkarova N.N. (2015). *Konfliktnyy i kooperativnyy tipy russkoyazychnogo diskursa v mezhkulturnom politicheskom prostranstve* [Conflict and Cooperative Types of Russian Discourse in the Intercultural Political Space] (Doctor of Science Thesis). Ekaterinburg: Uralskiy gosudarstvennyy pedagogicheskij universitet. (in Russian)

20. Larina T.V. (2009). *Kategoriya vezhlivosti i stil kommunikatsii. Sopostavljeniye anglijskikh i russkikh lingvokulturnykh traditsiy* [Category of Politeness and Style of Communication. Comparison of English and Russian Linguistic and Cultural Traditions]. Moskva: Rukopisnyye pamyatniki Drevney Rusi. (in Russian)

21. Lee H. (1960). *To kill a mockingbird*. New York: Harper Collins Publishers.

22. Likhacheva A.B. (2017). *Russkaya kommunikativnaya kultura i eye verbalnyye proyavleniya: v sopostavlennii s litovskoy i drugimi kommunikativnymi kulturami* [Russian Communicative Culture and Its Verbal Manifestations: in Comparison with Lithuanian and Other Communicative Cultures]. Vilnius: Vilniaus Universiteto Leidykla. (in Russian)

23. Medvedeva A.V. (2015). *Kommunikativnyye strategii i taktiki pri vyrazhenii kriticheskogo suzhdeniya v anglijskoy lingvokulture (na materiale sovremen-*

Chapter «Philological sciences»

nogo angliyskogo yazyka) [Communicative Strategies and Tactics in Expressing Critical Judgment in English Linguaculture (Based on Modern English)] (PhD Thesis). Ufa: Bashkirskiy gosudarstvennyy universitet. (in Russian)

24. Pauzha Y. (2007). Osobennosti russkogo i litovskogo kommunikativnogo povedeniya v situatsiyakh proyavleniya rechevogo etiketa [Features of Russian and Lithuanian Communicative Behavior in Situations of Speech Etiquette]. *Kommunikativnoye povedeniye*. Voronezh: Izd-vo "Istoki" vyp. 27. Russkoye. litovskoye. estonskoye i latyshskoye kommunikativnoye povedeniye, pp. 16–31. (in Russian)

25. Salinger J.D. (1951). *The catcher in the rye*. Boston: Little brown and company.

26. Shukshin V.M. (1992). *Sobraniye sochineniy v shesti tomakh*. Tom 2. [Collection of Works in Six Volumes. Volume 2]. Moskva: Molodaya gvardiya. (in Russian)

27. Sokoljuk O. (2016). *Eni [Eni]: roman*. Kyiv: Vyd. ghrupa KM-BUKS. (in Ukrainian)

28. Stepnova O.Yu. (2007). *Brachnyy kontrakt s madonnoy [Marriage Contract with the Madonna]*. Moskva: Eksmo. (in Russian)

29. Stockett K. (2009). *The help*. New York: Penguin Group.

30. Vilmont E.N. (2000). *Polosa vezeniya. ili Vse muzhiki kozly [Lucky Strip, or All Men are Goats]*. Moskva: AST: Olimp: Astrel. (in Russian)

31. Zabuzhko O. (2013). *Muzej pokynutykh sekretiv [Museum of Forgotten Secrets]*. Kyiv: KOMORA. (in Ukrainian)

32. Zhadan S. (2014). *Depesh Mod [Depeshe Mode]*. Kharkiv: Folio. (Ghrafiti). (in Ukrainian)