

MASTER THESIS

Course code:

BO303P - OP2

Candidate name:

Sultanbaeva Iuliia

Title

Philosophy of smile: beyond the border

Date: 15.11.2016

Total number of pages: 119

Acknowledgements

All way of writing this thesis, reflection and understanding of the ideas presented in this thesis is not only the reflection of my subjective understanding of the philosophy of smile but also of others. There would be no my understanding without the help and participation of others.

Taking this opportunity, I would like to express my gratitude to my dear people who have helped and have supported me in writing of this work.

The professor Jan Selmer Methi (UIN) is my thesis supervisor. Jan Methi gave me helpful feedback on my thinking of the whole thesis. He encouraged me and challenged much of my thinking. The professor Andrei Sergeev (MASU) provided me with the insightful and useful challenges to my thinking. The professor Viggo Rossvær (UIN) also encouraged me. The Ass. Professor Andrei Kopylov (MASU) provided me new thoughts about the developing the idea of the philosophy of language. Viggo Rossvær (UIN), our tutor Peter Utnes (UIN), Ass. Professors Inna Ryzhkova (MASU) and Alexandra Burtseva (MASU) and Professor Boris Sokolov (SPbU) gave me useful suggestions and ideas.

Also, I thank all our lecturers who gave us the lectures and seminars within the Joint Degree Master in Borderology. My classmates of the programme in Borderology gave feedback on the ideas of my two essays (Appendix 1, 2). My Mother encouraged me.

Having studied the programme, having exceeded all my borders and having discovered myself as another, I appreciate having this opportunity to acquire new knowledge of myself within this useful and fruitful Master Degree programme in Borderology.

Thank you very much!

Abstract

The master thesis is devoted to the study of the philosophy of smile. The philosophy of smile is a description of the relevant life of a smile in the Border zone. To be more precisely, this is a description of the life of smile as one language. It is possible to find out and describe dynamics of the development of the life of smile as one language, studying the smile as one language. It occurs only in the dialogical environment. A dialogical environment is a place, where language can live and develop. In this work this dialogical environment is as the Border zone, consisted of Russian and Norwegian cultures. I have studied the dynamics of life of smile as one language in this cultural dialogical environment.

In parallel with it, I have changed my attitude and my thinking. These changes consecrate within the context of the thesis in details. I have found out that I began to relate to both smile language, and two cultures differently. Another relation appeared in the case when a smile started to be studied not only as one language but also as a symbol (a mediator). To reach it, I have carried out a reflection on two essays, presented in the first and second year of study within the Master Degree Programme in Borderology. By a reflection on the essays I have a new thinking and understanding of the concepts of one's own, another and a smile as a mediator.

Thus, as a part of the research of master thesis, having begun to study a concept of smile as one language, I have also revealed for myself and have described new concepts in the thesis: the concept of one's own, and the concept of other. In the master thesis, it presented the 'trinity' of the relationship between one's own, one's own object and other. It leads to the new thinking, new description and understanding of the philosophy of smile.

Key terms: philosophy of smile, the concept of smile, language, Norwegian culture and Russian culture, abduction, dialogue, One's own, exceeding oneself, "the Other", other, border, Border zone, Borderology.

Table of contents

Acknowledgements	i
Abstract	ii
Table of contents	iii
Introduction	1
1.0 Chapter 1 Six Borders of reflection on the concept of smile within culture	3
2.0 Chapter 2 Philosophy of culture	16
2.1 The concept of culture	16
2.2 Value-sense content of culture	17
3.0 Chapter 3 Philosophy of smile within culture	20
3.1 Intercultural understanding of the concept of smile	20
3.2 Smile as a concept or as an appearance	25
4.0 Chapter 4 Methodology of study	26
4.1 Three Categories for understanding of the concept of smile known as one language ...	26
4.2 The study of language in the Bakhtin's philosophy of language	28
4.3 The theory of abduction in the study of smile as one language	34
4.4 The correlation between Bakhtin's and Peirce's theory in the study of smile as one language	40
5.0 Chapter 5 Five Borders of reflection on the Data of the experience of research of the concept of smile	44
6.0 Chapter 6 Conclusion	63
7.0 Chapter 7 Glossary	67
References	68
Appendix 1	76
Appendix 2	93

Introduction

Let us imagine the situation. It is a return to one of my memories. I am a baby. The baby, who was born several months ago, is not able to speak yet. My mother and my father are looking at me, are talking with me, but I keep silent and do not speak. Patiently the parents are waiting when I start talking. And at these moments of expectation suddenly the baby give a smile to the parents. And the world for parents is changed. They are full of light and purity, seeing the open smile of their baby.

An open dialogue has occurred, has not it?

My parents can have a feeling that I as a baby understand them. They are happy to the baby's smile and continue to have a universal dialogue with me through the language as the smile. They carry on dialogue on the base of love and understanding.

Now let us imagine the next situation. I have become an adult person. I have my own individual values and senses, have my own attitude and understanding of the universe. I have learnt to have a dialogue with different people with the use of not only language of smile, but also 'language' of speech. In my growing up the influence of the speech is much more than there is the power of smiles in the constructive conversation. I come up in the world and begin to carry on dialogue. What dialogue is it?

My dialogue is not always open and is not always organised by understanding. I face with the initial problems of understanding and misunderstanding in the dialogue. There is the another world than it was when I was a baby and used only the language of smile for carrying on dialogue. However, in this growing, there is my own development. I as an adult person begin to have a dialogue, and the smile does not play the main role in the language of the dialogue. In this case, the smile is only a mediator between me and others. In this actual dialogue, the smile demands to be determined as a concept, to be understandable in itself in the dialogue. However, due to the dialogical environments are different, the understanding will also be different.

For instance, I, having my own ideas about the value-sense content of my culture within a concept of smile, can have another understanding, than others, who also have their own points of view of the value-sense content of their culture within a concept of smile. Thus, there can be a conflict between two different processes of understanding of the concept of

smile in the dialogical environment. At this moment I am staying on the border of one's own (Sergeev 2016, 2015, 2011; Sergeev and Sokolov 2015) and "the Other" (Sergeev 2016, 2015, 2011; Sergeev and Sokolov 2015; Rossvaer 2015) understanding. Now I am in the Border Zone.

This Border Zone is "an Arena for Exceeding Oneself" (Methi 2015, p. 213-223). This "Exceeding oneself" (Methi 2015, p. 218) rely on the crossing of borders within the Border Zone. Then there is a leaving of this borders. As a result to come to an understanding and meeting with One's own (the Inner) in the conversation with others in the dialogue. As we consider, it helps to learn oneself. That is necessary, because if we are "failing to recognise ourselves, we also fail to recognise the Other" (Sergeev 2016, p. 160). In this "act, one coordinates oneself with something highly specific – with what is one's own and with oneself" (Sergeev 2016, p. 86). As a result, it becomes clear that I can come to the whole understanding of a concept of smile and the philosophy of smile by this dialogical conversation within the environment of other people in this Border Zone.

Thus, this presented thinking (description) process, implemented in the Border Zone by me, creates a particular philosophical thought about the concept of smile. As a result having this way of thinking (description) in the Border Zone, I can be exceeding myself and reveal myself as another.

To confirm and to understand the inner essence of all these mentioned statements, let us read the context of presented master thesis.

1.0 Chapter 1 Six Borders of reflection on the concept of smile within culture

“The philosophy of smile: beyond the border” is the title of this research. It would seem how the borders can correlate with a smile in the study of a smile, and how the borders connect with the smile in general. Considering a smile in the cultural content, and not only in the content but also as a “*facial expression of culture*” (Sternin 2000) I have faced with the problem of understanding in the dialogical communication with the help of such symbol as a smile between cultures. This problem was some ‘border’ – difficulty in the dialogical communication where a smile known as a symbol ought to appear in this ‘border’ as a *facial expression* and to disappear as a *concept* in the environment of ‘other’ concepts. Also, it ought to act both to break this ‘border’ or to appear beyond the ‘border’. I assume that the last act of the smile will lead to the understanding of this dialogical environment between the cultures.

A smile, its features have been already studied by researchers (LaFrance 2011; Freitas-Magalhaers and Castro 2009; Tsukiura and Cabeza 2008; Gueguen 2003; Gottman et al. 1998) for many years, there is a significant number of definitions of a smile. And it does not seem coincidental. The researchers (LaFrance 2011; Freitas-Magalhaers and Castro 2009; Tsukiura and Cabeza 2008; Gueguen 2003; Gottman et al. 1998) of the studied historical period tried to present and to understand what a smile is, studying it in different contexts. Some of the researchers (LaFrance 2011; Freitas-Magalhaers and Castro 2009) gives a clear understanding and an idea of a concept of smile, but some of them does not. What is a smile? – Also, this question remains open for me. My studying of a smile started long ago. The first, where the study has been stable expressed, was in the writing subjectivity - an essay “The “inner smile” - a key to freedom from the “internal fight” (Appendix 1). Therefore I will also begin immersion in the philosophy of smile, where the idea of the *concept of smile* has to be a red line within all thesis, starting from the reflexive analysis of the mentioned essay (Appendix 1). Chapter 1 is devoted to this reflexive analysis of the essay (Appendix 1).

A reader can ask: “Why is a smile?”– Why not. The smile is a “*facial expression of culture*” (Sternin 2000). And the smile became for me a big challenge for writing this research. This challenge was a ‘BORDER’ for me which I wanted to cross base on the ‘LOGY’ (gr. -λογία (-logia) 'words about' or ‘study’) (Harper n.d.). It was the challenge for me to immerse in my own experience, to reflect on it and to understand the *philosophical nature* of smile, but not only the image of a smile as a *symbol* of nonverbal communication. It is my research way called “BORDER-O(n)-LOGY”.

The first BORDER – ‘the first meeting with a smile’ – that is the start point of the essay (Appendix 1). There is the beginning of the reflection on the research questions about the culture. I am always interested in the study of culture. I grew up in the multicultural country where each culture has its own features. This desire to explore and understand these features was inside of me from my early age. I think that the reason for this is the inner desire since childhood to make all cultures more friendly to each other, non-conflict. That is why I have formed my educational way coincidentally. It is to find the possible ways of realisation of my own internal motives. My first educational way began in the environment of learning a foreign language, another language. Then it is the creation of the professional way within the pedagogy: teacher of English and teacher of Russian as a foreign language. The choice of these two professions, as it seemed to me earlier, gave me an opportunity to realise my desire to share and tell about the features of the Russian culture to the representatives of other culture. But in this desire, one aspect was excluded. This aspect was that other culture also has features and they can differ from the features of the Russian culture. And these diversities will be able to cause the conflict and misunderstanding between both cultures if the cultures carry on the dialogue in the wrong way. Within this desire now it is understood that I was going to have only a monologue, telling about the Russian culture, but not a dialogue. I think there was a challenge based on this aspect, on this ‘border’ exactly. The challenge was that other culture at the dialogical communication called me to be within the dialogue, to carry on dialogue. And this process was inevitable, because of the studying and understanding of one language of one culture by the other language of another culture and vice versa is possible only in the dialogue (Bakhtin 1975). At that moment I could not understand and accept it and have met the first, as it seemed a problem for me, the first smile of representatives of other culture. More precisely in a research situation in the essay (Appendix 1), I have met the absence of smile on the face of the representatives of other culture which I expected to receive a response to my smile. My doctrine about the idea of smile and culture did not give the chance to see a real situation.

My first meeting with a smile has taken place during training of the Norwegian students at the “Russian Arctic: language culture economy” winter school of Russian language for students from Norway, located in Murmansk. One of the aspects of this training was that I had to acquaint the students not only with The Russian language: its grammar or phonetics and another, but with the most important idea why the students came to Russia, is the study of Russian culture. I thought that it is very simple to do, but intuitively, I felt that it is not so. The difficulties appeared in the first meeting with students. The situation seems

usual: the first day, acquaintance, the first lesson, everything is like according to the plan of a lesson. And just at a stage of acquaintance, it was my first challenge- the appearance of a question: “why did not some Norwegian students smile at all in the case of acquaintance? It seemed to me strange” (Appendix 1, p. 78).

The first situation was my challenge of many different feelings which were destructive as I noticed and further they did not allow me to have a constructive dialogue with other Norwegian culture. Feelings were mixed: both disappointment, and interest, and curiosity. My current analysis in my head haunted me. My meeting with another that is different than my own forced me to think and analyse my behaviour and behaviour of the Norwegians, to compare why I was smiling but they were not in the case of the first acquaintance. There was no idea that this behaviour may be a feature of culture. At that moment my feelings began to provoke other actions which did not lead me to improve the *understanding* between two cultures in a *dialogical situation*. I will describe the actions more detailed: When I with my often smiling face appeared among the students of other culture with almost not smiling faces, my own starts to collaborate with others (students). In this collaboration, at first, it was my desire to make ‘other’ be as my ‘own’. But as a result, this environment of ‘other’ influenced on my own very much and in consequence of that I almost stopped smiling very often and merged with “the Other”. But I found out that border on which it is possible to balance a correlation between my own and “the Other”. The frequency of manifestation of my smile increased much more, calling for the appearance of a smile on the students’ faces. But ‘internal fight’ was remained. In general the meeting with ‘one’s own’ is always painful. The question about how my smile was ‘clear’ for the Norwegians or how my smile was strange for them and maybe my smile also was a challenge of ‘internal fight’ of the Norwegians remains open for me.

But my feelings have not led me to this problem. I think when any person faces with the problem of one’s own, he or she thinks about someone else rarely. The same with me. Whether the Norwegians welcomed my smile or did not interest in it. I was interested in *the question tag ‘why?’* (Appendix 1, p. 78-79).

I did not have an answer to this question, it was only my intuitive guessing and my own reflection, but that was not enough for me, and I referred to the sources, to the articles. In the Jensen’s (cited in Chaiklin et al. 1999) article it is mentioned that everything that is the first, previously new and unknown causes the question ‘why’ in the head if a person does not have the experience to manage this new and unknown.

According to the analysis of Hume's idea, presented in the book "Activity theory and social practice: Cultural-historical approaches" (Chaiklin et al. 1999, p. 82-83) I understood that the lack of experience leads to a constant search for the causes. As a result, this theoretical explanation led me back to a big problem, to the problem of the infinite *question tag* 'why?', to the dissatisfaction of the answer. Now according to my experience, I understand that I can choose and follow one of both ways in this situation. On the one hand, I find out only the reasons, on the other hand, I can understand the situation with the help of my thinking (description) of the idea and use the consciousness to perceive the situation holistically. Next, I lead to move in the way of *causality*.

The next BORDER: Question tag 'Why?' (Appendix 1, p. 78-79).

From my analysis of the ideas of the essay, it is noted that the *question tag* 'Why?' was not worried myself initially. Initially, I followed the idea of the fact of the situation: "the students got tired from the trip to Murmansk very much, and they had even no forces to express any emotions [...]" (Appendix 1, p. 79).

This fact of situational conditionality was the starting point that allowed me to start and continue to analyse the problem. I came to the conclusion that without reflection, analysis and consciousness of any behaviour, which I have met with as a problem behaviour or a problem feeling it is led me to 'internal fight'. Then this led me to the idea that there is no internal growth without analysis and consciousness. On the base of the method of abduction, I have tried to understand the cause of the lack of smile on the face of the Norwegian students in the situation of the acquaintance with them. I asked myself 'why?', and started looking for causes. But that search for the causes did not give a strong base and an answer to *the question* 'why?'. There is no base. And the main is that my reference to the facts of the situations led me to the feeling of inner balance, and the finding the best explanation for such reaction as a result of the first acquaintance with such cultural feature as a rare manifestation of a smile on the face, on the example of Norwegian culture. The following fact, based on the reflection, was the lack of experience of meeting with such situations and cultural feature. Finally, on the base of my intuitive guessing and confirmation of this guessing by the situational facts, it was able to prove all my guessing and inferences about it.

But back to the '*causality*'- the way which was chosen by me initially, except the way of studying the facts of situations as a basis for finding out the best intuitive explanation of the problem. In the essay (Appendix 1), my thought was that my idea about the study of the *causality* of all events led me to the inner growth and breaking of the internal borders. But was it really as it was? - I doubt it.

Thus, I think that this doubt was a mother of the following question, which I represent in the essay: “*Smile. Is it a border or a way to break a border?*” (Appendix 1, p. 78-79) - *the third BORDER*.

This question is crucial. Now I would say this: Is a smile guilty in my entire causality and ‘internal fight’?, What is a role of a smile in this situation?

I would like to start from the description of my view of the reality of this situation, answering this question. According to my reflection, first, there was an appearance of the feeling. This feeling was like outrage feeling because I did not get the response from the Norwegian students. This response is the appearance of their smile to my smile, as a feedback. Then it followed my reaction - I was looking for a way to make the students start to smile to response, and as a result, I had found out a way to do it. What is the role of a smile in this situation? – Using a smile in the communication, it was a kind of language of communication, which helped to carry on a dialogue between the Norwegian students and me. In this case, the smile mediates between both my ‘own’ feeling and ‘other’ feeling and my own reaction and reaction of the students.

A short observation of my feeling presented above: they were ambiguous, they demanded to be understood. And therefore the reaction followed. I expressed the reaction in the intuitive approach of finding out of this understanding. It was a search of similarities between the Norwegians and me within my cultural background, through which I was able to break the emotional borders and find out the best reaction – the action to maintain a constructive dialogue. My approach was simple in this situation: it was a choice of one student among Norwegian students, who was growing up in Russian culture and knew its features, even not completely, but still knew. I consider this student as one of my own most importantly. This student was like a *mediator* between a group of Norwegian students and me in the maintenance of the cultural dialogue, communicating through the language as a smile. Now I see that this intuitive choice from my side was not a coincidence. To study and understand the language of smile, it is not possible to do in the monologue; it is possible to do in the dialogue, using the dialogized language (Deeper into this, read Sultanbaeva 2016, chapter 4; Bakhtin 1975). Only through the dialogue, it was possible to study and to understand the *philosophy of smile as one language*. How did it happen? - According to the scheme of the concept of ‘trinity’ of parts of the philosophy of language (Deeper into this, read Sultanbaeva 2016, chapter 4; Bakhtin 1975).

I directed my own attention to my own object, having my own attitude to a smile, having my own view of the concept of smile. It means that I started to build a correlation

between me and my own object - a student, who I thought was my own because of the student had an idea about Russian culture and lived in Russia, and one understood me. What is the role of the other group of the Norwegian students in this collaboration? It was next: I am with my own understanding of the concept of smile in collaboration with my own object in the environment of other. In this case, the 'other' is the Norwegian students and their understanding of the concept of smile. The dialogic collaboration, based on the representation of a smile as one language, is possible to be organised this way: the collaboration between both one's own - one's own object- other. Thus it is possible to have a dialogic understanding. The communication, with the use of this dialogized language environment, was possible for both for the Norwegian students as representatives of other culture and for me as a representative of one culture and. In this thesis in Chapter 4, I have presented a complete understanding of the development of language and the philosophy of language.

In the perspective of philosophy of language, now I understand and consider that it has been the right intuitive choice of the best representation of the reaction in the situations in my own experience. This intuitive choice has led me to come to the best inference of the found possible inferences in the situations.

This choice brings me to pay attention to one more the fact that the behaviour of the students was influenced by other circumstances (for instance, the desire to sleep at the lesson because of different time zone) (Appendix, p. 80). Made *intuitive-factual* reflection on the essay (Appendix 1), it is my own understanding of that I was expecting the same behaviour from students, who are other as I behaved. The requirement to other is to behave according to my outlook and my view how it should be right, in fact, was a cause of my meeting with a problem. When it got a little bit clear, the behaviour and the collaboration between one's own, one's own object and other has changed.

For instance, at the second day of my collaboration with the students, there are not any expectations of an appearance of the smile. I have organised the lesson on the base of cooperation and dialogue. I saw the 'internal' side of the on-going situation, but not the 'external' one. At first, I put the question to myself: a smile is a border or a breaking of the border. But as the result of this reflexive analysis the smile became beyond the border. When a smile is beyond the border, then it is conscious that there is not a smile as an appearance, but there is a concept of smile, where the concept known as the value-sense content of culture. And this concept of smile is within each culture. This concept of smile, being beyond the borders, reveals the different spectrum of manifestations of smiles. Hence there was the

choice of my previous reflected way in the essay (Appendix 1), which was reasonable. The way is to research what the smile is and what the philosophy of smile is.

Fourth BORDER- expressions of smile

In the essay, I have considered the several manifestations of smiles: 'false smile', 'outer smile', 'sincere smile' and 'inner smile' (Appendix 1, p.81-82). These types of smiles give a distinction and understanding in what borders of the context I or any person may behave and react. Particularly in the essay (Appendix 1) I highlight an 'inner smile' and focus on it. I think that this is the highest type of smile. But this is only possible if it is interpreted dialectically as a kind of idea in which the smile has such form where the smile is not only the *appearance*, as something 'external', but is a *concept*, as a whole, as the 'internal' manifestation of all organism. My idea is comparable to the idea of Plato's "Alcibiades 1" (1999) about 'internal' and 'external'. In this idea of the argumentation about the soul, the 'inner' essence of the human is a soul. The soul is invisible for the 'external' eyes, but it exists and manifests in different ways in a person. Also, it has the multiplicity of its manifestation, i.e. the 'external' appearance, but internally it remains the whole – the soul of a man (Plato 1990, p. 259).

However, my track out of the way of the whole, out of the intuitive-factual, but again only to the way of causality followed me to the eternal question "Why?" which again led to the endless search for the causes.

I put a new border for myself – the border on the question "*Why am I writing about a smile?*" (Appendix 1, p. 83) – *the fifth BORDER*.

I have called this border "coming back". That means to find out the background of the origin of the problem, related to the appearance or absence of smile on the face in the different situations. A throwback to my childhood, mentioned in the essay (Appendix 1) when I watched cartoons. With the help of idea of cartoons I was training how to behave and it formed my personality. This way the personality of many children is formed (Lillard and Peterson 2011). But now that is not the point.

This action as a return to the past- the appeal to the memories of the past forced my thoughts to turn back and go into *causality*. This situation has caused new feelings, warm feelings from childhood, the joy of watching good cartoons. For me, it was the most favourite cartoon 'Little Raccoon and the Thing in the Pool' (*Kroshka Enot [The Little Raccoon]* (1974). The cartoon is about Raccoon and his central own 'symbol' as a smile. The hero shows how to use a smile as a 'symbol' of the communication. The part of the lyrics of the song "Smile"

(Lyrics translate 2011): “*A smile warms up everything*” (Appendix 1, p. 86) - the main phrase for me, which I remembered in all lyrics of the cartoon in the term of my life.

The main idea of this situation of *causality*, presented through the cartoon “Little Racoon”, is that I can have a constructive dialogue only with the help of constructive dialogized language – with a language of smile. I do not take into account all other terms of having a constructive dialogue, was not paid attention to the known situational conditionality, cultural characteristics, differences between people and many other things. Hence, there is a sense of confidence that a smile can help to carry on any dialogue in any situation. But as I noticed in my described practical experience a smile mediates between the feeling and the reaction destructively. The reason for this that I use the smile in any dialogues without paying attention to the necessity of its different use in the various dialogical situations. As a result in all dialogical situations and events in the life, some my reaction led to misunderstanding. Therefore, the reflection in pure form was not realised and did not lead to the ‘clear’ understanding and comprehension. But according to some researchers the essence of reflection is reverse (Linell 2006, Bakhtin1975).

The concept of smile was not presented as the whole concept and as a result “*A smile warms up everything*” “Smile” (Lyrics translate 2011) known as the idea about a smile does not work in the empirical life.

However, this does not always happen. If any person only needs to think about a smile and includes it in a certain dialogical situation, then the smile will mediate between the feeling and the reaction correctly. In this case, a smile acts as a mediator or a symbol which creates such correlation between the feeling and the reaction, which leads to ‘clear conscious’ understanding.

Like this, for instance, in the situation of the first acquaintance with the students from the Norwegian culture, I could express a smile not so frequently and a bit more modestly. It would not be such challenge within the reaction as it was. And at the second meeting and more, the use of smile, as I usually did, would be appropriate. Hence the perception of a smile not only as an appearance but as a concept would become clear, achievable and understandable consciously. But as in fact, the smile was understood by me at that time.

The use of smile as one language in the dialogical communication opened the border of the intercultural communication in the new perspectives and allowed me already to conscious and to understand a smile in the spectrum of the value-sense content of culture. It

was the understanding of the world through the perception and acceptance of other cultures (Appendix 1, p. 87).

So the smile began to be considered not only from the point of understanding of the sense of the concept of smile in the Russian communication but also in the Norwegian culture. This understanding has allowed me to open a new perception of reality. And this perception of reality begins to be based on the reflection of 'one's own' that is my 'the Inner' perception. Thus, the desire to see the smile not only in the perspective of the 'external' manifestation but the 'internal' concept led to the question of the existence of an 'internal' smile at all.

My insight about the 'inner smile', presented in the essay (Appendix 1), reflects the depth of reflection that contributes to the crossing of the *way of causality* and going on the *intuitive-factual way* and clear thinking (description), 'clear conscious' understanding of the situation.

The 'inner smile' is a metaphor. Again, there is an appeal to a feeling. The feeling expressed through a smile, may be different. Hence the smile is also expressed differently. If it is a lack of feeling, the smile will become the object of attention. It is not enough of smiling faces around; that is why there is no emotional satisfaction from the smile. Hence, this situation creates a problem of perception of reality and the reactions. When there is enough amount of the feelings, a person does not need to think about the manifestation of smile so often. In this case, the smile becomes natural for her or him and manifests in precisely those situations where it is appropriate really. In the essay (Appendix 1), I have come to the conclusion that it should be paid attention to the 'inner smile' - the conceptual component of the smile in any situations. Then the collaboration between 'one's own'- 'one's own' object – 'other' will be clear and conscious, and the smile as a mediator will lead to the construction of a conscious logical way of collaboration between the feelings and the reactions in dialogical situations.

This dialogical situation should also be under the reflective process, for instance, the reflection of the experience of meeting with a new cultural feature of its manifestation through a smile. In this reflection, there are specific inferences that also require their reflection. It means that these inferences require being under the new reflexive process of inferences by this way of the development of new logical inference of the earlier found inferences. Thus, with the help of the abductive method, it is possible to determine the best explanation and conscious understanding of inferences of the presented idea of the study: "Philosophy of smile: beyond border".

Described and analysed way of reflection allows crossing the *causality*, to come to the realisation and conscious understanding and perception of things. It could be answered to the “*question tag ‘Why?’*” by the “*because*” category in this case (Florenskii 1990, p. 211-213). In this case, the “*because*” category is a clear conscious of the whole dialogical situation.

The sixth BORDER- “within reflection”. According to the results of the presented reflexive analysis of some situations in the essay (Appendix 1), we will carry out the general complete reflexive review of the whole situation in the essay (Appendix 1). I see there are two schemes (or two ways) of thinking (description) within the described dialogical situations, which are challenges for me in the essay (Appendix 1). I called these schemes or ways differently. Within this work I would call them: the first way – a way of *causality* as I call it, and the second way - *intuitive –factual way*, that means the intuitive inference which based on facts.

In general, in the whole dialogical situation, the first way is developed as follows. First, a person faces with the situation. He is within the situation. Then whether depending on it is a familiar situation or not certain feelings appear. These feelings create such a big range of their manifestations. It leads to different reactions. This leading can not be without a symbol. The symbol can be any ‘symbol’ which the person uses in the dialogical situation (as, for example, in my case - a smile as a ‘symbol’ in the essay (Appendix 1)). The symbol will prove as a mediator and mediate between feeling and reaction.

I have remembered a lesson of physics, theme “Optics”. This collaboration between feeling –symbol-reaction is comparable to the law of light refraction known as Snell’s law (Fitzpatrick 2007). A light ray travels from one medium to another medium, it changes direction and, as a rule, is refracted. The refracted ray is the same angle as an incident ray, but the mediums may be different. It is the influence on the appearance of the refracted ray. Having a differently refracted index, refracted rays reflect differently (Fitzpatrick 2007).

But if instead of light it is presented feeling, and instead of any point environment of the intersection of the normal to the interface it is presented a symbol, then in this scheme a reaction will be various and will depend on the angle of incidence or refraction of feeling. As a result, there is the more refraction of feeling, the more refraction of reaction, the more than a different sample of understanding or misunderstanding of a sense of a situation. But what is ‘understanding’ or ‘misunderstanding’?

It is necessary to understand how I consider ‘misunderstanding. Relying on my empirical experience described in the essay (Appendix 1), I have noticed that a

‘misunderstanding’ does not exist in reality. ‘Misunderstanding’ is also considered as some understanding. It is easy to prove it. According to the linguistic analysis of a word ‘misunderstanding’, it is noted that ‘misunderstanding’ consists of the prefix ‘miss-’ and the noun understanding. I mean that in comparison antonyms ‘understanding’ and ‘misunderstanding’ are not look like antonyms ‘good’ and ‘bad. Thus, a ‘misunderstanding = ‘mis’+ ‘understanding’. ‘Mis’ may be formed from the verb ‘to miss’. The noun ‘misunderstanding’ means *‘missing of understanding’*. In this determination, a person who misunderstands is considered that he or she understands but not everything. The person has only a ‘common’ understanding. He or she only *‘fails to take advantage of ‘clear conscious’ understanding’*.

It is the description of the first way which leads to common understanding in a dialogical situation: situation – feeling – symbol – reaction – common understanding (or misunderstanding).

However, I am more interested in how to get a ‘clear conscious understanding’. What is the second scheme, the second way in the dialogical situation? In the beginning, in the first scheme a person appears in the dialogical situation, then there is an intuition, which based on facts and then feeling. Intuition is an intuitive perception of the situation which it is said first impressions of the situation by ordinary people in Russia.

