

TEACHING SPEECH BEHAVIOR: VERBAL AND NONVERBAL COMMUNICATION*Larisa V. Vladimirova**Kazan Federal University, lvladimi58@mail.ru**Rais N. Safin**Kazan Federal University**Daria A. Ivanova**Kazan Federal University**Tatyana A. Litvina**Kazan Federal University**Dinara R. Valeyeva**Kazan Federal University*

Abstract. Paper considers some problems of foreign language teaching and learning. Authors focus on importance of cultural peculiarities of nonverbal signs that accompany or replace the verbal ones in communication. Meanings of nonverbal signs in different cultures often are not the same. This can lead to communicative misunderstandings, or communication failures. In the process of intercultural communication, nonverbal aspect is an integral part of it, and actively interacts with the verbal, therefore, it needs to be taught, as well as we teach grammar or vocabulary. Authors proposed classification of nonverbal means of communication. This classification considers possibility or impossibility of substituting the nonverbal signs by the verbal ones or combining them in a communicative act. Authors also applied «enantiosemy» – to date, a purely linguistic term – to denote semantical opposition of nonverbal signs. Since the same nonverbal signs have opposite meanings in different cultures, authors introduce a new aspect of enantiosemy – phenomenon usually correlated to morphology and vocabulary: intercultural nonverbal enantiosemy.

Key words: nonverbal, intercultural communication, language competence, nonverbal intercultural enantiosemy, Russian as a foreign language

1 Introduction. It has been generally admitted that within the communicative methods of teaching foreign languages, ability of a student to perform speaking is the main goal of training. Thus, in teaching practice it is customary to talk mainly about the linguistic competence, or abilities, that should be shaped in the process of study: acquaintance with the language system, and ability to use this knowledge for conversation.

However, we believe that it would be not correct to limit communication behavior in the studied language by only language and speech (remember the classical Ferdinand de Saussure's «langue» and «parole» – language and speech). However, language and speech according the Saussure concepts do not form a dichotomy, since being joined by the third aspect, namely «language», a French word used by Saussure for «speech activity», or a system of expressive abilities of a given nation [1, Saussure, 1977].

In our opinion, experts in the field of teaching foreign languages should always consider one more kind of competence – the nonverbal, since when teaching the language, we must teach the culture of the country of the language being taught, and nonverbal features make an integral part of it. When teaching communication in a foreign language, it is necessary to remember one obvious fact: verbal communication usually, or at least very often, is not only verbal. Messages that interlocutors send to each other, can be encoded in different ways, because the signs can appear as deeds, gestures, things, in addition to the verbal signs. The national semiosphere, or environment of meaningful signs, includes a variety of codes, each of which differs in its specificity in conformity to a similar code in another national culture. Therefore, in the process of intercultural communication, nonverbal aspect is an integral part of it, and actively interacts with the verbal, therefore, it needs to be taught, as well as we teach grammar or vocabulary. Modern researchers in the field of the foreign language teaching agree to this: see the latest from the authors' close encircling – namely the Russian as foreign teachers (of course assuming the similar works beyond it) [2, Galiulina I., Yapparova V., Starostina O., 2016], [3, Tatyana A. Lukankina, Leyla A. Mardieva, Tatyana, Yu. Shchuklina, Radif R. Zamaletdinov, 2017], [4, Troshkina T.P., Gabdreeva N.V., 2016] and many others. Also check out some earlier authors' approaches to the problem [5, Safin R.N., Vladimirova L.V., 2012], [6, Gual, Roger Sanchis, Joan J. Solaz-Portolés, and Vicent Sanjosé López.2018].

Russian philosopher, theorist of European culture Mikhail Bakhtin called the human action a potential text. That is why one should not think of speech as an only component of a communicative act, but of communicative act that unites language in a form of speech and meaningful actions that accompany speech. In other words, speech action is carried out in interaction with other types of activity and must therefore be studied in combination with them.

2 Methods. The methods of research used by the authors are a set of techniques based on assumptions about the nature of the object of analysis. In other words, as often happens, the object of research determines methods for its study. These methods, representing the choice of authors, are not questioned, are adopted without evidence and are part of the authors' concepts.

