PERSONALITY TRAITS AS CULTURAL MODELS
(Georgian case – Aggression, Altruism, Flattery)

Lali Surmanidze[1]

Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University
Associate professor

Abstract

The article concerns the cultural models of personality traits viewed within the conceptual framework of cognitive psychological anthropology. It is believed that personality traits are shared cultural experiences formed in interaction with cultural practice and are represented in the psyche in the form of cultural models (schemas). 50 people (aged 25-45) participated in the study. For all participants Georgian was the first language. The study used psycho-semantic experiment and interviewing as research methods. 200 Georgian folk idioms were used as study material. The semantic space constructed on the basis of obtained results reflects the structure of semantic relations between the idioms. The interview provided material on the rational basis of semantic grouping used by research participants. It turned out that affective implications (feelings), perceptual implications (ideas about the similarity of the elements united under the same category) and cognitive implications (naming of categories) proved to play the leading role in categorization. The data obtained from the interview and experiment were synthetically interpreted. The study analyses 3 personality traits: aggression, altruism and flattery. Personality traits and their components are interpreted within the culture-specific context.

Key words: *Cognitive psychological anthropology, cultural model, metaphor, personality traits, synthetic methodology*

Introduction

Cognitive revolution in the 1950s "brought the mind back into experimental psychology" and, at the same time, prepared ground for relating anthropology to cognitive science (Miller, 2003). Cognitivist direction in modern anthropology is based on the assumptions of cognitive anthropology and cognitive psychology. In addition, relationship between culture and the individual's mental structures became the focus of attention (D'Andrade, 1992; Dressler et al., 2017; Shore, 1996; Strauss & Quinn, 1997). This direction views culture as a set of assumptions formed on the basis of shared cultural experiences which are organized by schemas.[2] In psychological anthropology, cultural schema or cultural model[3] is

---

[1] Corresponding Author:
Lali.surmanidze, Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University, Lali.surmanidze@tsu.ge

[2] Naomi Quinn and Claudia Strauss define culture as shared schemas formed on the basis of individuals' repeated experiences and the interaction of these schemas with the outer world (Chkhaidze, 2021).

[3] In modern psychological anthropology, the terms 'schema' and 'model' are used interchangeably (D'Andrade, 1995).

understood as a mental structure formed through cultural experience. It is believed that the group of people in a culture who acquire similar experience are expected to develop shared schemas. On its part, they are reflected in cultural experience. According to Naomi Quinn, people use similar schemas when forming expectations, making judgments or performing everyday activities (Quinn, 2005). It is clear that a specific culture has the models corresponding to numerous experiential phenomena. Cultural schemas and their mental representations are studied by school of cultural models which is one of the directions of cognitive psychological anthropology (Bennardo & Munck, 2014; Blount, 2011; Quinn, 2011).

An important direction studying the relationship between culture and the individual's mental processes focuses on cultural wisdom. This direction is closely related to the analysis of culture-specific adaptive processes, since historically preserved cultural practices normally make evolutionary contribution by bringing benefits to social groups.

Culture operates through cognitive processes at the individual and collective levels.[1] At the collective level culture forms relationships and social interactions, the themes that need to be tabooed, forms of emotional expressions, relationship style, etc. (Gudykunst & Kim, 2002; Matsumoto et al., 2008; Triandis, 1994). The differences between risk related cultural norms may be determined by ecological conditions, which, in their turn, are related to adaptive processes (Chen et al., 1995). The cultural practice of narration is a powerful adaptation mechanism because it is a way of passing knowledge through generations to cultural groups, the knowledge increasing the group's chances of survival (Lancy, 2008).

Personality traits as cultural models

The theory of personality traits is an important part of the theory and research-based personality psychology. Arthur Reber defines personality traits as basic personality characteristics which are hypothetical by nature. They can be used for the explanation of behavioral stability and consistency or as simple descriptions of behavioral models, perception, thinking, etc., without any explanatory intention (Reber, 1996). According to the basic assumption of personality theories, it is possible to describe human being in terms of the probability of experienced feelings or thoughts only because people are inclined to react in a certain, definite way (Perwin & John, 2000). According to R. Nisbet and L. Ross, although it is difficult to predict behavior from personality traits, most people, including professionals, deeply believe that the knowledge of traits provides us with important information for similar predictions (Nisbet & Ross, 2000). The importance of personality traits in adaptive processes was convincingly proved by social biologists in the 1980-1990s. According to this approach, personality traits are closely linked with the regulatory systems operating in the social environment, are important adaptive mechanisms in formation and functioning of