As shown in this scheme compared to the previous, there is the appearance of one more element as intuition. The nature of intuitive perception of things is represented in the understanding of the concept of intuition in the proposed scheme, relying on the work of Peirce (1906; 1905; 1903a,1903b,1903c,1903d,1903e, 1903f).

The understanding how the scheme works as a whole is possible by the language of light refraction. A situation refracted through an intuition leads to the feeling. The situation can be various and have different nature. It is refracted into a ‘wise’ intuition, which is like a ‘diamond’ and then reflects different nature of the situation. This intuitive refraction bases on real facts, so it is a ‘wise’ intuition. Next, there is a reflection of ‘clear’ feeling that does not confuse a person; it is only ‘clear’ feeling. In that sense, the feeling refracts into the symbol will reflect a positive ‘clear’ reaction and then leads to ‘clear conscious’ understanding.

Is it remembered as the nature of rainbow appearance? A ray of light strikes a drop of water in the atmosphere. It undergoes both reflection and refraction. The first refraction is at the front of the drop. Violet light will be the most. Red light will be the least. The light is reflected at the back surface of the drop. As it returns to the front surface and moves into the air, it is refracted again. At various angles, the rays leave the drop. In this case, there is an

internal phenomenon reflection which can occur when the light is directed from a medium toward one having a lower index of refraction (Kocharian 2014). As a result, we see the Rainbow leading to Beauty.

If instead of light it is presented a feeling and instead of the drop is a symbol a rainbow will be a reaction. At such way of collaboration: white light-drop-rainbow = ‘clear’ feeling - symbol - ‘clear’ reaction. It is a ‘beauty’ – ‘clear conscious’ understanding. The whole second way of thinking (description) is the next: situation-intuition-feeling-symbol-reaction-‘ clear conscious’ understanding. Thus crossing the last *sixth Border*, I can come to the summing up.

Let us summing up the presented reflexive ideas of the concept of smile in the ‘sixth’ Borders that is the “BORDER-O (n)-LOGY” research way. We have come to the conclusion that such studying and understanding of the concept of smile is the first opportunity to present my subjective understanding of smile in the Border Zone of the dialogical environment.

On the first border, the understanding of a smile has begun to occur in the dialogical environment of two cultures: Norwegian culture and Russian culture. This cross-cultural environment has given a chance to reveal one of the contradictions and some differences between cultures which can appear in this environment. It has challenged me to the understanding of a concept of smile within the situational conditions and has led to the ‘internal fight’.

On these ‘ruins’ of the first border, an exit was going out the first one and crossing of the second border. This border is a border of ‘question tag Why’. This junction of ways which has made me make a decision and choose the *way of causality*. But as it had appeared there is also another way which has been open for me when I was carrying out the reflexive analysis of the second essay (Appendix 2), presented in this Chapter. It is a way of studying of a smile within the philosophy of language. It means the smile is considered as one language which is a symbol in the dialogue which mediates in this dialogical environment. There is the third border when I have faced with the conversation between one’s own, one’s own object, other. Thus, a language of a smile has found its own new form, called a concept of smile. On the fourth border, two forms of a smile have cleared up: the concept of smile and appearance of the smile. Then the concept of smile turns into an object of research and is on the reflexive understanding on the base of ‘Three Categories’ (Peirce 1931–1935; 1893-1913; 1867–1893), which is the way for an understanding of the concept of smile. It is the basis of the fifth border. But having brought into challenge its uniqueness, having asked me whether this way

is the only way of understanding of a concept of smile, we are crossing the sixth border. In this border, I have attempted to present one's own way of understanding of the concept of smile.

Thus the written essay (Appendix 1) in the first year of study in the programme of Borderology can function in the thesis as my understanding of smile at that time. In the reflective analysis of the presented ideas of my own understanding of the concept of smile through the essay (Appendix 1), I have identified the important points and the background for the building of the theoretical and methodological basis of the research in the thesis. I will present these essential points and background of the research in the next three Chapters.

2.0 Chapter 2 Philosophy of culture

2.1 *The concept of culture*

Nowadays there is a difference of views about what culture is. All definitions of the culture, which the world science had represented since the late XIXth century until the middle of XXth, are about 200 definitions. In this work, we follow the definition of culture which is actual nowadays. In this thesis it is said that the culture is a culture, which "reveals **the difference** between that a person does not identify with one's own, and that he or she tends to associate with one's own as something special and only one's own, as a result, the contrasting of **one's own and others** is developed" (Sergeev 2014) in this thesis. On the base of knowledge of differences, people can know their own and relate it to someone else, which allows him or her to build a particular model of communication between his or her own and others. A man can cognize one's own and can relate it with another through the differences precisely. It directs the person to arrange the particular model of communication between him and her one's own and other. Such reveal or identification leads the reader to the philosophical reflection and philosophical understanding of culture. Philosophical understanding of culture is necessary to solve the problem of understanding between cultures in the dialogue of the cultures. In this research, the philosophical concept of understanding of culture¹ is the understanding of value and sense of the concept of culture.

Each culture has its own philosophy²: *'philosophy of life', 'philosophy of development', 'philosophy of behaviour', 'philosophy of perception and understanding of other culture', etc.* Understanding of the sense of culture, the specifics of the culture, manifestation of its features in the dialogue of cultures is not always achieved in the dialogue of cultures. The problem of understanding between cultures, especially in the dialogue of cultures is not a new problem. This problem always exists. Now the solution to this problem becomes more relevant, due to the large stream of received information by a man at present, which sometimes might confuse the understanding of culture. Besides the received information about the culture forms the value-sense content of the culture. Also, I should mention about the ambivalence of the value-sense content of the culture. I would agree with M. Bakhtin (1990), who says about the ambivalence of the value-sense content of the culture

¹ Hereinafter the 'philosophical concept of understanding of culture' is 'philosophy of culture'

² In this sentence the concept 'philosophy' is understood as a concept 'viewpoint' in the Oxford English Dictionary n.d.), in the part synonyms the 'viewpoint' is the synonym of 'philosophy (in English)

this way. On the one hand, the content is always a condition and the possibility of being of culture, on the other hand, the joint existence of the values of consciousness is subjected to extremely fast changes, permits and replacement of one set of values on others (Bakhtin 1990). In spite of the ambivalence of the value-sense content of the culture, we consider that this ambivalence forms the joint existence of the different values in the cultural content, that forwards to the full acceptance of the cultural content. The value-sense content of culture.

2.2 Value-sense content of culture

The existence of multiple definitions of culture, says its diversity and multiplicity. Each of the multiplicity of cultures has its own unique face. A meeting with various facial expressions of cultures is a discovery of many cultures, in which the question of the value and sense appears. The study of the issue makes it possible to research the ‘face’ of the culture on the theoretical level. So what should be called by value and by sense?

I will discuss these concepts in the content of the master’s thesis in the content of philosophy, culture and dialogue of cultures.

Referring to the history of Modern philosophy, we consider two ideas (theory) on this issue. The first idea is represented by the Baden school of Neo-Kantianism (Rickert 1998), where the value is “logical concept, allowing to distinguish one culture from another one, but at the same time expressing something in common that unites all the representatives of each of them” (Mezhuev 2013).

The second theory is based on the hermeneutical process of understanding of the culture, where the concept of culture is a spirit (Dilthey 2002). In this theory, the objects are the spiritual generation, which is not perceived by logical operations, but by psychological empathy in them, thereby generation has not only value - just something that is meaningful for a person, but also has a sensible character.

Briefly having considered the two procedures of understanding of cultural – logical and hermeneutical – it found that the value and sense are in the different conceptual ranks and assigning the definitions to these concepts depends on the procedure of understanding of culture.

In this issue of differentiation of the concepts, it is a presented interesting idea about value and sense by Mezhuev (2013). The author writes: “Values do not have a particular author, often they are inherited from generation to generation in the permanent form, while

each generation has a new outlook on his or her life in a modern way. I will express this idea can in another way: there is eternal value, but there is no eternal sense. In a sense there is the sense of the presence of time of the changed life, what is called historicity. I can share some of the values coming from the past with others, but I can not live with the same sense as my ancestors” (Mezhuev 2013, p.132).

It is noted that the sense creates a particular pattern of its existence in a culture that is static and independent of time, in the process of understanding the statement, regarding the logical procedure of understanding of culture. However, the value gets to a certain dependence on the time, it is created promptly and is relevant to the period in which it was generated. For instance, speaking about the values of Norwegian or Russian culture it might be taken into account the presented time. But the senses, created with cultures, are comprehended in the real time.

The disability to live with the same sense as the ancestors have is based on the fact that the nature of sense is generation by somebody. Namely, the generation of sense is the primary evidence of its belonging to a culture and defining a feature of the culture. Sense, laid by an ancestor in childhood, can be stored up to a certain time. But in the end, one or the other sense will still fall under the influence of time, and will be generated in the new formulation, rethought, and will be ‘one’s own’, ‘alive’, staying in real life. I agreed with M. Bakhtin (1986) that such ability of culture as the generation of new sense is a creative process.

Following Bakhtin, in this study, it is used such procedure of the understanding of sense as the procedure of a creative hermeneutics. Hence, the sense is considered as a concept. According to Bakhtin’s (1986) idea, the sense demands only its consideration in the context of anthropology. The man consists of senses. The sense is a man. The sense is a man. Here it can be represented an image-painting, there is a man with values and senses around him. Also, we can say a sense is a life. For example, in the Russian culture, it is used a proverb: to lay down one’s life. That means one man can give one’s life for one’s country, for other’s life, for anything that is considered a sense by the man. This sense of anything is identical as a sense of life. The understanding of value and sense begins with a man. If it is compared a value with a sense, it is also significant that the group of people make a value, individuality makes sense. Studying the sense and value, a man leans on oneself and follows from inside guessing for an understanding of it. Perhaps this is because the full of sense is a man. The man tends to make sense of everything when he or she faces a challenge, a problem situation. A search of a sense of this or that event sometimes turns into the sense as itself that

is considered to be understood intuitively through the symbol. The sense is individual (vide supra).

Between the challenge and sense, there can be a mediator. The mediator as a symbol of the phenomenon that is according to Peirce (1931–1935; 1893-1913; 1867–1893) mediates between the feelings and reaction. If we are talking about the cultures and its features, the challenge, for example, in the dialogical situation may be any differences within cultures that the representative of one culture faces. These differences provoke the feelings and then it is a reaction to them. And in this case, the difference may occur as a mediator. After that, there may be a guessing formulation of sense content of the culture that a representative of any culture may put in it if he or she tries to understand the other culture in the dialogue.

The mediator may be any fact that is a part of the logical sequence: feelings-mediator-reaction.

In this research, we try to represent the smile as a symbol that is used by all representatives of different cultures.

3.0 Chapter 3 Philosophy of smile within culture

3.1 Intercultural understanding of the concept of smile

Smile, I think, is a sun ray, gift for any person to bring each other warm, love, openness, friendliness. And only the 'sincere smile' is capable of causing such feelings in the person, and so he or she can share them with people around. Smile force is in sincerity. The 'sincere smile' always attracts attention and helps people to be open for communication and does relations of people truthful. Where is a truth, there is one. Also, there is no lie. And a 'false smile' is like a 'stretched bow' which is visible directly and declares to any person a 'danger' and impossibility to construct sincere human relations. It brings people to sufferings and great tension and failure of continuous sincere cooperation.

In my life, I have met many expressions of different smiles. Seeing a smile gives a possibility to read internality of the person. Probably it is also noticed different variations of smiles. Most brightly it is observed in various cultures where it is the possibility to study the manifestation of a smile and try to guess this smile means.

Having an individual subjective vision on a smile within any culture I can determine it by levels: from a 'false smile', continuing an 'outer smile', and then at the highest levels are a 'sincere smile' and an 'inner smile'. All these levels of a smile, as I determine, are metaphorical levels.

Here I would like to express my opinion about the highest level of manifestation of a smile, as I think, is an 'inner smile' when the person can smile from the inside, with all his muscles of the face from the representative of Russian culture. When a person has an 'inner smile', there is no difference whether he smiles specially or sincerely, here it is visible that all his muscles of the face are calm, beautiful and smile as though, he is open for communication with any person entirely. The calm face expresses smile and kindness as itself. The person, whom the 'inner smile' is directed, feels the openness and wants to carry on a dialogue with another person. There are no borders, all borders are broken, and there is no 'internal fight' because the person is in harmony. The presented subjective point of view to a smile is not enough to understand its 'inner' nature, philosophy of smile within culture completely. It is needed to study others points of view of different cultures to the concept of smile.

According to A. Freitas-Magalhaers and Castro (2009, p. 1-18), a smile is a facial expression, which is created by flexing the muscles near both ends of the mouth and by flexing muscles throughout the mouth.

That is very easy to understand how the smile appears but it would be better to know what a smile in the human beings is.

There are some interesting facts about the smile in different fields of human beings. I agree with these points, and I would like to use them for giving the determination for one of my mentioned levels of a smile as an 'outer smile' or 'social smile'. The stranger's smile expresses more "Good Samaritan" (Gueguen 2003) effects on the receiver. Research reports that people receive more help when they smile (Gueguen 2003). "In fact, smiling correlates with greater trust, greater financial earnings, and increased interpersonal cooperation" (Godoy 2005). When people smile, even memory retrieval of their names is "enhanced as is shown in neuroscience research versus people who have neutral facial expressions" (Tsukiura and Cabeza 2008). Gottman and et al.'s (1998) work presented that smiling, and other expressions of emotions are very important to shaping relationships with others. I can see the smile influences on human behaviour and human cooperation.

The human cooperation in different cultures could be realised in a different approach. But the main aim of intercultural collaboration and communication is understanding. The study of a smile as a sign of language of emotion opens the question. It is claimed by Paul Ekman (2004, p. 3) "How could we have found that people from many different cultures agreed about what emotion was shown in an expression when so many smart people thought just opposite?". There is a problem in a sense and a type of reaction to the different events. Ekman (2004, p. 3-5) has given an example of the face reaction of Japanese and Americans while watching the surgery film. It notices that the Japanese are smiling more than the Americans and the smile has the negative expression.

As we can see cultures are individual –specific and each culture puts its own understanding of when and where to smile and has its own rules and reasons for smiling. Aristotle said that if a person is smiling, this act has been done at the right time and in the right place (Trumble 2004).

According to the research of Marianne LaFrance (2011) in her book "Why smile?: the science behind facial expressions", it is compared different concepts and understanding of smile in different cultures. It is noticed that for Chinese if the person can not smile he or she can not sell something. But in some Muslim countries smiling at customers expresses sexual interest. In some countries in the northern Europe, it is not accepted to smile at strangers. For example, Russians and Poles are suspicious when to see an unfamiliar person who is smiling at them, and it may mean even a stupid.

Next interesting note about Scandinavians. The smiling at strangers for the Scandinavians is nonsense. They do not smile at the strangers. And LaFrance (2011, p. 195-198) emphasises the reason for that is that if a stranger is smiling to the Scandinavian, it will mean he or she tries to invade that Scandinavian's private space. According to the examples of understanding of smile of different cultures (Chinese, Muslim, Russians, Poles, Scandinavians), the smile gets the sacral tinge. For these cultures, the smiling at the stranger at the right time and in the right place and the situation is especially important.

However, in the American culture, the smile has another tinge. There is a duty smile. Next, we try to represent the reasons. "Service with a Smile'—this has always been at the core of American businesses since the beginning of the 1900s. Research continually proves that this is true; smiling does increase attractiveness and likability between humans. In fact, smiling correlates with greater trust, greater financial earnings, and increased interpersonal cooperation" (Godoy 2005). "In a time of increased stress due to cutbacks, high debt, and increasing family issues, employees are often required to work with a distressed public. However, a smile tends to convey respect, patience, empathy, hospitality and compassion. For example, when an employee smiles at a stressed customer, and exhibits excellent listening skills, most of the time, there is a report of total satisfaction" (Hunter 2011). "Research also reports that people receive more help when they smile. Even the smile of a stranger produces more "Good Samaritan" effects on the receiver" (Gueguen 2003). "When you smile, even memory retrieval of your name is enhanced as is shown in neuroscience research" (Tsukiura and Cabeza 2008).

The Americans are not indifferent to smiling at strangers. The smile acts as a symbol of that if a person does not have anything to say he or she is smiling.

As we can see the use of smile of different cultures as a cultural sign is different and is understood in a different way and may have an unexpected influence on the understanding between representatives of any cultures. For example, the Americans can not read the Japanese smile apparently. But the problem of understanding of smile is noticed not only between cultures in different countries but also in the inland. It is represented that the smiling of residents of the American South is different from the smiling of the inhabitants of the American North. In the North, they are rarely smiling than in the South. The author explains that the reason for this is a spoken language and dialects. In this case, the expression of a smile is with the cultural specific accent (LaFrance 2011, p. 197-198).

It is noted that one of the reasons for misunderstanding of smile within cultures is a cultural specific accent, having represented the understanding of smile within different

cultures. LaFrance said: “Different cultural groups imbue their facial expression with unique inflexions even when they are speaking the same language” (LaFrance 2011, p. 200).

Such tinge is inherent in the representatives of all different cultures. There is a problem of misunderstanding of the emotional information that is within emotion. First of all, a person perceives this information in the light of his own culture: he identifies the expressions of the smile of people from his own culture. Thus the person starts comparing aliens’ smiles with the smiles of people from his own culture and believes that since the expressions of smile look like they do at home and concept and consequences are the same. It helps people to identify people from their own culture in the crowd without any problems. But if a face of people from the same culture has a neutral expression it will be difficult to identify their own representative. There was an experience with the Australians and the Americans who asserted that they could identify the representatives from their own country in the crowd quickly. But during the experiment, described in the Ekman’s book (2004), it was a challenge for them because the faces of people of the same culture that they were looking at in the crowd had neutral expressions. The statement of the Australians and the Americans failed.

One more experiment has shown that such expression as a smile is more sacral for some culture than it is thought. So Japanese prefer to express the smile through the eyes which can show and express sincere smile more deeply than through the mouth as the Americans do. Return to the Scandinavians, Russians and Poles, in general, the smiling for them is invading person’s private space (LaFrance 2011, p. 200-203).

Thus learning to smile with a proper accent is necessary for understanding the inner nature of smile within any culture. Here it also needs to note that there is something in the culture that makes people smile. For example, the Indians and the Americans say that increasingly the smile has more the positive connotation, but the concept of this connotation is different. For the Americans, a happy smile and happy feelings attribute to success and for the Indians – to consideration of individuals together with others.

There is a dispute among different authors about the concept of the smile in different cultures. According to Damasio (2000), the sincere smile involuntary, and if a person sees an expression, he or she will know the cause of this emotion. This cause is the same for any culture. But Birdwhistell (1970) disagreed. He has noted that expression of a human smile can be the same, but the concept is not the same. The example of it is the situation when one Japanese is watching the emotional film with the group of Americans. And while watching it, he expresses his emotion through his smile as the same way as the Americans do. Ekman called such phenomenon – the display rules of smiling – when the individual of cultures may

be led with a group of cultures – cultural appropriate. The concept of smile within culture implements in cultural and social content.

In different countries, the smiles make a difference. The difference may be expressed in person's feeling. It is considered in some countries in a different situation when a person sees a smiling face; this smile means the protection not the smiling person but those who sees the smile.

The opposite in many Asian countries the smile means a message about how he or she wants other to feel. In Japan, the Japanese do not express their feelings open and emotional as the Americans do.

During the whole life a person, living in one culture, receives the individual cultural program even he or she is not aware it. If a person sees the Americans, Japanese, Russians and Argentineans, it will be seen how difference they are in their emotional expressions. The Western cultures are more concentrate on the individualism. The Eastern – on the collectivism. Many experiments prove it. For example, it was an experiment with the Japanese and the Americans when they were asked to identify who a happier person in the first picture and the second picture is. At the first picture a person is smiling and is surrounded by gloomy talked people, and at the second one he is also smiling but is surrounded by happy and smiling faces of people. According to these pictures, the Americans looked at these pictures and said that the person has the same emotion that is happiness in both pictures. But looking at both different pictures, the Japanese said that the person in the first picture is less happy than at the second picture. This example is showed that different cultures perceive the same facial expression at the face of a person in the same situations from the different point of view (LaFrance 2011, p. 204-217).

According to that human fact, we can see that smile influences on human behaviour and human cooperation. The understanding of such cultural facial expression as a smile is a necessity because it helps people to relate to one another. We agree with Marianne LaFrance (2011, p. 206) that to recognise the sign as a smile and its concept in different cultures it is necessary to pay attention to the cultural content.

3.2 Smile as a concept or as an appearance

After studying the presented above material, we have considered that a smile may be presented as an appearance as well as a concept. If we consider a smile as a concept, there will be the content, which is in the concept of smile. This content is understood as the cultural content, with its values and senses within the content of culture.

The appearance of a smile may be different. It depends on the mood of the person, from its internal state and external factors affecting it. The appearance of a smile is considered the same for all people or all representatives of different cultures. People are smiling independently of the cultural background. The Chinese, the Russians, the Norwegians, the Japanese and others are smiling. This external manifestation is a feature of all cultures.

However, the value-sense content of culture, which is included in the concept of smile, may be different. It has been presented in details in this work in the comparative analysis of intercultural understanding of the concept of smile – the analysis of its cultural content. Awareness of cultural content within the concept of smile, its difference allows us to identify the cultural features of non-verbal communication between representatives of different cultures. The knowledge of these features admits creating a dialogical space between the representatives of different cultures, which breaks the borders of misunderstanding and helps to build such communication relationships which will be supported by other representatives of different cultures on the level of understanding of both language and content presented through the concept of smile.

In this work, we are studying the concept of smile which is included a value – sense content of culture. Hence, the smile is interpreted not only as a language of non-verbal communication but also as a manifestation of one language within particular cultural and situational content.

4.0 Chapter 4 Methodology of study

4.1 Three Categories for understanding of the concept of smile known as one language

As it is mentioned above in this research, we are interested in the study of the concept of smile which has behind the concept a value – sense content of culture. Hence, the concept of smile should be interpreted not only as a language of non-verbal communication but also as a manifestation of one language in a particular cultural and situational content.

When I remember how I started writing about a smile and have continued to analyse a smile as a subject of research, we could see the differences of my own point of view to this concept and the development of my own understanding of this one. Now from today's point of view, we can see that the development of an understanding of the concept of smile has been based on the three categories of Peirce (1931–1935; 1893-1913; 1867–1893). This way I present how the concept of smile becomes a concept.

Looking at the first category: “Category the First is an Idea of that which is such as it is regardless of anything else. That is to say, that it is a *Quality of Feeling*” (Peirce 1893-1913, p. 160). The feelings challenge people to judge and to reflect on the problem. The feeling directs a person to the reasoning and the understanding of the problem. It may be mean that the first step is based on the feeling which leads to the second.

The Second category is calling reaction. According to Peirce (1893-1913, p. 160), “Category of Second is the Idea of that which is such as it is as being Second to some First, regardless of anything else and in particular regardless of any *law*, although it may conform to the law. That is to say that it is a *Reaction* as an element of the phenomenon.” It means that after the feeling, it is a reaction.

There is also some mediation between the quality of feeling and the reaction that is calling an element or a symbol. It is the third category. “Category the Third is the Idea of that which is such as it is as being a Third, or Medium, between a Second and its First. That is to say, that it is a *Representation* as an element of the Phenomenon” (Peirce 1893-1913, p. 160). The first the feeling can come, then the reaction comes and then comes the symbol that mediates between the process and the outside world. Thinking about a smile, we may conclude that the smile would be a symbol that mediates the feelings and reaction.

Such way of presentation of the concept of smile leads us to regard to and reflect on the philosophy of concept of smile. We consider that the philosophy of concept of smile should be presented as a part of the philosophy of language. If we discuss a smile in the

philosophy of language, we will present the smile as one language. If we use a word 'smile', it will refer to the concept of smile based on being a mediator. We call it 'a smile' which is a symbol or an element through which we try to understand the reality. The symbol is familiar, but the concept behind is not familiar. It means that we know a symbol of a smile, but we are not aware of the concept of smile that is expressed through the value-sense content of culture. When a smile is considered as an element or symbol, it becomes a mediator. The condition of it is the dialogical communication. There is some connection or communication between both participants of different cultures in the dialogue. The smile would be a symbol which mediates between the process of internal feelings and reaction to an outside (external) world in the dialogical communication.

Talking about the philosophy of language the development of different languages brings a different kind of relations between the words. There is a birth of language diversity. A word is only a mediator or a symbol on the content. Hence, the word can only mediate that means it can give some information. It is not a content it is not a concept. It is the mediator of concept. That is why there is a reason why having different languages we have the same concept on them. A smile as a mediator could connect people within the dialogical communication. And in this communication, there is a connection, the same understanding of the concept of smile between the people. This way we can analyse and discuss the concept of smile while putting it into an understanding of language within the culture.

The study of different cultures and their features through the cultural content is mentioned in the Bakhtin's (1975) research, in the Bakhtin's (1975) philosophy. In this research, we have tried to interpret the concept of smile both from the point of the philosophy of smile as it is a typical human being behaviour and also from the point of Bakhtin's (1975) philosophy of language. Therefore a concept of smile is mentioned in this thesis as one language which is interpreted in the philosophy of language. In this case, a concept of smile is a symbol of dialogical communication which is a display of a human being language.

It is necessary to look through some of their definitions in the dictionaries briefly, for the better understanding of the concept of language and the concept of smile.

According to the Oxford English Dictionary (n.d.), a word 'language' has several definitions: Language is "the method of human communication, [...], consisting of the use of words [...]" (the Oxford English Dictionary n.d.).

According to Dal's Explanatory Dictionary of the Living Great Russian Language (n.d.), a language is a set of all words of people and their right combination for thoughts of people transfer.

Thus, in this thesis a language is known as a method of human communication, consisting of the correct use of words for thought transfer.

At the computing definition of language, the language is considered as “a system of symbols and rules for writing programs or algorithms” (The Oxford English Dictionary n.d.).

The interesting fact that if we consider a smile as one language and take the presented part of the computing definition of the language (I mean only for interpretation), it ought to be a concept of smile is a system of symbols for carrying on a dialogical communication and for thought transfer.

Also, let us pay attention to the concept of the word which will be used in the text of further interpretation of the language in the Bakhtin’s philosophy. At the first definition, that is mentioned a language consists of words. A word is “a single distinct conceptual unit of language, comprising [...] variant forms” (The Oxford English Dictionary n.d.). In this thesis a word is considered as a unit of language, a unit of communication, comprising a unit of thought.

4.2 The study of language in the Bakhtin’s philosophy of language

Historically the concept of formation of a philosophy of language was presented as a “system of unitary language” (Bakhtin 1975) and “speaking this language individuum” (Bakhtin 1975). Throughout the historical development and under the influence of the social factors a “system of language” (Bakhtin 1975) and “the speaking individuum” (Bakhtin 1975) had some changes in the form. But their contents did not change – it led to the formation of defined concept of word in the category of unitary language (Bakhtin 1975, p. 83).

According to Bakhtin the category of unitary language is a theoretical expression of historical processes of unification and centralization of the language, and also is an expression of centripetal forces of a language”. Here the “unitary language” (Bakhtin 1975) is always specified and opposed to language diversity in “every moment of “language life”” (Bakhtin 1975, p. 83).

It is noted that a “unitary language” (Bakhtin 1975) is considered by Bakhtin (1975, p. 84) as a force which determines the certain borders for the language diversity. Maximum of mutual understanding within these certain borders is constructed. In this content, the border becomes a frame, and in this case, the borders can be considered as the plus sign: they lead to

mutual understanding. Earlier in the thesis text (Sultanbaeva 2016, chapter 1), the borders were considered with the minus sign.

Another force of the “language life” (Bakhtin 1975) of a “unitary language” (Bakhtin 1975) which is presented by Bakhtin (1975) is a system of language norms. This system overcomes the language diversity through the unification of the verbal-ideological thinking, which creates a unitary core of the language diversity. In this content a language is considered by Bakhtin (1975) as not a system of symbols, providing a minimum of understanding in communication, but in such a way that the ideologically-filled language is determined as a worldview and even as a definite opinion. Such language provides a maximum of mutual understanding in all spheres of ideological life. Hence, the life of “unitary language” (Bakhtin 1975) is closely connected with the social, political and cultural life. However, despite the presented resistance of “unitary language” and “language diversity, it should be noted that a life of “unitary language” (Bakhtin 1975) is possible only in the language diversity environment, and only this way the language lives and develops (Bakhtin 1975, p. 84).

For a better understanding of the life of the language, it is thought to be necessary to present the approach in the Bakhtin’s (1975) representation of the life of “unitary language” (1975). It is expressed through centripetal and centrifugal forces: the unitary language possesses a centripetal force, which is the force of unification. Subject to it, we have come to the conclusion that any communication should be mutual because the centripetal force tends to unity and understanding. However, this does not happen. People often do not understand each other talking in different languages. The reason for this – language diversity. Such language diversity is a necessary process. While there is a language diversity, language is in the process of development. Thus, while it is a work of centripetal forces of language, at the same time it is a work of centrifugal forces. It means that the processes of unification and the processes of disunification are both processes proceeds simultaneously (Bakhtin 1981, p. 272).

