

Ten ‘Whys’ About Intercultural Communication

Nikolay V. Baryshnikov^(✉)  and Armen V. Vartanov 

Pyatigorsk State University, Pyatigorsk 357500, Russian Federation
Baryshnikov@pgu.ru

Abstract. The author of the article poses ten questions vital for understanding the phenomenon of Intercultural communication. These reveal the most crucial aspects of the concept and the myths around it that are quite firmly established in the popular consciousness. The author believes that it is a matter of the utmost urgency for the world cross-cultural research community to demythologize of the term “Dialogue of Cultures” and to work on scientifically based principles of the parity cross-cultural communication.

Keywords: Intercultural communication · Dialogue of cultures

1 Introduction

The term ‘Intercultural communication’ experiences a real renaissance today. It was firstly introduced by E. Hole more than 60 years ago in the sphere of highly specialized problems connected with the adaptation of American diplomats to conditions of exotic cultures. Today the term has acquired quite a wide spectrum of knowledge and contexts of research. The phenomenon ‘Intercultural communication’ is the subject of investigation of various scientific spheres including philosophy, sociology, culture studies, ethnology, pedagogy, language, and culture didactics.

It is well known today that the process of mastering a foreign language is often groundlessly treated as an act of Intercultural interaction or as linguistic preparation to real Intercultural dialogue, what seems to us to be more accurate. We will see ten difficult questions below, and the author’s answers to them as a proposal to continue the scientific debate about the multidimensional and contradictory phenomenon ‘Intercultural communication’.

2 Literature Review

The response of the higher education to the active development of international networks was the start of specialists training in the field of intercultural communication at the educational institutions. In the period when this field of study was emerging, the scientists used the literature which mainly reflected the point of view of American anthropologists who were at the origin of the development of intercultural communication as a discipline. Since the middle of the last century, the world situation has

undergone significant changes, which entailed the transformation of the very nature of intercultural interaction. Today, the theoretical and methodological bases for writing the article were the studies on the formation of intercultural communication by N.I. Almazova, N.V. Baryshnikov, O.R. Bondarko, G.V. Elizarova, O.G. Oberemko, O.G. Polyakov, V.V. Saphonova, P.V. Sysoev, S.G. Ter-Minasova, V.P. Phurmanova, M. Byram, C. Kramersch, A. Nickols, S.J. Savignon, D. Stevens, etc.

3 Professional Intercultural Communication Implementation

3.1 Why is Verbal and Non-verbal Interaction Between the Representatives of Various Cultures Termed ‘Intercultural Communication’? After All, Cultures Cannot Meet Each Other

Answer: As we suppose, there is a rather complete answer in the question itself. In fact, communication takes place between individuals, not between cultures. These are individual representatives of various cultures, who have their special level of communicative abilities and psycho-linguistic characteristics. Thus, it proves that the term ‘intercultural communication’ is not very accurate, there is some metaphorical effect in it.

Undoubtedly this term should not permit any shades of meaning, it must be neutral and monosemantic. However, historically the term ‘interlingual communication’ has not been clearly determined by the scientific terminology.

We can presume with certainty that the term ‘Intercultural communication’ originates from the comprehensive and universal term ‘culture’. According to some authors, the term ‘culture’ has more than 600 definitions. This is the evidence of the fact that the term ‘culture’, when used in hundreds of contexts, loses its semantics. It is sensible to agree with the fact that one of the greatest minds once said that ‘terms shouldn’t be argued, they should be agreed upon’. Moreover, there are some very good definitions of ‘Intercultural communication’ in scientific literature. We think that the best one belongs to the professor Khaleeva. ‘Intercultural communication is the combination of special interactions between humans who belong to different cultures and speak different languages. At the same time the participants of the interaction realize that they belong to different cultures, and each of them accepts the foreignness of the other’ [8, p. 11].

It’s clear from the definition given above that the author associates the term ‘Intercultural communication’ with the differences in languages and cultures between partners.

