

The Lingua-Pragmatic and Methodological Aspects of Nonverbal Means

Kurbanov Muzaffar Abdumutalibovich

PhD, Andijan State University, Uzbekistan

Abstract: This article is devoted to the analysis of the possibility of using paralinguistic (nonverbal) means of communication as the main means of communication, and not as a secondary one, as a linguistic process which expressing independent meaning and content in communication. The results of a study of the parallel use of nonverbal and verbal means in communication are presented in this article.

Key words: nonverbal communication, verbal communication, paralinguistic means, nonverbal means, verbal means

INTRODUCTION

Language is a unique means, which serves in meeting the needs of a particular society to know the world, to transmit and receive information. Social needs define the different functions of language. The implementation of these simple and at the same time extremely complex functions of language is carried out through two different mechanisms that regularly complement each other: *verbal* and *nonverbal* communication. When a person communicates, he/she expresses their thoughts not only by the help of organs of speech, but also eyes, eyebrows, face, nose, hands, feet, and other body parts. Using linguistic and paralinguistic means is, in fact, a practical possibility to complement each other. The extent to which they are used depends on a person's life experience, knowledge and skills, and morals.

In almost all situations, when verbal and nonverbal means are used together in parallel, they in some sense serve as conditional symbols. According to V. Konetskaya, in communication, information, pragmatism and expressiveness play a role, one complements the content of the other, and in some cases replaces it¹.

Verbal communication is the main means of information exchange between individuals, and it allows communicators to easily deliver and receive information from each other. Nonverbal communication, on the other hand, serves to capture additional information about it, to express the information provided quickly, easily, clearly and precisely. In addition to the language that is the central organ of speech, in the process of nonverbal communication, the goal of communication is fully achieved through smiles, gestures, tone of voice, body parts, hand gestures and other methods.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Researches on nonverbal communication and its components have been conducted in almost all linguistic schools. In them, nonverbal means have been interpreted mainly as a completely secondary component to verbal communication or as an additional tool used in parallel. Issues such as the fact that in some cases the capabilities of linguistic signs may be limited, and that verbal means serve as an auxiliary component for nonverbal communication, i.e. secondary and additional

¹ Конечкая В. Социология коммуникации: учебник. –М.: 1997. –С.110, 113, 124.

information, have been overlooked by researchers². For example, G.Kolshansky said about paralinguistic means that they: a) have an auxiliary task to ensure the smoothness of communication; b) are used in place of certain linguistic units and compensate them, and stated that «Paralinguistic means cannot be an independent and unified semiotic system.»³

One of the founders of Uzbek paralinguistics A.Nurmonov also supported G.Kolshansky's opinion, noting that even when gestures fully compensate for language units, there is a trace of verbal means in communication – articulation⁴.

Apparently, the researchers did not consider all the features of nonverbal means as a whole. In particular, there is no monographic study in Uzbek linguistics on the types of nonverbal communication, such as dactylogy for the deaf, Braille for the blind, Semaphores and Morse alphabets of the military, their specially coded notation, semiotic units. However, it has been pointed out that in English, Russian, and Ottoman Turkish, in some situations nonverbal communication can be used when human feelings and thoughts cannot be expressed in words⁵.

It is recognized that encyclopedic dictionaries that the use of nonverbal means in verbal communication can perform 3 functions:

- a) adding more clarity to the content of verbal communication (winking, smiling, etc. in the process of informing the listener);
- b) filling in the gaps of verbal communication (the process of refusing to answer a question by nodding, etc.);
- c) interacting with verbal communication and repeating its meaning (showing the object of conversation through gestures, etc.)⁶.

Research shows that while nonverbal means i.e., gestures and body movements accepted by mankind seem to be based on a universal character in all studied languages at a glance, in fact, they differ from each other as a result of the transition from general to specific, and sometimes have contrary meaning in world languages, as nonverbal means manifested in so many different forms. Although in some cases nonverbal means may seem interlingual in general, they may be completely different due to ethno-psychological, geographical location, or customs, moral concepts, and national values.