---

[1] According to studies, in Western cultures the individual's perception focuses on separate objects and their peculiarities, whereas perception in oriental cultures is more holistic (Nisbett, 2004). Differently from the members of individualistic cultures, representatives of collectivist cultures better memorize social information (Wang et al., 2002). It has been proved that the cultural practice of meditation improves attention and cognitive control (Brefczynski-Lewis et al., 2007).

basic adaptive strategies, also describe the most important personality traits required for steadiness and progress in social environment and include information on the basic individual differences required for 'our' well-being and the well-being of 'our group' (Macdonald, 1998; McCrae et al., 1998). That is why the terminology describing personality traits is encountered in different languages. Although researchers in the field of psychology believe in the universality of the structure of the Big Five[1] personality traits, a group of scientists holds a different opinion: the similarity of linguistic-semantic structures in different cultures does not mean that the given linguistic structure reflects the people's life experience and can be regarded as its linguistic equivalent. It does not mean, either, that a specific personality trait (or a set of these traits) is identically understood in different cultures. It is believed that this terminology, or at least its part, is determined by cultural, evolutionary and adaptive processes and, although linguistic equivalents in different languages do exist, they cannot be considered semantic equivalents (Perwin & John, 2000). The research confirms the legitimacy of such an approach. For example, the verification of the five-factor model in the Filipino culture, revealed a culture-specific organization of personality peculiarities, which is thought to be a manifestation of cultural and individual differences in thinking, feelings and behavioral tendencies (Church, 1987; Church & Lonner, 1998). Furthermore, it has to be taken into consideration that personality traits are classifiers of conscious categorial structures, and, therefore, represent a source of cultural determination of cognitive processes. It is clear that the semantic peculiarities of traits are reflected in the personality type acceptable for the given culture, which guides the establishment of the central principles for the model of proper upbringing (Surmanidze, 2001, 2010).

In psychological anthropology opinions about different approaches to research into personality traits have always been controversial. In line with the Gestalt psychology, configurationalism in the culture-personality school (1930s – 1940s) defined traits as the elements of personality – a complex, organized whole (that is why this approach viewed culture as an analogue to personality) (Bock, 1988). For students of national character which is another direction in culture-personality school, personality traits are regarded in combination with cultural patterns: national character is defined as relatively stable personality traits and patterns characteristic of adult representatives of the given society (Inkeles & Levinson, 1969).

G. Bateson examined binary and triadic patterns to describe the differences between the characters of the representatives of different cultures (Bateson, 2000). The linguist

---

[1] First 5 and later 6 categories of personality traits were confirmed in many languages. The universality of the so-called Big Five (openness, extraversion, neuroticism, agreeableness and conscientiousness) structure has been supported by the existence of equivalent terms in different languages, similarities of classifications of personality traits in different cultures, unchangeability of the structure, high reliability/validity of all the five factors and its relative stability throughout the individual's life (Perwin & John, 2000). At the same time, skepticism regarding the universality of this personality structure is related to a full neglect of the cultural factor: The data used for the development of five-factor model has been generated by culture for which the individual is an autonomous being, separated from others, whereas there also exists the other, opposite perspective which emphasizes fundamental connectedness of human beings to each other (the so-called non-Western as well as Eastern cultures. See: Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Markus & Kitayama, 1998; Triandis, 1995).

Edward Sapir, who was one of the distinguished representatives of the given approach, was categorically against "Trait psychology" and insisted on using the following terms: "pattern", "organization", "configuration" (Bock, 1988).

Therefore, psychological anthropology has been against the universalist understanding of personality traits from the very beginning and emphasizes the significance of contextual specificity. Because of the importance of the adaptive function in the cultural space, personality traits are a natural product of this particular space. They bear cultural meanings represented in the psyche by cultural schemas, which, on their part, are based on the shared cultural experiences formed through relationship with the so-called objective cultural products (cultural texts, practices, institutions). Viewed from this perspective, the cultural models of personality traits reflect the cultural practices of evaluation, and, consequently, can be considered cultural wisdom.

Folkloric formations as cultural models

Folklore is a treasury of culture and is believed to be cultural wisdom. In 'native' socio-cultural environment folkloric consciousness discovers ready material for generalizations and ideological evaluations. From this point view, it also performs reflective function. The so-called minor folklore (idiomatic expressions, proverbs, aphorisms) are verbal formulas reflecting cultural experiences unified by Bradd Shore under linguistically coded models. According to the author, verbal formulas reflect traditional wisdom and represent specialized knowledge and/or tactics in the highest conventional form. They exist in 'ready-made' forms and are linguistic resources mastered by all speakers; are automatized response patterns and simplify speech. The knowledge of linguistic forms becomes more convincing and is represented as 'cultural wisdom' (Shore, 1996). According to G. White, linguistic formulas are generalized models of experience. It is possible to examine their organization due to their deep rootedness in the cultural context. For example, when interpreting proverbs, the conclusion made by a language user always stems from the context in which the model is used. Therefore, the process of drawing conclusions from proverbs follows the structure of the underlying shared knowledge (White, 1987). The above statement can be generalized to the so-called minor folklore, including idiomatic expressions.[1] It is believed that the metaphor plays an important role in relating the meaning expressed through verbal formulas to the cultural model.