Proceeding the research in this field, we paid attention to the fact that specific processes of interaction between people who belong to different cultures are realized by means of common language for both partners. At the same time for one of the partners this language is, as a rule, a mother tongue, for the other - learnt, i.e. a foreign one. Thereby, the communication takes place in a language, but de facto there are two cultures in it. Therefore, we can surely state that in the process of communication partners’ position themselves as the representatives of their own cultures. Consequently, it becomes possible to define the interaction between different cultures as ‘Intercultural communication’. Consequently, taking all the metaphorical sense of this term into account, it seems not so rational to change one inaccurate term into another.

It's very important to understand the specific character of Intercultural communication, which is often ignored by many Russian and foreign authors. It is about the unequal character of Intercultural communication in cases when one of the participants speaks one native language and vice versa. We do not need to prove the fact that even the professional knowledge of a foreign language (according to the European scale - Level 6) cannot be compared with the knowledge of native speakers. There are many ways to recognize a foreigner who speaks not his/her native language.

Evidently that is why Khaleeva in her definition of Intercultural communication emphasizes the fact that the participants of the interaction realize that they belong to different cultures and each of them accepts the foreignness of the other [8, p. 11].

No doubt there are variants of Intercultural interactions including those in which status-inequality is excluded.

Let's take the Intercultural communication between the representatives of American and Australian cultures as examples. We want to point out that in spite of all the differences between American and Australian variants of English, representatives of these cultures as a rule do not have any difficulties with verbal and non-verbal communication. A similar example is the interaction between the representatives of French and, for instance, Moroccan, Senegalese, Congolese cultures, as far as they speak French as second native language.

Intercultural communication deeply changes its character when it is realized by the representatives of incomparable cultures. The brightest example of such a case is the Intercultural interaction between the residents of West-European countries and the USA with the representatives of Russian cultures (in integrated understanding). Communication is realized in the languages of Russian partners (English, French, Spanish and German), these languages are native for them but not for their Russian counterparts.

Russian system of higher education in its linguistic field is unique. It provides highly qualified linguistic training. Russian students-linguists become proficient in foreign languages. It is a well-known fact. However still we must admit that even the proficiency level of a foreign language is not always sufficient for equal Intercultural communication as far as it presupposes deep knowledge of communicative culture, customs, traditions, and habits of the partner.

Hence, cross-cultural communication in its modern interpretation is not a simple communication between partners who belong to different cultures and speak different languages. It is interaction between partners of the same status where for one of those the communication language is native and for the other it is a foreign one. Therefore, this process is characterized by some specific processes:

- maintenance of parity in Intercultural dialogue on conditions that partners' knowledge of a language is on different levels;
- opposition of interests between partners, which they defend in the process of Intercultural dialogue;
- productivity of Intercultural interaction is provided by the relations between partners on the interpersonal level, but also by the relation between countries which they represent;
- use or misuse of manipulations, deceptions, crooked techniques, and other communicative tricks.

3.2 Why Does Intercultural Communication Acquire Tougher, More Aggressive Character?

Answer: There are a lot of reasons of communicative practices rules tightening, however, the most important of them is the desire of Intercultural communication partners to gain advantages by hook or by crook. A special language of communication, the negotiations, business advice, and other forms of Intercultural interaction are carried out, favors communicative practice tightening.

In the connection to the fact that financial and economic interests are the subject of business communication, each of the participants of business communication strives for making a treaty, contract, agreement by means of communication. Business interests have stipulated the elaboration of manipulations, tricks and deceptions which are widely used in communicative practice.

Bredmayer has worked on the communicative techniques for German-speaking Europe, which acquired the name ‘Black Rhetoric’ and it is defined by the author as the manipulation by means of all the necessary rhetorical, dialectal, eristic, and rabulistic methods in order to turn the conversation into the necessary course and drive the opponent or the audience to the desired result. [4, p. 12] The author points out directly that those who use Black Rhetoric, breaking the rules of conducting the conversation is a winner.

Black Rhetoric techniques have acquired the wide expansion in Intercultural communication and became one of the most significant tools for waging the information war. Therefore, the usage of manipulations, tricks and deceptions makes the Intercultural communication tough and uncompromising.