The object of research in this paper is teaching of language. Language as a mean of communication is a complex and multifaceted phenomenon, and here we completely agree with a group of researchers on nonverbal means of communication, who emphasize the importance of a synergetic approach to the problem: «in the framework of the synergetic approach, the formation of student nonverbal communication culture ... is justified as an integral process of transition of a constituent components' complex system from a disordered to an ordered state ...» [7, Boris P. Morgunov, Gulsina Sh. Azitova, Gulsum Sh. Azitova, Yuliya M. Fedorchuk, Viktor T. Parkhaev, Elena V. Spirina, 2018, 3] The key methods of analysis in this work are descriptive, comparative and structural.

We use a descriptive technique in studying the functioning of language as an object of teaching for a foreign audience. Speech activity is a complex phenomenon, therefore it is necessary to describe not only the system aspect of the language (grammar, vocabulary), but also what lies beyond it, namely: resources of nonverbal communication. The technique for describing the means of nonverbal communication has been tested in the works on this topic. Wonderful books have been written about nonverbal communication: [8, Andersen, 2007], [9, Burgoon, J.F; Guerrero, L. K. & Floyd, K., 2011], [10, Kutuev, R. A., Mashkin, N. A., Yevgrafova, O. G., Morozov, A. V., Zakharova, A. N., & Parkhaev, V. T. 2016], [11, Remland, Martin S., 2009] and many others. Our main goal is to adapt theory to practice, namely to practice of teaching Russian as the second language.

A comparative method, the main object of which are the structures of various linguistic systems, is naturally dictated by the subject of research. Teaching the language, including Russian, in a foreign audience requires a qualified teacher to get acquainted with the structures of two languages – the language that is taught and the mother tongue of the students. Comparing of languages has a great tradition in linguistics, including comparison exercised for the needs of teaching. The authors set themselves the task of comparing nonverbal means of communication also for the purpose of teaching the language as foreign.

The use of the structural method, which consists in the cognition of a phenomenon in the form of an integral structure, parts and components of which are connected through a strict system of relations, is necessary for studying the connections, relationships, and dependencies that arise between verbal and nonverbal means of communication.

3 Results And Discussion . So, in the process of intercultural communication, nonverbal elements play an important role in it and interrelate with the verbal in different ways that can be reduced to the following: 1) addition, or accomplishing, accompaniment; 2) substitution, replacement; 3) regulation; 4) contradiction, or antilogy, antinomy. The classification, based on the circumstances of non-speech and speech communication interplay, and that is in fact based on the functions performed by the nonverbal elements of communication, has been sufficiently well studied. However, it is not the only possible one. It seems to us that it is equally important to classify nonverbal techniques from the point of view of the possibility or impossibility of them to be replaced and (or) combined with the verbal ones. As far as we know, nonverbal elements of communication have not been specifically investigated so far in this sense.

Given the mentioned possibility or impossibility of substitution, it is possible to distinguish at least three groups of nonverbal means of communication.

- The first group includes those that allow possibility of substitution and / or parallel use of both. So, if someone talks too loudly, the communication partner can a) ask him to speak quietly, or b) simply puts his index finger to the lips (replacement). On the other hand, it can combine verbal and nonverbal actions (alignment).

Here is another example of the nonverbal sign of this group, which appeared relatively recently in Russia under the influence of the Western culture: aerial (sometimes called virtual) quotes – air quotes – gesture with two hands, more precisely, flexion and extension of the index and middle fingers of both hands. This gesture means that the phrase spoken at the time of its demonstration has an indirect meaning, or the meaning of the phrase should not be taken literally.

Discussing the issues of the war in Syria during one of the television talk shows, the Russian politician says: «The United States, of course, want very much to find a consensus with Europe on the solution of the Syrian problem (and framed his words in air quotes), but they are unlikely to succeed» («Zvezda» TV channel, June 6, 2018).

In a discussion on the problem of fighting of the alimony non-payers, one of the Russian TV hosts says: «I do not have time to run around the courts. I want this money from the father of my child to be beaten out – in quotation marks – by the state (at the same time she makes a gesture shaping virtual quotation marks in the air)» («Rossiya» TV channel, January 22, 2010).