Thus, Bakhtin (1975, p. 85-88) has revealed a unique feature of the language, has unified the strength and the nature of its interaction in the social life of the language. Paying attention to this feature, a border of misunderstanding in the communication can be broken. The reason for this is the understanding of the essence of the “unitary language”, which has the centripetal forces, and through the understanding of the need of centrifugal forces – the authentic environment of life of the language, in that environment, the language is living, forming and has further development. This environment is called **dialogized language diversity** by the author. Earlier this dialogized language diversity was not studied. Language

dialogism and all its phenomena were not considered due to the focus only on the centripetal force of the language and ignoring of the environment of a language life. Bakhtin (1975) noted that this problem did not admit to the given complete picture of the interaction of centrifugal and centripetal forces of language. Ignoring the second power of language - the life and behaviour of words in the languages of the world, "language awareness" (Bakhtin 1975) led to misunderstanding in the dialogue. This problem within the historical development of the philosophy of language and word leads to study some phenomena of the word of the language, which are determined by the dialogical orientation of the word of language within the limits of the socio-cultural environment of the same language.

One of fundamental phenomenon of dialogized language is reflected in the collaboration and meeting between one's own word, one's own object (or a speaking person), and another word. Following text present the idea that the philosophy of language bases on the concept of 'trinity' of one's own word, one's own object (or a speaking person), and another word in their collaboration.

According to Bakhtin (1975, p. 88-89), a word exists and is familiar only with oneself, with its own object, its content and with its own one language. But another word, which exists beyond its content, is familiar with neutral, no one, alien word. In the collaboration of one's own word with its own object, own object resists its own word because of the word can not fully disclose the inner of the object. But in this collaboration between the one's own word and its own object, the another word has not a resistance between one's own word and another word.

However no each one's own word resists its own object. In this case in the collaboration of one's own word with its own object, the environment of other words about that object is between one's own word and its own object.

Thus, a speaking person substitutes one's own words by other words, and one's own word becomes another one, but at the same time, this another word is considered as one's own word in the process of collaboration with this environment of other words. This collaboration between one's own word and the environment of other words carries dialogical orientation of one's own word which is explained in the entry into the environment of other words, a merge to one, pushing away from others, crossing with the third. Thus, there is a forming of a *dialogical image of the word* (Bakhtin 1975, p. 88-90).

The phenomenon of a *dialogical image of the word* begins with a dynamics of an image of the word – the word is merged into a diverse variety of the object but does not show an understanding of a diverse of the object. And the object is vice versa. It shows the

understanding of a diverse of its, which is constructed by the images of other words. Hereafter the diverse variety of the object is considered that it is led to the complete, whole image, consisting of dialogical images of other words (Bakhtin 1975, p. 91).

Thus, the word oriented on the dialogue. This dialogic orientation of word is a natural phenomenon of every living word: “In all the ways to a subject, in all directions, the word meets other word and can not be without live and intense collaboration with it” (Bakhtin 1975, p. 92). Bakhtin (1975) called this phenomenon as an internal dialogism of the word. It explains that the word is born in the dialogue, and this is living utterance within the dialogue, which can be formulated in the dialogic collaboration with another word (Bakhtin 1981, p. 279).

Hence, It is represented in the philosophy of language of Bakhtin (1975) one of the important phenomena – internal dialogism of the word of the language, which makes a basis of dialogical language through the manifestation of the concept of ‘trinity’ of dialogical language.

The understanding of the value of language occurs when it is considered in its dialogism, in its current understanding. However, it does not happen if a language is considered in a passive understanding of its value, its sense. The passive understanding of any language does not bring something new to the understanding of the word but only shows that understanding which is already given, that is duplicate. An object or speaking person remains within the content and the thoughts. It is observed other processes at the current understanding of language: the word has new values and sense and also the object has new senses (Bakhtin 1975, p. 94-95).

It is necessary to notice that “a word is living on the border between one’s own and other content” (Bakhtin 1975, p. 97), turning to the study of the internal dialogism of the word of the language. An utterance of any dialogue consists of one’s own and other words, which is constructed and comprehended in the content of the whole dialogue. If the utterance is deleted from the dialogue, that will occur the loss of any sense in the dialogue. “The utterance is an organic part of the whole language diversity” (Bakhtin 1975, p. 97).

Speaking about the dialogism of the word, about its dialogic orientation, we have come to the idea that dialogical relations are made between “languages” and are perceived as points of view on the world, or on the different opinion about the world. Thus, language as a different opinion is also living on the border between one’s own and other. The word of a foreign language would change a position to one’s own language if the word had its own sense. However, this is not always possible, and other word remains other or alien. “Language

is not a neutral environment, that becomes the intentional property of a speaker freely and quickly, – it is inhabited and crowded with other intentions” (Bakhtin 1975, p. 107). Such ‘settlement’ of language gives it a specific understanding (Bakhtin 1975, p. 97-113).

The understanding of the language is realised about dialogism of this language. This dialogism of a language, as it is called “dialogized overtone” (Bakhtin 1981, p. 357), creates the authentic image of a language. This overtone is a framing content, which frames the borders of the other (alien) speech, creates speech’s sound and existence, changes speech, adding its own accents, “creates for speech a dialogizing background” (Bakhtin 1981, p. 358), and also acts as its own speech. Thanks to this ability, the image of a language is created. Bakhtin (1981, p. 358) mentioned there are three basic categories to the device the creation of the image of a language: 1) hybridizations, 2) the dialogized interrelation of languages and 3) pure dialogues.

The category of hybridization is a mixture of two social languages, two language consciousness. Due to this mixing, the language can be changed in its historical development and to be perceived differently. It is important to note that the image of a language is created through the awareness of one’s own language by another language when one’s own language consciousness is aware of another language. Only, in this case, there is a mixture of two individual language consciousness, two voices, two accents, when different points of view on the world, inherent in these forms are faced (Bakhtin 1975, p. 172).

The second category, creating the image of a language, is the dialogized interrelation of languages. Within the dialogized interrelation of languages, it is only one language actualization, particularly the actualization of other (alien) language (Bakhtin 1975, p. 173-175).

Outstanding interest among the category is the third category of creating the image of a language: pure dialogues. This device is the dialogical comparison of languages, which “frames the borders of languages, creates a sense of these borders, makes to feel plastic forms of languages” (Bakhtin 1975, p. 176).

Thus, the creation of a deep image of the language is not realised due to a simple mixing of languages, but due to hybridization of thinking of languages, due to the deep insight of one language into other language consciousness, getting the level of the disappearance of alienness between languages.

From our point of view, this creation of the image of a language affords to see the inner and whole picture of the social environment in which the language operates and

contributes to the formation of a dialogical understanding of language between different language consciousness.

“How could invisible be recognised? [...] – There is no another alternative but understanding” (Sergeev 2011, p. 16). That means the ability to understand another language, its concept, that is hidden from the person typically, who speaks one’s own language. That means the capacity to find out the concept of ‘trinity’ of the language life (the correlation between both languages and objects in the dialogical environment). That is one of the main approaches to the study of a language in the philosophy of language.

A sense of a language consists of the sense of words. An understanding of a language is the understanding of words. To understand the words it is not important what their direct, expressive sense is, but how this sense is used by a speaker, defined his social status in a particular situation. Bakhtin (1975, p. 212) writes: “Who speaks and what circumstances are – this is that determines the actual sense of the word”. There is the philosophy of understanding of the words in the language.

In the writing text, some authors focus on being understood by the readers. It applies not only to the relationship between the author and the readers of the text, and also to the relations between two speaking persons, to all line of dialogical relations. Also in our work (thesis), we try to transfer to the reader our own understanding that we put into our language of the text. The willing of the author to be understood by another person prevails over him. Focusing on the understanding, on the willing to be understood by the reader, the author forgets that there is a field of misunderstanding that can be created with a specific purpose. So, for instance, Bakhtin (1975) in his book presents us clearly the necessity of having a misunderstanding in any concept of language. The misunderstanding may have a radical character, creating a specific language style of understanding of the environment of life of a language. This style can be determined as a loss of these or those events in the life of language. According to Bakhtin (1975), a misunderstanding correlates with high intellect, moreover with “untrue high intellect” (1975, p. 214). That means that the only use intellect in carrying on dialogue, a misunderstanding has exposed the intellect. In any language field, the misunderstanding as also understanding are dialogical. Misunderstanding in a language is manifested through the lack of understanding of other (alien) language, other words which claim to comprehend the language. Hence, there is the great variety of situations or dialogical contradictions: situations of misunderstanding and situations of understanding. Recurring again that Bakhtin (1975, p. 214-222) noted that the presence of misunderstanding in the concept of language is necessary because this uncomprehending presence breaks the world of

social conditionality and teaches participants of the dialogue to be wisdom. This wisdom is concentrated within the outlook of one's own language to other (alien) language with the help of the eyes of other (alien) language. Such vision admits an author of one's own language to be trained, to see the social conditionality of other (alien) language, to feel its objectivity and relativity, to recognise the borders, to find out and to create images of various social languages. Thus, while comparing one's own language with other languages, it is possible to understand each language, because they have contradictory unity of the social formation.

Social formation of the language is based on a social contradiction. The social contradiction is not a conceptual comprehensiveness of different points of view but is the comprehensiveness of social, ideological languages. In this dialogized interrelation each language starts to sound differently, which contributes to the full understanding of its sense content. A comprehensive understanding of this content is possible only with a comprehensive completeness of the dialogue of languages (Bakhtin 1975, p. 222).

We are quoting here Bakhtin's (1975) words, generalised understanding of the need to research the dialogized interrelation of different languages. He wrote: "Languages of 'language diversity', as like the mirrors directed to each other, where each of these mirrors reflects the reality of a part of a world by its own sense, forces a person to guess and recognize the world more widely, more multi-faceted and more diversely within the correlated aspects of different languages, and then it is recognized within one language – one mirror" (Bakhtin 1975, p. 225-226).

Thus, summarising the results of the study of language from the perspective of philosophy of a language in the work of Bakhtin (1975, p. 227), we have come to a conclusion. We have concluded that a language is built, developed and is studied in a continuous dialogized collaboration of languages that surround one. There is no a unitary language, so the attempt to describe the language methodologically is not possible. It is possible to study a language from the philosophical concept of language, where it is possible to track the manifestation of the concept of 'trinity' of dialogized language, the sense content of social formation of the language, and its dialogical relations with other languages.

4.3 The theory of abduction in the study of smile as one language

The Peirce's (1906; 1905; 1903a,1903b,1903c,1903d,1903e,1903f) presented abduction as a method of scientific argumentation, as a way of discovering new knowledge,

as a way of development of creative abilities is the particularly valuable. Peirce developed the theory of abduction at the different stages of his philosophical work.

In this work, we will try to represent our own analysis of the understanding of this method and the possibilities of its use in this research as a method.

Before studying the abduction let us examine the etymological basis for it. The prefix “ab” from the Latin means in English “away from”. Suffix “ductive” from the Latin “dusere” means to lead in English, and in combination with “ab” it means “to lead away from”. Thus the abduction is “leading away from” (Chiasson 2001, p. 3-4). But this definition does not fit the definition of abduction that Peirce (1906; 1905; 1903a, 1903b, 1903c, 1903d, 1903e, 1903f) had coined the term abduction that is an inference to the best explanation. We consider, there is the correlation between two definitions of abduction. The definition for the understanding of abduction as “to lead away from” may be meant the process of logical thinking that guides the mind to the choice of the best explanation of any phenomenon, carrying away (leading away) from any wrong explanation. This guess fits with the definition as an inference to the best explanation, because inference means the process of logical conclusion.

Also the understanding of abduction as a ‘moving “away from”’ (Chiasson 2001, p. 3-4) allows to look at this term from another point of view. ‘*Moving “away from”*’ (Chiasson 2001, p. 3-4) shall be considered metaphorically. Any force directs any movement. Any movement is started for any reason. In this case, the task of the abduction is to find the best explanation for the existence of an action or movement. ‘*Moving “away from”*’ (Chiasson 2001, p. 3-4) point of any (we mean the point refers to the idea) allows to suggest inference creatively and abductively and to conclude only possible inference to the best explanation.

In our work we will use this definition for the term abduction: abduction is an inference to the best explanation.

Abduction as a method has been studied and used by many scientists for a long time. The study of abduction may be found out in the research works of Douven (2011), Chiasson (2001), Wirth (2001a, 2001b), Kapitan (2000), and others. In this research we will point out the main ideas of these researchers but the main research on the understanding of abduction will be based on the scientific works of the ‘forefather’ of this concept – C.S. Peirce.

Douven (2011) mentions that abduction has a “special status to explanatory considerations”. This status is determined with illogical conclusions from assumptions. I agree with Douven (2011), and for general understanding, it is given an example from the

experience of the first contact with the phenomenon of the Norwegian's smiling and my own further assumptions.

It was the first meeting with the Norwegian students, which had been a big challenge for me. The challenge was a smile, or more precisely the absence of smile on the faces of the Norwegian students as a feedback to the appearance of my smile at the first meeting. It was like a small cultural shock. The first meeting with the students has been described in the first essay (Appendix 1) in more details. Here I will give a short description of the action. To learn Russian as a foreign language a group of Norwegian students came in Murmansk. There is the first day of class of the Russian as a foreign language. I as a teacher met and taught the Norwegian students for the first time and faced with the problem of the lack of smiles on the faces of the students during the meeting and conversation at the lessons of Russian as a foreign language. It was repeating act for several lessons. In this situation, I was confused and did not know what to do. I tried to make the students express the emotions, to make them smile with the symbol as a smile, but there was no reaction of the students, there was no feedback as a smile.

The presented problem of expectation of the smile from the Norwegian students which I have been faced with in his experience in teaching them Russian as a foreign language, I have my own experience when I started making students smile when she did not get their feedback like a smile. I gave them the task that I thought it would bring up their mood but it did not work. As a result, such behaviour has brought me another problem. It is a problem of misunderstanding different cultures in the dialogue.

After some reflection of this challenge, I came to guessing of what the smile for the Norwegian (through the Norwegian students) was. These were: the Norwegians do not often smile when they get acquainted with new people. If unfamiliar people are smiling the Norwegians, they will not give a feedback of smile to the unfamiliar people. They smile when they comprehend that something is worth of smiling. If the Norwegians do not want to smile, they will not smile. This result is some of that I have reflected on the Norwegian smile (Appendix 1).

My own conclusion as a teacher does not seem a logical conclusion, but I have tried to find out the inference to the best explanation of her problem, tries to find out the logical truth.

According to this example, we see that while reasoning, it appears the inference. Besides such inference which is the most likely and truthful from the supposed person's point of view.

Concerning the Douven's (2011) point of view on abduction, we have come to the conclusion that abduction in principle is the logical reasoning, which carries no truth or even partial truth. "It is logically compatible with the truth of the premises" (Douven 2011).

It is ought to turn to the work of Peirce (1931–1935; 1893-1913; 1906; 1905;1903a,1903b,1903c,1903d,1903e;1903f; 1867–1893), to understand how the abduction as a method can be used for studying any problem and how its use can help in the solving the objectives of the research, and also to reveal the truth of the research findings.

Having studied the chapter on Abduction of Peirce (1903a, CP.5 144-145), he says about the significance of abduction and the necessity of its use in the practice of science because "all the ideas of science come to [—] that if we are ever to understand things at all, it must be in that way". And we agree with him. Peirce writes that the origin of abduction and its existence dates back to the time of Aristotle. It was presented in the theory of three kinds of reasoning. Peirce introduces the concept of abduction widely. Peirce was able to retrace the relationship of the three concepts in this trinity (deduction, induction, abduction). Each of them performs its particular function. In our understanding, abduction within this trinity is a 'rung'. When the idea only begins to emerge in mind, it is a birth of the certain hypothesis; then the key 'rung' between the abductive reasoning and deductive one is induction, with the help of which a data of hypothetical inference are developing in a theoretical way, and next deduction is already proving the truth of the inference.

From this perspective, to ask oneself the question about the practicability of the use of abduction as the logical inference in the research, the argument about the truth of abductive method is not feasible, because the purpose of abduction is to introduce a new idea and suppose the inference to the best explanation. "Abduction furnishes all our ideas concerning real things, beyond what are given in perception, but is mere conjecture, without probative force" (Peirce 1905 CP 8.209). That is why it is better to consider Abduction as the process because it generates new ideas. "Abduction is the process of forming explanatory hypotheses. It is the only logical operation which introduces any new idea" (Peirce 1903c, CP 5.172). And it's function is a formation of explanatory hypotheses which tries to infer to the best explanation.

However, Kapitan (2000) in his article, expressing the idea about abduction, says that abduction's function is uncertainty. In his work (Kapitan 2000), it is also the point at issue of the truth of the existence of this logical operation and its necessity in the research field. Kapitan (2000) emphasises that abduction cannot justify the plausibility of the hypothesis and does not give a clarity of hypothetical inference. "More is required to legitimately conclude,

select, or make plausible a hypothesis than what reveals and, if anything, the logic of abduction should bring this out” (Kapitan 2000, p. 5).

However, Peirce (1906; 1905; 1903a,1903b,1903c,1903d,1903e, 1903f) provides a clear explanation of this and shows how abduction can be used in the science. But it might be taken into account the main thing is that there are the certain conditions, emphasised by Peirce, for seeing the validity of the use of the abductive method.

Let us understand the process of abductive thinking (description) and form explanatory hypothesis according to Peirce. Abduction as a method has “a perfectly definite logical form” (Peirce 1903d, PPM 282-283). It will be proved if there are certain conditions. In that way, we can talk about abduction as a form of explanatory hypothesis because any hypothesis as itself should be provided with facts which may form the inference. It is also proved the fact that abduction is a logical inference.

Thus the first it should be taken into account if we use the abduction as a logical inference it will have to be facts that proved the guess. We may go only through them. If there are no facts which prove the guess, the abduction loses its meaning as itself. “ [—] It occurs to us that if we were to assume something to be true that we do not know to be true, these facts would arrange themselves luminously. That is abduction” (Peirce 1903d, PPM 282-283).

Thus, the assumption of facts to set up a hypothesis is a necessary condition of the use of the abductive method. The author also mentions that it is necessary to consider that these facts should be arranged in a specific sequence. By the collected facts of the hypothetical assumption, it is allowed the veracity of this hypothesis, which is the basis for abduction. In the Kapitan’s (2000) work the presented information and fact by Peirce’s work does not be taken into account, so there is no presumption of truthfulness of the hypothesis. In this case, the abductive method in principle loses its value.

What is the right understanding of abduction?

Having analysed the information from Peirce’s work “Harvard Lectures on Pragmatism” (1903a, 1903b, 1903c, 1903d, 1903e, 1903f), the answer to the question how to understand our view follows abduction. We will try to give an example. When a person thinks of any question, idea or phenomenon, he or she is reflecting, constructing a logical reasoning, supposing and trying to find the answer or explanation of a particular phenomenon. The purpose of those operations is to understand the problem question in person’s mind. Such a long operational process of reflection includes search activity in the brain, which ultimately can lead to inspiration or “flash” (Peirce 1906, CP 4.541 n1) in mind. At that moment a man begins to realise this thing that he has not understood before. Here is a “flash” (Peirce 1906,

CP 4.541 n1) – a kind of intuitive knowledge that has become realised. This operation is located between the objective and the subjective judgment when the understanding becomes pure. “The abductive suggestion comes to us like a flash. It is an act of insight, although of extremely fallible insight” (Peirce 1906, CP 4.541 n1). In some scientific fields such understanding does not give the strong foundation, and the use only abductive method, excluding deductive reasoning and inductive reasoning, is not permissible. The philosophy is different. This kind of method is a free creative reasoning, “a method of forming a general prediction without any positive assurance that it will succeed either in the special case” (Peirce 1903b, EP 2:299). It can be formulated as inferences to the best explanation, which can give hope for a rational explanation for anything. It is on the base of existing inductive past fact that “from past experience gives us strong encouragement to hope that it will be successful in the future” (Peirce 1903b, EP 2:299).

Thus abduction may be based on two stages: the selection of the best explanation of the facts and then the creation of explanatory hypothesis.

In choosing the best explanation of any phenomenon a person relies on some belief, he or she believes in this explanation, believes in the reasons for its appearance, despite the fact that there “is not a matter of belief” (Peirce 1903f). However, the person believes and tries to prove it and creates the explanatory hypothesis. But it is only “scientific reproduction” (Peirce 1903f). In this way, he follows the “‘action-guiding’ hypotheses” (Peirce 1903f) but not “explanatory mechanisms” (Peirce 1903f) that the scientists use. In this case, such belief in a hypothesis gives the ‘frame’ of Abduction as a method, and it becomes a practical reasoning process, that directs to the next action. There is the question of the rational use of abduction as a method. We know Peirce was researching Abduction throughout his life, hence his point of view and understanding of the rationality of the use of this method is also changed. However, returning to the main idea of Peirce, we may see the positive aspects, where it is observed how Peirce thought about Abduction and its function, are varied. There is an evolution of abductive reasoning. In 1900 it was not a clear picture of abductive reasoning. Then abduction understood through the prism of induction, but which “*commits us to nothing*” (Peirce 1903e); then abduction is considered as a type of universal reasoning; and the last stage of abduction development is that it has a tinge of ‘directive’ hypothesis, which gives the possibility of the further prospective study of phenomenon.

Thus, studying the presented point of views of different authors to the theory of abduction in this work we are following Peirce’s conception because we are studying the subject of the thesis through the content of guessing.

After reading the Peirce theory of abduction, we have found out that this theory fits in our research when we are talking about a smile. A smile is something that a person cannot be sure what it means. The person can always misunderstand a smile. He or she is doing some abductive reasoning by guessing what the smile means. Also, that is unexpected. A person smiles because something is unexpected, but he or she often guesses before the person checks it out.

4.4 The correlation between Bakhtin's and Peirce's theory in the study of smile as one language

The study of the abduction theory of Peirce (1906; 1905; 1903a, 1903b, 1903c, 1903d, 1903e, 1903f) and Bakhtin's (1981, 1975) philosophical study of a language have some correlated conditions of their use as the methods in the scientific research.

Thus, the first condition is a situational condition. After having studied the theory of Bakhtin's (1981, 1975) philosophy of language and the theory of Peirce's (1906; 1905; 1903a, 1903b, 1903c, 1903d, 1903e, 1903f) abduction, in this Chapter we try to imagine how these theories can be applied to study such language as a smile. Summing up the basic theory of Bakhtin (1981, 1975), we have concluded that dialogism consists of Bakhtin's (1981, 1975) concepts. These concepts are inherently dialogical. Considering the language in the philosophy of Bakhtin (1981, 1975), it is also inherently dialogical. In this thesis, as it is mentioned above, a smile is studied as one language. Hence, the smile has also a dialogical nature. Dialogical nature consists of the use of the language in the social and cultural content. The dialogue is implemented in the communication between persons through the language. We may conclude that dialogue and language are interrelated.

Also, it should be noted that language is interrelated with a dialogue only in the situations. It has a dialogical nature and situational conditioning. Situational conditioning expresses the person's experience in the socio-cultural content, thinking that is realised in the certain conditions. This situational conditioning creates the situational senses for the language within the socio-cultural content. The situational sense is the implementation of the inferences which are created on the base of different possible senses and content. As we are talking about a smile as a language while studying this concept, it should be done within the situational conditioning. Thus to understand the nature of a smile, its concept, it has to be studied in the close relation with a dialogue within situational conditioning.

This idea that any concept should be studied within the situational conditions is strictly presented in the studied above Bakhtin's (1981, 1975) philosophy of language and Peirce (1906; 1905; 1903a, 1903b, 1903c, 1903d, 1903e, 1903f) abduction theory in this thesis. Such concept in this work is a concept of smile as one language. It should be noted again that a language is created by words which have special social situational conditioning and direct the communication. Situational conditioning of word is one's own background about the world and experience of the use of the language.

If it is said about a smile as one language, the word should be concerned as a cultural background of experimental knowledge of the use of a smile within the socio-cultural content.

Besides a smile is one language. Any language is social. Social language has the borders, which have mentioned as 'language diversity' by Bakhtin (1981, 1975). Thus a smile as a social language has also the borders. These borders are expressed by different inside misunderstanding between the persons (Bakhtin 1975).

There is an example of the data of research. Presenting a smile as one language, a misunderstanding of a culture is the most common border. Thus having got a practice of organising data of research of the smile in Russian and Norwegian culture, one of the experiments was a 'circle-table' dialogue with the representatives of one and other cultures. During this talk, it was mentioned different points of views to the concept of smile between Norwegian and Russian representatives. These views have shown that misunderstanding between cultures through the smile as one language should be changed with understanding within the dialogue (Appendix 2).

According to Bakhtin (1981, 1975), the breaking of the borders ought to be implemented with the approach to the study of language through the excepting of the language as a whole world view, which has mutual understanding in the situational socio-cultural condition.

If breaking a border is seen through Peirce's abduction method, the language will be presented as a collection of different facts of the hypothetical guessing, between one of them is the inference to the best explanation which gives the mutual understanding within the situational socio-cultural content.

Thus a smile as one language ought to be researched through the dialogical analysis of the language and abductive analysis of its situational sense.

The second is an interpretation of this situational condition. Firstly understanding of any situational conditions is built on the base of assumption. Both Peirce (1906; 1905;

1903a, 1903b, 1903c, 1903d, 1903e, 1903f) and Bakhtin (1981, 1975) in their researchers write about the situational interpretation of conditions of the phenomenon.

According to Peirce (1906; 1905; 1903a, 1903b, 1903c, 1903d, 1903e, 1903f), if it is a situational condition of any phenomenon, different situational facts will be observed by the researcher in the socio-cultural content in the logical abductive sequence.

According to Bakhtin (1981, 1975), the logical sequence is presented in the logical position of the words in the dialogical utterance within the socio-cultural content or socio-cultural situational conditions.

Hence, the use of both methods involves consideration of the situational conditions and its interpretation that create a further definite sense among all assumed interpretations. On the base of the situational conditions, it is possible to organise the analysis of senses of a smile as one language.

Finding out the senses is the necessity for a further understanding of the phenomenon.

In the dialogical situations, the concepts are created in the process of production of the utterance in the communication. The language of the communication may be different, but the concept is produced only with the accordancy of the situational conditions. For instance, when a person sees a smile as one language in the dialogical situation, he or she can interpret it in a different way. Then for producing the concept to this language he or she chooses the best interpretation and gives the best concept to that language within the situational conditions. In this example, we can see how both methods may be complemented each other in the research of the phenomenon as a smile in the dialogue.

The third one - the reflexive process of inferencing. There is one more aspect that should be mentioned about the use of methods based on Peirce's (1906; 1905; 1903a, 1903b, 1903c, 1903d, 1903e, 1903f) and Bakhtin's (1981, 1975) theories. They are both based on the reflexive way of inferencing.

If we are studying a smile as one language within the situational understanding of utterance* we will firstly reflect on its situational conditions and then find out the concept for further acquiring the best explanation and understanding. According to Carston (2005), Linell (2006, p. 170) understanding of utterance assumes reflexive. 'Reflexive process of inferencing' (Linell 2006) suggests the process of arguing and guessing the inference to make logical inferencing for finding out the best understanding.

* According to Bakhtin (1986) utterance is the unit of communication

For the purpose to study the sense and to find out the best understanding of it in the language in the dialogical situational conditions, it is needed to organise the empirical data – the dialogical data, based on the language of the socio-cultural context or situational conditions (Linell 2006).

In this research, such empirical data is the data within the reflexive analysis of essay (Appendix 2) of the second year study in the Joint Master Degree Programme “Borderology”. The necessity to use this essay (Appendix 2) as the empirical material is reasonable. It is connected with the fact that the reflexive analysis of the first essay (Appendix 1), which reflects the started point of this research, has shown two ways of the study of the philosophy of smile. We consider that these two ways lead to its understanding. There is a *way of causality* used in the study of a smile in the first essay (Appendix 1). In the second essay (Appendix 2) the smile is studied within the *way of causality* in several situational contents. Also in the second essay (Appendix 2), the reflection and study are presented within the *intuitive-factual way* that leads to the ‘clear conscious’ understanding. The main idea of all this work is to present the philosophy of smile: beyond the border. But before, it is necessary to be in this border and cross it. Crossing a border, as a result, to be “beyond the border”, that perhaps leads to the ‘clear’ understanding from my view. Therefore It seems that finding out the best understanding of the philosophy of smile lie in the reflection on the text of the second essay (Appendix 2) by the given above theoretical and methodological foundation.

5.0 Chapter 5 Five Borders of reflection on the Data of the experience of research of the concept of smile

Excursus into the reflection on the first essay (Appendix 1) will allow us to move forward on reflection on the second essay (Appendix 2). It needs to be done because of the second essay (Appendix 2) represents an empirical research, which was written on the basis of the context of the first essay (Appendix 1). There were several reasons for the writing of the second essay (Appendix 2). Originally it is to bring into challenge everything that has been presented in the context of the first essay (Appendix 1) – all ideas and reflexive conclusions, conclusions and to try to prove their practicality.

The second reason is a personal reason – the absent of answer to the question about what the concept of smile in the dialogical environment of different cultures is. This question has been realised after a reflection on the context of the first essay (Appendix 1) in Chapter 1 of this thesis.

And the third reason, as I see it now, is an opportunity to present the ways of actualization and understanding of the philosophy of smile.

Thus, these reasons were concreted after done reflective analysis on the first essay (Appendix 1). However, originally while organising the second research, it was set another objectives and reasons. I think that this is due to the lack of structured methodology of research in the past. Let me remind that in the content of the first essay (Appendix 1) I was not able to have a complete understanding of the philosophy of the concept of smile. Therefore it was conducted the second research by me. The purpose of the second study was still to understand what the concept of smile in the diversity of cultures is and how to communicate through this language.