RESULTS

Modern linguistic advances require that nonverbal means be interpreted not only as a necessary component of verbal means, but also as a means of encoding and delivering information, decoding, and engaging in nonverbal communication using semiotic symbols. In some cases, without nonverbal means, thoughts become naked, logically incomprehensible and psychologically incorrect⁷. With a narrow approach to nonverbal means, it seems to be limited in terms of both application and scope, but on a broader view, one can witness that its means and practical effects

² Колшанский Г. Паралингвистика. –М.: Наука, 1974; Панфилов В. Взаимоотношение языка и мышления. –М.: Наука, 1971; Реформатский А. Введению в языкознание. –М.: 1960; Якобсон Р. Избранные работы. –М.: Просвещение, 1985; Нурмонов А. Ўзбек паралингвистик воситалари // Танланган асарлар. 1-жилд. –Т.: Академнашр, 2012; Саидхонов М. Алоқа-аралашув ва имо-ишоралар. –Т.: Фан, 2008.

³ Колшанский Г. Паралингвистика. –М.: Наука, 1974. –С. 21.

⁴ Нурмонов А. Ўзбек паралингвистик воситалари // Танланган асарлар. 1-жилд. –Т.: Академнашр, 2012 –Б. 161.

⁵ Yildirim İ. İletişim. Üçüncü kısım. –Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi, 2017. –S. 17.

⁶ Ярцева В. Большой энциклопедический словарь. 2-е изд. –М.: "Большая Российская энциклопедия", 1998.

⁷ Саидхонов М. Алоқа-аралашув ва имо-ишоралар. –Т.: Фан, 2008. –Б. 9.

are endless. Accordingly, while language is the most effective means of human communication, it cannot in some cases serve as the sole hegemonic means of communication.

According to our results the superiority of nonverbal communication can be seen in its over verbal communication in the following cases:

- a) when the interlocutor is not able to express his goals, thoughts and inner feelings in words or has limited opportunities (*communication at night through the semaphore alphabet, etc.*);
- b) when the information addressed to the listener is of a general and permanent nature or the ability to repeat it regularly is limited (*road signs or warning siren sounds, etc.*);
- c) when there is no equivalent of the information to be conveyed precisely in verbal communication, it is conveyed by verbalization according to the nature of nonverbal means (*imitation words that are not in dictionaries: bangilloq, gurr; vak-vak; clop-clop; bdyshch*).

It can be noted that the same nonverbal medium can also have affirmative and denying, positive and negative meaning in dialogue. Only when the speaker uses nonverbal means correctly in communication will he be able to express the original purpose of the speech to the listener, enhancing the effect of the verbal means and exerting a mental effect. This can lead to possible misunderstandings with the use of excessive or unnecessary nonverbal means. This is because nonverbal means, like verbal means, consist of gestures, actions that have one or more meanings. For example, first in English, and today in most nations, the touching the tips of the thumb and forefinger meant «OK» (all is well). However, at the same time, this gesture is zero for the French (including Uzbeks) and a severe insult for the Turkish people⁸. This situation plays an important role in the study of foreign languages.

For example:

In Uzbek – *Зикр кела солиб қўлимни қисди. – Раҳмат, генерал бизга уй қуриб берапти. Раҳмат сизга.* (Ахтамов А. Бухородан Берлинга).

In Turkish – *Biraz evvel birbirimizle kavga etmemize bıçak sırtı kaldığı halde şimdi ihtiyar komşu ile gülüşüyor, ayrılırken birbirimize el sallıyorduk.* (Güntekin R. Çalikuşu).

In English – *If Shagrat himself was to offer me a glass of water, I'd shake his hand,' said Sam.* (Tolkien J. The Return of the King).

In Russian – *Знаю, что вместе войдем, но мне хочется здесь пожать тебе руку и здесь с тобой проститься. Ну, давай руку, прощай!* (Достоевский Ф. Преступление и наказание).

While speaking about the lingua-pragmatic and methodological aspects of nonverbal means, it is expedient to touch upon the phenomenon of paronymy. While considering the head as a whole, horizontal, vertical or circular movements of its parts: forehead, eyebrows, eyes, ears, nose, lips, mouth, cheeks, tongue, throat, teeth, etc. serve to convey specific meanings.

Observations show that the expression of internal emotions corresponds more to the language units formed by the head and its parts (*forehead, eyebrows, eyes, ears, nose, lips, mouth, cheeks, tongue, throat, teeth*). For example, the processes involved in the use of the head and its parts in speech may in some cases be incomprehensible to the listener, acting as an antonym or neologism. In a word, those movements may have a *universal, national or private* character in communication.