Metaphor and the cultural model

"The essence of metaphor is understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another" (Lakoff & Johnson, 1990). G. Lakoff and M. Johnson (1980), the authors of the cognitive theory of metaphor, were the first ones to use the method of metaphor as

---

[1] The terms 'phraseology' and 'idiomatics' are differentiated from each other. Idioms are based on metaphors and express messages in a disguised, indirect form. Sometimes they are called 'petrified' metaphors. The terms 'idiom' and 'idiomatic expression' are synonyms (Akhaladze, 2022).

an indicator of schemas. In their opinion, metaphors which penetrate the entire human life manifest themselves not only in the language, but also in behavior and thinking. They are used unconsciously, mainly automatically in accordance with certain schemas. G. Lakoff and M. Johnson argue that a metaphor creates cultural model/schema (Lakoff & Johnson, 1990). Differently from the above authors, modern psycho-anthropologists believe that instead of creating schemas, the metaphor reflects the underlying cultural schemas (Strauss & Quinn, 1997). To reveal schemas, Claudia Strauss and Naomi Quinn use a schema categorization method and believe that the categories revealed by this method are widely shared.

To study national psychology, W. Wundt attached a great importance to descriptive sciences, the methods used by ethnography, folkloristics and linguistics. He believed that folklore is one of the most valuable sources to study national psychology (cultural psychology) (Wundt, 1998). However, there are very few psychological or psycho- anthropological studies which use this kind of material. Here are some of them: psycho-anthropological study of proverbs (White, 1987), semantic space of Russian idiomatic expressions (Petrenko, 1988), study of adaptive strategies with the use of proverbs (Chubinidze, 2018), studies conducted by the author of the present article in which folkloric idiomatic expressions were used as scales for the assessment of stereotypes (Surmanidze, 1993, 2010).

Modern cognitive psychological anthropology reveals cultural models through the analyzes of metaphors used in everyday speech (Chkhaidze, 2021; Chkhaidze et al., 2019). Differently from the above, our study used 'natural' metaphors, specifically Georgian folk idioms (Sakhokia, 1979). These are relatively stable linguistic formations still actively used by native speakers because their meanings reflect largely shared cultural beliefs/viewpoints, which, on their part, represent the foundation of cultural model. According to G. White, these are used as a basis for inferences from verbal formulas when we construct meaning (White, 1987).[1]

Study description

The given study presents a secondary interpretation of the data obtained within the framework of the unpublished study[2] conducted in the 2009-2010s.

The **Purpose** of the study is to reveal the cultural models of personality traits using Georgian folk idioms.

Tasks:

- Selection of the idioms relevant to the study from the idioms picked out of the dictionary;
- Establishing a categorial structure of idioms – constructing semantic space and dendrogram analysis;

---

[1] The idioms describing verbal behavior mostly convey negative dispositions and, therefore, establish the values operating in the social environment through the negation principle. This is the reason why negative idiomatic expressions prevail over positive idiomatic expressions in the experimental material.

[2] See Surmanidze 1993 for a part of the analogous study.

- Semantic and discourse analysis of the rationale behind the classification of idioms;
- Analysis and interpretation of the components of revealed traits.

Methodology

One of the important directions in the examination of relationship between cultural schemas and their mental representations is the study of meanings.[1] Meaning is considered to be the interpretation instigated in the individual by an object or an event at a given moment. It implies the existence of a cognitive process as a whole which involves identification of an object or an event, expectations and emotions related to the object/event and the motivation to respond to the given object/event (Bennardo & Munck, 2014). The methods used are versatile, including hybrid methods or their combinations created for the purpose of similar studies. The methods are broken down into three categories: ethnographical data and the relevant methods of analysis, linguistic data and the corresponding methods of analysis, experimental data and statistical analysis methods (Bennardo & Munck, 2014). The tendency to use balanced or synthetic methods has become quite obvious in the current research practice (Surmanidze, 2021).

The present study used a synthesis of positivist and hermeneutic approaches. Methodological synthesis has been achieved through the synthetic analysis of data with the use of experimental psycho-semantic method and interviewing.