Let pay attention to the title of the second essay (Appendix 2). This title is “*Crossing the border in the dialogue between Russian and Norwegian cultures*”. It is interesting to notice that there is nothing that is told us about a smile in the title. It seems that the first research can not correlate with the second essay (Appendix 2) in any way. But as it is noticed by me in the reflection on the first essay (Appendix 1) I have set the objective to consider a smile beyond the border, and one of the first steps is the crossing of the border. A choice has been made to cross-border into ‘internal’ side, but not in ‘external’ side. What does it mean?

First of all the concept of smile is expressed through a symbol - a certain sign which is shown on a face. And the sense of this smile lies in the concept deeply. As it was specified earlier, the concept of smile can be studied through the value-sense content of culture. This

concept is different in the different cultures, hence the manifestation of a smile is also different. 'External' manifestation of a smile is not an object of this research. This that hidden from an 'external' eye as a concept has to be studied, and it was possible to be made through "*crossing the border in the dialogue between Russian and Norwegian cultures*" (Appendix 2).

Two cultures have their own value-sense content which can be expressed through a symbol as a smile. And studying of this concept is obviously possible in cultural diversity. If it is spoken about understanding in the dialogical environment of cultural diversity between cultures, the understanding can occur or even can not occur. However, a 'diversity' is created by different senses. The understanding of these senses gives a chance to see a complete concept, for instance, in our case, it is a concept of smile.

It is considered some factors for comparison of correlation of the reflexive components between the first and the second essays (Appendix 1, 2). In the second essay (Appendix 2), it should be noted that not only one culture is considered, but also at the same time, two cultures are considered. It expands possible inferences in the understanding of the concept of smile. It means the understanding of the value-sense content of both Russian and Norwegian cultures in a certain dialogical situation. It leads to the perception of a new reality in the dialogical situation. In this environment, it is also possible to build a way of thinking (description) as an *intuitive -factual way*, resulting in 'clear conscious' understanding and understanding of the philosophy of smile.

One more of the important facts which has been noticed in the comparative analysis of both essays (Appendix 1, 2) is that the understanding of a concept of culture is the started point at the beginning of both essays (Appendix 1, 2). In the first essay (Appendix 1) the concept of culture is considered, and in the second one, the concept of culture is considered from a position of understanding of the philosophy of culture. The philosophy of culture is understood as studying of cultural values and senses, especially their understanding of a cultural content (Appendix 2, p. 94-95).

Within paragraphs mentioned above, there can be the feeling of misunderstanding and possible confusion for the reader that the concept of smile is understood as the same as a concept of philosophy of culture. In both cases, the value-sense content of culture is mentioned, but the main emphasis has to be placed that it is paid much attention to the study of the value-sense content of culture within the dialogical situations in the study of a concept of smile. In the philosophy of culture, the value-sense content of culture is considered, without the factual dialogical conditions.

Having understood the concepts and coming back to the reflexive analysis of the second essay (Appendix 2), the question about features of conversation between cultures has top priority. The problem that is exercising my mind within all research is the problem of understanding, but to be more specific now there is a problem of the dialogical understanding between cultures. Earlier the emphasis was placed on the understanding of smile. Thereby, it is possible to notice that the focus of my attention has changed from studying of the language of a smile as a symbol to the language of a smile as a dialogical language in a conversation between cultures. The important thing is not the understanding of smile as an 'external' manifestation (appearance), but the understanding of smile as an 'internal' manifestation which may be presented through the cultural content within a smile, and cultures per se. The content is that condition which allows us to present both values and senses in total and to understand the features of any culture entirely. This whole can be considered within philosophy. Hence the concept of culture is determined as a philosophical the concept of culture in this work.

Next factor which we have to emphasise is a condition of the choice of the environment and the choice of a method of research in the second essay (Appendix 2) as well as in the first essay (Appendix 1). Let us remind that the confirmation of data which were obtained in the first essay (Appendix 1) was one of the reasons for carrying out an empirical research in the second essay (Appendix 2). Thereby we have understood that the choice of carrying out a similar lesson of Russian as a foreign language for the Norwegian students as the base for data acquisition, as it was organised in the first essay (Appendix 1), was logical. But, whether I have chosen, for instance, an interview or reading the text about features of the Norwegian culture and have reflected on it without organising the lesson, it would give me those results, which I got. I think, no. The main thing that was made correctly, from my point of view, it was a choice of the dialogical environment of the lesson. Only in the dialogical environment, it is possible to understand cultural features (Bakhtin 1975) which lie outside conversation and the symbol of communication as a smile. The ability not only to live in the experience but to live within experience is a basis of high-quality acquiring of knowledge and understanding.

It should be noted that the studying of the philosophical concept of the Norwegian culture through the study of the value-sense content of culture is emphasised in the studying and the reflection on the empirical data, received in the second essay (Appendix 2). This value-sense content of the Norwegian culture has a general character, but not private. It has the private character when it exists within the cultural dialogue. This general value-sense

content can be reflected through different languages in this dialogue. For instance, from the perspective of the value-sense content of smile as one language or the perspective of other objects, for example, the value-sense content of language of gestures, the language of eyes, etc. Thereby in the world of understanding of any phenomenon of culture the general and epy whole understanding of a phenomenon is exposed to the separation by the languages. That is why there is the opportunity to study a complete phenomenon from different perspectives of language. But even the perspective of language changes, the whole will remain invariable, the essence will not change, whereas the perspective outlook has the different level of vision and understanding of a nature (Florenskii 1990, p. 554).

According to the reflexive analysis of data of the second essay (Appendix 2), the perspective of the study of the value-sense content of culture was based on the methodology of the comparative analysis and also ‘specially arranged classroom dialogue’. The choice of this methods is explained by the fact that the possibility to study and understand the features of culture exists in the studying of its diversity and its comparison with other cultures (Sergeev 2014; Bakhtin 1975).

Let us present the set objectives in the second essay (Appendix 2), which are used in the ways of the reflection on the data in this thesis:

- going into the field work;
- using methods and grouping the data;
- analysing the data;
- doing a critical reflection on my report’s results;
- drawing conclusions. (Appendix 2, p. 96-97)

These objectives are presented as special ways of “crossing the border in the dialogue between Russian and Norwegian cultures” (Appendix 2). And even more, these ways are the borders themselves.

Summing up, there is a small excursus of the introduction of what was planned for carrying out an empirical research which is described in the second essay (Appendix 2).

After that, having faced with new borders which need to be crossed, and as a result to appear beyond the borders and to understand the philosophy of smile, we start a reflection on the written report and the analysis of the submitted data (Appendix 2, p. 97-106). The reflection on the report from the second essay (Appendix 2, p. 107-116) will be implemented on the base of five ways of crossing the borders, which called as the set ‘objectives’ of the

second essay (Appendix 2). These are the borders on the base of which the knowledge and understanding of the philosophy of smile will be built.

The first BORDER- 'going into the field work'.

I have started writing the work from the study of the cultural aspect. This cultural aspect was expressed in search of contradiction. It was such search of contradiction that would allow me to begin to conduct research. It was the search of a challenge. This challenge was to find out the attitude of the foreigners to the Russian culture. It did not matter my attitude to the foreigners; the main was the attitude of the foreigners to Russian culture as my culture because my attitude to the foreigners had earlier been presented in the first essay (Appendix 1). Now it was necessary to think about the foreigner's attitude to the Russian culture in the research. And in this border, I met that material which became the challenge for me. It was the article "Why do not the Russians smile?" (2013).

This article that many foreigners said that the Russian people are unsmiling people. As it was revealed further that the material for this article was borrowed from Sternin's (2000) article, titled "the Russian communicative behaviour as a smile". And the challenge is that almost 13 years the foreigners' attitude to the Russian culture, namely to such aspect of manifestation of a feature of the Russian culture as a smile was not changed. This challenge is forward to study of cultural values and senses which were earlier considered by Mezhuev (2013).

This 'unchangeability' can be explained by the fact that it belongs to the category of values. The values do not change during historical time, as a rule, they are descending from generation to generation in the permanent form (Mezhuev 2013, p. 132). Hence, the unsmiling behaviour of the Russians has been considered as a certain value for the Russians, which is stable constantly. The text about the Russian smile in the both articles, published in 2000 and 2013 (Why do not the Russians smile? 2013; Sternin 2000) confirmed it. Then the questions come, what sense is behind the 'unsmiling' behaviour, which remains throughout the long period? The answer that it is only the feature of culture that was given by the Norwegian student in the talk about the Russian smile (Appendix 2) is not sufficient, I think. Therefore it is worth conducting a research and to understand all these inferences by the obtained data. It is the first border. Crossing it there is the start point of *intuitive- the factual way* in research of philosophy of smile. The presented inferences will be understood through a prism of other culture. This approach will allow seeing the Russian culture not only with one's own view but also with other's view. This approach makes a basis of development of cultures (Sergeev 2015, 2014; Bakhtin 1990). So, studying and understanding the concept of

smile could be carried out by studying and understanding of features of the value-sense content of the Russian culture through a prism of the value-sense content of the Norwegian culture.

To achieve this aim, I have organised a certain dialogical environment where the value-sense content of one culture can be revealed for another. The dialogical environment has to be caused by a situational component. Hence, all possible inferences and the ideas about of value-sense content can be submitted for the approval and consideration. Thus the language of culture will be clear (Bakhtin 1975; Peirce 1931–1958).

As a sample of such dialogical environment, it is used the ‘special arranged classroom dialogue’ in work. And the situational component is represented by the text. Why is it considered that the text is a suitable tool for the use as the situational component of the dialogical environment for studying of the value-sense content of culture? It is also possible to use any movie, isn’t it? However, the text is the most suitable for the use in a dialogical situation for studying of the value-sense content of culture. The text in itself is the complex organisation consisting of statements, utterances, words, and the most important “initially created” (Bakhtin 1979, p. 331) thoughts of the author. According to Bakhtin (1979, p. 285), the text is dialogical; that is very important in its use in the dialogical environment. The dialogical text is expressed by the dialogical language which is entered in a framework of cultural content. Thus, within the cultural content, the dialogue is carried on. This dialogue is based on the dialogical text. A language of the text has the dialogical nature and the situational conditionality. This situational conditionality can create a situational sense of the language of the text within a cultural content.

Accordingly, in the text, there are several poles: a so-called language of the text, and the sense content of the text, “which is exceeding the borders from the text into the cultural contents of both subjects” (Korniyenko 2010, p. 129; Bakhtin 1979). The concept of ‘both subjects’ is understood as the fact that the text is dialogical, and the dialogue demands the presence not only one person but two subjects (persons). In a case, there are an author and a reader. Thus, through the dialogical text, it is possible to see that hidden component, namely the value-sense content of culture in the cross-cultural dialogical environment. Dialogicity of the text is understood “as a chain of reactions of the subject to the perceived text, which has a cultural reflection of itself” (Bakhtin 1979, p. 467). The studying of a smile through the text is explained by that the smile as one language is social and exists within a cultural context (Bakhtin 1975). In turn the text as a super symbol also exists in the system of the cultural

context (Bakhtin 1979). That is why this unity is the basis for the use of the language of the text in the understanding of smile as one language.

Thus there is the sequence of the fact that a situational component as the dialogical text will be entered in the dialogical environment as ‘special arranged classroom dialogue’ harmoniously. It is the crossing of *the second BORDER- ‘using methods and grouping the data’*.

On the second border for carrying out research and data acquisition, it is used the method of ‘specially arranged classroom dialogue’ which has acted as the dialogical environment. The organisation of the dialogical environment occurred within “Russian Arctic–language, culture, the economy” project (School of learning Russian as a foreign language for the Norwegian students) (Appendix 2, p. 99). In this project, my task was the teaching the Norwegian students of Russian as a foreign language and some features of the Russian culture. I have organised several lessons of Russian as a foreign language for the Norwegian students. The participants of the dialogical environment are the students from Norway, and I have acted as the teacher, who is a representative of the Russian culture. There are two and more subjects of cultural contexts. It creates a basis for exceeding the borders of one cultural context and results to wider understanding within the dialogical environment. Let us study what the dialogical environment as ‘special arranged classroom dialogue’ is in more details.

As it is remembered before carrying out research and data collection, there were many unresolved questions which are connected with a smile, to be exact with the understanding of the value-sense content of culture in the concept of smile from the view of the Russian and Norwegian cultures. Also, there were some internal no crossing borders which did not give ‘clear conscious’ understanding. Therefore to find out the answers to the remained questions, I needed to organise the dialogical environment that way, which neither Norwegian students nor I have internal borders in the dialogue. The dialogue had to be built not as destructive, but constructive. The purpose was to build such dialogical environment, which leads to organise a dialogue between the participants, but not a monologue, or polemic, or dispute.

The emphasis on the importance of the creation of such environment seemed in the research of dialogue in itself (Appendix 2) and it is reflected as follows. One of the decisive steps to use of ‘special arranged classroom dialogue’ in the field work of research was my practical experience, described in the first and the second essay (Appendix 1, 2). The practical experience has shown me that is possible to hear and understand each other within the

dialogue. I mean dialogue in its best understanding. For the first years of training in “Borderology”, I saw how my teachers used a dialogue as a method. I consider that dialogue is used for the organisation and management of the best lessons. It is noticed that many new obtained information and new knowledge became clear with the help of dialogue. Also, I saw that one more important aspect of such form of the organisation of conversation as a dialogue is the equality of all participants of dialogue. It gave the chance to have an open dialogue. Not for nothing among the famous philosophers, the dialogue was modern. Among them, there are Socrates, Plato, Kant, Bakhtin, etc. The reason for this may connect with the unique property of dialogue. One of them is an opportunity to develop a philosophical topic through the dialogue (Plato 2011), and another is the development of the personality. As for instance, Bakhtin devoted to dialogue studying a large number of his works. During lifetime Bakhtin created a dialogical circle. He gave a great sense to dialogue. According to him, dialogue is the universal phenomenon reflecting human life through the human speech. “Where the consciousness begins there is a dialogue” (Bakhtin 1972, p. 71). Dialogue seems to Bakhtin as a base for development of the personality. He saw the development of the personality in “Other”. In the dialogue, both “one’s own” and “other” are changed. “One’s own” begins to hide into “other”, enters into the world of “other”, to take off a ‘coat of oneness’ in the world of “the I” (Bakhtin 1986, p. 371). The revealing of “one’s own” to “another” is also mentioned in the works of other authors (Sergeev 2016, 2015; Sergeev and Sokolov 2015; Florenskii 1990). There is an understanding of personal ‘wealth’ of the person in the phenomenon of ‘friendship’ of one’s own with “the Other”. From my point of view, there is the deep sense of dialogue and the necessity of its use.

Coming back to reflect on ‘special arranged classroom dialogue’ we have noted that it is used a ‘circle’ approach to the creation of the favourable environment in the dialogue. Historically this approach has various names: “Round table” (Trudgill 2001; Weiss 1999;), “Socratic circle” and “Socratic seminar” (Coffey 2016; Copeland 2005; Tredway 1995), “Dialogue Circle” (Hydle 2014, p. 46-49; Lewis 2009; Bohm 1990) and “special arranged classroom dialogue” (Appendix 2, p. 108), etc.

The use of this approach has the important reasons. For the first time, this approach began to be used in the 12th century when it called “Round Table”. The concept “Round Table” was used by the poet Wace (cited in Weiss 1999) in his “Roman de Brut” in the stories about the King Arthur. According to the researchers ‘round table’ was used on the one hand “as an instrument of political propaganda” (Johnson 1990, p. 133), and on the other hand, it mattered “as a means of avoiding rivalry between knights” (Trudgill 2001, p. 33; Schmolke-

Hasselmann 1982). Nowadays it is considered as a “symbol of unity” (Trudgill 2001, p. 33; Schmolke-Hasselmann 1982). We think that this consideration also comes from the Wace’s (cited in Weiss 1999) legends. It is also mentioned in the work of Johnson (1990) the idea of Henry II wanted to have the “cosmic power” (Johnson 1990, p. 133) and cosmic power is the power of unity this is why now ‘round table’ is considered as a “symbol of unity” (Trudgill 2001, p. 33). As we see there is a force in the unity, hence it is possible to conduct uniform dialogue. Also in the modern value, the expression ‘round table’ is used since the 20th century as the name of one of the ways of the organisation of discussion of some questions. The purpose of the organisation of such discussion is to generalise the ideas and opinions concerning the discussed problem. In discussion all participants are equal. As a result, all offered ideas and opinions are synthesised, and the new idea is created (The Great Encyclopaedic Dictionary n.d.).

Then the ‘circle’ approach was more popular in the Socratic period. It called Plato’s Socratic Dialogues (cited in Kraut 2015). And now this approach is very popular in the field of teaching. Today’s the Plato’s Socratic Dialogues transformed into the ‘Socratic method’ that consists of the ‘Socratic circle’ and ‘Socratic seminar’ (Coffey n.d.). According to Copeland (2005, p. 26), the use of the ‘Socratic circles’ develops the critical thinking and cooperative work among the students that helps them to find out their own sense of the reading text (Copeland 2005, p. 26; Coffey 2016). The aim of ‘Socratic seminar’ is to engage new knowledge and understanding (Tredway 1995; Coffey n.d.).

The last one that I would like to mention about is “Dialogue Circle” (Hydle 2014). The “Dialogue Circle” (Hydle 2014) is used for the purpose to study the suggested problem and to find out the necessary decisions for its solving, which leads to the acquirement of new knowledge be the participants of the dialogue (Hydle 2014, p.49). The “Dialogue Circle” (Hydle 2014) is the modern approach to problem-solving.

Whereas different names of this ‘circle’ approach, all of these names have in themselves one main idea that it is the idea of equality of participants in the expressing their own opinion, concerning the solution of any problem, and also the idea of receiving and synthesis of new knowledge that leads to understanding.

In this research, the organisation of the dialogical environment consists of a combination of presented several approaches, such as “Round table” (Weiss 1999), “Socratic seminar” (Tredway 1995) and “Dialogue Circle” (Hydle 2014). It creates the approach, called ‘specially arranged classroom dialogue’ (Appendix 2, p. 108). It is due to that the offered

research problem in the essay (Appendix 2) demands uses of several approaches for its solving.

The specially arranged classroom dialogue engages the students in reading and studying new article, in presenting their own ideas about the mentioned problem by the teacher. Thus the students get new knowledge, solving the problem, inferencing to the best explanation, which leads to the clear understanding. The role of students is to be active participants in the dialogue and to express their ideas freely. Each of the students is equal and may express any idea and respectful. The role of the teacher is to be a moderator, to provide the questions that require decision making from the students. Also, the teacher guides the students to a deep and clarified consideration of the concept of the text (Tredway 1995; Coffey n.d.). The developed question by the teacher has to construct the dialogue, leading to a clear consciousness understanding of textual concepts and the dialogical topic. Such organisation of the specially arranged classroom dialogue helps the teacher to get feedback from the students, examining their ideas, inferences, based on human belief. Thus the created fundamental basis for the organising data it is necessary to present all the participants of this dialogical environment.

Summing up, we have come back to a question of how the text is entered into the dialogical environment, relying on Bakhtin (1975) philosophy and a subject of our research. Let us remind that the main objective of carrying out this research reflection is to present a concept of smile through his 'internal' value-sense content of culture. The smile is considered as a certain language which is dialogical. According to Bakhtin (1975), dialogicity of language is built on condition of the scheme with three components in their collaboration: one's own, one's own object (or a speaking person), and other. Whereas a language, a word and a text in its own nature are dialogical, and the text consists of the words, this scheme can be used more widely, putting it into the dialogical environment. Thus, according to our research 'one's own' may be considered as a text of the article; 'one's own object' is as a concept of smile in the text, and 'other' is a teacher of Russian culture and students of Norwegian culture in the environment of specially arranged classroom dialogue. Interaction of three aspects is presented in the description of the lesson organisation and data acquisition (Appendix 2, p. 100-107). In this work, we present our own reflection on the interaction between three aspects by the methodology of studying of language in Chapter 4 of this thesis.

The interaction with the Norwegian students has begun from attraction of their attention to the topic of the dialogue. I have reported to them that many foreigners consider that Russians are unsmiling people and the article "Why do not Russians smile?" (2013)

reflects it. It has attracted the interest of the Norwegian students to read this article. Reflexing on the described situation, according to the methodology we have noticed that the scheme of the development of an understanding of the concept of smile is appeared through the information, provided by me. It causes the feeling. In this case, the feeling is the interest of the students to the topic. Then the title of the article was as a mediator for the students that then has to lead to their reflection on the contents of the text about a smile. It is noticed that the scheme of understanding of a concept of smile on the base of Three Categories of Peirce (1931–1935; 1893-1913; 1867–1893) was used in all dialogue: feeling-mediator-reaction.

I am as a teacher, and also information in the text caused certain feelings in the Norwegian students in the joint dialogue. The smile in this dialogue was as a mediator both between students and me, and between the text and students, and also between feelings and reactions of students.

If we are talking about the formation of reactions, then their current originally proceeded from another scheme, their internal scheme. For instance, there is a ‘portion’ acquaintance with the text. The students read the paragraph, studied a situation in which the smile was used, and intuitively assumed an essence of the concept of smile and considered their intuitive inference about the concept of smile in their own cultural content and their own life experience of the presented situation. As a result, a language of the text, with the help of smile as one language was considered in the environment of the language of other cultural content and then was expressed by the language of reaction. This reaction gave rise to new cultural senses for an understanding of the philosophy of a concept of smile. These cultural senses made a cultural concept of smile; thereby it began to have its certain expression through a situational component. Thus, according to the studied material in the essay (Appendix 2, p. 105-107) we have noticed that each reaction of the students leads to a creation of certain sense for a concept of smile. Such creativity is possible by a synthesis of Bakhtin’s (1975) philosophy of language, the abductive theory of Peirce (1903f) and Three Categories of Peirce (1867–1893; 1893-1913; 1931–1935). The schemes from synthesis are submitted by a reflection on the obtained data. However, besides the obtained data it was carried out their analysis which has shown that the development of two cultures in the dialogical environment within the understanding of a concept of smile.

The development of two cultures in the dialogical environment has led to the enrichment of representatives of two cultures by new knowledge and a new understanding of a concept of smile. The important aspect which leads to understanding in a dialogue is the availability of three substances. It occurs both in the philosophy of language of Bakhtin

(1975) and in the theory of Three Categories of Peirce (1931–1935; 1893-1913; 1867–1893). One's own is developed through the environment of other, through a symbol. Such 'friendship' leads to the unity of understanding.

After this idea, we move to a reflection on analysed data. We are crossing the *third Border* – '*analysing the data*'.

Crossing this border we can present several conclusions which we have made on the base of intuitive interpretation of assumptions of the value-sense content of culture. These assumptions, made through a prism of the Norwegian culture in the synthesis of the Russian culture, have designated a concept of smile in different dialogical situations, described in the text as follows (Appendix 2). In the concept of smile, it can be interpreted as an expression of politeness, openness, sympathy, readiness to conduct dialogue, sincerity expression. The most important that it would be desirable to note is the consideration of a concept of smile as an *expression of nature*. The nature of a smile means that to be smiling is also naturally and it is necessary. It is necessary as well as to brush teeth in the morning, for its nature there can also be no reasons (Appendix 2, p. 116-118).

Several reasonable assumptions create these assumptions, and there is the choice of the best inference to the best explanation. Thus, these assumptions have opened a part of that understanding of a concept of smile and have planned a further way in the studying of the philosophy of smile, namely a way of crossing *the fourth Border* - '*Critical reflection on my report's results*' (Appendix 2, p. 107-116).

In this border, I also do a reflection. It needs to be made because any studied content within the philosophy of language, which interrelated with dialogue, has to have in itself three aspects: one's own, one's own object, other (Bakhtin 1975). This reflection is based on the interpretation of the situational conditioning and "reflexive process of inferencing" (Linell 2006). This inferencing is taken from the done reflection on the report's results presented in the essay (Appendix 2).

Situational conditions in the presented content about a smile are presented and considered in such way that it shows how the text can create itself these situational conditions on the border of the dialogical environment (Appendix 2, p.104).

Summing up, the concept of smile is studied in a certain cultural content with its values and senses. As we have noticed the concept of smile, entered into its own cultural content, gets such sense form which is clear only for its own cultural content. The concept of smile needs to be entered into the other environment of a cultural content and to see it in the light of another, for the purpose to extend the understanding of a concept of smile. As a result

of such actions the smile as one language has begun the development and the movement in several dialogical environments. The first environment is an environment of One's own, that is the text, and the second environment is an environment of the value-sense content of the Norwegian culture, the environment of 'other'. As a result, this interaction developed as we would call it metaphorically by the principle of formation of ripples in the water, because of the thrown stone in the water. A smile as one language is inside the circle of cultural content of 'one's own', and the cultural content of 'one's' is in a circle of 'other' cultural content. Thus, according to the philosophy of language of Bakhtin (1975), smile as one language interacted with 'one's own' and 'other' cultural content in unity.

Let us consider in more detail a question about existence a concept of smile in each of dialogical environments and interpret it. In the work of interpretation of a concept of smile (Appendix 2) two dialogical environments for a cultural content are represented as two forms of the text (Appendix 2, p. 109; Bakhtin 1986). On the one hand, the cultural context is the first form, called "a speech imprinted on a paper" (Bakhtin 1986), on the other hand, the second form is the reported speech of the Norwegian students, which represents the value-sense content of the Norwegian culture (Appendix 2, p. 109), called "a living human speech" (Bakhtin 1986).

The reflection on the study of language is implemented in the cultural context of the use of a by a special method of understanding of content in a dialogue (Bakhtin 1979, p. 361). This method is divided into four levels: 1. Perception of the text; 2. Recognition and understanding of the importance of this language; 3. Recognition and understanding in the context of a given culture; 4. Active dialogical understanding (Bakhtin 1979, p.361; Appendix 2, p. 109). According to these levels, the presented material reflects the influence of the different dialogical environment on the phenomenon of dialogical interaction between smile as one language and language of one's own (The text about the features of the Russian culture) and language of another (The students, who are the representatives of the Norwegian culture) (Appendix 2, p.109-118).

Let us present the dialogical environment 'Perception of the text' (Appendix 2, p.109-111) and consider what collaboration between smile as one language, the text and the Norwegian students are created. According to Three Categories of Peirce (1931–1935; 1893-1913; 1867–1893) and Bakhtin's (1975) philosophy of language, we have noticed that the Norwegian students began to have different feelings about the situation of perception of the text. It has been connected with the fact that the text was in another language that created a certain tension. In this case, the language of the text acts as the reason for "language

diversity” (Bakhtin 1981, p. 272). According to Bakhtin (1981), it is characterised as the beginning of work of “centrifugal force”. According to the Bakhtin’s (1981) view in the parallel line, it has to be also a work of “centripetal forces” (1981, p. 272). But in this dialogical situation, it is absent. Firstly, it could be the reason that we have found out in the work of Sergeev (2014). He writes: “A person tends to perceive one’s own in the parameters of a certain simplification, but Others is always understood as some complication by him or her, which prompting the adherents of culture to come into a warlike position against others” (Sergeev 2014). Secondly, according to Three Category of Peirce (1931–1935; 1893-1913; 1867–1893), it is first the feelings of the Norwegian students have come, then it should be the appearance of the reaction and between them the symbol as a smile. But I have noticed that it is not. It has to be explained. In the dialogical situation ‘Perception of the text’ (Appendix 2, p.109-111) the smile as one language has been beyond the Norwegian students’ attention. It seems that the “centrifugal forces” (Bakhtin 1981, p. 272) have forced out the smile as one language from the environment of another (among the Norwegian students). Hence, there is no basis for the work of “centripetal forces” (Bakhtin 1981, p. 272). In this situation, the understanding and interaction between three designated subjects can not be implemented. Therefore it could not be told that it is a dialogue. The dialogue has not succeeded in this situation.

As the results, the reaction of the Norwegian students was the unwillingness to understand the essence of purpose of dealing with the text, and above all, to begin to carry out an open dialogue. According to Bakhtin (1981), for balancing and unification of both "centrifugal forces"(Bakhtin 1981, p. 272) and "centripetal forces" (Bakhtin 1981, p. 272), it is necessary to present a smile as one language like a ‘unitary language’ which is developing in the ‘language diversity’ (Bakhtin 1981, p. 272; 1975, p. 84). Thus let us see how the both forces have been balanced through the symbol as a smile. In the “critical reflection on my report’s results” (Appendix 2, p.107-116) paragraph of the essay, it is written that the students’ attention from the situations presented in the text was changed from their own life experience of the use of symbol of smile as one language in the dialogical situation in their own life. This approach has balanced both forces. Hence, a smile as one language has harmoniously fitted into the language of the text and then into the language of another. Thus, when the attention of the students has become directed not only to the language but also to the life of the language, both “centrifugal forces” and “centripetal forces” (Bakhtin 1981, p. 272) would be in such collaboration that leads to the understanding and open dialogue.

The next two levels of interpretation of the concept of smile in the dialogue are the process of ‘recognition and understanding’ (Appendix 2, p. 111; Bakhtin 1979, p. 361). At this process, the situation looks like a journey in the content of the ‘other’ culture. At this step, the concept of smile is recognised in the content of the Norwegian culture. The created dialogized situation demands from the students the understanding of the language of the Russian cultural content. This language is rather difficult for clear understanding. That is why the consideration of the concept of smile is built on the base of the new scheme, presented in 1 Chapter of this thesis: the situation; then it is an intuition, then it is feeling, mediator, and the last one is a reaction.