In its turn strategies and methods of manipulative techniques’ neutralization are being worked out. Still it remains impossible to break a vicious circle: Intercultural communication often represents a communicative duel with the use of communicative attacks and self-defense. Therefore, communicative contacts become inefficient according to its content and aggressive according to its impact on the Intercultural communication partner. We consider further development of ‘poisonous communication’ as hopeless because it is well-known that a powerful ‘communicative antidote’ will be opposed to them.

We believe that an optimal variant of Intercultural communication is an open, symmetrical communication realized by eristic strategies, based on humanistic values, such as kindness and beauty. Following academician Likhachev we affirm that ‘kindness and beauty are common for all the peoples. They are common in two senses: truth and beauty are eternal helpmates, they are united with each other and equal for all nations. Lie is evil for everybody. Sincerity and honesty, integrity and unselfishness are always virtue [7, p. 10]. Apparently, Likhachev was an idealist and firmly believed in the mankind. However, the civilization developed according to another scenario, consequently Intercultural communication has acquired even more non-symmetrical and tougher character. We should not ingenuously suppose that Intercultural communication is an unsophisticated, smooth and nice interaction between partners, whose aim is to give each other compliments and make concessions.

Alongside we believe that there still exist unused reserves of changing the nature of Intercultural communication.

We mean the unity of all subjects of Intercultural communication under the slogan/appeal 'Intercultural communication is not luxury, but a means of peaceful co-existence of various languages and cultures', and also supervision of our Intercultural partners and our Code of Honor of the participants of Intercultural communication, which is not perfect of course, but can become a uniting basis for the followers of Intercultural communication of the same status.

3.3 Why is Tolerance in Intercultural Communication Realized in Most Cases on the Declarative Level?

Answer: It is a well-known fact that Intercultural communication is based on a number of principles one of which is the principle of tolerance, as the first between the equals. The term 'tolerance', being widely used in scientific literature, is defined as an ability of an individual to perceive without any objections and oppositions the way of life, behavior and peculiarities of other people which differ from his/her own [3]. Such understanding of tolerance is the main hindrance of Intercultural tolerance principle as for every Intercultural partner it is very difficult, practically impossible accept without any objections the opinion of the partner as their points of view often do not coincide and sometimes are absolutely different in its content.

To give the complete and definite answer to this question it is important to get into the deep meaning of tolerant attitude to the position of Intercultural partner. The superficial view of the situation is not enough for understanding the psychological nature of tolerant attitude towards the partner's position. Here the deep analysis of the perception, adoption or aversion of the foreign partner's position is necessary. According to the original statement of Bowt, tolerance is the readiness to equalize your own and others' position on the value-scale. When the positions are equalized, the difference of potentials must be coordinated, and then the search of the neutral decision begins which will satisfy everyone [2]. Thus, at this very point the most important obstacle of tolerant attitude is hidden, as it is quite a complicated matter to find a neutral decision which would satisfy all the partners with their opposite interests. So, the principle of tolerant attitude cannot be realized as it is not so easy to reach the neutral decision. From our point of view tolerance is a cornerstone of Intercultural communication. However, to make tolerance provide a peacekeeping mission, it's necessary to follow two rules of the tolerance principle:

- (1) to act tolerantly does not mean you have to accept the position of partner, without any objection, on the contrary, you can and should argue, but in a tolerant form, without fits of anger and annoyance;
- (2) the principle of tolerance must be implemented by both sides of Intercultural interaction.

One-sided tolerance leads to the Intercultural dialogue, which doesn't share the same status of the participants.

We believe that 'declarative character' of Intercultural communication is the evidence of the respect between partners, their readiness to reach the consensus in spite of obvious obstacles. We need to be tolerant to listen to an unacceptable position and react to it properly.

The antipode of tolerance is intolerance which means aversion to alien values and positioning your own point of view as an only right one which excels other ones [5].

Thus the realization of tolerance principle is rather difficult due to the considerable difference in values between the representatives of different cultures.