Thus, the data were obtained with two types of methods: 'rigorous' psycho-semantic experiment [2] and a 'soft' method – interview with study participants. The total number of research participants was 50 (28 women, 22 men). Participants' age ranged from 25 to 45. Georgian was the native language for all research participants. Informed consent was obtained prior to the study.

Strategy, method, procedure

The study used emic approach which centers on the participant's (insider's) point of view. This approach is based on the following principle: "Let's look at the culture through the locals' eyes".

Psycho-semantic experiment – constructing semantic space. Based on the idioms used in the study, categorial structures of the consciousness were reconstructed and

---

[1] It has to be noted that anthropologists use the concepts of 'culture' and ' meaning' interchangeably (Bennardo & Munck, 2014).

[2] Psycho-semantics- psycholinguistic research strategy focusing on the examination and analysis of texts during the actual process of speech. Experimental procedures are used to model actual forms of speaking/ thinking activities, which implies the reconstruction of the system of meanings of an individual or a social group. The semantic space created with the use of experiment is an operational analogue of consciousness and reflects the research sphere (a fragment of the psyche). Construction of a semantic space is accomplished through different primary methods (association experiment, scaling, classification, etc.). Data processing is performed with multicomponent statistical methods (Petrenko, 1988, 1997; Petrenko & Mitina, 2010).

semantic space was construed. For this purpose, the classification method was applied as a primary method.

Experimental procedure: Study participants were given 200 numbered cards with one idiomatic expression on each. Idioms were to be grouped according to similarity in meaning. The principle of grouping (number of groups, their composition and size) was chosen by the participants. The experiment was conducted individually and lasted 40-45 minutes. The data obtained were recorded on a special form.

Interview procedure: When studying meanings, **explanation** and specification of participants' activities is crucially important. The research participants provided information about their activities performed in the framework of the given study. Upon the completion of experimental procedure, we asked them about the rationale behind the classification/ grouping required by instruction. In other words, the participants were asked to try to formulate the classification principle they used and identify/describe the shared meaning of the idioms included in the same group. Participants performed this task individually and their responses were audio and video recorded. The interview lasted 25-30 minutes.

Data processing and interpretation

The **experimental** data were processed using hierarchical cluster analysis (data analysis tool SPSS 23) and the dendrogram ('multilevel semantic tree'- semantic space) was constructed. The dendrogram is based on the similarity between pairs of objects and the frequency of their appearance in the same cluster. Semantic groupings are represented in the dendrogram in accordance with their enlargement according to the hierarchical principle. The dendrogram is normally analyzed at the mid-level of the hierarchy where more or less independent clusters and their structures are more salient. The meaning of a cluster is formed by its sub-clusters. The number of sub-clusters in a cluster is different. Idioms fall under the same cluster due to implicit essential attributes. The purpose of interpretation was to reveal the above attributes.

Qualitative data processing. The texts obtained through interviewing were systematized using the 'analytical coding principle' which was followed by thematical classification of the elements of the texts and content analysis (Boehm, 2004). Qualitative data were analyzed with NVivo 10. Interpretation was performed using ethnographic, folkloric, historical and other material.

17 more or less independent clusters were singled out from 200 idiomatic expressions. Due to the format limitations, the present article contains the analysis of only three personality traits.

1. *Cluster 'Aggression'.* This cluster includes 3 sub-clusters. The research participants' perceptions and definitions explicated the semantic basis of aggression. During the rational justification of grouping, the participants singled out different forms of aggression:

D. R., man, 29:

"It's a behavior of a person who does not control oneself, impulsive person who might not even want anything bad for others."

P. M., man, 57:

"It's an undermining activity. You, actually, take away support from the other person, spoil their life and make it difficult. It is a behavior of an evil person."

N.B., woman, 23:

"It's a manipulator who uses others for one's own benefit; they are profiteers, who fool others and treat them as a thing; do not respect them."

To conclude, the content of the cluster represents aggression. This criterion is presented by several components.