Scanning the text, the smile as one language is understood intuitively by the Norwegian students. In the field of the dialogical environment of the context of the Norwegian culture. New guessing ideas are born and have to lead to the inference to the best explanation. The students use the abductive thinking (Peirce 1931–1935; 1893-1913; 1903f; 1867–1893) in the process of understanding of the concept of smile as one language in the presented cultural content. At this level, there is the first act of abductive method (Peirce 1903 f), that means that the students are making only some prediction, guessing. Then as it is known it should be the second act, the act of finding out of the foundation of facts of the guessing. It is noted that these facts are presented by the students’ real life and their experience. Hence, I can conclude that the students have used the abductive thinking in the process of understanding of the concept of smile (Appendix 2, p. 100-114).

Thus we have to move to the last level of the interpretation of the concept of smile in the dialogue and reflection on the concept of smile. At this level, called “active dialogical understanding” (Appendix 2, p. 111-116; Bakhtin 1979, p. 361), I have completed the understanding of the function of full mentioned above scheme, which is used for understanding of the life of dialogized language. Thus, I have already reflected on such parts of the scheme as the situation and the intuition and the feeling, and now it should be done the reflection on the mediator, then on the reaction and the last one on the ‘clear conscious’ understanding.

According to the “critical reflection on my report’s results” (Appendix 2, p. 107-116) paragraph in the essay, crossing the fourth border, I have decided for myself that being in the Border zone gives me the ‘clear conscious’ understanding of the concept of smile. At this zone of being in the dialogical situation, I have summed up all acquired knowledge about the smile as one language in the philosophy of language. But it is also should be paid the attention that the facts should also provide the presented conclusion and presentation of the inference to

the best explanation. The inference was built on the base of the interpretation of the value-sense content of culture, which is behind the concept of smile. This interpretation was a result of reflection on the students' opinion about the smile in the special described cultural situation in the presented text. Such results and interpretation belong to the category of the reaction, which forms in the collaboration of feelings and mediator.

Going through the context of the dialogical environment of the study of the concept of smile, the understanding of the smile as one language is presented in the concept of 'trinity' of the dialogized language (Bakhtin 1975). And at this part of the thesis, I will try to study how the collaboration between the concept of smile as one language with the value-sense content of culture is realised.

Before in the thesis, the concept of smile and value-sense content of culture have been considered separately. This reflection is considered as my possibility to make an inference and to present my abductive thinking about this collaboration.

In the dialogical environment, a language acts as a symbol (a mediator) between participants of dialogue. The way of the use of this symbol influences on the different appearance of the reaction. The reaction can be different, but the essence does not change. Hence, the concept of language also does not change, and the same is the value-sense content of culture. This assumption should be proved to be facts. If it is created a certain dialogical language environment, then a concept of smile as one language will be changed, and also value-sense content will be changed. It occurs, according to Bakhtin's (1975) philosophy of language, because of 'language diversity'. In this process, the different dialogical environments appear more initially, than reactions. Also mentioned above sample has presented that the lack of the description of the philosophy of the smile leads to 'language diversity'.

As an example, the Norwegian students have got acquainted with a small context that the Russian smile is a sign of a personal sympathy that is unusual and even strange for the Norwegian culture (on behalf of the Norwegian students). The dialogical environment of 'language diversity' has changed the students' perception of the concept of smile and value-sense content of culture. But in fact, a concept of smile and value-sense content of culture has not changed. But they are only more enriched. The value-sense content of culture which is hidden behind a concept of smile is not a simple sign, but the sign of the fact that the smile is considered as a private, personal symbol. This understanding may occur in the case of personal admission of one's own for another. And the concept of smile is spoken as the sacral relationship between one's own and another. Also, this abductive thinking has the foundation

which can be interpreted as follows. At first, the time when the Norwegian culture has entered into this dialogical environment, it has appeared the conflict that represented as ‘threat’ for one’s own. It lasts while the Norwegian culture (on behalf of the students) has seen that the text as another is the ‘assistant’ of understanding of a concept of smile. As a result, it has brought to the open dialogue and the understanding of the importance of the interaction of one’s own with another. The smile as a mediator has led to a reaction which has led to clear understanding.

Summing up, it is noted that the organised dialogical relationship between the concept of smile and the value-sense content of culture is expedient.

But, as a rule, this relationship does not always implement according to that presented above scheme. Most often the concept of smile is not only full of the value-sense content of culture but also another contents or senses. For instance, private senses or political, etc. In fact, the concept of smile is so extensive for the studying that it contains in itself a set of senses. Hence, the concept of smile can differ from the value-sense content of any culture. They only coincide when we consider smile as one language when the value-sense content of culture is hidden in the smile as one language. In this case, it is interpreted on the base of the cultural dialogical environment. The concept of language is formed due to the understanding of language through the cultural dialogue (Bakhtin 1975). These are so-called borders of another which create a certain image of language. Thus, for instance, a concept of smile is entering into two different dialogical situations. These situations: one person are smiling only to known people, on the one hand, another (‘alien’) person is open for conversation, on the other hand. In this case, the concept of smile has different images (Appendix 2). The another person conscious the language of one person through the creation of another persons’ limits of understanding of that one person’s language. Thereby another person is forming an image of one person’s language. At this process of hybridization (Bakhtin 1981, p. 358, 1975, p. 172) of the value-sense content of culture within the concept of smile is painted by the value-sense content of both cultures. As a result of the value-sense content of culture of one person’s language is represented in the content of value-sense content of culture of another person’s language.

But, as it has been noticed earlier, the understanding of a concept of smile as one language within two cultures reflects on the category of studying of language as “dialogized interpretation of language” (Bakhtin 1975). In this case, the way of understanding of the concept is not built by mixing of both one language and another language, but by leaving the borders which are created by another.

Thus, the concept of smile is considered within the uniform value-sense content of both cultures. It could be presented the confirming fact of that assumption. It is the use of essay's situational content as dialogical situation, taken place in the customs (Appendix 2, p. 116), which is used for the reflection on a concept of smile. In this case, the interpretation of the concept of smile in this dialogical situation is the creation of such image of language which has no borders of neither 'one's own', nor borders of 'another'. The language is out of these borders. Thus, I have noticed that a concept of smile as one certain language, living and existing in different dialogical environments, can be described completely, as well as partially.

The way of revealing of the concept of smile, then to find out the way of its description beyond (outer) the borders leads us to the final, *the fifth Border – 'drawing conclusions'*.

In the concept of the philosophy of smile the revealing of a concept of smile is not the most important, from our point of view. There is more important the determination of the existence and being of the concept of smile, being independent of any situation. But the paradox is that the concept of smile allows being studied only in the dialogical environment. In this dialogical environment the concept of smile as one's own enters into both borders one's own border and another border at the same time. Moreover being on the border of another it develops and changes and becomes understandable, hence it is "exceeding oneself" (Methi 2015, p. 218) only when it is within the borders of another.

Thus, mentioned in the whole thesis, thin, metaphorical description of the concept of 'trinity', which is the conversation between one's own, one's own object and other, presents in itself as a philosophy of smile.

Summing up all results of the reflexive analysis of the data of the experience of research of the concept of smile (Appendix 2), we have come to the conclusion that all obtained data successfully can be investigated in the presented methodology of studying the philosophy of smile. Use of the second essay (Appendix 2) as the data of the experience of research of the concept of smile has shown that it is the good base which acts as the confirming facts. These facts are the fundamental 'links' for carrying out "reflexive process of inferencing" (Linell 2006). Crossing *the five Borders* of understanding and interpretation of a concept of smile, it is possible to consider that, to make logical inferencing for the purpose of determination of the best understanding, all process of arguing and guessing the inference always has been proved by the facts. In every border, the reflection on the data of the second essay (Appendix 2) has become the basis for studying the concept of smile as one language.

Thus, it has been possible to determine the basis for the creation of a certain way in the study of the philosophy of smile. Crossing all presented borders as the ways has led to the representation of philosophy of smile, which is reflected in this chapter.

The whole view of this way in the Border zone is considered as follows: the whole way is created according to the certain schemes. This way has appeared from another way. That is the most important. Another way has been set initially in the first chapter. It is so called “a way of the crossing of six Borders”. What is the next way? It is so called “a way of the crossing of five borders in the fifth chapter”.

The necessity of crossing of these borders and being on them is caused by a possibility of exceeding the borders ‘language diversity’ between different cross-cultural dialogical environments and staying in the environment of dialogical understanding of language³. For this reason crossing the first border has given us the chance to note the prerequisites of ‘exceeding’ the ‘language diversity’ of cultures. The “exceeding” could be implemented in the special dialogical environment because language in itself has the dialogical nature. Having created this dialogical environment, we have crossed the second border. The crossing of the third border is marked by the fact that some assumptions about language within this dialogical environment are formed. The existence of these inferences has demanded its justification and factual confirmation, hence the crossing of the fourth border is considered as the main and decisive. Crossing this border it has become clear it has become understandable the possibility of exceeding cross-cultural ‘language diversity’. In the fourth border, it has become visible that there are the certain schemes of *thinking (description)* which are created in the conditions of the certain conversation of ‘one’s own’, ‘one’s own object’ and ‘other’ in different dialogical environments. In this concept of ‘trinity,’ the dialogue is carried in such way, that that the studied concept of smile as one language has become ‘clear conscious’ understandable. Thus, crossing the last border it has given us the certain description of the concept of smile as one language and has opened the philosophy of smile.

³ In the generalised given below conclusion the language should be understood through a concept of smile.

6.0 Chapter 6 Conclusion

My big journey in the Border Zone comes to an end. It is time to make a conclusion.

Studying of the philosophy of smile within this thesis is a way of crossing the borders and being in the Border Zone. The whole Border zone consisted of small borders. The crossing of the borders leads to the understanding. The question comes: What do I want to understand? What is a life of concept of smile? What is the philosophy of smile? What possible ways should I use to present a philosophy of smile?

If it is considered the written work as the whole work and to sum up the results, all done work in the studying of the philosophy of smile can be occurred this way. Let us imagine round tasty 'pie' (circle). Let us imagine that 'pie' is understood as a philosophy of smile, or so-called Border Zone. Then let us imagine that pie is divided into 'pieces' (segment of a circle). Pieces of pie are as the borders of understanding of the concept of smile. That means that the borders are insight Border Zone. To eat all pie it is necessary to eat one by one of the pieces of pie, then, in this case, it is possible to understand a taste of all pie.

Thus we are doing the same writing our work for the purpose to understand and to present philosophy of smile. We are crossing all borders of understanding of the concept of smile. As a result, we have tried to distinguish and describe a way which helps us to cross all borders and to be in "the Border Zone as an Arena for Exceeding Oneself" (Methi 2015, p. 213-223). In this work, the "exceeding oneself" (Methi 2015, p. 218) is the result of not only crossing the Border but also the being beyond the border.

Thus, what is the philosophy of smile is? Answering this question, we will consider how a way of crossing borders has been built; that has led to the completeness of understanding of being in the Border Zone. Thus we define a way of studying the philosophy of smile from insight.

The first border is connected with studying of how a concept of smile is studied within the culture and why it is so closely connected with culture. A smile as a concept has not been defined at once. In the first border, all attention has been directed to the differences in the 'external' factors, which are the cultural differences, where the smile is only considered as a facial expression of culture but not as a concept. We have both points of view, considering a smile as a concept. First, it has to be the appearance of it in the dialogical cultural environment. Secondly, a concept of smile can be considered as a concept if it is studied from its 'internal' content. It means that we study 'that is hidden' behind the facial

expression of culture. And ‘that is hidden’ begins to be open for us when we are crossing the second border. In this border, there is the first understanding that the concept of smile is different for different cultures. And also it can depend on the value-sense content of culture. Such inference has become my first opportunity to leave a border consciously and to start crossing the third border. In the third border the idea, which has appeared as an inference about the existence of the concept of smile in the second border has to exist in the dialogical environment. In the dialogical environment, a smile has to be studied as one language, because the language has a dialogized nature (Bakhtin 1981, 1975) and is represented through the philosophy of language well. Thus, we have come to the conclusion that the understanding of the concept of smile is possible through the dialogical understanding. Also crossing the next border of the dialogical understanding, it is possible to consider a smile as ‘inner smile’ for identification of concept of smile. My inference, made in the first border, that the smile can also be studied in a different perspective, but not only in mine and that there is the existence of a concept within a smile, has allowed me to accept and consider a smile as one language of other culture, but not only my own. Thus, I could exceed myself, and the way of the last two borders has been opened for me. In the fifth border, it was succeeded to find out a way which has not led to a vision of a concept of smile and opportunity to understand and to explain the philosophy of smile. It is called a *way of causality* by me. But the second new opened way has defined new vision and understanding of smile by myself that has formed a basis for methodological and profound theoretical understanding of the philosophy of smile. At this point, the first half of a long way into the Border Zone has been finished.

The second half of the way has begun with detailed studying and reflexive understanding on what the others consider and understand behind a concept of smile. Having studied the concept of culture we have determined its real interrelation with a concept of smile. This connection has represented the way of how the one’s own culture correlates with other culture on the base of the differences between the value-sense content of cultures. This idea reflects the development of cultures. It is shown us the philosophy of smile within the understanding of different cultures, entering the concept of smile in a cultural context of the development of cultures. We draw the main conclusion by the idea of LaFrance (2011, p. 200) that different cultures express the value-sense content of culture differently in spite of the fact that they can speak one language, for instance, using a smile as one language. This different expression is shown differently because of different situational conditions and views of understanding of smile as one language. The first view is that the smile as one language can be studied and be understood through three Categories of Peirce (1931–1935; 1893-1913;

1867–1893). And also through the concept of ‘trinity’ of dialogicity of language: one’s own – one’s own object–other (Bakhtin 1975). This concept of ‘trinity’ in the philosophy of language has formed the basis of carrying out the reflexive analysis of the data presented in the second essay (Appendix 2). And it should be noted that without reflection and an abductive method it was difficult to present and to describe a concept of smile and philosophy of smile. Within two presented different principles of the concept of ‘trinity’, it was immersion in the seventh border of methodological and theoretical understanding of the content of my subjective understanding of smile.

The next step is the crossing of the next five borders. According to this step, my initial understanding of smile, which is reflected in the reflection on the first essay (Appendix 1) with the use of the abductive method, both three categories of understanding and the principle of the concept of ‘trinity’ in the understanding of dialogical language was immersed in the environment of other. This environment of other is the reflexive analysis of the data of experience of the study of the concept of smile, presented in the second essay (Appendix 2). The environment of other is those facts which reflect and confirm the inferences about a concept of smile. These inferences are made at the first stage of research and implemented at the second one and the third stage. This understanding is examined by new reflection, finally to be recognised as ‘alive’.

Thus, in the sixth border, we confirm that a language of a smile can be interpreted within other cultures. Moreover, such mixture of one’s own and other interpretation can extend a concept of smile.

In the seventh, eighth, ninth, tenth borders we see that the available context of reflection on data leads to understanding how a concept of smile can be understood through three categories of understanding of a concept of smile, and through concept of ‘trinity’ of dialogicity of language, and also through the abductive thinking. Such consideration of a concept of smile has allowed to see it in the concept of “behind perspective” (Florenskii 1995). For our research, this concept of “behind perspective” entered by Florenskii (1995) means the perspective of consideration of a concept of smile within smile’s movement and smile’s being (life), but not within smile’s death - the understanding of smile as an appearance.

At the last final twelfth borders it is the last piece of ‘pie’ for eating, to gain the whole impression about ‘pie’ and consequently the whole understanding of the philosophy of smile or the whole vision in the Border Zone.

Having crossed all eleven borders at the end, we do not give a certain definition of a concept of smile. We tried to give it in the thesis earlier, but we have not found out the suitable definition to the concept of smile which would open its inner essence completely. At this research stage, we consider that it is not necessary, because of that the concept can be understood differently, which depends on the situation in the dialogical environment of its existence. Also, it is not an aim of this research.

We will speak about the understanding of the philosophy of smile. According to the result of this study, we have seen that the understanding of the concept of smile in different dialogical environments is built by the principle of the concept of 'trinity'. This concept is entered by us because it is used and function among all work as a principle of understandable thinking (description) of the concept of smile.

This principle is reflected in the reflexive analysis of dialogical environments and contextual situations in which the concept of smile is living. Also, it is reflected in the understanding of functioning of a smile as one language in dialogical environments which is implemented on the base of three categories of understanding of a concept of smile. Also, a life of language of smile and its conversation with other phenomena in the dialogical environment is based on this principle that is considered as a principle of dialogicity of language.

Summing up all ideas of presented ways of thinking (description) and understanding, the 'internal' perspective of the end of the cycle of crossing the borders (pieces of 'pie') within the border zone ('pie') is opened for us. Thus it is the opportunity to see the picture of the Border Zone not only in the perspective of being in the borders but also entirely, as a whole picture of the Border Zone. It means the "exceeding oneself" (Methi 2015, p. 218) and the reveal of the philosophy of smile beyond the borders.

7.0 Chapter 7 Glossary

In this Chapter 7, I have tried to present the short definition of some important concepts that the reader can face with, reading this thesis. I think it is necessary to make them clear for better understanding. But we should not forget about the possibility of the inner understanding of the reader. Also, it is important to pay attention to the context of the use of these presented below concepts in work. That is why there is more than one definition for some of the concepts. And some of the definitions is not possible to present for these concepts, because of internal and private understanding of the reader of them. Let us give a freedom for the reader in his or her understanding.

Glossary

1. Border – obstacles; something that the person faces with; a place for reflection on something.
2. Border zone – the arena for exceeding oneself in the process of reflection
3. Culture – a platform of revealing the difference between that a person does not identify with One's own, and that he or she tends to associate with One's own as something special and only One's own, as a result, the contrasting of One's own and others.
4. Crossing the border – leaving oneself and revealing another (the "Other")
5. Language diversity – the development of different languages brings a different kind of relations between the words
6. One's own – The Inner; internal understanding of a person; internal attitude
7. Own – something in us that belongs to One's own
8. "the Other" – someone in us whom we would not have known; another.
9. Oneself – one in us who belongs to essential being of I
10. Other, Another – an alien; someone who belongs to other people or to another language, that is not one's own, at any level; attitude of others.
11. Smile – as one language of dialogue; an appearance; facial expression; the concept; expression of nature.

References

1. BAKHTIN, M.M. (1972) *Problemy pojetiki Dostoevskogo [Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics]*. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaja.
2. BAKHTIN, M.M. (1975) *Slovo v romane. K voprosam stilistiki romana. Voprosy literatury i estetiki [The Word in the Novel. The features of the roman's stylistics. Questions of the literature and esthetics]*. Moscow, pp. 72-227.
3. BAKHTIN, M.M. (1979) *Jestetika slovesnogo tvorcestva [The Aesthetics of Verbal Art]*. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaja literature.
4. BAKHTIN, M.M. (1981) Discourse in the Novel. In: HOLQUIST, M. (ed.) *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Austin: The University of Texas Press, pp. 259-422.
5. BAKHTIN, M.M. (1986) *[The] Aesthetics of Verbal Art*. Moscow: Iskusstvo
6. BAKHTIN, M.M. (1990) *Tvorcestvo Fransua Rable i narodnaja kul'tura Srednevekov'ja i Renessansa [Rabelais and His World]*. M.: Hudozhestvennaja literatura.
7. BIRDWHISTELL, R.L. (1970) *Kinesics and Context*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
8. BOHM, D. (1990) *On Dialogue. David Bohm Seminar*. Ojai, CA.
9. CARSTON, R. (2005) Pragmatic inference – reflective or reflexive?. In: *Paper at 9th International Pragmatics Conference, Riva del Garda, Italy, 10-15 July, 2005*.
10. CHAIKLIN, S., HEDEGAARD, M. and JENSEN, U.J. (1999) *Activity theory and social practice: cultural-historical approaches*. Aarhus University Press.
11. CHIASSON, P. (2001) Abduction as an Aspect of Retroduction. In: BERGMAN, M. and QUEIROZ, J. (eds.) *The Commens Encyclopedia: The Digital Encyclopedia of Peirce Studies. New Edition (pub. 121217-1944a)*. [Online] URL: <http://www.commens.org/encyclopedia/article/chiasson-phyllis-abduction-aspect-retroduction> [Accessed 03/03/16].
12. COFFEY, H. (n.d.) *Socratic method* [WWW] Learn NC. Available from: <http://www.learnnc.org/lp/pages/4994?ref=search> [Accessed 11/09/16].
13. COPELAND, M. (2005) *Socratic Circles: Fostering Critical and Creative Thinking*. Portland, MN: Stenhouse Publishers.
14. DAL, V. (n.d.) *Tolkovyj slovar' zhivogo velikoruskogo jazyka [Explanatory Dictionary of the Living Great Russian Language]*. [Online] URL: http://slovoonline.ru/slovar_dal/ [Accessed 27/08/16].

15. DAMASIO, A.R. (2000) *The Feeling of What Happens: Body and Emotions in the Making of Consciousness*. New York: Harcourt.
16. DILTHEY, W. (2002) *The Formation of the Historical World in the Human Sciences*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
17. DOUVEN, I. (2011) Abduction. In: ZALTA, E.N. (ed.) *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Spring 2015 Edition. [Online] URL: <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2011/entries/abduction/> [Accessed 08/10/16].
18. EKMAN, P. (2004) *Emotions revealed: understanding faces and feelings*. London: Phoenix, pp. 282.
19. ERIKSEN, S. (2015) *Borders as opportunities - new book*. Nord University. [Online] URL: <http://www.nord.no/en/news-events/news/Pages/Borders-are-opportunities.aspx> [Accessed 03/10/16].
20. FITZPATRICK, R. (2007) *Law of Refraction*. In: FITZPATRICK, R. *Electromagnetism and Optics*. Austin: University of Texas. [Online] URL: <http://farside.ph.utexas.edu/teaching/316/lectures/node128.html> [Accessed 15/09/16].
21. FLORENSKII, P. (1995) *Ikonostas [Iconostas]*. M.: Iskusstvo.
22. FLORENSKII, P. (1990) *Stolp i utverzhdienie Istiny.U vodorazdelov istiny [The stronghold and confirmation of the Truth. The boundary of the truth]*. M.: "Pravda".
23. FREITAS-MAGALHAES, A. and CASTRO, E. (2009) The neuropsychophysiological construction of the human smile. In: Freitas-Magalhaes, A. *Emotional expression: The Brain and The Face*. Porto: University Fernando Pessoa Press.
24. GODOY, R. (2005) Do smiles have a face value? Panel evidence from Amazonian Indians. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 26, pp. 469-490.
25. GOTTMAN, J.M. et al. (1998) Predicting Marital Happiness and Stability from Newlywed Interactions. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 60(1), pp.5-22. [Online] URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/353438?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents [Accessed 07/10/13].
26. GUEGUEN, N. (2003) The effect of smiling on helping behaviour: Smiling and good Samaritan behaviour. *Communication Reports*, 16(2), pp. 133-140.
27. HARPER, D. (n.d.) *Online Etymology Dictionary* [Online] URL: http://www.etymonline.com/index.php?allowed_in_frame=0&search=log [Accessed 04/10/16].
28. HUNTER, J. (2011) A study of consumer perception of smiling customer service within the airline industry. *Journal of Transportation Security*, 4, pp. 35-36.

29. HYDLE, I. (2014) A study on Norwegian street mediation used in a cross cultural comparison project as part of ALTERNATIVE: Developing alternative understandings of security and justice through restorative justice approaches in intercultural settings within democratic societies. An investigation of the role of gender and age in conflict perception and conflict transformation. In: *Seventh framework cooperation programme. Deliverable 2.4: Final research report on conflict and restorative justice*. Oslo: NOVA. [Online] URL: <http://www.alternativeproject.eu/> [Accessed 14/08/16].
30. JOHNSON, L.A. (1990) *Commemorating the past: a critical study of the shaping of British and Arthurian history in Geoffrey of Monmouth's Historia Regum Britannie, Wace's Roman de Brut, Lazamon's Brut and the alliterative Morte Arthure*. Published thesis (PhD), King's College, London University. [Online] URL: <https://kclpure.kcl.ac.uk/portal> [Accessed 15/09/16].
31. KAPITAN, T. (2000) Abduction as Practical Inference. In: BERGMAN, M. and QUEIROZ, J. (eds.) *The Commens Encyclopedia: The Digital Encyclopedia of Peirce Studies. New Edition (pub. 121219-1528a)*. [Online] URL: <http://www.commens.org/encyclopedia/article/kapitan-tomis-abduction-practical-inference> [Accessed 04/03/16].
32. KOCHARIAN, A. (2014) *The Nature of Light and Propagation of Light*, from Chapter 33. Santa Monica College. [Online] URL: http://homepage.smc.edu/kocharian_armen/Physics23/PC_Chapter_Optics_33_lecture_1.pdf [Accessed 29/09/16].
33. KORNIYENKO, E.R. (2010) Text through the Prism of M.M. Bakhtin's Philosophy. *Lingvistika i mezhkul'turnaja komunikacija [Linguistics and intercultural communication]*, 1, pp.128-133.
34. KRAUT, R. (2015) Plato, The historical Socrates: early, middle, and late dialogues. In: ZALTA, E.N. (ed.) *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Spring 2015 Edition. [Online] URL: <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2015/entries/plato/> [Accessed 05/10/16].
35. *Kroshka Enot [The Little Raccoon]* (1974) Cartoon. Directed by CHURKIN, O. Russia: Jekran.
36. LAFRANCE, M. (2011) *Why smile?: the science behind facial expressions*. NY: W.W. Norton & Company.

37. LEWIS, A.J. (2009) *The dialogue circle method*. *Annual Conference Proceedings* [WWW] National Organizational Development Network. Available from: <http://www.slideshare.net/Angelojohn/dialogue-circle-method> [Accessed 09/08/16].
38. LILLARD, A.S. and PETERSON, J. (2011) The immediate impact of different types of television on young children's executive function. *Pediatrics*, pp. 128-649.
39. LINELL, P. (2006) Towards a dialogical linguistics. In LAEHTEENMAEKI, M. et al. (eds.), *The XII International Bakhtin Conference: Proceedings, Jyväskylä, 18-22 July, 2005*. Finland: University of Jyväskylä, Department of Languages, pp. 152-167. [Online] URL: <https://liu.se/ikk/medarbetare/per-linell/filarkiv-per-linell/1.175583/127Towardsadialogicallinguistics.pdf> [Accessed 28/09/16].
40. LYRICSTRANSLATE (2011) *Ulybka [Smile]* [WWW] LyricsTranslate. Available from: <http://lyricstranslate.com/ru/ulybka-ulybka-smile.html-0#songtranslation> [Accessed 13/10/13].
41. METHI, J.S. (2015) The Border Zone as an Arena of Exceeding Oneself. In: ROSSVAER, V. and SERGEEV, A.M. (eds.) *The philosophy of the Border Zone (through the Eyes of Russian and Norwegian participants)*. Oslo: Orkana Academic, pp. 213-223.
42. MEZHUEV, V.M. (2013) Cennosti i smysly v kontekste kul'tury [Values and senses in the context of culture]. In: *Dialog kul'tur: cennosti, smysly, kommunikacii: XIII Mezhdunarodnye Lihachevskie nauchnye chtenija [Dialogue of cultures: values, senses, communication: XIII Lihachev International Science Reading]*, Saint-Petersburg, 16-17 May, 2013. SPb.: SPbGU, pp. 131-133. [Online] URL: http://www.lihachev.ru/pic/site/files/lihcht/Sbor_full/2013_rus.pdf C. 131-133 [Accessed 18/08/15].
43. PEIRCE, C.S. (1867–1893) *The Essential Peirce - Volume 1: Selected Philosophical Writings*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, pp. 160-178.
44. PEIRCE, C.S. (1893-1913) *Edition Project*. In *The Essential Peirce - Volume 2: Selected Philosophical Writings*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
45. PEIRCE, C.S. (1903a) Abduction. Harvard Lectures on Pragmatism: Lecture V, MS [R] 312, CP 5, pp.144-145. In: BERGMAN, M. and PAAVOLA, S. (eds.) *The Commens Dictionary: Peirce's Terms in His Own Words. New Edition (pub. 03.01.13-18:56)*. [Online] URL: <http://www.commens.org/dictionary/entry/quote-harvard-lectures-pragmatism-lecture-v-0> [Accessed 27/02/16].