- The second group consists of the few nonverbal signs that can not be used in the same time with the verbal ones, that is, in this case, the combination is excluded. For example, superstitious spitting back over the left shoulder in Russian culture for fear of jinxing something or anyone, or as a sign of frustration after receiving certain information, as a reaction to bad news or a reminder of something unhappy.

We consider it to be necessary to allocate some nonverbal signs that allow combining with another nonverbal means to a special subgroup, that is, we are talking about the simultaneous use of two non-linguistic actions. An illustration can be the answer to the question «will you have dinner?»: moving head from side to side, accompanied by a

corresponding voice sound meaning «no»; or the aforementioned superstitious spitting back over the left shoulder with the simultaneous tapping of the fingers on the wooden surface.

- The third group unites those signs of nonverbal communication, which, as a rule, are not used without speech accompaniment, that is, only parallel use is possible. For example, when one of the participants in a communicative act, wishing that the other participant leaves the room, screams «out!», while his hand with a forefinger extended forward is aimed at the door.

One can also refer here the nationally-labeled Russian gesture (quite vulgar and offensive), conditionally referred to as the «three-finger configuration» – «fig» or «kookish» in Russian, which in the Russian tradition is usually accompanied by expressions such as: «fig (or kookish) to you!» This usually stands for: «not bloody likely! there you go! get it!, eat it! here! just you wait! here's a new phone for you! here you go for a walk!» etc. As an illustration, let us cite a dialogue from the movie «Okhlamon» (Russia, 2008; approximate English translation of «okhlamon» would be «blockhead, ne'er-do-well»).

The son turns to his father: «Can't you give me some money for my poverty? – Here's to you! (very emotionally shows the corresponding gesture, directing him towards the son's face)».

The nature and forms of expression of various means of communication allow us to talk about significant differences in verbal and nonverbal communication. Nonverbal messages are always situational, you can understand the status of communication participants at a given moment, but it is impossible to obtain information about missing persons and objects or events that occurred elsewhere, which can be done using a verbal message. In addition, if verbal units of communication are, as a rule, conscious, intentional, the nonverbal elements of communication manifest themselves in different ways. On the basis of being intentional or not, they can be divided into several groups.

1. Unintentional (for example, biting the lips, rubbing the earlobes, etc.).
2. Behavioral (e.g., blushing from shame or shaking hands due to excitement).
3. Actually communicative nonverbal actions, which are the subject of our research interest. These are signs, signals that transmit information about an event, object or state.

Nationally-conditioned, i.e. taking place only in a certain culture, nonverbal means of communication deserve special attention for the practice of intercultural communication, and therefore for the practice of teaching of the foreign languages.

So the inhabitants of Bulgaria, Greece or India shake their heads from left to right (from side to side) in agreement instead of traditional for most people shaking a head back and forth (down-up). Note that we consider this nonverbal sign as a kind of intercultural nonverbal enantiosemia, since the cultural tradition of Bulgaria, Greece, India ascribes to it the meaning of «yes», in Russian culture (and not only) on the contrary it means «no», that is, we have two opposite meanings, combined in one non-linguistic sign.

Italians, when they want to praise a dish that they eat, twist their finger around a center of their cheek, that is, this gesture replaces the phrase «very tasty». Compare this to the universal Russian gesture of twisting one's index finger at the temple, meaning «someone is out of his mind», «someone is crazy, fool». Quite funny, in Holland this gesture is interpreted as «wit, smarts», which also allows talking about intercultural nonverbal enantiosemia.

Since we are talking about the practice of teaching foreign languages, in particular Russian as a foreign language, it is necessary to say about the specifics of nonverbal behavior of the Russians. We can find several relatively unique gestures in Russian culture.

- One of these gestures is a snapping of a bent finger across the neck – a sign known to many foreigners who collided with the Russians in an informal atmosphere. It is associated with the well-known passion of a Russian for drinking, in other words – his loyal attitudes to drinking. The question «why do Russians drink so much?» became almost rhetorical. Without concentrating on the historical, social, moral and economic aspects of heavy drinking as a significant factor in Russian life and as an important feature of Russian mentality [6, Vladimirova, 2004, 75], we note that this gesture has several meanings and, depending on the situation, it can mean a question («have you got anything to drink?»), and a message («he's drunk again»), and an offer («let's have a drink»), and much more.