Sub-cluster A*:* (in most cases, the following are word-for-word translations of the Georgian idioms) *block the mouth* (resist someone), *use thorns* (hinder, resist), *pour one's bile* (express one's anxiety/anger), *pour venom* (express hatred), *show claws*, *let fire from one's mouth* (be irate), *speak fire* (be irate), *bitter-tongued, set someone as a target, set the record straight* (revenge), *reduce to ashes, annihilate.*

The meaning of the cluster describes aggression as an extremely tense opposition of two parties. Most idioms reflect situational verbal aggression, although semantics of these idioms implies letting out strong, angry emotions rather than the destruction of the other party. In addition, some of them can be regarded as the violation of traditional, normative tactfulness. For example, the idiom *bitter-tongued,* which means saying something unpleasant easily, without trying to control oneself, implies that the person has a tendency to act impulsively. Expressive discharge of aggression in the verbal form does not take into consideration the situation or the partner, which points to the neglect of certain normative standards. The latter expression is not directly manifested in semantics. But the context of 'politeness' as a value – "A man is thousandfold valued, while his politeness ten times over", in which the expression of benevolence towards the other person according to the knowledge of corresponding standards (attributes) and the ability to apply these standards, at the same time implies that the person restricts oneself to normative standards during conversation and does not step beyond limits. In this respect, *bitter-tongued* violates the above standard which means that such a behavioral disposition also implies the deficit of politeness. Therefore, this expression refers to verbal aggression and contains the negative implication of the violation of the normative standard.

Only three idioms in this cluster: *reduce to ashes, take revenge and annihilate* refer to behavioral orientation. In spite of this, in the given expressive semantic context these idioms bear a stronger expressive connotation than behavioral connotation. Therefore, the overall content of these 'elements' can be considered a component of ***expressive aggression.***

Sub-cluster B*: add oil to fire, muddle water, tread on a painful spot, kick someone* (hurt their feelings), *dig a grave, dig out the foundation, muddle one's ways, tangle some-*

one's paths, leave someone gaping (disappointed)*, leave someone dry* (empty-handed), *stuff one's mouth with hay* (thwarted), *throw ash into someone's eyes* (lie, pretend), *shove a ball into someone's mouth* (not allowing someone to speak), *pour cold water over someone, give someone a cold no* (firm refusal), *wash one's hands, treat like a trifle* (belittle), *gnaw one's feet* (not to be afraid of someone.

This sub-cluster is most numerous and directs the semantics of the entire cluster due to its behavioral dispositions referring to extreme aggression. Both verbal and non-verbal behavioral models are used to demonstrate strength. The described strategies leading to the set purposes are directed at the creation of tension and oppressive situations and hurting the other person's dignity. It should be emphasized that the person performs a purposeful behavior and is quite aware of its damaging nature. This intention dominates the content of the entire cluster and explains its name – **damaging aggression.**

Sub-cluster C: *fish in muddy waters, uproot nettles with someone else's hands, forgetting the hospitality, becoming a pig* (stingy)*, giving a stone instead of bread, taking a piece of bread from someone's mouth.*

This sub-cluster also describes damaging, destructive aggression, but in this case its semantics explicates manipulatory and degrading behavioral dispositions towards the other person, disrespect of traditional values and profiteering. We can say that the disposition of manipulating people for personal purposes is the basic meaning of the given sub-cluster. This component is regarded as **instrumental aggression.**

Therefore, the analysis of the content of the cluster shows that expressive, damaging and instrumental aggression are the components of the cultural model of aggression as personality trait. This component has versatile meanings and contains the destructive dispositions of interaction. However, the idioms reflect different intensities of aggression and manifest different shades of the meaning. For example, the idioms *pouring cold water over someone* and *giving someone a cold no* indicate that the interpersonal relations bear a clearly negative meaning, that the actor openly refuses to support the other member of the interaction. However, this kind of behavioral disposition does not imply immorality. The other idioms in the same cluster, such as *muddle one's ways* and *tangle someone's paths* imply that the actor tries to disguise his/her intention, but does not unequivocally imply the intention of bringing damage to the other person or gaining some profit. Despite the above said, in the negative context like this, it still acquires a negative meaning because of supporting split and destructive tendencies.

To conclude, aggression is represented by cognitive, affective and behavioral orientations. In the Georgian normative system – where the preservation of harmonious relations within a social group, close relationship between family members, mutual respect and interpersonal relations within referent groups – is a priority, the above criterion is considered to bear a clearly negative connotation.

2. **Classical 'altruism'.** The idioms in this cluster metaphorically reflect different understanding of altruism in the given culture. The meanings in the cluster logically supple-

ment each other which is proved by research participants' arguments explaining the rationale of classification they used. See the examples below:

A. G., woman, 47
"People should help each other, because humans survive thanks to each other's help. Existence without others is incomprehensible."

T. N., man, 25
"A lot has changed today, but the main thing is to extend a helping hand to others, not because of something, but just for nothing."

The given cluster is represented with two sub-clusters and the leading themes are social support and selfless mutual help.