Decades are necessary for the Intercultural partners to be ready to express the readiness to equalize on the hypothetical scale your and other people's position which are, as it was said above, incompatible.

Intolerance in Intercultural communication is a dead-end of Intercultural interaction if it is based on condescending attitude of one partner to another, the violation of equality in the status of Intercultural dialogue, suppression of the culture of one participant by the culture of the other one and as a result Intercultural communication acquires the destructive features.

It is highly probable that tolerance in Intercultural communication will be declared until Intercultural partners learn to adapt an alien position to their own cultural tradition. It would be extremely irresponsible to believe that it will be easy to bring this thing into life.

3.4 Why Should Intercultural Dialogue Be Necessarily Carried Out in One Language?

Answer: Actually, such a requirement is not prescribed by any official document. Most probably a monolingual Intercultural dialogue is a tribute to traditions. Answering this question we should take into account a series of circumstances, which in our opinion have a significant meaning.

First of all, initially the Intercultural dialogue was carried out by 'a tolmach', this was the name for an interpreter in Russia. In the course of development of international contacts, Intercultural interaction became predominantly monolingual. It is still being studied in different kinds of educational institutions: kindergartens, elementary schools, secondary schools, universities, including specialized linguistic universities. Moreover, there is a broad network of linguistic courses, state and private linguistic schools.

As a result of a purposeful linguistic policy, Russian participants of Intercultural communication achieved status of bilingual or polylingual individuals. Therefore, the tradition of implementation of Intercultural communication in native language of a foreign partner has improved, as well as in English as a language of global communication.

At present, it has changed a lot. It is quite proper to suppose that the traditions have been established for years may change. We believe there must be no clampdown on carrying out Intercultural communication solely in one language. Intercultural communication can be quite bilingual. In case of a sudden misunderstanding between the participants of Intercultural communication, they may well turn to another language for communication, including the native language of the other participant or an Interlingua that both participants of the Intercultural dialogue share.

Undoubtedly everything depends on a certain situation emerging in course of Intercultural dialogue. However, in Intercultural communication of the same status it is conceded to turn to other languages, if that improves mutual understanding between the participants of the Intercultural dialogue.

We think that the fundamentally important factor is mutual striving of the participants of Intercultural communication for mutual understanding and for reaching a consensus on questions being discussed without infringement of interests of any of them. This psychological set is a guarantor of efficiency of Intercultural duel, where there is a place neither for a winner, nor a loser.

Studying Intercultural interaction problems on professional level, we formulated some principles of Intercultural interaction, which include the principle of choosing the language for a professional Intercultural communication, where its implementation improves impartial status-equality of Intercultural communication, provides a friendly and democratic style of communication [1, p. 118].

3.5 Why are Cultural Differences of Participants Considered to Be the Main Difficulty of Intercultural Communication?

Answer: We believe that this statement is false. The matter is that cultural differences are not the difficulties, but the basis of Intercultural communication. To substantiate this thesis there is no necessity to carry out research experiments, as long as it is obvious, that if there were no differences between cultures that the participants belong to, their communication could not be classified as Intercultural. Thus, the main difficulty of Intercultural communication is the so-called barriers, including psychological and language barriers.

Experts studying problems of Intercultural communication often claim that linguistic lapses of the participant, for whom the language of communication is not native, are easily forgiven. As for socio-cultural lapses, they are painfully perceived and are hardly forgiven. So, what can we say? On the one hand, everything is correct, but on the other hand it's impossible to agree with it. Actually, it is not about the nature of lapses (linguistic or socio-cultural ones). It is solely about the nature of relations between the partners of Intercultural communication. If there is a mutual desire to understand each other, we have every reason to believe that any lapse will be not only forgiven, but even taken no notice of. And vice versa, if there is no intention to reach a mutually acceptable decision, then even skillful language proficiency of a foreign partner will not work out.

In fact, it is a question of tolerant relations between the partners that we discussed answering one of the previous questions.