- Another specific gesture is the tapping of the knuckles on the wooden surfaces. Having a general meaning of «snitching», it is considered a landmark for Russia, since it is connected with its history, more precisely, the history of the Soviet Union (recall the infamous 1937 year). This nonverbal action has nothing to do with the superstitious gesture that we mentioned above and which is used by the Russians, as they say, «so as not to jinx it».

To illustrate this sign, we borrow an example from the D. Gudkov book: «During conversation with the Germans, the Russian, noticing that a man entered the room, looked at him expressively and, lowering his voice, tapped his knuckles along the edge of the table. In the context of what happened, the Russians involved in the communication understood this gesture as a warning that the person who entered could inform the superiors about the content of the conversation – that he was a «snitch». For the Germans instead the same gesture remained incomprehensible» [12, Gudkov, 2003].

- The Russian gesture, which is verbally designated as «fig» («figa») or kookish, also has a cultural specificity. Since we have already spoken about it, we only note that this sign is easily verbalized, in addition, its linguistic equivalent in modern Russian has an extraordinary word-formation, or derivational, activity. Its derivatives are very frequent in colloquial speech, especially in the youth slang («figushki» meaning «no», «fignya» stands for «trash,

nonsense, stupidity», «figovina» – for «the thing», «ofiget» – «to get mad», «ofigenno» – «wonderful, cool», «figovo» – «very bad», «figli?», «nafig?» – «why?», «pofigist» – «a careless person», «pofigizm» – «carelessness», and some others).

Special attention must be paid to nonverbal means of communication in the process of the language study, especially at the initial stage of training. A.V. Mirtov, the author of the first methods of teaching Russian as the second language, advocating a so called «natural», or conversational, method back in the 20-s of the last century, claimed that it was necessary to begin to talk with students in the studied foreign language from the very first days of training, using nonverbal means: to explain words using different gestures, actions, show objects, drawings, etc. [13, Methods, 1998, 113]. This becomes very relevant in a situation where the teacher does not speak the native language of foreign students, and there is no intermediate language [5, Safin, Vladimirova, 2012, 80].

Here is an example from the teaching practice of one of the authors of this paper. While teaching Russian as Foreign Language in a multinational group, she noticed that a Japanese student avoids looking into her eyes. The teacher felt upset. Only sometime after did she learn that in Japan it is not customary to look directly at the person, especially there is absolutely unacceptable to look straight into the eyes of someone positioned higher in terms of the social status. On contrary, direct eye contact is considered extremely important in communication among the Russians. They say: «Eyes are mirror of the soul»; «He does not look into your eyes – then he lies (or hides something)», etc.

Some tactile actions («touching»), or rather, the consequences of these actions in some cultures may seem to be very harsh, if not cruel to representatives of the Russian culture. That is, touching the head of a communication partner is regarded as a terrible offense in some Asian cultures, and therefore it is forbidden to touch the head of the interlocutor. It appears to be even more surprising that the teachers in these cultures often beat pupils on the head in order to toughen the punishment and humiliate the students. We are far from advising anybody to evaluate your disciples' achievements by cuff on the nape, but any knowledge about cultural peculiarities is useful to take into account in the practice of class communication with the foreign students.

However, it is necessary to take into account the intercultural features of educational communication even at the intermediate and advanced stages of teaching foreign languages. The well-known American linguist Charles Freese told about a communicative misunderstanding which once happened in his pedagogical practice: upon coming to lecture in the group of Spanish students, he was greeted with the «sh-sh-sh» sound. He took this action as a sign of disapproval, but the students simply called for silence, as in the USA this sound actually expresses discontent, and in Spain (same as in Russia) – call for silence. In this case, intercultural communication failed, although there were no purely linguistic barriers to mutual understanding. The cultural extralinguistic barrier between participants in the communication act became an obstacle. It is important to say that Americans use whistles to express their admiration at the sight of a beloved politician, actor or to approve a speaker's speech, which is absolutely unacceptable for representatives of Russian culture who use applause in such situations. And the Germans, when they, for example, liked the lecture, knock on the table.