⁸ Gündüz N. Sociopragmatic Elements and Possible in EFL Teaching. Dil dergisi. Sayı: 167/1, Ocak-Haziran, 2016. –S. 49-65.

A comparative analysis of 20 nonverbal means (head gestures) across four languages revealed that, there 19 of them in Uzbek, 10 in Ottoman Turkish, 7 in English, and 16 in Russian. Apparently, in the Uzbek, Ottoman, Turkish, and Russian nations, head gestures are active in communication, but are rarely used by the British.

DISCUSSION

Modern science, the development of technology, today's globalization processes show the advantages of using nonverbal means over verbal means in the exchange of ideas and information, especially in remote communication. As a result of the interaction of sciences and linguistics, intermediate sciences are emerging.

We should note that there are professionals whose work is based only on nonverbal means, whose action in the process of communication, the expression of ideas differs sharply from others. These include, for example, *a conductor, a pantomime actor, a magician, an artist, a dancer, a surdo translator, a semaphore sailor, a traffic controller, and referees in football, volleyball, and hockey*. Every gesture made by the representatives of these fields has a great professional, social and, in some cases, political significance.

We should also take into consideration that the fine arts, music, dance, flag representing state symbols, the images of the coat of arms cannot be expressed in verbal means, that is, in words. Each of them can be taken as a conditionally coded character.

Over time, some nonverbal means of tradition may lose their relevance and become obsolete. It has been suggested that such nonverbal means be called **historical-traditional nonverbal means**. In addition, forgetting in one geographical area and acquiring other or additional content in another can lead to cross-country, inter-ethnic or intercultural differences. It has been suggested that such nonverbal means be called **space-related nonverbal means**.

CONCLUSION

It has been found out that nonverbal means adapt to an emerging situation (e.g., a pandemic), that gesture movements are limited by social distance, that they become passive in daily communication, or that some become more demanding and create new features. It has been established that nonverbal communication is in constant motion, just like verbal communication, that it is periodically updated, and most importantly, that the laws of semantic branching according to the demands and needs of society are identified.

There are certain challenges in the use of nonverbal means in the Uzbek language, especially in its complete understanding by the listener in a nonverbal communication. In particular, there is a lack of focus on problems related to the expression and understanding figurative arts and national culture through nonverbal means. In the field of linguistics, art history and cultural studies, the lingua-pragmatic aspects of nonverbal means and the problems associated with their translation have not been sufficiently studied, although their academic research is important, in both theoretical and practical aspects.

REFERENCES

1. Ахтамов А. Бухородан Берлинга. –Т.: Адабиёт ва санъат нашриёти, 1971. – 288 б.
2. Достоевский Ф. Преступление и наказание. –М.: АСТ, 2015. –672 с.
3. Колшанский Г. Паралингвистика. –М.: Наука, 1974. – 80 с.

⁹ Саидхонов М. Алоқа-аралашув ва имо-ишоралар. –Т.: Фан, 2008. –Б. 19.

4. Конецкая В. Социология коммуникации: Учебник. –М.: Межд. ун-т бизнеса и управления, 1997. – 304 с.
5. Нурмонов А. Ўзбек паралингвистик воситалари//Танланган асарлар. 1-жилд. –Т.: Академнашр, 2012. – 414 б.
6. Панфилов В. Взаимоотношение языка и мышления. –М.: Наука, 1971. – 231 с.
7. Реформатский А. Введению в языкознание. –М.: Аспект Пресс, 1996. – 536 с.
8. Саидхонов М. Алоқа-аралашув ва имо-ишоралар. –Т.: Фан, 2008. – 83 б.
9. Якобсон Р. Избранные работы. – М.: Просвещение, 1985.– 460 с.
10. Ярцева В. Большой энциклопедический словарь. 2-е издание. –М.: "Большая Российская энциклопедия", 1998. –685 с.
11. Gündüz N. Sociopragmatic Elements and Possible in EFL Teaching // Dil dergisi. Sayı: 167/1, Ocak-Haziran, 2016. –S. 49-65.
12. Güntekin R. Çalikuşu. –Istanbul: Inkilap Kitabevi Yayın Sanayi ve Ticaret AŞ, 2017. – 448 s.
13. Tolkien J. The Return of the King: Being the Third Part of the Lord of the Rings. Part 3. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2012. – 432 p.
14. Yıldırım İ. İletişim. Üçüncü kısım. –Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi, 2017. –69 s.