3.6 Why Cultural Universals Don't Significantly Influence the Success of Intercultural Communication?

Answer: To give a precise answer to the given question, it is necessary to specify, what 'cultural universals' mean in the context of Intercultural communication.

In scientific literature on linguistics, universals (from Latin *Universalis* - common) – are phenomena that occur in many languages.

Linguistic universals are the basis of multilingual didactics, as they promote forming of transposition, i.e. positive transfer of phonetic, lexical, and grammatical skills from one language into another.

In Intercultural communication universals are interpreted as phenomena, peculiar to cultures which are in contact and compared.

Therefore, cultural universals take place practically in any culture, which is proved by the existence of objective cultural facts in all cultures. Cultural universals are such phenomena as love for mother, paternal house, loss of the dearest and nearest, friendship, love and many others. One can give a lot of examples.

We think that cultural universals don't significantly influence the success of Intercultural communication, because they are not perceived by representatives of different cultures as such, as long as they are ethnically tinged in minds of both of them; and cultural facts of the foreign interlocutor of Intercultural communication are interpreted through the prism of native culture. In this transformed perception of cultural universals one can observe the primary reason for insignificant influence on the success of Intercultural communication. As in case with linguistic interference, the notion 'cultural interference' was introduced as well.

Therefore, it is cultural interference which is the major hindrance to mutual understanding in communication of representatives of different languages and cultures.

3.7 Why is the Question 'Why' Inappropriate for Intercultural Communication?

Answer: We are strongly confirmed, that question 'why' is inappropriate in the process of Intercultural interaction, because the answer does not clear anything up. Such a question is rhetorical deep down, if it concerns not the subject of discussion, but the culture peculiarities of the partner of Intercultural communication. This stipulation is significant. The question 'why' touching upon the cultural principles of one of the partners of Intercultural communication, is an oral display of intolerant attitude to the culture of the other partner. Indeed, what answer can one give to the questions asked by a foreign partner of Intercultural communication, addressing his Russian interlocutor, for example:

Why do children stand up in Russian schools when the teacher enters the classroom?

Why do people address each other using first and patronymic names?

Why do people eat so much bread in Russia?

Why do Russians smile so little?

The given examples of questions and hundreds of similar ones have a conflict nature, as long as they provoke excessive emotionality of the participants of the Intercultural dialogue. Besides, they often come out as an irritating factor.

Answers about something being accepted in Russian culture does not impress some of the foreign interlocutors, because there is no readiness to perceive 'without objections' other cultural facts, differing from standards, rules, and customs accepted in their culture.

Question 'why' in Intercultural communication may indicate an unfriendly attitude towards the partner, and as a rule the Intercultural dialogue comes to a gridlock. However, it does not mean that one should not ask 'why' while discussing business matters on a Intercultural level. This question is quite appropriate, when it is necessary to specify the partner's position and the argumentative basis concerning statements discussed earlier.

It is arguable that Intercultural communication like all other kinds of speech interaction has an interpersonal character, as long as it is carried out by certain individuals, despite their belonging to different languages and cultures. Thereupon, it makes sense to suppose that in Intercultural communication restrictions are made or not made by the participants of this communication themselves. Much, if not everything, depends on the internal censorship of the partners of Intercultural communication. Thus, special focus is given to a human factor, which we consider to be fundamental, because it lies at the basis of partner's self-non-self-discrimination. Partners of Intercultural communication mark their belonging to different cultures and depending on the goals of the dialogue they look for points of contact to reach mutually acceptable results of Intercultural interaction or vice versa, they demonstrate differences in positions, impossible achievement of a positive result. It is obvious that a fragile communicative balance it extremely difficult to maintain with inappropriate 'why' questions.

3.8 Why Does the Opinion About the Necessity of Isolating from One's Own Culture to Succeed in Intercultural Communication Become Predominant?