As for the Russian nonverbal culture, two important observations should be made here. First, about the booing by means the «sh-sh-sh» sound. In Russian culture this nonverbal act is multivalued, although the meaning of the expression of disapproval should, apparently, be recognized becoming obsolete, and going out of use. In this case, the value of the call to silence remains relevant. Second, about the whistle. The Russian word «osvistat» stands for «to boo; to whistle somebody down», or «whistle to express disapproval, condemnation, contempt». Thus, given the meaning of admiration, endorsement that this sign expresses in the nonverbal culture of the USA, one can speak of the inter-cultural extralinguistic enantiosemia that we mentioned above.

4 Summary. All said before can be summed up as follows.

Meanings of nonverbal signs in different cultures often are not the same. This can lead to communicative misunderstandings, communication failures. Unfortunately, such failures are still paid little attention in research papers and text books on language teaching. We believe that knowledge of nonverbal signs must become an obligatory component of the language student overall communicative competence. So it is important to familiarize foreign students not only with the national specifics of nonverbal means of communication, but also with how they are interrelated with verbal: the conditions of substitution, parallel use and independent use.

We proposed the classification of nonverbal means of communication. This classification considers possibility or impossibility of substituting nonverbal means by the verbals or combining them in a communicative act. We also applied «enantiosemia» – to date, a purely linguistic term – to denote semantical opposition of nonverbal signs.

5 Conclusions. All written above strengthen us in the idea that the professional competence of the second language teacher must necessarily include knowledge of the nonverbal cultural features of the students they teach. Of course, this knowledge – even complete and thorough – can turn out to be insufficient for teaching unless it is supported by presence of appropriate information in the textbooks and everyday teaching practice.

6 Acknowledgements. The Work Is Performed According To The Russian Government Program Of Competitive Growth Of Kazan Federal University.

References

1. Saussure, Ferdinand de. Works on linguistics. Moscow, Progress publishers, 1977.

2. Galiulina I., Yapparova V., Starostina O. Foreign Student's Social Competence Formation on Russian Speech Listening Lessons (by The Example Regional Studies Texts) // *Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods*, SI, 37-42, 2016,
3. Tatyana A. Lukankina, Leyla A. Mardieva, Tatyana, Yu. Shchuklina, Radif R. Zamaletdinov. Russian language as non-mother tongue in polyethnic region of Russia// *QUID-INVESTIGACION*, 818-822, Special Issue, Medellín-Colombia, 2017.
4. Troshkina T.P., Gabdreeva N.V., Practice in drafting a retraining program for teachers of the Russian language as a not native // *Bulletin of the Orenburg State University*, № 6, p.30-39, 2016.
5. Safin R.N., Vladimirova L.V. Humanitarian subjects at pre-university stage of training in the light of ethnomethodics // *Vocational-directed teaching of the Russian language to foreign citizens. Collection of materials of the III International Scientific and Practical Conference. Volume 2.* – Moscow: MADI Publishing house, p. 79-83, 2012.
6. Gual, Roger Sanchis, Joan J. Solaz-Portolés, and Vicent Sanjosé López. "Creencias sobre tiempo meteorológico, clima y cambio climático en estudiantes de secundaria." *Opción*34.86 (2018): 987-1010.
7. Boris P. Morgunov, Gulsina Sh. Azitova, Gulsum Sh. Azitova, Yuliya M. Fedorchuk, Viktor T. Parkhaev, Elena V. Spirina. Formation of student nonverbal communication culture // *Revista ESPACIOS*, Vol. 39 (Nº 17), 2018.
8. Andersen, Peter. *Nonverbal Communication: Forms and Functions* (2nd ed.). Waveland Press, 2007.
9. Burgoon, J.F; Guerrero, L. K. & Floyd, K. *Nonverbal communication*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 2011.
10. Kutuev, R. A., Mashkin, N. A., Yevgrafova, O. G., Morozov, A. V., Zakharova, A. N., & Parkhaev, V. T. (2016). Practical Recommendations on the Organization of Pedagogical Monitoring in Institutions of Vocational Education. *International Electronic Journal of Mathematics Education*, 12(1), 3-13.
11. Remland, Martin S. *Nonverbal communication in everyday life*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 2009.
12. Gudkov D.B. *Theory and practice of intercultural communication*. – Moscow: Gnosis, 2003.
13. *Methods of teaching Russian as a foreign language: Reader / Comp.* A.N. Shchukin. – Voronezh: Publishing house Voronezh Pedagogical University, 1998.