46. PEIRCE, C.S. (1903b) Abduction. Syllabus: Nomenclature and Division of Triadic Relations, as far as they are determined, MS [R] 540, EP 2, p. 299. In: BERGMAN, M. and PAAVOLA, S. (eds.) *The Commens Dictionary: Peirce's Terms in His Own Words. New Edition* (pub. 04.01.13-16:54). [Online] URL: <http://www.commens.org/dictionary/entry/quote-syllabus-nomenclature-and-division-triadic-relations-far-they-are-determined> [Accessed 27/02/16].
47. PEIRCE, C.S. (1903c) Abduction. Harvard Lectures on Pragmatism: Lecture VI, MS [R] 314, CP 5, pp. 171-172. In: BERGMAN, M. and PAAVOLA, S. (eds.) *The Commens Dictionary: Peirce's Terms in His Own Words. New Edition* (pub. 03.01.13-18:48). [Online] URL: <http://www.commens.org/dictionary/entry/quote-harvard-lectures-pragmatism-lecture-vi> [Accessed 01/03/16].
48. PEIRCE, C.S. (1903d) Abduction. Harvard Lectures on Pragmatism: Lecture VII, a deleted passage, MS [R] 315, PPM, pp. 282-283. In: BERGMAN, M. and PAAVOLA, S. (eds.) *The Commens Dictionary: Peirce's Terms in His Own Words. New Edition* (pub. 03.01.13-16:58). [Online] URL: <http://www.commens.org/dictionary/entry/quote-harvard-lectures-pragmatism-lecture-vii-deleted-passage> [Accessed 03/03/16].
49. PEIRCE, C.S. (1903e) Lowell Lectures on Some Topics of Logic Bearing on Questions Now Vexed. Eighth Lecture. Abduction. In: BERGMAN, M. and PAAVOLA, S. (eds.) *The Commens Dictionary: Peirce's Terms in His Own Words. New Edition* (pub. 11.06.14-18:20). [Online] URL: <http://www.commens.org/dictionary/entry/quote-lowell-lectures-some-topics-logic-bearing-questions-now-vexed-eighth-lecture-3> [Accessed 03/03/16].
50. PEIRCE, C.S. (1903f) The Harvard Lectures on Pragmatism. In TURRISI P.A. (ed.) *Pragmatism as a Principle and Method of Right Thinking*. New York: State University of New York Press (pub.1997).
51. PEIRCE, C.S. (1905). Abduction. Letter draft to Mario Calderoni, L [R] 67, CP 8, p. 209. In: BERGMAN, M. and PAAVOLA, S. (eds.) *The Commens Dictionary: Peirce's Terms in His Own Words. New Edition* (pub. 04.01.13-18:20). [Online] URL: <http://www.commens.org/dictionary/entry/quote-letter-draft-mario-calderoni> [Accessed 27/02/16].
52. PEIRCE, C.S. (1906) Abduction. Prolegomena to an Apology for Pragmaticism. *The Monist*, 16, CP 4.541 n1, pp. 492-546. In: BERGMAN, M. and PAAVOLA, S. (eds.) *The Commens Dictionary: Peirce's Terms in His Own Words. New Edition* (pub. 11.06.14-

- 18:11). [Online] URL: <http://www.commens.org/dictionary/entry/quote-prolegomena-apology-pragmaticism-26> [Accessed 27/02/16].
53. PEIRCE, C.S. (1931–1935) *Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce*. Vols. 1-6. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 66-92.
 54. PEIRCE, C.S. (1931–1958) *Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.
 55. PLATO (1990) *Sobranie sochinenij v chetyreh tomah [The collection of Essays in Four volumes]*. M.: Mysl'.
 56. PLATO (1999) Alcibiades I and II. In: LAMB, W.R.M. (trans.) *Plato: Charmides, Alcibiades I and II, Hipparchus, The lovers, Theages, Minos, Epinomis*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
 57. PLATO (2011) *Dialogi [Dialogues]*. Moscow:AST.
 58. RICKERT, H. (1998) O sisteme cennostej [About the system of values]. In: RICKERT, H. *Nauki o prirode i nauki o kul'ture [Nature Sciences and Art Sciences]*. M.: Respublika, pp.363-391.
 59. ROSSVAER, V. (2015) Philosophy in the Border Zone: A postscript. In: ROSSVAER, V. and SERGEEV, A.M. (eds.) *The philosophy of the Border Zone (through the Eyes of Russian and Norwegian participants)*. Oslo: Orkana Academic, pp. 245-249.
 60. SCHMOLKE-HASSELMANN, B. (1982) The Round Table: Ideal, Fiction, Reality. *Arthurian Literature*, 2, pp. 41-75.
 61. SERGEEV, A.M. (2011) *Klyuchi: (Filosofskie razmyshlenija) [The Keys: Philosophical Reflections]*. Murmansk: MGGU, p. 224.
 62. SERGEEV, A.M. (2014) *Kul'tura i soznanie: svojo i chuzhoe [Culture and consciousness: one's own and others]*. Murmansk: MSHU. [Online] URL: www.mshu.edu.ru/index.php?option=com_content&task=section&id=53&Itemid=2940 [Accessed 14/11/14].
 63. SERGEEV, A.M. (2015) The Internal, the External, and One's Own. In: ROSSVAER, V. and SERGEEV, A.M. (eds.) *The philosophy of the Border Zone (through the Eyes of Russian and Norwegian participants)*. Oslo: Orkana Academic, pp. 21-42.
 64. SERGEEV, A.M. (2016) *Thinking and language: metaphysical junction: a collection of philosophical essays*. Murmansk: Murmansk Publishing House.
 65. SERGEEV, A.M. and SOKOLOV, B.G. (2015) *Razryv povsednevnosti: dialog dlinoyu v 300 chashek kofe i 3 bloka sigaret [A Rift in the Everyday: a Dialogue that Lasted for 300 Cups of Coffee and Three Cartons of Cigaretts]*. St. Petersburg: Aletheia.

66. STERNIN, I.A. (2000) Ulybka v russkom kommunikativnom povedenii [The smile in Russian communicative behaviour]. In: STERNIN, I.A. et.al. (eds.) *Russkoe i finskoe kommunikativnoe povedenie [Russian and Finish communicative behaviour]*. Issue 1. Voronezh: VGTU, pp. 53-61. [Online] URL: <http://commbehavior.narod.ru/RusFin/RusFin2000/Sternin4.htm> [Accessed 11/10/13].
67. SULTANBAEVA, I.N. (2013) The 'inner smile'- a key to freedom from the 'internal fight', essay. Norway: Nord University.
68. SULTANBAEVA, I.N. (2014) Crossing the border in the dialogue between Russian and Norwegian cultures, essay. Murmansk: MSHU.
69. SULTANBAEVA, I.N. (2016) *Philosophy of smile: beyond the border*. Unpublished thesis (Master's degree), Nord University and MASU.
70. The Great Encyclopaedic Dictionary (n.d.) *The Round Table* [WWW] VEDU.RU. Available from: <http://www.vedu.ru/bigencdic/31519/> [Accessed 19/10/16].
71. *The Oxford English Dictionary* (n.d.). Oxford University Press. [Online] URL: <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/> [Accessed 01/10/16].
72. TREDWAY, L. (1995) Socratic Seminars: Engaging Students in Intellectual Discourse. *Educational Leadership*, 53 (1).
73. TRUDGILL, M.L. (2001) *The representation of chivalric ideals in twelfth-century northern France*. Published thesis (PhD), University of Bristol. [Online] URL: <http://research-information.bristol.ac.uk> [Accessed 11/09/16].
74. TRUMBLE, A. (2004) *A brief history of the smile*. NY: Basic Books, pp. 226.
75. TSUKIURA, T. and CABEZA, R. (2008) Orbifrontal and hippocampal contributions to memory for face-name associations: The rewarding power of smile. *Journal Neuropsychologia*, 46(9), pp. 2310-2319. [Online] URL: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18455740> [Accessed 07/10/13].
76. WEISS, J. (ed. and trans.) (1999) *Wace's 'Roman de Brut': A History of the British*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press.
77. *Why do not the Russians smile?* (2013) [WWW] ADME. Available from: <http://www.adme.ru/svoboda-psihologiya/pochemu-russkie-ne-ulybayutsya-591505/> [Accessed 11/05/14].
78. WIRTH, U. (2001) Abductive Inference and Literary Theory – Pragmatism, Hermeneutics and Semiotics. In: BERGMAN, M. and QUEIROZ, J. (eds.) *The Commens Encyclopedia: The Digital Encyclopedia of Peirce Studies. New Edition (pub. 121219-1940a)*. [Online]

URL: <http://www.commens.org/encyclopedia/article/wirth-uwe-abductive-inference-and-literary-theory-%E2%80%93-pragmatism-hermeneutics-and> [Accessed 05/03/16].

79. WIRTH, U. (2001) Abductive Reasoning and Language Philosophy: Peirce's and Davidson's Account of Interpretation. In: BERGMAN, M. and QUEIROZ, J. (eds.) *The Commens Encyclopedia: The Digital Encyclopedia of Peirce Studies. New Edition (pub. 121220-1059a)*. [Online] URL: <http://www.commens.org/encyclopedia/article/wirth-uwe-abductive-reasoning-and-language-philosophy-peirces-and-davidsons> [Accessed 05/03/16].

Appendix 1



UNIVERSITETET I
NORDLAND

Title:

**THE 'INNER SMILE'- A KEY TO FREEDOM FROM
THE 'INTERNAL FIGHT'**

Name:

SULTANBAEVA IULIIA

BO 301 P – Writing subjectivity

Autumn 2013



On graduating from my university, directly I have known that I would work as a teacher of English language. At that time I could not represent myself in another field. So I have worked some years, enjoying my profession, working with students and now I continue doing it. I like studying and getting new knowledge and then to put them into the practice.

But once I also wished to get a profession of the teacher of Russian as a foreign language. This desire arose that time when I was teaching English. While I was telling the Russian students about the culture of English people, the culture of the studied language (English) at the English lesson, suddenly unexpected idea has come into my mind. I've thought what if I tell the foreigners about my own culture especially where I have been brought up, about the Russian culture and teach them the Russian language. As I love my country and culture very much, I could share it with the international students with pleasure.

After that, this idea did not leave me. I started looking for where I could get a good knowledge in the field of teaching the Russian language as a foreign language. I took the program in Lomonosov Moscow State University and began to study. After finishing it, unfortunately having got the excellent theoretical knowledge I had no opportunity to teach Russian as a foreign language frequently, therefore, I had not so much practical experience.

After a while I was suggested to work at the Winter school of Russian language "the Russian Arctic: language culture economy" for students from Norway. I was very glad to have such opportunity because I wanted to share with the international students my knowledge, to have a practice, to teach them to speak Russian, to tell them about the culture of the Russian people, to communicate, to learn their culture too. It was very responsible work for me as I understood that it was necessary to organise work and lessons such way when it would be very interesting and useful for students. Fortunately, I worked with very skilled colleague at this school. We organised and thought over the excellent plan of lessons together. Though everything has been organised and thought over, I experienced a thrill because I got used to having a responsible approach to any work. To live responsibly, to speak responsibly, to behave responsibly. As I can understand the more you are responsible for dealing with your work and do it the best way, the more you will get feedback from your work. I try to behave that way in any events of my life. As now it is a responsible event for me.

Here was the first day of the meeting with the students and I worried but I tried to control myself. My colleague and I began the first day with an acquaintance to the students. Our acquaintance went off very well. The students and we were glad to meet each other as I thought. All participants of the school have told a little about themselves in Russian. However, I've noted that in the case of acquaintance very few people from the students

smiled and they had an equal person but friendly. This feature aroused my interest directly. I had a question: *why did not some Norwegian students smile at all in the case of acquaintance?* It seemed to me strange.

To answer myself to this question I started comparing and analysing my habit and behaviour when I have the first acquaintance with new people. When I meet and get acquainted with a new person such person represents for me a great interest. I am interested in getting information about that person. Who is he/she? What does he/she do? What way does he/she think? So involuntarily the smile on my face starts appearing from the pleasure of acquaintance and communication with a new person.

In the case of our first acquaintance to the Norwegian students, I behaved the same way. I smiled. I also expected that the students would express pleasure of an acquaintance and a new communication through an open smile too. But it didn't occur. The feeling of vagueness and uncertainty, in whether the students were glad to our acquaintance or not, makes me think deeply.

I thought whether an open smile could only express the pleasure of a meeting and acquaintance. While we were getting acquainted, my smile appeared very quickly and disappeared the same way. When I looked at the students, listened to them and saw their unemotional faces I started noting that my behaviour became rather strange for me in some moments. During the long conversation with the students when I listened to them I noted that my sincere smile transferred in on duty and stimulated smile. I started to dislike it in myself. I wondered why it occurred and I have understood that thus unconsciously, in hope, I tried to force to smile the students. I tried to cheer them up. But all my efforts were unsuccessful. As soon as I realised what I have done I stopped to behave such way.

Then I noted that I stopped smiling more often as I did it at the first time of our meeting and began to talk in the same manner as the students did. It was not peculiar to my trait of character. It was the first meeting which from the meeting of pleasure and smile developed into the meeting of my internal fight.

For a little, while the explanation of the appearance of my internal fight during that experience was found in the article by Jensen (1999). I understood as it is my first meeting with such event there is only one question in my mind 'Why is that way ?- why did not some Norwegian students smile at all in the case of acquaintance?'. If I do not have any experience in managing events in which I am, now the question tag 'Why..?' is always in my mind – the question of causality.

‘Hume explains the relationship between the category of causality and our experiences. He argued that causality is nothing over and above the constant conjunction of events.

Causality can only be understood in the context of complex practices governed by procedures for choosing and justifying objects of intervention’ (Jensen 1999).

And I have started to find the answer to that question tag ‘Why..?’ in that event in my life. But there were no results, no answers because analysing that event now in Hume's point of view to the causality of the event, I saw that early I have not try to find any causes of that event, I avoid it. That time I only decided to hold the opinion that probably the students got tired from the trip to Murmansk very much and they had even no forces to express any emotions, for the purpose not to remain in this internal fight and not to have a question tag ‘Why..?’.

After a while, I conscious the thought which is taking away from the analysis and consciousness of any behaviour, emotions is not the best way to leave the internal fight. I would tell on the contrary that such behaviour makes even more problems to the person. In this case, the person can lose the ability to continue the internal growth of the identity. Therefore, internal borders should be broken. The fact is the fact. I cannot deny the absence of experience in that event. I have to find my causality of my internal fight. Fight which I think is grown up from the absence of emotional feedback like a smile. Expansion of understanding of the ordinary external perception of event obliterated internal borders.

Smile. Is it a border or a way to break a border? Next day I and the colleague began to lead a lesson of the Russian language. The first lesson is always disturbing. I was prepared for it very carefully and wanted to carry it out in the best way.

When students entered into a class, I was glad to see them again. My smile did not leave my face. Today I have been waiting for the students that our meeting will be more emotional. I hoped to see more smiles. But it has deceived my expectations. Only a few people smiled modestly. They were Alex and Ida. Alex was from Russia, but in the childhood, he moved with his parents to live in Norway. He knew Russian but not in perfection. He was impregnated with the upbringing of the Norwegian culture, and only ‘echoes’ of the Russian culture was sometimes met. He was the person of two cultures. At the lessons, he was often like as an assistant for me in understanding and acceptance of behaviour of the Norwegian students which was new for me that time. So it was that time.

The students in the class began to sit down on their chairs. There was silence. I asked them how they were feeling, but the silence also remained. Then after a while which

seemed to me the eternity of expectations of the response Alex replied that they were fine but only they didn't sleep well. Others kept silent and did not express any emotions. It embarrassed me a little. I have expected of my habit that many students would share their feelings as it is usually with the students at English lessons which I lead for the Russian students. I thought it might not be considered for Norwegian students. I looked at the students again and conveyed sympathy to them. From this moment their faces changed a little, and I felt that the spark of easy mutual understanding and acceptance crossed between us.

I started leading a lesson. Everything that I have prepared for a lesson for students I showed and told them carefully. We played the games. I tried to encourage and to interest them. But all the time it seemed to me that it was not interesting, and it was boring for them because they expressed very few emotions, and where it was necessary to express emotions, the students did not express in spite of the games were cheerful. And here again, Alex came to the rescue. For example, the task for the students was the reading of funny short dialogues and inventing the funny end according to the situation in the dialogues. Though all words in the dialogues were familiar for the students, the essence of the Russian humour was not clear. Only Alex could understand what a humour essence was. When students read, I hoped that this task would let them feel at ease and they would be more open in an expression of their emotions in the class. I expected from them laughter and smiles again, but I did not get them. Only after Alex's explanation to other students the essence of the dialogues in the Norwegian language, the students began to smile and laugh. How I was happy to see their smiles and laughter and their aroused interest to continue to do this task. Now we spoke in one language as it seemed to me. In the end, they managed the task very easy. In this situation, I did not experience fight and internal collision of understanding of two cultures inside myself.

As a result, even the first lesson did not pass as it was planned I did not consider that the students got tired from the trip and also there was the influence of the different time zone. But the first day of the lesson of the Russian as a foreign language was a dialogue of two cultures for the students where they learned my behaviour and for me where I learned their one. And the smile as I think in that case was like a 'litmus paper' which helped us to indicate that.

Considering the fact of passing the first day of lessons, I was prepared for the second one. Next day when we met with the students at the lesson again, I asked them how they were, but thus I did not expect from them smiles as I did it earlier. I was my own self and accepted everything as it was. Seeing their sleepy again, I have understood everything and started leading a lesson. The second lesson has passed well, though also the students almost

did not smile and did not express emotions. Their persons were equal and quiet. Following the results of the lesson again it seemed to me that it was possible to organise the lesson better. I have analysed it. As I could see methodically, the lesson was organised well, but my ability to organise the students has failed sometimes. I was conscious that I had to improve myself.

So working day by day I have acquired skills of the right organisation of a lesson of Russian as a foreign language for the Norwegian students. Every day the lessons passed better and more interestingly. The students have already got used and smiled more but the truth they continued to maintain emotional moderation that was peculiar to them as I thought. I stopped to pay much attention to it. The exception of a smile and inability to receive that one stopped to be a problem for me. So I got acquainted with features of the Norwegian students – restraint of emotions and moderation. From each lesson I have become more confident at the lesson's organisation and learned a new culture and also it was very interesting for me to work with the Norwegian students.

This meeting with the Norwegian culture (through these students) was for me a door of understanding myself and also the understanding of the Russian culture. Here I understood that my habit which is to be open and to smile in the case of a meeting and acquaintance to new people forced me always to expect the same answer behaviour from the counter person. And if it was not it brought me chagrin and misunderstanding of that each person has the right to behave as he wants and according to his culture of upbringing. And this does not always mean that if a person does not smile to me in the case of a meeting or acquaintance, mutually he will not want to get acquainted or communicate with me. I saw the outer part of things instead of the inner.

All the same, the smile in this life experience has become for me a way of breaking the borders. The expectation of a smile from other person makes a conflict. But I understood that it is natural for me to smile. That is only the consciousness of influence of the smile on the situation but not a consciousness of causality of inner fight where the cause is my expectation of a smile. I am a smiling person what I am.

So what is a smile? Smile, I think, is a sun ray, gift for any person to bring each other warm, love, openness, friendliness. And only the 'sincere smile' is capable of causing such feelings in the person, and so he or she can share them with people around. Smile force is in sincerity. The 'sincere smile' always attracts attention and helps people to be open for communication and does relations of people truthful. Where is a truth, there is one. Also, there is no lie. And the 'false smile is a 'stretched bow' which is visible directly and declares to any person a 'danger' and impossibility to construct sincere human relations. It brings

people to sufferings and big tension and impossibility of continuous sincere cooperation.

In my life, I have met many expressions of different smiles. Seeing a smile gives a possibility to read internality of the person. Probably you also notice different variations of smiles. Now having a certain subjective vision on a smile concept I can determine it by levels: from a 'false smile', continuing an 'outer smile', and then at the highest levels are a 'sincere smile' and an 'inner smile'. All these levels of smile, as I determine, are metaphorical levels.

Here I would like to express my opinion about the highest level of manifestation of a smile, as I think, is an 'inner smile' when the person can smile from the inside, with all his muscles of the face. When a person has an 'inner smile', there is no difference whether he smiles specially or sincerely, here it is visible that all his muscles of the face are calm, beautiful and smile as though, he is open for communication with any person entirely. The calm face expresses itself smile and kindness. The person whom the 'inner smile' is directed feels the openness and wants to carry on with another person a dialogue. There are no boundaries, all boundaries are broken, and there is no internal fight because the person is in harmony.

The 'inner smile' is a 'gift' which each person needs to develop. My ability or disability to develop such 'gift' in myself only depends on me. It is only my responsibility.

The presented subjective point of view to a smile is not enough to understand it completely and solve the problem of understanding of smile. I need to study others points of view to the concept of smile and clarify its metaphorical levels.

According to A. Freitas-Magalhaers (2009), 'smile is a facial expression formed by flexing the muscles near both ends of the mouth and by flexing muscles throughout the mouth'.

It is very easy to understand how the smile is formed but it would be better to know what smile means in human beings.

There are some interesting facts about the smile in different fields of human beings. I agree with these facts and I would like to use them for giving the determination for one of my mentioned levels of smile as an 'outer smile' or 'social smile'. The smile of a stranger produces more "Good Samaritan" effects on the receiver. Research reports that people receive more help when they smile (Gueguen 2003). In fact, smiling correlates with greater trust, greater financial earnings, and increased interpersonal cooperation (Godoy 2005). When people smile, even memory retrieval of their names is enhanced as is shown in neuroscience research, versus people who have neutral facial expressions (Tsukiura 2008).

The smile also can carry the hidden emotions itself. I can call it as a 'false smile'. I

had mentioned here the situation when I started smiling more often as a result of nervousness, which reason was absent of smiling feedback during the first meeting with the Norwegian students when my 'sincere smile' transferred in, as I mentioned above, 'on duty and stimulated smile'. Now I can tell that 'sincere smile' was changed in a 'false smile'.

Also, the change of smile made me nervous and arose the internal fight, as I think, in the result of my inner Russian national habit – to smile sincerely. Reading the article 'Smile in Russian communicative behaviour' by Sternin (2000) I have found out the statement that "the Russian smile is urged to be only sincere". But in spite of that statement I can question: Perhaps it was also true for me in that situation or may be, it is my own feature of my character and not a Russian nation habit.

Thinking about the influence of smile on giving birth to friendship, human cooperation I just start thinking about the influence of smile in my life experience. Here is appeared one more question in my mind: *Why am I writing about a smile?*

As a result, I understood that such thinking helped me to find out the causality of my internal fight which cause is the absence of emotional feedback like a smile. And also I have found the answer to the question why I am writing about a smile.

Writing that abstract and asking myself a question whether I have ever had such events in my life and my train of thought moves from this event.

Yesterday my mother asked me: "What am I writing about in my essay now?"

I said: "About smile. I'm writing what it means, and for a better understanding of the power of smile now I try to remember the event when and why my smile helps me to reach a success in my life, helps me to give a birth to friendship. I said that I need an example from my life."

We start thinking together. Suddenly mother asks me if I remember the song from my childhood that I loved and listened to it for hours.

- What is the song? - I ask her.

She starts singing "A smile warms up everything..."

- Remember?-she asks.

Exactly I have remembered... Perhaps there is a reason why I am writing about a smile! My interest to smile is behind it!?

I begin to refresh my memory my childhood, start to sing that song:

"... Smile warms everyone -

Both an Elephant and a tiny Snail

So let smiles, everywhere on Earth,

Turn on like small electrical lamps”...(Lyrics translate 2011)

It was wonderful and joyful as I remember. I also remembered how I sang that song with pleasure, how I did really like that cartoon where that song was singing by the main character.

Right now I want to find and watch this cartoon to remember what the plot of the cartoon is about, its characters, the entire song about a smile and at last to realise why I am writing about a smile.

As a result, I have found that cartoon ‘Little Raccoon and the Thing in the Pool’ based on a novel by Lilian Moore and started watching (‘Russian cartoon’ 2012).

The plot is that the Little Raccoon as the main character has a birthday today, and he thinks and brags that he is an adult by this time to his mother, but he is a little now. And his mother suggests him to check it and prove his maturity. She sends him to the pond where he should gather the sweet sedge for dinner. He agrees with enthusiasm and skips down the path that is shown by the mother. But the more the Little Raccoon moves away from his home, the more he is afraid. It is his first time going there alone, but he goes.

Suddenly he meets a little Monkey and then they are talking about their maturity. The Little Raccoon brags about his maturity and his trip to the pond alone. The Monkey is surprised his courage of going to the pond alone and being not afraid of seeing someone who is sitting in the pond. But the Little Raccoon does not know about it and also is surprised to hear it. In spite of this, he behaves bravely and continues his trip.

When he comes near the pond and hides behind the bushes and starts looking out it, there is somebody anywhere that he does not know. Then he comes to the pond and looks at it and sees his image on the smooth of the pond as in the mirror. He does not know who it is in the pond. He does not know that it is his image in the pond. He starts to make a mouth to that image in the pond and suddenly the Little Raccoon is afraid of his image and is taking to his heels.

While running, he meets the Monkey again and tells her that he has never met such an awful racoon yet. The Monkey objects him telling that there is no awful racoon in the pond there is an angry monkey in the one. Then the Monkey suggests the Little Raccoon taking a big stick and driving those two awful ‘images’.

And the Little Raccoon is going to the pond for the second time. And the story is repeated. The Little Raccoon is afraid of the awful image of the racoon with the big stick in the pond and is running away from the pond to home.

Coming home, he promises his mother that he will never go to the pond alone and tells her a reason. The mother is laughing and caressing him on his head gives him advice that when he comes to the pond again, he should not make a mouth to someone who is sitting in the pond (someone means an image of the Little Raccoon in the pond) he should smile to him only, and that is all. The Little Raccoon is surprised that he can conquer someone who is sitting in the pond and whom he is afraid with the help of smile only. He does not believe.

The Little Raccoon is going to the pond again, comes there, looks at the smooth of the pond with a big smile on his face and seems friendly and kind image on the surface of the pond. The Little Raccoon is glad and understands that someone who is sitting in the pond is not awful and bad as he thought. He smiles and can do a mother's task of gathering the sweet sedge in the pond.

On his way home the Little Raccoon meets the surprised Monkey and tells her a secret how to give birth to friendship with someone who is sitting in the pond, as the Little Raccoon went and did. As a result, the Monkey is also smiling when she looks at the pond and makes friends with someone who is sitting in the pond (someone means a monkey's image here). And then the song "Smile" is been singing with the Little Raccoon and the Monkey. There are the lyrics of the song "Smile".

"Smile" ('Lyricstranslate' 2011).

A smile will make a dull day brighter,

A smile will make a rainbow appear in the sky...

Communicate your smile,

And it will come back to you more than once.

Chorus:

And then, for sure, the clouds will start dancing,

And the grasshopper will start scraping on its fiddle [...]

The blue stream will give birth to a river,

As well as a smile gives birth to friendship.

The blue stream will give birth to a river,

As well as a smile gives birth to friendship.

One sunny smile

Will make the saddest rain stop crying,

The sleepy forest say goodbye to quietness

And start clapping in its little green hands.

Chorus

A smile warms up everything -
The elephant and even the little snail [...]
So let's turn on our smiles
All around the world like lightbulbs!
Chorus

At the end of the cartoon, the Monkey congratulates the Little Raccoon on his birthday and presents a pineapple to the Little Raccoon who is happy and proud of his progress.

After having been watched the cartoon, I recognise that the communication by my smile as a sign of friendship has become the main slogan of my life. Once the plot of this cartoon taught me how to give birth to friendship with the help of smile. According to the lyrics in the cartoon "As well as a smile gives birth to friendship" ('Lyricstranslate' 2011) as I think it has influenced me, in every meeting or acquaintance I smile. In which connection it is a real and open smile which can help me to give birth to friendship with people. Throughout all my life since my five- year age when I had seen that cartoon the first time the smile helped me, and now it helps me to follow my life. A smile is a tool which helps to overcome the inner and outer borders in communication with people.

One more aspect that I have recognised is that this cartoon also taught me how the smile could help me to make people smile and warm up everything. I have come to this assertion while Listening to the song in these lyrics:

"...A smile warms up everything -
The elephant and even the little snail [...]
So let's turn on our smiles
All around the world like lightbulbs!" ('Lyricstranslate' 2011)

These lyrics can be connected with my willing to make people smile. Unconsciously I think that the smiling face makes the World better and everybody will feel good. But in my life the use of this tool does not bring me such results as I have expected, to be precise, it brings but not always.

There is an example from my own life when the smile makes a person smile and feel better. Recently my student had told me unexpected thing when I taught her English in the group of students. She thanked me that I smiled. She said that when she came to the English lesson, she had not any force and desire to learn and study English, she had a problem and thought how to solve it, but when she saw my smiling face she felt warm, and the problem

flew away somewhere. She smiled. Analysing it now this situation can be compared with the lyrics from the song:

“...A smile warms up everything
-The elephant and even the little snail...” (‘Lyricstranslate’ 2011)

Hearing that from my student, I was glad and happy to help her. In that situation, the smile gives birth to renewed friendship and retrieves the spirit of the person of that student.

Returning to my presented problem of expectation of the smile from the Norwegian students which I have faced with in my experience in teaching them Russian as a foreign language, I have my own experience when I behaved making students smile when I did not get their feedback like a smile. I gave them the task that I thought it would bring up their mood but it did not work. As a result, such behaviour has brought me another problem. It is a problem of miscomprehension different cultures in communication.

That is why there is a problem of my rejection of the feature of the behavior of the Norwegian culture (my understanding through teaching the Norwegian students) which is the feature of a seldom smile during the first communication and acquaintance.

My collaboration and communication with the Norwegian students allowed me to see in myself the designated boundaries of different cultures (Russian, Norwegian, Kazakh) through teaching Russian as a foreign language and to break them where it was necessary, for example, one of such boundaries is my rejection of the feature of behavior of the Norwegian culture – to smile seldom that led to my vision of the outer part of things instead of inner. So learning part of the culture of the Norwegian people I could learn myself and the culture of Russian people in comparing. It is an expansion of borders in understanding and vision of picture of the world through the perception of different cultures.

As I see that experience shows me what the smile is for Norwegian (through the Norwegian students). They do not often smile when they get acquainted with new people. They do not smile unfamiliar people if these unfamiliar people smile them. They smile when they understand that something is funny. They will not smile if they do not want to smile. That is all that I can mention about Norwegian smile now.

Demanding emotions from the Norwegian students I forgot that in the Russian culture (through the students who I teach English) there are also Russian people who do not get used to smiling and express their emotions in the case of an acquaintance and communication at the first time. Sternin (2000) explains it that way ‘In the Russian communication it is not accepted to smile the unfamiliar. The smile in the Russian communication is generally addressed to the familiar people’.

In my opinion, I would not assert Sternin's (2000) and my observations in Russian and Norwegian cultures as the statements. I think, such special lines of different cultures consist of the units of people which make larger or smaller quantity in the total amount of people, belonging to these cultures separately.

Comprehensive knowledge of the Russian culture and Russian people for me as a person who originates from two cultures is necessary. Originally I am brought up in two cultures: Russian and Kazakh. And my desire to teach Russian as a foreign language was no coincidence.