Sub-cluster A: reflects selfless help of others, positive semantics of generosity, such as *give a hand*, which is semantically linked with loyalty to common job as a value (*pulling a shared yoke loyally, putting one's head away* (selfless), *pouring oneself over someone else.*

Sub-cluster B: contains the motives of support (*stand by someone, put someone on the right track, stretch a hand*). Some altruistic behavioral models are viewed in the context of Christian beliefs and, are consequently, described in religious terms (*soul be graced, adding mercy*). It also contains the cultural constructs typical of collectivist orientation, such as 'honor' and 'respect', the former referring to decency and the latter to considerate treatment of others, in expressions such as *keeping someone's honor* (covering up someone's indiscretion) and *keeping respect* (unable to refuse someone due to respect).

It is interesting to note that in the given cluster 2 verbal formulas *say something in someone's face* and *coming out in the light* are represented by independent units. The former phrase might imply saying something unpleasant to the other person and bear signs of aggression, but within the semantic context of the given cluster it is perceived as a manifestation of the individual's decency, his/her kind intention rather than verbal aggression. It seems that the motivation of straightforwardness (sincerity) of a *direct speaker* individual is more valuable than the factors which are taken into consideration in high context cultures: the form of expression, situation, the speaker's personality, etc. Our study shows that despite some kind of seeming ruthlessness this idiom clearly opposes the idioms falling under the category of verbal aggression (see Cluster 1).

The entire cluster describing altruistic orientation actually manifests itself in the phraseology *coming out in the light* as the ultimate purpose of support.

Contribution to success and the achievement in the person's social life is *bringing someone/something into the light.* Selflessness is the semantic axis of the given cluster. For this reason, is has been arbitrarily labeled 'altruism'.

3. **Cluster 'Flattery'.** The content of the given cluster can be illustrated with the below examples:

M.B., woman, 55
"Such a terrible person, burns incense to someone, surely for some personal gain, so artful."

D.S., man, 25

"These are the flatterer's behaviors. This is how people make their career."

P.M., woman, 42

"Why would you like to please others? It seems you expect some profit."

The structure of the given cluster is formed by 3 sub-clusters.

Sub-cluster A unites three idioms: *wagging one's tail, licking feet, crawling on one's belly*. The idioms describe physical behavior using the attributes and movements specific of animals: tail, licking, crawling. Therefore, human behavior is metaphorically described in analogy with animal behavior. In the context of the given cluster these behaviors evoke associations of the invectives identifying human being with the animal ("dog", "pig", "snake"). It is not coincidental that a research participant used the word 'disgusting' in relation to this cluster. In these idioms, the analogy with animals reflects flattery as a disposition degrading human dignity. It should be mentioned that Sub-cluster A sets the tone for the whole cluster.

Sub-cluster B. Idioms *oiling someone's head, covering someone in honey, burning incense* continue the semantic dominance of the first sub-cluster, but in this case indirectly, using 'human', i.e., verbal means. The meaning of all the idioms refers to the varieties of flattery – disposition to please the other person.

Sub-cluster C: pouring honey from one's mouth, pleasing someone's heart. The content of the given sub-cluster implies influence with verbal means. It should be noted that outside the context an independent meaning of these idioms is more positive than negative. In particular, the former implies, first of all, the pleasantness of speech. Pleasantness of speech was a positively evaluated ability in Georgia as long as the Georgian culture has always recognized the persuasive power of the word and believed that it is strong enough to overcome resistance (Rustaveli's phrase that has long become a proverb: *A sweet-speaking tongue can force the snake out of its hole.*) I. Javakhishvili also noted that the pleasantness of speech had been used as a method of upbringing (Javakhishvili, 1956). *Pleasing someone's heart* or *winning someone over* is also polysemous and its evaluation depends on whether the person profits from the given act or it is completely selfless.

However, in our context both cited idioms are part of a negative context. Implicitly, such a strategy must be related to a lack of trust in the person using the given strategy. Although pleasantness of speech is explicitly recognized to have a positive value, in everyday practice is seems to be associatively linked with egocentric interests of a tricky, sly person.

It should be noted that the semantic basis of slyness is adaptability/flexibility, which is considered to be one of the most valuable traits in Georgian culture (also proved by several studies; see Chubinidze, 2018; Surmanidze, 1993). However, this characteristic has quite a wide range (it ranges from flexibility to slyness); secondly, the category of flexibility,

as such, is extremely polysemantic and its positive or negative implication stems from the context of an individual's activity.[1]

Thus, the given cluster reflects flattery which is represented with two components – flattery and the wish to please. At the same time, verbal influence is emphasized and is given priority. The cultural verification of the five-factor model revealed a number of personality traits which have totally different semantics despite linguistic equivalency. For example, flattery as a trait which, in our study, bears clearly negative connotation, in Mexican culture is represented with the terms corresponding to positive connotation (Díaz-Loving, 1998). The researcher notes that 'exaggerations' natural for this behavioral style are even considered desirable in Mexico, which is explained by the high value attached to conflict-free interpersonal and in-group relations in the given culture.