Answer: It is better to say unequivocally and unceremoniously, that even if this opinion gains more and more supporters, we consider it to be false and even harmful, that is why we can't accept it. Let us turn to substantiation of our position. Firstly, everything was very correct and attractive, when such an anthropological, cultural, linguistic and linguodidactic phenomenon was discussed as 'a dialogue of cultures' for the first time. A dialogue of cultures is considered either as an interaction form of representatives of different languages and cultures, or as a concept of teaching foreign languages, as a linguodidactic tendency, teaching technology or as a version of Intercultural communication.

On the whole, the dialogue of cultures was interpreted by the specialists from different countries as a teaching of 'understanding the alien', that is as 'Intercultural', based on interaction of two cultures. This understanding of 'dialogue of cultures' in all its hypostases caused no objections. However, with time some authors began to specify the notion 'dialogue of cultures', which seems as a monologue in a dialogue, which is able not only to strengthen but also to ruin understanding. Thus, the dialogue of cultures became more comparable with suppression of one culture by the other. This understanding of 'dialogue of cultures' principle moved to the field of Intercultural communication. Authors advise that while communicating in a foreign language this understanding goes beyond the limits of one own culture, 'without isolating from it', adopting another culture, copying it and rejecting their own one. This understanding of Intercultural communication causes serious objections. First, adopting another culture eliminates Intercultural interaction, as long as communication gains multicultural character. Second, denial of one's own culture turns a person into a cosmopolitan, badly influences his psyche, and may lead to dual personality. Third, the interlocutor rejecting their own culture becomes a boring participant of Intercultural dialogue. Finally, statement of a question about isolating from native culture of a potential participant of Intercultural communication invariably leads to Intercultural interaction of the same status and open suppression of all the cultures by one of them.

3.9 In Certain Sources It is Underlined that in Intercultural Communication It's Necessary to Imitate Strategies of Speech and Behavior of the Foreign Partner. Why?

Answer: We believe that a partner of Intercultural communication imitating strategies of speech and behavior of a foreign partner makes an impression of a bad clown on the circus arena.

We can also answer this question with a question: for what purpose? It's quite difficult to formulate an answer to the last question. In our opinion, the demands about imitating strategies of speech and behavior of a foreign partner and isolating from one's own culture are closely connected. Their aim is to make Intercultural communication of the same status impossible.

Even having a perfect command of foreign language, the partner for whom the language of communication is not native, can't be compared with the native speaker. This is the first reason to claim that a foreigner studying foreign language is permitted to make some linguistic and socio-cultural mistakes and certainly preserve his or her patterns of speech and behavior, that can't affect the success of Intercultural communication, if there is a bilateral (mutual) striving for reaching a mutually acceptable agreement.

The demands about imitating strategies of speech and behavior of a foreign partner, in our view, are dictated by a negative attitude of some anthropologists to Intercultural communication of the same status.

3.10 Why are the Representatives of Russian Culture Considered to Be Uninteresting Partners of Intercultural Communication?

Answer: Most probably one can assume that our answer will differ much from those given by authors and representatives of other languages and cultures.

Following the principle of objectivity, we would like to notice that evaluation of the partner of Intercultural communication – the representative of any languages and cultures, including the representative of Russian culture depends on several factors:

1. Attitude towards the personality of a certain partner of Intercultural communication;
2. Attitude towards the culture which a certain partner represents;
3. Attitude towards the country, in this case to Russia, which a certain partner represents;
4. Language in which Intercultural communication is carried out;
5. Degree of tolerance between the partners of Intercultural communication;
6. Degree of trust between the partners for reaching adequate mutual understanding;
7. Use or nonuse of communicative tricks and manipulations by partners of cross cultural communication;
8. Degree of readiness of the partners of Intercultural communication to status-equal communication.

Factors mentioned above are enough to make sure of the evaluation ambiguity of the partner of Intercultural communication - the representative of Russian culture.

As we can see, the attitude towards any of the given factors can be either objective or subjective. As a rule, objective attitude is positive whereas subjective is negative.

Subjective negative evaluation forms the opinion about the uninteresting character of the partners of Intercultural communication – the representatives of Russian culture.