Living in Kazakhstan in two cultures, it is not so simple at the same time. In any situations when business concerns my personal behaviour in the cultural aspect I always have a question somewhere in my heart: "*What culture do I belong to?*"

Since the language is what gets me the contact with the world of any culture, I have found the answer to that question. It occurred when I wished to teach Russian as a foreign language. Here also the boundary of my uncertainty of choice of culture was broken. And as a result I designated my belonging to the Russian culture and have being built my development in this direction - I moved to Russia.

Learning and studying techniques of teaching Russian for international students, teaching foreign students Russian language, I start understanding the culture of the Russian people better absorbing and realising it in a new way.

Now living in Russia many ideas which I had earlier about the Russian culture, especially that time when I lived in Kazakhstan, have not turned out to be true. Thus absorbing the features of the Russian culture, boundaries of understanding and perception of the Russian culture have begun to fail. As I can notice now the question '*What culture do I belong to?*', which made me suffer in Kazakhstan, disappears in my life living in Russia. It does not disturb me here. I think that the reason of it is in my running into Russian culture and my neighbourhood. I live among Russian. And I identify myself as Russian.

Why is the question of cultural identity arisen? Cultural identity is something which is opened and described in many books by different authors. But what it is for me. If I open this question from looking at my passport that I had in Kazakhstan, there is the information about myself- surname, which is popular among Kazakh people; name, which is famous among Russian people; and nationality- Russian. In Kazakhstan, it arose a question why I have the surname with the shade of Kazakh culture but name and nationality with the shade of Russian culture. It was not accepted by Kazakh people. But it is accepted by me.

Looking in Russian passport, it has only surname and name and the place of birth-

The Soviet Union. Here is the harmony because there is no nationality, but there is only a place of birth that tells everything that is needed to understand in Russia. When someone who was born in the Soviet Union looks at my passport she or he sees my surname with a shade of Kazakh culture and my name with a shade of Russian and the place of birth the Soviet Union, she or he understands that I am native to the identical state as she or he is. In that case, it does not matter what nationality I am because we have an equal cultural identity. Nobody asks me what culture I belong to, as it was in Kazakhstan. The border of cultural identity vanishes in Russia because many people have the equal cultural identity. There is my fusion with the Russian culture.

The Russian culture is huge as Russia itself. That is why I would like to clarify for my reader that my fusion with the Russian culture is observed from the point of my view to the part of Russian culture in the Barents Arctic region. Also, I can mention that my interest to research the concept of a smile appears at the time of my living in the Barents Arctic region and communication with the people from that region. According to my observations during my two years living here, I have noticed people do not smile so often and have unsmiling faces in that region. When I smile to people here, I do not always take a feedback like a smile as it was earlier when I lived in the South of Kazakhstan. Here the problem shows up, the problem of my disability to overcome the border of not- acquaintance and give birth to friendship with people. If people do not smile me in response, the information will appear in my brain unconsciously that I will not be able to give birth to friendship with them and I will become upset. But in reality, it quite differs.

Have been living in the Barents Arctic region I understand that the friendship should not always be given birth with the smile. In spite of people do not give a response as a smile to my smile I continue to communicate with them, and they also continue to communicate with me. They are open to me as I do and that process does not depend on the presence of smiles on our faces. They treat me kindly as I do and it does not depend only on a smile at all.

The feeling of disappointment that is thought to be my disability to give birth to friendship makes me open the question about the concept of smile. Some behaviour that works in the South cannot always work in the North. And again I come to the conclusion that I should develop in myself the 'inner smile' where I do not depend on respond of people's smiles. The 'inner smile'- the 'smile of calm' as it is called.

Returning to the plot of the cartoon, the Little Raccoon smiles to the image on the smooth of the pond as I understand he smiles himself, his image. My conclusion is if I can smile myself and I have an 'inner smile'. As a result, I will be able to smile anybody easily

without expecting the feedback with the smiling face. It will not depend on having an 'outer smile' on my face or someone's face. So I return to the concept of 'inner smile' again.

Why do I always refer to the 'inner smile'? I see in it the outlet, do not I? Here I would like to express my insight after having a talk with my teacher (In the conversation on the 1st of November, 2013).

I think any person always tries to be satisfied emotionally. He looks for any ways to satisfy his or her emotional requirements. For example, the person can feel emotional 'hunger' in communication, he goes to society and communicates with people. Such way he satisfies his 'hunger'. He can do it constantly until he becomes 'saturated'. As soon as it is saturation, the desire in his active communication disappears.

Another example, the person can feel sadness or be depressed, feel negative emotions all the time. By his behaviour he can reflect these emotions to everything and transfer them to people around, thereby here is the strengthening of such emotions and suffering from them. In this case, such behaviour is his way of search of riddance from negative emotions, translating them on other people and search of relief of suffering.

In the first and the second examples, over time person becomes dependent emotionally, unsatisfied emotionally. Such dependence can involve big consequences. The person cannot realise even at all why he behaves one way or another one.

The strongest emotional dependence is sexual- emotional dependence. This dependence enslaves the person and does not give a chance to the person continue personal development. From this, it follows the sufferings. As soon as the person starts doing the reflection of his emotions, that is to transfer his emotions to consciousness; he takes the first step to freedom. In this case, he starts addressing to internal, to himself.

Living in the Barents Arctic region, where people smile seldom, I started going short of such emotion as a smile. In Kazakhstan, the smiles were enough and this emotional requirement was always satisfied, there was not a shortage.

Non-receipt of a smile generated emotional 'hunger' in me, which became so strong and at the result, it developed into dependence, and now demands the reflection.

Reflection of my thoughts led me to awareness of the dependence on smile expectation from all people around (in my problem case it was brightly expressed during teaching and communication with the Norwegian students) and the dependence on its non-receipt. And later it has brought me the dependence on consequences of its non-receipt, which is an internal dissatisfaction.

In the course of the analysis of my behaviour, connected with receiving a smile as feedback or its absence on a face of the Norwegian students, I always come to a conclusion that I should have an 'inner smile'. I consider it as an ability to smile from my inside and not to depend on whether the person smiles me or not. But the concept of 'inner smile' is only a metaphor. The smile in itself remains a smile, and its metaphorical forms can be various. My appeal to the concept of 'inner smile' has become for me a signal that I stopped to be dependent on whether there is a reciprocal smile upon the face of other person or not. With the help of my reflection, my emotional 'hunger' of expectation of a smile has disappeared. Emotion 'Smile' has become pure. My dependence on the feedback of a smile has disappeared, consequently, both my internal fight and misunderstanding have disappeared, the question tag 'Why..?' has disappeared. My emotional freedom has come. Inner emotional harmony has come to me.

The event that I had in my childhood (watching a cartoon about a smile) can be the causality of my behaviour and appearance of a smile on my face in my life. The Little Raccoon as a main character of the cartoon shows the visual examples of overcoming his inner 'borders' with the help of his smile. My smile as the tool helps me to overcome my inner 'borders' (fear, uncertainty, alarm) when I meet with the event or life experience that I have never met before. And when I have overcome these feelings. As a result, the smile on my face appears. Here I have on my face the sincere smile, and it brings me happiness and satisfaction, and I can share it with others. I start sharing my inner victory, and I become calm and have the 'inner smile'.

I understand that the events in our childhood have the influence on our behaviour in our adult life. It seems all of us are of childhood ancestry. Such behaviour should be realised and recognised for a better understanding of ourselves.

Now all 'borders' of misunderstanding of presence or absence of smile on the face of interlocutor vanish. My internal fight, which is the cause of expectation of smile from people around, is understood and prevented. I understood why I have the habit to smile: The smile helps me to be inner balanced and feel gladness, to overcome inner problems and feel happiness. I am a smiling person what I am.

LITERATURE

1. CHAIKLIN, S., HEDEGAARD, M. AND JENSEN, U.J. (1999) *Activity theory and social practice: Cultural-historical approaches*. Aarhus University Press.
2. FREITAS-MAGALHAES, A. AND CASTRO, E. (2009) *The neuropsychophysiological construction of the human smile*. In Freitas-Magalhaes, A. *Emotional expression: The Brain and The Face*. Porto: University Fernando Pessoa Press. [Online]. Available from: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Smile#cite_ref-1 [Accessed 11/10/13].
3. GODOY, R. et al. (2005) Do smiles have a face value? Panel evidence from Amazonian Indians. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 26(4), pp.469-490. [Online]. Available from: www.researchgate.net/publication/222547511_Do_smiles_have_a_face_value_Panel_evidence_from_Amazonian_Indians/file/79e4151083bec31777.pdf [Accessed 11/10/13].
4. GOTTMAN, J. M. et al. (1998) Predicting Marital Happiness and Stability from Newlywed Interactions. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 60(1), pp.5-22. [Online]. Available from: <http://www.jstor.org/discover/10.2307/353438?uid=3738936&uid=2&uid=4&sid=21103026218991>. [Accessed 07/10/13].
5. GUEGUEN, N. (2003) the effect of smiling on helping behaviour: Smiling and good Samaritan behaviour. *Communication Reports*, 16(2), pp. 133-140.
6. LYRICSTRANSLATE (2011) *Smile* [www] LYRICSTRANSLATE Available from: <http://lyricstranslate.com/ru/ulybka-ulybka-smile.html-0#songtranslation> [Accessed 13/10/13].
7. RUSSIAN CARTOON. (2012) *The Little Raccoon-Крошка Енот* [online video]. Available from: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ev7y6FEEF8A> [Accessed 17/10/13].
8. SOKOLOV, A. (2011) *Little Raccoon and the Thing in the Pool- 'Smile'* [online video]. Available from: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8RJQynqjAbo> [Accessed 17/10/13].
9. STERNIN, I.A. (2000) Ulybka v russkom kommunikativnom povedenii. *Russkoe i finskoe kommunikativnoe povedenie*. Vyp.1Voronezh: Izd-vo VGTU, 2000. S. 53-61. [online]. Available from: <http://commbehavior.narod.ru/RusFin/RusFin2000/Sternin4.htm> [Accessed 11/10/13].
10. TSUKIURA, T., CABEZA, R. (2008) Orbifrontal and hippocampal contributions to memory for face-name associations: The rewarding power of smile. *Journal Neuropsychologia*, 46(9), pp.2310-2319. [Online]. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18455740> [Accessed 07/10/13].

Appendix 2



Title:

**CROSSING THE BORDER IN THE DIALOGUE BETWEEN
RUSSIAN AND NORWEGIAN CULTURES**

Name:

SULTANBAEVA IULIIA

BO 301 P – Writing subjectivity

Winter 2014

www.mshu.edu.ru

Introduction

Having got the “*key to freedom from the ‘internal fight’*”^{*} I am opening the *door* of the understanding of myself, the Russian and Norwegian culture^{*} that I have already started doing working on my first essay. According to my reflection on the first essay I have understood that I have got rid of the expectations of getting a smile from the Norwegians (through the students who I teach English) and have recognised the reasons for it. With the help of my first experience, I have supposed what the Norwegian smile and its reasons of appearance are for the Norwegians: “They do not often smile when they get acquainted with new people. They do not smile unfamiliar people if these unfamiliar people are smiling them. They are smiling when they understand that something is funny. They will not smile if they do not want to smile. That is all that I can mention about Norwegian smile now” (Sultanbaeva 2013). That is my subjective point of view to the Norwegian smile.

But this my subjective opinion, presented in the first essay, does not give the answers to the next questions: 1. Are my estimates about the Norwegian smile and its reason of appearance relevant for the Norwegians or not?; 2. Do they explain the reasons for appearance or absence of the Norwegian smile in their culture the same way as I do or not ?.

Telling about the smile in the Russian culture, I have noticed that generally in the Russian culture the Russians do not get used to smiling and express their emotions to the unfamiliar people too. What are the reasons of smiling in the Russian culture? How does the Norwegian culture understand the Russian culture through the smile?

Asking those questions I understand that each culture has its own philosophy: ‘*philosophy of life*’, ‘*philosophy of development*’, ‘*philosophy of behaviour*’, ‘*philosophy of perception and comprehension of other culture*’, etc. Understanding of the meaning of culture, the specifics of the culture, manifestations of its features in the dialogue of cultures is not always achieved in the dialogue of cultures. Philosophical understanding of culture is necessary to solve the problem of understanding between cultures in the dialogue of the cultures. In this research, the philosophical concept of culture is the understanding of the

^{*} The title of the first essay (Appendix 1)

^{*} Hereinafter the meaning of the “Norwegian culture” is in the Norwegian culture a Norwegian communicative behavior which is presented through such nonverbal component as a smile. Hereinafter the meaning of the “Russian culture” is in the Russian culture a culture of Russian communicative behavior which is presented through such nonverbal component as a smile.

value and the concept of culture's content. The problem of understanding between cultures, especially in the dialogue of cultures is not a new problem. This problem always exists. Now the solution to this problem becomes more relevant, due to the large stream of received information by a man at present, which sometimes might 'blear the eyes' of understanding of culture. It can happen this way "the huge stream of information, people and images, which are circulating all over the world, ... have changed the context in which should happen any cultural processes" (Held 2004). Besides the received information about the culture forms the value-sense content of the culture. Also, it should be mentioned about the ambivalence of the valuable- meaning content of the culture. I would agree with M. Bakhtin (1990), who says about the ambivalence of the valuable- meaning content of the culture this way: on the one hand the content is always a condition and the possibility of being of culture, on the other hand, the joint existence of the values of consciousness is subjected to extremely fast changes, permits and replacement of one set of values on others.

The study of the value-sense content of culture is the *stronghold* of my reflection that gives the philosophical concept of culture.

In me first essay "Key to freedom from the 'internal fight'" I have presented my experience of the philosophical understanding of the Norwegian culture through a *smile*- as a 'facial expression' of culture*. The study of the philosophy of Norwegian culture as itself was the result of comparative analysis of situational appearance or absence of smile in the dialogue of the Russian and the Norwegian cultures. It is done through the prism of my subjective perception. It has contributed to the understanding of my subjective understanding of the concept of a smile for myself personally. And it has also formed a certain knowledge of the reasons for appearance or absence of the Norwegian smile and the Russian *smile*- as the 'facial expression' in the Russian and the Norwegian cultures. At the first Russian - Norwegian cultural dialogue I have tried to represent the value-sense content of the Norwegian culture through the analysis of the reasons for appearance or absence of the Norwegian smile which may reflect some part of the philosophy of the Norwegian culture. Validity or falsity of my first subjective knowledge and understanding of the value-sense content of the Norwegian culture requires confirmation.

* Hereinafter the meaning of the "smile – as a 'facial expression' of culture" is expression of smile on the face as a nonverbal component of communicative behavior of any representatives of culture.

Such confirmation and also a new data about valuable- meaning content of the Norwegian culture I have intended to find out at the second Russian -Norwegian cultural dialogue and have reflected on them in the second essay. **The aim** of this work is to represent a philosophical concept of the Norwegian culture through the study of the value-sense content of the Norwegian culture. The study and understanding of the valuable- meaning content could be contributed with **the method** of specially arranged classroom dialogue, the comparative approach in the analysis. This comparative method has been used by me both in my first essay and at the second one. I think the best way to study the philosophy of the other (the Norwegian) culture is to compare the differences with the philosophy of my own (the Russian) culture. To know why I think that to compare is the best way to study the culture it is needed to represent the meaning of culture.

Talking about my personal understanding, of the reasons for the appearance or absence of the Russian *smile* as a '*facial expression*' in the Russian culture it has already formed by my own life experience. I think the objectivity of the part of my subjective understanding of it is reflected in the work of the scientist I. Sternin (2000) and one more modern article (Why do not the Russians smile? 2013). He researched the feature of the Russian communicative behaviour as a smile and explained the reasons for the appearance or absence of the Russian smile in the Russian culture. Therefore I have decided to use the presented information as a material for my fieldwork.

Knowledge and understanding of the reasons for the appearance or absence of the Russian smile create such valuable-meaning content of the Russian culture that allows representing the philosophy of the Russian culture. The existence of the '*key*' (*understanding of valuable- meaning content of the Russian culture*) will allow opening the '*door*' of philosophical understanding of Norwegian culture. That will prevent misunderstanding and even allow to have the Russian -Norwegian cultures' dialogue with a bigger understanding of the valuable- meaning content of the cultures.

In achieving this aim I set some **objectives**:

- going into the field work;
- using methods and grouping the data;
- analysing the data;
- writing a small report;
- doing a critical reflection on my report's results;

- study the reasons for the appearance or absence of the Norwegian *smile* as a '*facial expression*' of the Norwegian culture in the dialogue of the Russian and Norwegian cultures;
- drawing conclusions.

Submerging myself in the philosophy of the foreign (Norwegian) culture and submerging Norwegians in the philosophy of the foreign (Russian) culture by method of special arranged classroom dialogue and the method of comparative analysis, I was able to collect and study the reasons for the appearance or absence of the Norwegian smile in the Norwegian culture. After having analysed the data, I was able to write a report.

Report of the fieldwork.

“Excursus in the dialogue of the Norwegian and Russian cultures.”

Background

“Smile is my face.
Laughter is my character.
Joy is my life.”
*(The status in the social network
written by unknown author)*

It seems to be one of the most popular status, which is used in the social network Vkontakte. What is the cause of its popularity? That is a question that I still have no answer. I can only answer that peculiarity of emotional features of the Russian culture as a smile, laughter and joy acquire an interest for discussion in society.

Recently there has been an article “Why do not the Russians smile?” on the Internet, published in 2013. It attracted my attention, and I read it because the subject of my research is related with a smile. This article, as an unknown author writes, tells that the Russians have their own reasons for smiling. And it explains why “the foreigners constantly tell that the Russians are surprisingly unsmiling people. It is written in blogs and guidebooks, asked in person, told all your friends and acquaintances” (Why do not the Russians smile? 2013).

What my surprise was when I have discovered that above mentioned article contains the information from the article “Smile in Russian communicative behaviour”, written by

Sternin in 2000 and so far according to the unknown author, this article has not lost its relevance.

Is that so that the foreigners' opinion that the Russians are surprisingly unsmiling people changed or not? Do the foreigners have the same opinion about the reasons of 'unsmiling of the Russians' as it is written in the article, published in 2013?

Earlier in my essay I mentioned Sternin's article about Russian smile and tried to clear up and understand what the meaning of Russian smile is for the Russians and for the foreigners and what is the reason of the 'unsmiling of the Russians'. And now I find out on the Internet a new, based on that Sternin's version of the article, which is called "Why do not the Russians smile?" (2013). After reading this article, I have noticed that the unknown author wrote the text of his new article adapted it to thinking and perception of the present society. It was 13 years since the publication of the original article written by I. Sternin (2000), and I have seen that even a little bit, but still over the 13 years, the opinion of foreigners and their perception of the Russians' smile and the reasons of the 'unsmiling of the Russians' are changed.

For example, one of the distinct information about Russian smile, described in the Sternin's (2000) article, is that the smile on the face is a symbol of wealth and material well-being for the Russians. Comparing it with the information in the "Why do not the Russians smile?" (2013) I see that the unknown author does not write about it there, perhaps this fact is no longer relevant.

Information is very dynamic, it is constantly changing, and the information that is true today, tomorrow becomes no longer relevant. The information in the Sternin's article is as well, in my opinion. But the most interesting thing is that 13 years later, explaining the reasons of 'unsmiling of the Russians' and explaining the meaning of Russian smile for the Russian people, the unknown author guides the information in the article, written by I. Sternin in 2000. He adapts it and gives a fresh and new information. As we can see as an example of the old information can rebirth. Is this information relevant and true for the Russians and foreigners at present? I mean the information about Russian communicative behaviour as a smile and its reasons of appearance, about the reasons of 'unsmiling of the Russians' and also about the claim of the foreigners that "Russian is surprisingly unsmiling people" (Why do not the Russians smile? 2013). According to the unknown author's article, the foreigners have a stereotype of 'unsmiling of the Russians'. It makes me think whether all reasons of the 'unsmiling of the Russians' are cleared up by author or there are some more reasons which we

do not even guess. The answer to these questions I have tried to find out in my observations, which I would like to share.

What has been done?

I start thinking of what the best way I can use to make the observation of the dynamics changes of perception of Russian smile in communicative behaviour by the foreigners. I have decided that it is whatever way, but it should be made with the foreigners conjointly.

It has been two years since my first meeting with Norwegian students and with the problem of ‘unsmiling’– no smile on the face as a response. During this period I have been brought this problem to my conscious level, and it stops to be a problem for me. The smile has become an object of my research.

Now there is an opportunity to participate in the “Russian Arctic–language, culture, economy” project (School of learning Russian as a foreign language for the Norwegian students) and to have a lesson of Russian as a foreign language for the Norwegian students. It is the possibility to get experience and study the smile from a different perspective. My inner explorer prompts me to arrange a lesson for the Norwegian students in a way where I can reply to many questions about reasons of ‘unsmiling of the Russians’. I would like to know the foreigners’ opinion of the explanation of the reasons of ‘unsmiling of the Russians’, as it is explained at the “Why do not the Russians smile?” article (2013); to understand whether that presented explanation in the article about nature of Russian communicative behavior as a smile is relevant and is clear for the foreigners. The foreigners who could assist me to reply to those questions are the group of the Norwegian students who study Russian as a foreign language and are interested in Russian culture.

Method for organising data

The day before I started to think of organisation of the discussion-lesson for the Norwegian students. I took the article “Why do not the Russian smile?” on the Internet, printed it for the students as the main handout of the lesson, prepared a presentation with pictures of smiling faces and a few quotes about a smile for a short conversation with the students at the introductory part of the lesson. To organise the discussion-lesson in a more informal setting, I decided to do it sitting at the round-table with a cup of coffee and sweets with the students (I think it helps the students to be more open and informal with me as a teacher).

Next day I would come into the class, prepared handouts for the students, spread out on the organised round-table, set up the presentation, putting the first slide with an image of a smiling face of a girl, began to wait for the meeting time with the students. It is 10.15. – The time when students began to come into the class. When they came and saw the coffee, smiling face on the screen, they were smiling and sitting at the table with pleasure and feeling of something unexpected. I suggested the students fill with a coffee and start the lesson. Students did it. I also fill with coffee my cup, we sat at the round- table and began our discussion-lesson.

“Today we are talking about the information that recently has become very widespread information on the Internet. It is the information about ‘unsmiling of the Russians’ ”, I started the lesson.

There is an expression of interest and attention on the students’ faces.

“What ‘unsmiling of the Russians’ is, we can study from an article entitled “Why do not Russian smile?” ”, I said.

It was interesting for the students, and after these words, many Norwegians were smiling. I did not ask them why they were smiling; I observed only their responses. I gave them the task to read this article to themselves. It took them about 15 minutes. Then we planned discussion with the students about the information presented in the article.

However, as it was clarified, discussing chapters of the articles with students, the situation where the Russians did not smile in response were familiar to the Norwegian students.

After a 15-minute reading and acquaintance with the text of the article, I have continued and asked them a question, “How do they think why the Russians do not smile frequency?”.

Responses were different:

One student said whether the Russians smiled, this would be considered a sign of stupidity. As I knew, she read about it earlier, and she also tried to prove her words from the article where the same information is presented.

Evidently, this information is known to the Norwegians.

Another student added, “ If the Russians do not want to smile, they will not smile.”

I became to be interested in this talk, and I interfered and asked all students whether they think the smile is a sign of stupidity.

The answer was, “No, They do not think so.”

Here is a little pause.

“Smile for me is a sign that I am happy. When I am happy, I am smiling ”, this was the response of the Norwegian, who was educated in the USA and then was back again to Norway by his parents.

After these words, another group of students were smiling and laughing.

The opinion of another student was next she said that she was smiling when she wanted to smile, as well as Russian did. Whether she did not want to do it, she would not smile.

Many students from the group agreed with her opinion.

Analysing the situation, I saw that for the Norwegians in the person of these students, the question, whether they think that a smile is a sign of stupidity, was strange. When I asked them this one, their faces expressed complete surprise and incomprehension that how someone could think about it. According to this situation, I saw that the Norwegians in the priority that if they want, they will smile and there is no any reason for smile manifestations. The smile is not the sign of stupidity for the Norwegians.

We continue the discussion-lesson, considering the first statement in the article and analyse it.

The Student A read the first point, “ *Smile in Russian communication is not a signal of courtesy. Western smiles during greetings mean pure politeness. The more a person smiles, the more he/ she wants to show friendliness to their partner. A constant polite smile is called “duty smile” by the Russians and is considered a bad sign of human, manifestation of insincerity, secrecy, unwillingness to discover true feelings. Russian smile – is a sign of personal sympathy, and it is not a sign of politeness*”.

I asked the students to express their opinion about the Russians attitude to the “constant polite smile”.

The Norwegians agreed with the opinion of the Russians about the meaning of “constant polite smile” as “a duty smile”.

However, the following statement that “Russian smile – is a sign of personal sympathy, and it is not a sign of politeness” caused great surprise. As it turned out, the students have never thought about it. And earlier the students thought that the Russian smile is not a cause of personal sympathy but the cause of politeness. The Norwegians are acquainted with the new reason of Russian smile as a personal sympathy.

I said, “Tell the truth, I also have not thought about this reason of Russian smile as an expression of sympathy early. Have thought of this statement I began to remember the smiles that I met during the meeting with people who are familiar to me. They are all smiling, expressing personal sympathy. In my opinion to the information about the reason of Russian smile, that we have read, should be added a brief comment that Russian smile is a sign of personal sympathy when people are familiar with each other. But in another case, a smile is a sign of politeness when people are unfamiliar, and perhaps they meet the first time.”

The students expressed their consent with my words. For me, it becomes clear why the Norwegian students have been thinking only about a smile as a sign of politeness.

The Student B read next point, “ *The Russians do not smile any strangers. Smile in Russian communication is addressed mainly, familiar people. That's why buyers are not smiling sellers because they do not know them. If the buyer is familiar to the seller, he or she always gives him or her smile!*”.

After reading this information, one of the students was smiling immediately and telling his life event that occurred yesterday when he was at a store. He stood at the cashier's desk and paid for goods, at this point he smiled the cashier, but she did not smile back. He said that now he understood why he had not got the smile at the cashier's desk. He thanked for the information.

I was glad that the information, obtained from the article, became useful for the understanding of the feature of non-verbal communication between two cultures. An interesting fact that when I asked the Norwegian students whether any sellers and cashiers at stores in Norway were always smiling foreigners and strangers. The Norwegians did not hesitate to answer “Yes. They do.”

Also, I agreed with them that I was always smiled when I was in Norway at the cashier's desk in the store. But I said, “In the city among the citizens I do not get it always. Any people do not give a mutual smile, for me it turns out that the Norwegians also has a feature of unsmiling behaviour to the strangers.”

Listened to this idea, one of the Norwegian students would like to comment it. She said, “ I am a Norwegian. If I smile a stranger at the street, it will mean that I am open to the dialogue and anybody can come to me and ask a question. If I do not smile, so I will not want to talk. I mean I am not ready to come into contact.”

This information was new for me, as I have not known about this feature of Norwegian smile. I took this into account and thanked the student for new information for me.

Next point. *“It is uncharacteristically for the Russians to smile back. If the Russians see smiling stranger, they will look for the cause of fun undoubtedly. They will think whether it is something bad in their clothing or hairstyle as a result of the reason of stranger’s fun.”*, read the Student C.

According to the Norwegians, such statement seemed very funny and confusing. As I understood, they are not accepted to laugh at that reason. The Norwegians are not so worried about their appearance, as described in the Russian article about the Russians. Therefore, as I noticed on the Norwegian students’ faces, this information became easy shock for them and raised their eyebrows. To dispel this astonishment I tried to give them an example of ordinary daily life when two passers-by can walk down the street, to run across each other and one of them can notice something ‘funny’ at the other. I said, “ It can be a ‘funny’ hat, for example, but here it should be noted that it may be laughable just for that passer-by, who smile him or her. Others may not respond with a grin (ironical smile).”

But even after that example the Norwegian students still were looking at me in astonishment and with the question in their eyes – “How could it be a reason for smiling?”.

As it turned out, a smiling man is natural for the Norwegians in the Norwegian culture, and there can never be such reasons for smiling as it is written in the article. That presented information was a little culture shock for them.

Another fact was read by Student D, *“The Russians need to have enough reasons for smiling, which are obvious enough to others. It gives a person the right to smile – from others. In the Russian language, there is a unique proverb: “A fool is known by his laughing”*.*

This information also caused confusion among students. One student said a little indignantly, “What can be the reason for a smile?”.

It was noticed that another student also felt the same. We started to discuss and tried to answer that question.

* My translation

Next student said, “ How could it be the reason for smiling? If I want to smile, I will smile, and this is normal and in any way it does not mean madness.”

To clear it up I decided to get a little comment and said, “ I give you an example if a person tells us a funny story, there is a sense of humour, we can laugh or smile. The reason is humour in the funny story.”

There is a little silent for a while.

Then another student said, “If I am smiling it will mean that I am happy. The reason of my smiling is my feeling of happiness.”

After these words, the other Norwegians were smiling and laughing.

At the end of our conversation, the students agreed and understood that there was the possibility of being of any reason for a smile.

Something emerges from something. The reason emerges from consequence.

Next feature was controversial for the students. It caused misunderstanding of how laughter can be a sin, and why this information is presented in the topic about the smile. That's what is written: “*The image of unsmiling Russian man (Just it is unsmiling, but is not gloomy. In most the Russians are funny, cheerful and witty people) maintained in Russian folklore. It is found in many proverbs and sayings “against” laughing and joking. Examples from the “Proverbs of Russian people” dictionary written by V. Dal: “ Good does not come out of joke”, “A laughter brings a sin”, “You don't know whether to laugh or cry”.*”*

This statement from the article was a little discussed at the beginning of the lesson when I asked students the question “How do they think why the Russians do not smile frequency?”. There are some additions.