Conclusion

The present study shows that expressive, damaging and instrumental aggression are the components of cultural model of aggression as a trait. The semantic axis of the trait 'altruism' is selflessness. In the context of the present study, the themes of social support and selfless mutual help are represented as essential components. The components of the cultural model of trait 'Flattery' are represented with the analogy of animal attributes and their behavioral dispositions. A wide verbal spectrum is used to express influence exerted on the other person for personal benefit. It should be noted that although 'flattery' is semantically negative in the given cultural model, other components represented with idioms might bear positive or negative connotation outside this context.

In justification of the similarity of elements falling under the formed categories, affective implications (feelings), perceptual implications (ideas about the similarity of the elements included in the same group) and cognitive implications (category naming) played the leading role. Thus, all the traits described above are represented with the corresponding cognitive, affective and behavioral components.

The results of the given study support the findings of other studies on the specificity of the Georgian culture, where personality assessment criteria are revealed with different methods, in a less detailed manner and in a larger semantic context (Surmanidze, 1993). Our results also correspond with the findings of research into Georgian adaptive models (Chubinidze, 2018).

---

[1] In general, the criteria used for the evaluation of personality and their dual semantics were formed a long time ago in Georgian culture and are influenced by the elements of the world outlook of the past epochs. According to J. M. Lotman, such formations become understandable if we look at the semantic specificity of the universal opposition "honor/glory" developed in the medieval centuries and its close link with the category "worthy/unworthy". The category of "honor" presented as a dual model in Christian cultures is described with the corresponding dichotomies: Christin/ecclesiastical – "eternal/momentary", secular, feudal/ knightly – dichotomy "glory/shame" famous/ unknown, praise/debasement, etc. (Lotman, 2002a, 2002b). Therefore, the attribute "worthy/unworthy" is determined by a cultural context.

Bibliography:

Akhaladze, A. (2022). *Idiom expressions in Georgian and Turkish languages* [PhD status defending in Linguistics].

Bateson, Gr. (2000). *Ecology of the Mind*. Meaning.

Bennardo, G., & Munck, V. C. D. (2014). *Cultural Models: Genesis, Methods, and Experiences*. Oxford University Press.

Blount, B. G. (2011). A History of Cognitive Anthropology. In *A Companion to Cognitive Anthropology* (pp. 9–29). John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444394931.ch1

Bock, P. K. (1988). *Rethinking psychological anthropology: Continuity and change in the study of human action* (pp. xii, 254). W H Freeman/Times Books/ Henry Holt & Co.

Boehm, A. (2004). Chapter 5.13 "Theoretical Coding: Text Analysis in Grounded Theory." In *A Companion to Qualitative Research*.

Brefczynski-Lewis, J. A., Lutz, A., Schaefer, H. S., Levinson, D. B., & Davidson, R. J. (2007). Neural correlates of attentional expertise in long-term meditation practitioners. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *104*(27), 11483–11488. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0606552104

Chen, C., Lee, S., & Stevenson, H. W. (1995). Response Style and Cross-Cultural Comparisons of Rating Scales Among East Asian and North American Students. *Psychological Science*, *6*(3), 170–175. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.1995.tb00327.x

Chkhaidze, T. (2021). *Fatalism – Georgian Cultural Model* [PhD status defending in Psychological Anthropology]. Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University.

Chkhaidze, T., Chubinidze, D., & Gegenava, E. (2019). Fatalism – Georgian Cultural Model. *Prizren Social Science Journal*, *3*(3), 41–52.

Chubinidze, D. (2018). *Georgian proverbs and cultural models of adaptive behavior* [PhD status defending in Psychological Anthropology]. Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University.

Church, A. T. (1987). Personality research in a non-Western culture: The Philippines. *Psychological Bulletin*, *102*(2), 272–292. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.102.2.272

Church, A. T., & Lonner, W. J. (1998). The Cross-Cultural Perspective in the Study of Personality: Rationale and Current Research. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *29*(1), 32–62. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022198291003

D'Andrade, R. G. (1992). Schemas and motivation. In *Human motives and cultural models* (pp. 23–44). Cambridge University Press.

D'Andrade, R. G. (1995). *The Development of Cognitive Anthropology*. Cambridge University Press.