It is important to point out that in respect of Intercultural communication the opinion about a Russian partner as an uninteresting one emerges depending on the attitude towards the country which he/she represents. The research has been recently held by the BBC: the representatives of 25 countries were asked which country in the world they treated best? The results turned out to be very interesting and conspicuous: only in 8 countries (32%) people are friendly towards Russia. The worst attitude to Russia is shown in France (63%), in Germany (61%), in Great Britain (57%) and in the USA (59%) [6, p. 5]. Taking such an attitude to Russia and its authorized representatives hardly we may expect the positive or even neutral treatment towards Russian Intercultural partners from their foreign colleagues.

Many universally recognized qualities of the Russian Intercultural partners are well-known all over the world. In particular:

- (a) the benevolent attitude towards foreign partners;
- (b) proficiency in language on a prompt level;
- (c) tolerance to the cultural facts of the represented country;
- (d) high level of trust in the foreign partner;
- (e) high degree of readiness to conduct the communication of the equal status;
- (f) exclusion of communicative tricks, manipulations and deceptions;

Given above unbiased collective image of Russian Intercultural partner is the evidence to the fact that it is misleading to consider the representatives of the Russian culture being uninteresting. Moreover, it has mostly a subjective nature.

It is quite fair to refer this opinion to the Intercultural communication.

One of the urgent aims of the world Intercultural research community is the demythologization of the term “dialogue of cultures” and working out scientifically based principles of the Intercultural communication parity.

4 Conclusion

The article contains a comprehensive analysis of the conditions and principles for the professional intercultural communication implementation. The author considers the conditions for the intercultural communication implementation without “rose-colored glasses”, showing that the socio-cultural background of intercultural dialogue is an information war and propaganda.

The principles of professional intercultural communication in the author’s formulation, the principle of cooperation, the principle of protecting the interests of the homeland, the principle of self-esteem, the principle of striving for mutual understanding, etc., are a vivid evidence of the author’s concept of professional intercultural communication.

The article presents the author's style of communication to the reader, which does not incline him/her to his/her point of view, but offers the reader to become a worthy interlocutor as the material is read.

References

1. Baryshnikov, N.V.: *Osnovy Professionalnoy Medzkulturnoy Kommunikatsiyi* (in Russian) [The Fundamentals of Professional Intercultural Communication]. Infra-M, Moscow (2013)
2. Bowt, G.: *Ne sprashivaite, i ya ne skazhu*. Politicheskaya korrektnost effektivna dadze s nedostatkami (in Russian) [Don't ask and I'll not tell. Political correctness is effective even with drawbacks]. *Izvestia* (2002). <http://web.archive.org/web/20070930171308>, <http://www.hro.org/editions/press/1102/18/18110261.htm>. Accessed 5 June 2017
3. Bondareva, S.K., Kolesov, D.V.: *Tollerantnost (Postanovka Problemy)* (in Russian) [Tolerance. Introduction to the Problem]. Moscow Psychology and Social University Press, Moscow (2003)
4. Bredemayer, K.: *Chernaya Ritorika; Vlast i Magiya Slova* (in Russian) [Black Rhetoric: the Power and Magic of a word], 5th edn. Alpina Business Books, Moscow (2007)
5. Leontovich, O.A.: *Ruskiye i Amerikantsy; Paradoksy Medzkulturnogo Obsheniya* (in Russian) [The Russians and the Americans: Paradoxes of Intercultural Communication]. Gnozis, Moscow (2005)
6. Rur, A.: *Myagkaya sila Rossiya* (in Russian) [soft power of Russia]. *Argumenti Facti* **23**, 27–30 (2013)
7. Likhachev, D.S.: *Pisma o Dobrom i Prekrasnoim* (in Russian) [Letters About kind and Beautiful], 3rd edn. Detskaya Literature Press, Moscow (1989)
8. Khaleeva, I.I.: *O gendornykh podkhodakh k teorii obucheniya yazykam i kelturam* (in Russian) [about gender approaches to the theory of teaching languages and cultures]. *Izv. Russ. Educ. Acad.* **1**, 11–19 (2000)