The cause of misunderstanding of the students could be understood. I tried to explain them. In my opinion, a smile should not be connected with laughter. Trying to answer the question of the students why this information is presented in the topic about the reasons of ‘unsmiling of the Russians’, I said, “If we assume that the smile is the starting point of a laughter, but it is not a laughter itself, it can be assumed that the author connects smiling with a laughter. As long as laughter is associated with a sin, hence the smile becomes a sin, as the starting point of laughter. To be no sin, the laughter and smile have to be refused; it follows that it is no laughter, no smile (‘unsmiling of the Russians’). Perhaps that is why the author of the article, explaining the reason of ‘unsmiling of the Russians’, provided the information, where the laughter is considered a negative point view, such as a sin.” Unfortunately, the

* My translation

students did not express their comments on my answer, but I see on their faces the evident remaining dissent that laughter could have a meaning of a sin, and therefore a smile is also.

However, next feature was very familiar and understandable for the Norwegian students.

“Customary Russian does not smile while on duty, in the performance of any serious business. For example, at the airport's customs officers never smile as busy, serious matter. This feature of Russian smile is unique.”, read the Student E.

The students began to give examples from their life experiences when they are faced with the ‘unsmiling of the Russians’ while on duty of the Russians. This feature they called as an absolute reason of the so-called ‘unsmiling of the Russians’.

A student said, “I remember when I passed the customs control at the Russian customs the Russian customers were not smiling.”

Another Norwegian agreed absolutely, “When any serious business there is no need to smile. I mean if you are doing serious business, there is no smile, because it will interfere with the business.”

I agreed with the students and reminded them the situation about the Norwegian customs control, where customs officials have serious business, and they are smiling, but the Russian customers are not. I asked them, “Why it is that, how do you think? The Norwegians also have serious business at the Norwegian customs, have not they?”

One of the students said, “Perhaps these are the features of the Russian and the Norwegian smile.”

Everyone was smiling and laughing after his words.

We continued. Reading the latest feature of the Russian smile, I noticed that it caused the Norwegian students smile. Perhaps you would like to know “why?”

As the Norwegians said, it is that because they also smile for this reason. And the reason is sincerity.

It is read in the article, *“Russian smile is intended to be only sincere, it is regarded as a genuine expression of good mood or disposition to the interlocutor. So if a foreigner smiles it will not mean anything, he or she was taught to smile to everyone. And if the Russian smiles it will be because of he or she wants to do it.”*

Another student added, “I would also add that the Norwegians meet people smiling sincerely.”

I was smiling and said, “the Russians can be said the same thing.”

What did I see?

According to my observations, I have noticed that the smile on the faces of the students does not appear by accident. They find in the article the features and those one are close to them that caused them joy and smile with the result. There was a reason for joy smiles. It is the gladness of finding similarities between two different cultures. In many cases, I have seen other picture when people are essentially looking for the differences between each other, for example in the language, nation, social status and so on. Thus conflicts emerge. I mean that I do not deny that we are different, but there is something that makes us feel unity. Working with the Norwegian students, I see a reverse example, a living example of gladness. It seems, to break the barriers between people, boundaries, states it needs to look for more similarities that may help feel a sense of joy and unity.

A Russian smile remains a sign of sincerity and openness to the foreigners (in the person of the Norwegian students). Some of the presented information in the article “Smile in Russian communicative behaviour” written by I. Sternin in 2000 has remained relevant today. And that presented information was used as a base for writing new article “Why do not the Russians smile?” by an unknown author in 2013.

This work as a discussion lesson was very useful for the Norwegian students and me. After this work many features of the Russian smile and the reasons of ‘unsmiling of the Russians’ have become clearer for the Norwegian students and me.

According to the student's words, the presented information at the lesson has helped them to solve their inner problems of misunderstanding of the Russians behaviour related with a smile. In my opinion, it has given them the freedom from ‘why’-tags questions which emerge when they meet with the Russians and face with the features of their culture in different situations.

The lesson is over. We thank each other and say goodbye.

Critical reflection on my report’s results

Having started doing a critical reflection on my results, written in the report, I have come to some interesting conclusions. One of them is that I have realised that I wanted to investigate not that I have written in the background for my fieldwork in the report. Those aims that I set myself before the organisation of my fieldwork were only part of the large aim which I see now but have not seen yet at that moment. According to my report’s background in the fieldwork, I am a challenger to the unknown author who claimed in his article that the

foreigners have a stereotype that the Russians are ‘*unsmiling*’ people. He claimed that it makes me challenge whether the foreigners have that stereotype. If it is true whether all reasons of the ‘unsmiling of the Russians’ are cleared up in the article written by the author or there are some more reasons which both the foreigners (the Norwegian students) and I do not even guess. (Report of the fieldwork 2013). Writing critical reflection I have realised that I did not aim to find out why the Russians are ‘*unsmiling*’ people, in fact, I wanted to confirm the *conclusions* which I came in my first experience, written in the first essay and extend my understanding in my fieldwork. They are the conclusions about the reasons for appearance and absence of Norwegian smile in the Norwegian culture in the dialogue with other (Russian) culture, which forms the value-sense content of the Norwegian culture. Such aspiration to extend my understanding of the valuable-conceptual content of the Norwegian culture is reasonable because it has already appeared in my first experience. Setting the aim to find out why the Russians are ‘*unsmiling*’ people, unconsciously I have achieved the second aim to understand the valuable-conceptual content of the Norwegian culture, which now is on my conscious understanding level.

Reflection on the method for collecting and organising data.

Before collecting and organising data, I have put the questions for myself. “ I would like to know: 1. Is the foreigners’ opinion of the explanation of the reasons of ‘unsmiling of the Russians’ the same as explained in the “Why do not the Russians smile?” article?; 2. Is that presented explanation in the article about nature of Russian communicative behaviour as a smile relevant and clear for the foreigners?

The foreigners, who could assist me to reply to those questions, are the group of the Norwegian students who study Russian as a foreign language and are interested in the Russian culture. (Report of the fieldwork 2013). For answering those questions, I have used the method of specially arranged classroom dialogue and the method of comparative analysis of the research of the Russian -Norwegian dialogue of cultures.

Why do I use the method of specially arranged classroom dialogue? I had found out this method for myself when I participated as a member of the philosophical circle which is arranged in MSHU. According to my observation, the use of this method helped the leader of the philosophical circle to organise the group members in a special way so each member could express his or her idea freely, see each other and have an open and free dialogue. The important feature of that method is to allow to organise the dialogue that way, when the

dialogue is made between not only leader and one member but also all members of the group begin to be involved in the dialogue and all members, are equal. Even if any person of the members of the circle does not want to involve in the dialogue, he or she will be involved. Such method also was used by the teachers when the Assembly of Joint Master Degree Programme was arranged in Murmansk, Nickel and Kirkenes. To my point of view, this method allows a teacher or any leader to organise the open dialogue between members of dialogue. When I did it in organising data, I would like to get the results that will be more or less relevant. The way I was able to use this method I have described in my report (Report of the fieldwork 2013). Whether this method is used correctly, I plan to study it. But the fact that this method has helped me to enlighten my research questions on a smile is obvious. The arrangement of the dialogue in the circle work allowed me to get the answers to the questions that I put myself before going into the fieldwork. The use of dialogue is valid. According to and Plato, the dialogue is a special form of the development of philosophical topics. The dialogue is made by one or some interlocutors where the philosophical questions are discussed (Plato 2011). According to Bakhtin “ a dialogic relationship ... - is almost a universal phenomenon, permeating all human speech and all relationships and manifestations of human life, that is everything, everything that has meaning and value [...] Where the consciousness begins there is a dialogue” (Bakhtin 1972, p. 71). In my work, the main thing was to use not just a simple dialogue but to use the dialogue of cultures. As through the dialogue of cultures the *person* of one culture perceives himself or herself as he or she is the correlation with the other (the interlocutor of a different culture). In Bakhtin’s (1979) philosophy culture is seen by the individual as “a form of self-determination of our life, consciousness, thinking ...” (Bakhtin 1979, p. 289).

In the “dialogue of cultures” it is talked about the dialogic of truth as itself (.. beauty, goodness ...), about understanding of other person that means a “I – you” understanding as the ontological different personalities who had actually or potentially different cultures, logical thinking, various meanings of truth, beauty, goodness ... The dialogue understood in the idea of culture - is not a dialogue of different opinions or ideas. It is always a dialogue between different cultures ...” (Bibler 1990). I agree with the Bachtin’s and Bibler’s ideas. The study of the dialogue of cultures in my research I as a person of one culture perceive myself through the correlation with the 'others' (students of Norwegian culture). So it is built the dialogue of different cultures.

As a form of communication of cultures, I have chosen a *text*. Under Bakhtin (1986), a person can be studied through the *text*. According to Bakhtin (1986), the *text* can be

presented in different *forms*: as a living human speech; as speech, captured on paper or any other medium, etc.. In my work, I use two *presented forms of the text*. As a speech imprinted on paper is the article “Smile in Russian communicative behaviour” written by Sternin in 2000 and which was adapted and rewritten by the unknown author in 2013 and had a title “Why do not the Russians smile?”. That article reflects the information about the Russian communicative behaviour as a smile and describes reasons of appearance and absence of Russian smile, and explain the author’s statement that the foreigners said: “The Russians is surprisingly unsmiling people” (Why do not the Russians smile? 2013). As a living human speech is both a reported speech of mine and a reported speech of the Norwegian students, which is presented in the report (Report of the fieldwork 2013).

According to Bakhtin (1979), the *text* is understood as a dialogic meeting of two subjects, submerged in the endless cultural context that requires special *method-understanding*, which includes *four acts*: 1. Perception of the text; 2. Recognition and understanding of the importance of this language; 3. Recognition and understanding in the context of a given culture; 4. Active dialogical understanding. Within that method-understanding, it was arranged the work under the text “Why do not the Russians smile?” with the Norwegian students.

Perception of the text “Why do not the Russians smile?”. In my opinion, this act is the most simple and at the same time the most difficult, because at this act when two subjects meet at the dialogic meeting it is not expected to understand the text, and it is assumed dialogue with one’s own. That is because the reader is not familiar with the author’s position yet and can not understand it. The same is said of Bakhtin’s (1979) work. The organisation of this act is required me such actions, which would allow students to prepare for the understanding of the text in a certain way. This way is the scanning text of the article in 15 minutes. Then I should ask the leading question to the students, that allows opening a dialogue with them. It helps to know the level of readiness of students to the understanding and perception of the information in the text and turn to the next acts. While scanning the text some students have difficulty understanding of the meaning of information in the text, as their level of Russian language does not always allow all students to understand the text freely. That has created some tension in making dialogue between the students and me, but when I have explained to them that we will work with the text more deeply now and analyse each situation in the text in detail, and it will be clearer, the situation has changed. The students were willing to work on it. In this case, I had to ask them to imagine that they did not read the

text and that now they just have to remember their experience of being in Russian culture and answering the question from their own perspective. I asked them to answer the question: “How do you think why it is said that the Russians do not smile?” not from an understanding of the “Others” -Russian culture, and from the perspective of understanding of their “own” Norwegian culture. That was necessary to do because the text understanding for students was difficult, and I had to have a dialogue with students. The reduction– answering to this question from the perspective of understanding of their “own” Norwegian culture– contributed to this. This turn I would explain that way: “ A person tends to perceive one’s own in the parameters of a certain simplification, but Others is always understood as some complication by him or her, which prompting the adherents of culture to come into a warlike position against Others”(Sergeev 2014). I agree with the author’s idea completely because I have noticed it in my experience. When the students’ attention was directed at one’s own, they did not come into a ‘warlike position’ and were able to get rid of the tension that has been arisen from a misunderstanding of the first time scanning text and began to speak freely, to open a dialogue. Only after this action, “**the act of perception of the text**” began to take place, as it is considered by Bakhtin originally, where it is not supposed the understanding of the text, but it is supposed a dialogue with one’s own, this is due to the fact that the reader is not familiar with the author’s position and can not understand it (Bakhtin 1979). To answer that asked question, the students had to have a dialogue with one’s own and ask oneself how one can answer this question. This immersion in “one’s own” allowed them to remember all that they have seen, known, heard about the unsmiling of the Russians and Russian culture. Analysing all the answers, which were telling the students, I saw that the first response to that question turned point, as it has allowed creating a ‘*dialogue space*’ for all students. The answer was that the Russians did not smile because this would be considered as a sign of stupidity (Report of the fieldwork 2013). This answer has caused a number of contradictions in the students, that again made them come into a ‘warlike position’ with peaceful nature, when the complicated “Others” was perceived through the prism of simplified “one’s own” and came to the main opinion, with that. As a result, all Norwegian students agreed: the opinion of another student was next. She said that she was smiling when she wanted to smile, as well as Russian did. Whether she did not want to do it, she would not smile (Report of the fieldwork 2014). Thus the dialogic meeting of two cultures was opened. Built act of ‘**perception of the text**’ by that presented way has given the feedback of the students and allowed me to understand the readiness of the students to turn to the next acts.

The following two acts: 2. Recognition and understanding of the importance of this language; 3. Recognition and understanding in the context of a given culture intertwined with each other closely.

At the Act of **Recognition and understanding of the importance of this language** the understanding of the text is realised only at the level of this language, but not in the context of culture. At the Act of **Recognition and understanding in the context of a given culture** where it is both the recognition and the understanding of the text, but the understanding of one culture, which greatly reduces the possibility of understanding as it is. According to the report, the scanning of the text by the students for the second time and understanding of the text on the mentioned above two levels was as follows: Initially, the students understood the text at the level of the Russian language, learnt new words for themselves, and then moved on to the understanding within “one’s own”– within the context of the Norwegian culture– happened recognition and understanding in the context of Norwegian culture. The recognition and understanding were hidden from me at this act but was presented at last the fourth act of understanding of the text - **Active dialogical understanding**.

In my opinion, the last act allows to open the ‘*door*’ of knowledge of the reasons for appearance or absence of Norwegian smile and to form a value-sense content that contributes to as the philosophical understanding of the Russian culture so the philosophical understanding of the Norwegian one.

At the fourth act of understanding - **Active dialogical understanding**- a conceptual framework for the Norwegian students has already formed with the necessary information, supporting to carry on dialogue, therefore to understand the text from the perspective of the author and interpreter. **The Active dialogic understanding** of the text was organized on the basis of a comparative approach, where the students have the opportunity to understand the meaning of the text on one’s own, through the prism of understanding of their culture- through “One’s own”, then through the prism of the article’s author and through the prism of interpreter-teacher in other words through the prism of the understanding of the Russian culture- through others. “Thus, through the dialogue of cultures a person of one culture (own- the Students of the Norwegian culture) cognizes oneself as oneself in the correlation with the others (others - author and interpreter of the Russian culture). At this act of understanding of the role of the interpreter belonged to me, but my teacher’s role has paled into insignificance. This state of affairs was no accident. This role was vital for a better understanding of what the author wanted to say in the text, as the level of students of Russian language did not always

allow the students to understand the notional content of the text. That allowed the students and me to notice some things that perhaps would not have been seen in self-understanding without an interpreter. For example, after reading the first paragraph in the article about the reasons for the appearance or absence of Russian smile, the statement “Russian smile - is a sign of a personal sympathy, and it is not a sign of politeness” (Report of the fieldwork 2013) caused surprise to the Norwegian students, as they said, they had never thought that «Russian smile - is a sign of a personal sympathy» previously. And without giving a situational example by the interpreter in what situation the “Russian smile - is a sign of a personal sympathy,” the statement would have remained misunderstood and would continue to form the border between the understanding of others in the dialogue of cultures (Report of the fieldwork 2013). After the first dialogue between the Norwegian students with the author and with the interpreter, I had the opportunity to formulate the first reason of the Norwegian smile. The first **‘reason of appearance or absence of the Norwegian smile’** is “ The Norwegian smile is a sign of politeness, but the constant polite smile is a duty smile” (Report of the fieldwork 2013).

Next, dialogic meeting of the Norwegian and Russian culture was within the context of the fact that *the Russians smile only familiar people* (Report of the fieldwork 2013). In the understanding of this context was distinguished the clear boundary “ One’s own-others”, in which as opposed to the typical features of Russian culture – *the Russians smile only familiar people* –it was clearly introduced the feature of the Norwegian culture. According to the report, the Norwegian student said, “ I am a Norwegian. If I smile a stranger at the street, it will mean that I am open to the dialogue and anybody can come to me and ask a question. If I do not smile, so I will not want to talk. I mean I am not ready to come into contact” (Report of the fieldwork 2013: 10). Therefore, sorting others are from “ One’s own” the Norwegian students has presented the following **‘reason of appearance or absence of Norwegian smile’**: “If A Norwegian smiles the stranger it will mean his or her readiness to dialogue”.

From my point of view, the most significant and turning dialogic meetings were the meetings of the Norwegian students with the *statements* in the text about the reasons of appearance or absence of Russian smile as follows: 1. “It is uncharacteristically for the Russians to smile back. If the Russians see smiling stranger, they will look for the cause of fun undoubtedly. They will think whether it is something bad in their clothing or hairstyle as a result of the reason of stranger’s fun.”;

2. “The Russians need to have enough reasons for smiling, which are obvious enough to others. It gives a person the right to smile – from others. In the Russian language, there is a unique proverb: “A fool is known by his laughing”;

3. “The image of unsmiling Russian man (Just it is unsmiling but is not gloomy. In most the Russians are funny, cheerful and witty people) maintained in Russian folklore. It is found in many proverbs and sayings “against” laughing and joking. Examples from the “Proverbs of Russian people” dictionary written by Dal: “Well does not come out of joke”, “A laughter brings a sin”, “You don't know whether to laugh or cry” (Report of the fieldwork 2013)

Reflection on the first dialogic meeting. The presented information in the text provoked a variety of emotions, both positive and negative by the students. This one is described in details in my report (Report of the fieldwork 2013). This response to the information was predictable for me, because in the first act “**Perception of the text**” it already appeared. Observing the behavior of the Norwegian students, their recognition and understanding of the text, I have come to you to the conclusion that extreme and radical information about any culture, in this case about Russian culture, firstly caused the negative emotions on the stage of its recognition, and then at the stage of comparing and understanding the emotions became calm and have already had another form that allowed to look at this information from the other side and to understand other culture. This response is due to no correlation of any part of one’s own with other culture and as a consequence its absolute rejection. When the transition occurs on the level of correlation and understanding of the reasons appearance of such behaviour on the part of the Russians, as it is presented in the text, the “others” for the Norwegian students becomes understandable, and “one’s own” is understood even better. From this point of view, I also can say about the Bakhtin’s (1979) ideas, that person becomes a person and cognizes oneself as oneself only through the correlation with others.

According to my report, I have presented some conclusions about all statements that I have noticed after discussion on them. Such conclusions give me the possibility to formulate the reasons of appearance or absence of Norwegian smile. When we were discussing the possible reason of Russian smile as awkward appearance or item of clothing (First statement), the Norwegians could not accept such a reason and told me one simple thing: smiling man is natural for the Norwegians (Report of the fieldwork 2013). Analysing the situation now, I have realised that the answer was as familiar to me and said me that if a Norwegian smiled me I would not think that it would be the reason for my awkward appearance or item of clothing,

I should not be anxious about it. Therefore, the following **‘reason of appearance or absence of Norwegian smile’** is called: “A smiling man is natural for the Norwegians in the Norwegian culture”.

Reflection on the second dialogic meeting. The second statement “*The Russians need to have enough reasons for smiling*” (Report of the fieldwork 2013) has brought up questions for Norwegian students: “Why are the Russians looking for this reason for smiling?”. In my opinion, this question is arisen, because the students have forgotten that they study the cultural features, the features of appearance of the Russian culture through a smile as a component of the Russian communicative behaviour. The Students went out of the position of an external observer, as they were original when they first became acquainted with the text. And they began to be influenced by their culture, where a finding of any reason of any phenomenon was not as prevalent as in the case of dialogue meetings with the other in other culture. As a result of open dialogue between the two cultures, we came to the conclusion that the lack of knowledge of the reasons for the existence of any features in the other culture and its consequences give even more lack of knowledge and misunderstanding of these features and make it impossible to understand “other” culture. That leads to the condition of the inner struggle of one’s own culture with others one on the border of understanding and misunderstanding in the dialogue of cultures. I think that such struggle is necessary because I would agree here with the Sergeev’s (2014) words that a struggle is a form of cultural development.

On the basis of the report and aforesaid it is presented the following **‘reason of appearance or absence of the Norwegian smile’**: “The Norwegian smile might include the reasons in itself, but it also might not”.

Reflection on the third dialogic meeting. My reflection on the presented above third statement is not about the reasons of the appearance of the Russian smiles, but about of the reasons of its absence which can be represented as follows. Considering this statement with the students, I acted as an interpreter of the presented information. My effort to explain to the students why the reasons for Russian unsmiling are considered from the point of laughter was not clear. That was evident in the expressions of their faces. I think one of the reasons for this students’ misunderstanding is that a smile is considered as a sign of stupidity in the statement. The second one – we have already discussed this information a little bit at the beginning of the lesson, and it was not interesting for students to discuss this the second time. And the third reason – this information for the students is not connected with their ‘one’s own’. But this is only my estimates.

Lively discussion and open dialogue have developed between the students in the discussion on the fourth statement “Customary Russian does not smile while on duty, in the performance of any serious business and me. *For example, at the airport's customs officers never smile as busy, serious matter. This feature of Russian smile is unique.*” (Report of the fieldwork 2013). This statement had allowed the students to remember a lot of their own life experiences when they were at the customs in different countries. And all of them have come to the conclusion that doing serious business there is no need for smiling. But when I asked them to remember the moment when they crossed the Norwegian border and hint them at the Norwegian customs are always smiling during greeting with the passengers, then the student have lost in thoughts.

I think that the return of the ‘one’s own’ allowed the Norwegian students to understand the meaning of the information more deeply, which in turn has allowed one of the students to formulate a new understanding of **‘reason of appearance or absence of the Norwegian smile’** as follows: “The fact that the Norwegian customs officer are smiling you at the Norwegian customs border during the greeting is the feature of the Norwegian culture”.

In my opinion, the last statement in the text was the most understandable for the Norwegian students. The statement that the Russian smile has the character of sincerity (Report of the fieldwork 2013). If the Russian wants to smile, he or she will smile. I remind that at the beginning of the lesson, I have been talking to the Norwegian students about that the Norwegian will smile when he or she wants to smile. And now as it is seen the Norwegian students have found the same character among the Russians. That information has caused the Norwegian students a lot of positive and joyful emotions. I would call it as they have recognised ‘one’s own’ in the ‘others’. It seemed a sincerity has broken the borders between ‘one’s own’ and ‘others’ and a consciousness of ‘holism’ has come. The act of understanding between two cultures in the open dialogue of cultures is occurred. At the end of the discussion on this statement was formed **‘reason of appearance or absence of the Norwegian smile’**: “The Norwegians meet people smiling sincerely” (Report of the fieldwork 2013).

Referring to my conclusion that I have presented in part “What did I see?” in my report I could notice that this part represents new result that I did not intend to find out before. Thus, it is the realisation of that finding of similar features between each other in the dialogue of two cultures gives a sense of unity. Also, it should be mentioned, as the Norwegian students said me, that this conducted lesson helped them to solve their inner problems of misunderstanding of features of the Russian communicative behaviour as a smile. But this

conclusion does not provide answers to those questions that I have put before the organisation of fieldwork. In that way, they should be reflected in the summary of the essay.

Conclusion. The use of the method as specially arranged classroom dialogue has contributed to the possibility to reach the object in view. Working with the students at the level of an act of *active dialogical understanding* has allowed formulating the next reasons of appearance or absence of the Norwegian smile both me and the students.

Valuable-meaning content of the Norwegian culture through the concept of smile:

1. “The Norwegian smile is a sign of politeness, but the constant polite smile is a duty smile”.
2. “If A Norwegian smiles a stranger it will mean his or her readiness to dialogue”.
3. “A smiling man is a natural appearance for the Norwegians in the Norwegian culture».
4. “The Norwegian smile might include the reasons in itself, but also it might not”.
5. “The fact that the Norwegian customs officers are smiling someone at the Norwegian customs border during a meeting is the feature of the Norwegian culture”.
6. “The Norwegians meet people smiling sincerely”.

This information forms the value-sense content of the Norwegian culture. The knowledge of the reasons contributes the understanding of the appearance of different features of communicative behaviour as in the dialogue of cultures. In this essay, it has represented the dialogue of Russian and Norwegian cultures. In carrying on a constructive dialogue, which helps to build the good cooperation, the understanding between two cultures was one of the important components. More precisely the understanding was as the understanding of value and meaning of both cultures. In this essay, the aim is to represent the philosophical understanding of the Norwegian culture. Philosophical understanding of the Norwegian culture is based on the understanding of value-sense content of the Norwegian culture. Such valuable- meaning content of the Norwegian culture was possible to find out and represent in the dialogue of Russian and Norwegian cultures. Thus the open dialogue between two cultures contributes the philosophical understanding of the Norwegian culture.

In addition

Referring to the information at the beginning of that essay, I also would like to represent whether my subjective point of view about the Norwegian smile and its reasons of appearance are confirmed. Let remind them: “They do not often smile when they get acquainted with new people. They do not smile unfamiliar people if these unfamiliar people are smiling them. They are smiling when they understand that something is funny. They will

not smile if they do not want to smile. That is all that I can mention about Norwegian smile now”.

Now it is possible to represent by comparison of data for reasons for appearance or absence of the Norwegian smile from my first and the second experience. It is noticed that not all of my subjective statements are confirmed. I suppose that this is because in my first experience, which I described in the first essay, I am acutely experienced the problem of misunderstanding of the reasons for appearance or absence of the Norwegian smile, but now this is not a problem and only stronghold of the reflection.

Writing my reflection in some central parts of my experience from the field work I have formulated some questions. In summary, it is needed some remarks on them.

The remarks to question “Do the Norwegians understand why the Russians do not smile the same as it is presented in the article? ” are:

- The Norwegians students did not always agree with that information, which was presented in the article. Hence their understanding was different.

- Is the presented information about the nature of smile in the article relevant to the Norwegian students? Answering this questions, I would say that this presented information is relevant, but not always understandable. I suppose this is due to the little experience of the Norwegian students of communication with the Russian culture. In this case, in my opinion, such kind of work is necessary for successful communication and common understanding.

What are the reasons for the Russian smile? The answer to this question has already represented in the article, but I would like to present the reasons which were mentioned by the Norwegian students.

- They are:

1. “The Russians need to have enough reasons for smiling.”
2. “The fact that the Russian customs officers are not smiling you at the Russian customs border during the meeting is the feature of the Russian culture.”
3. “The Russians meet people smiling sincerely.”
4. “Russian smile – is a sign of a personal sympathy.”

How do the Norwegians understand the Russian culture through the communicative behaviour as a smile?

- They accept the smile as facial expressions of the face of the Russian culture. That fact of how the *Norwegians understand the Russian smile might be described by the last*

episode of my fieldwork: ““A student said, “I remember when I passed the customs control at the Russian customs the Russian customers were not smiling.”

Another Norwegian agreed absolutely, “When any serious business there is no need to smile. I mean if you are doing serious business, there is no smile, because it will interfere with the business.”

I agreed with the students and reminded them the situation about the Norwegian customs control, where customs officials have serious business, and they are smiling, but the Russian customers are not. I asked them, “Why it is that, how do you think? The Norwegians also have serious business at the Norwegian customs, have not they?”

One of the students said, “**Perhaps these are only the features of the Russian and the Norwegian cultures and no more.**” ” (Report of fieldwork, 2013)

Whether those remarks open the answer to those questions will be decided by the reader.

REFERENCES

1. Why do not the Russians smile? (2013) Why do not the Russians smile? [online]. Available from: <http://www.adme.ru/svoboda-psihologiya/pochemu-russkie-ne-ulybayutsya-591505/> [Accessed 11/05/14].
2. BAKHTIN, M. (1986) *[The] Aesthetics of Verbal Art*. Moscow: Iskusstvo
3. BAKHTIN, M. (1972) *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaja
4. BAKHTIN, M. (1979) *[The] Aesthetics of Verbal Art*. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaja literatura.
5. BECK, U. (2001) *What is globalization?*. Moscow: Progress-Tradicia.
6. BIBLER, V. (1990) *Ot Naukoutscheniia - k Logike Kul'tury (From epistemology to culture logic)*. Moscow: Mysl'.
7. HELD, D. et. al (2004) *Transformations: Politics, Economics and Culture*. Moscow: Practice. literatura.
8. PLATO (2011) *Dialodues*. Moscow:AST.
9. SERGEEV, A. (2014) *Kul'tura i soznanie: svojo i chuzhoe (Culture and consciousness: one's own and others* [online]. Available from: www.mshu.edu.ru/index.php?option=com_content&task=section&id=53&Itemid=2940 [Accessed 14/11/14].

10. STERNIN, I. (2000) Ulybka v russkom kommunikativnom povedenii. Russkoe i finskoe kommunikativnoe povedenie. Vyp.1Voronezh: Izd-vo VGTU, 2000. S. 53-61. [online]. Available from: <http://commbehavior.narod.ru/RusFin/RusFin2000/Sternin4.htm> [Accessed 11/05/14].
11. SULTANBAEVA, I. (2013) The 'inner smile'- a key to freedom from the 'internal fight'. Essay. Norway: University of Nordland.