Díaz-Loving, R. (1998). Contributions of Mexican Ethnopsychology to the Resolution of the Etic-Emic Dilemma in Personality. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022198291006

Dressler, W., Balieiro, M., & Santos, J. (2017). Cultural Consonance in Life Goals and Depressive Symptoms in Urban Brazil. *Journal of Anthropological Research*, *73*, 43–65. https://doi.org/10.1086/690610

Gudykunst, W., & Kim, Y. Y. (2002). *Communicating With Strangers: An Approach to Intercultural Communication* (4th edition). McGraw-Hill Humanities/Social Sciences/Languages.

Inkeles, A., & Levinson, D. J. (1969). National character: The study of modal personality and sociocultural systems. In *The handbook of social psychology: Vol. 4(2)* (pp. 418–506).

Javakhishvili, Iv. (1956). Man in ancient Georgian writing. In *Issues of the Georgian language and writing*.

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1990). *Metaphors we live by/Metaphor theory*.

Lancy, D. F. (2008). *The Anthropology of Childhood: Cherubs, Chattel, Changelings* (1st edition). Cambridge University Press.

Lotman, Yu. M. (2002a). About the opposition "honor – Glory" in secular texts of the Kyiv period. In *Articles on the semiotics of culture and art* (pp. 439–455).

Lotman, Yu. M. (2002b). Again about the concepts' honor – Glory. In *Articles on the semiotics of culture and art in in: Lotman* (pp. 456–465).

Markus, H., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the Self: Implications for Cognition, Emotion, and Motivation. *Psychological Review*, *98*, 224–253. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.98.2.224

Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1998). The Cultural Psychology of Personality. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *29*(1), 63–87. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022198291004

Matsumoto, D., Yoo, S. H., Nakagawa, S., Alexandre, J., Unicapital, S., ˘o, S., Altarriba, J., Bauer, L., Granskaya, J., Grossi, E., De, F., André, S., Joshi, R., Mahmud, H., Mogaji, A., Sterkowicz, S., Wu, R., Drezgic, M., Pacaoan, S., & Ward, C. (2008). Culture, Emotion Regulation, and Adjustment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *94*, 925–937. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.94.6.925

Miller, G. A. (2003). The cognitive revolution: A historical perspective. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *7*(3), 141–144. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1364-6613(03)00029-9

Nisbet, R., & Ross, L. (2000). *Man and situation*. Aspect-Press.

Nisbett, R. (2004). *The Geography of Thought: How Asians and Westerners Think Differently...and Why*. Simon and Schuster.

Perwin, L., & John, O. (2000). *Personality psychology. Theory and Research*. Aspect-press.

Petrenko, V. F. (1988). *Psychosemantic consciousness*. MSU.

Petrenko, V. F. (1997). *Fundamentals of psychosemancy*. MSU.

Petrenko, V. F., & Mitina, O. V. (2010). Using psycho-semantic methods in political psychology. *Societal and Political Psychology International Review*.

Quinn, N. (Ed.). (2005). *Finding Culture in Talk*. Palgrave Macmillan US. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-137-05871-3

Quinn, N. (2011). The History of the Cultural Models School Reconsidered: A Paradigm Shift in Cognitive Anthropology. In *A Companion to Cognitive Anthropology* (pp. 30–46). John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444394931.ch2

Reber, A. S. (1996). *Dictionary of Psychology, The Penguin: Second Edition* (Revised edition). Puffin.

Sakhokia, T. (1979). *Georgian iconic word-saying*. Merani.

Shore, B. (1996). *Culture in Mind: cognition,culture & Problem of Meaning*. oxford University Press.

Strauss, C., & Quinn, N. (1997). *A Cognitive Theory of Cultural Meaning*. Cambridge University Press.

Surmanidze, L. (1993). *Experimental Studies of Georgian Mentality (on the Basis of Folk Idioms)* [PhD status defending in Psychology]. The Georgian National Academy of Sciences.

Surmanidze, L. (2001). *Individual and Collectivist Societies*. Nekeri.

Surmanidze, L. (2010). *Culture in Methodological Perspective*. Universali.

Surmanidze, L. (2021). Psychological Anthropology viewed from another flank. *Georgian Psychological Journal*, *2*(1), 207–225.

Triandis, H. C. (1994). *Culture and Social Behavior* (First Edition). McGraw-Hill College.

Triandis, H. C. (1995). *Individualism & collectivism* (pp. xv, 259). Westview Press.

Wang, Q., Nisbett, R. E., & Peng, K. (2002). Culture and working memory: A theoretical analysis. *Psychological Review*, *109(3)*, 465–488.

White, G. M. (1987). Proverbs and cultural models: An American psychology of problem solving. In *Cultural models in language and thought* (pp. 151–172). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511607660.007

Wundt, V. (1998). *Problems of psychology of peoples*. Institute of Psychology of the Russian Academy of Sciences.