

Стаття надійшла до редакції [Article received] – 05.09.2024 р.

Фінансування [Financing] – самофінансування [self-financing]

Перевірено на плагіат [Checked for plagiarism] – 07.09.2024 р.

Оригінальність тексту [The originality of the text] – 94.34 %

<http://doi.org/10.17721/2663-6530.2024.46.10>

STIMULI AND PROVOCATIONS OF NONVERBAL COMMUNICATION

Nataliia Dmitrivna Tkachenko (Kyiv, Ukraine)

lbyjpfhhh@ukr.net

The object of the article is semiotics of nonverbal means of communication., The purpose of the article is to describe the semantics of nonverbal means of communication to improve people's understanding in the conditions of the time deficit and social and national barriers of communication. The subject comprises the kinds of nonverbal signs used in communication. This research required the empirical qualitative interpretation, introspective and intentional analyses of the social and psychological situations of solving the communication problems with nonverbal means leading to their classification based on the social stereotypes such as gender, age, social groups, etc. and devising the method of interpreting and reacting to them. The material covers observation in vivo and the information from the scientific literature. Nonverbal means of communication are divided into optic-kinetic, gestures, mimic and pantomimic. The intentional function of the nonverbal means comprises cognitive, emotional and social (conventional) information. Semiotic communication performs various functions in life: security, warning, calling, agreeing or refusing, relaxing or straining, pleasing or displeasing, attracting or repulsing, etc. when communicating it is necessary to read the whole system of signals rendered by a person and adequately react to them. The research opens the problems of the correct decoding nonverbal signs, their choice in communication, ways of transferring them into verbal speech, etc.

Key words: communication, semiotics, nonverbal means, social and psychological intention, interpretation.

СТИМУЛИ ТА ПРОВОКАЦІЇ НЕВЕРБАЛЬНОЇ КОМУНІКАЦІЇ

Наталія Дмитрівна Ткаченко (Київ, Україна)

lbyjpfhhh@ukr.net

Призначення статті описати невербальні семіотичні засоби комунікації для покращення порозуміння людей в умовах дефіциту часу та суспільних та національних

(Актуальні питання комунікативної лінгвістики [Aktual'ni pytannja komunikatyvnoi' lingvistyky])

Стимули та провокації невербальної комунікації (Англійською)

[Stymuly ta provokacii' neverbal'noi' komunikacii']

© Ткаченко Н. Д. [Tkachenko N. D.], lbyjpfhhh@ukr.net

барерів комунікації. **Метод.** Це дослідження вимагало емпіричного квалітативного аналізу: в різних ситуаціях спілкування. Досліджені вимагало інтерпретаційного, інтропектичного, інтенційного аналізу невербальних засобів спілкування задля класифікації суспільних стереотипів, таких як гендерні, сімейні, професійні, дружні, національні угрупування та ін. Невербальні засоби провокації поділяються на оптико-кінетичні, жести, міміку та пантоміміку. Інтенційна функція невербальних засобів охоплює когнітивну, емоційну та соціальну (конвенційну) інформацію. Дослідження відкриває проблеми декодування, вибору невербального засобу спілкування, їх регулювання та переведу у вербальне мовлення

Ключові слова: комунікація, семіотика, невербальні засоби, соціальні та психологічні інтенції, інтерпретація.

Introduction. The object of the article is semiotics of nonverbal means of communication and its interpretation. The purpose of the article is to describe the semantics of nonverbal means of communication to improve people's understanding in the conditions of the time deficit and social and national barriers of communication. The subject comprises the kinds of nonverbal signs used in communication. This research required the empirical qualitative interpretation, introspective and intentional analyses of the social and psychological situations to describe the communication problems with nonverbal means leading to their classification based on the social stereotypes such as gender, age, social groups, physical and other factors. The material covers observations in vivo and the results of the scientific investigations. Description and classification of nonverbal means has already been made by many scientists, and their semiotic functions have received much attention too. Nevertheless both social and individual semiotics of nonverbal signs is so varied and is changing with time and space that their study in vivo and in the functional styles deserves permanent studies.

Literature review. The kinds and functions of nonverbal devices in communication were described by psychologists E. A. Petrova, N. B. Smirnova, A. Shtangl, I. V Kovalinska, T. M. Nikolayev, I. Gulbert, V. O. Labunska, A. Pease, etc. One of the most detailed classifications of nonverbal means of communication was given by I. V. Kovalinska (2014), jestures and mimics functionally were treated by T. M. Nikolayeva (1972), I. Gulbert (2003), A. Pease (1995), V. O. Labunska (1986), etc., proxemics by T. Chaievskaya (2015); paralinguistic signs by V. V. Pogosova and V. V. Lobunko (2000). A. Musienko (2018), M. I. Zabolotna (2019); N. V. Kolotii (2021). Y. Radkevich-Vinnitskii (2001), T. K. Chmut, G. L. Chaika, M. P Lukashevich. (2003)

L. E. Orban-Lembrik (2003) described functioning of nonverbals in business and O.O.Baibakova (2014) and Korneva (2004) revealed their distinctions in cross-culture communication.

Findings and their discussion. All living beings use nonverbal language of face, body, voice force, intonation, eyes expression speaking of human physical, mental and emotional state and disposition and often intentions, it often tells each other more than words. People can understand each other without words due to their knowledge of social conventions and typical situations. People prefer to keep silence in public, silence is also nonverbal means of communication, it implies multiple cognitive and psychological meanings and requires decoding it for good and evil, it can praise and endanger, warn, accept, refuse, etc. People's silence is intentional, it can be egocentric and endocentric, directed to protect themselves from undesired influence to save good mind and optimism and not to harm or just irritate others, to be polite and not accused of rudeness, to respect oneself and express regards to others, to demonstrate culture and peaceful intentions, non-interfere with other's talk, to show no emotions that can be turned against their author for quiet socializing. People copy silence as they do everything else, when they need it and when they do not. On the other hand silent communication limits mutual understanding, information exchange and friendly contacts though this limit may be the pressing intention of people because of time deficit, for pragmatic reasons, e. g. wives hate their husbands communicating with other women. But when copied by lonely people silence is their real obstacle in life, they say that even a fish will not bait if it learns to keep her mouth shut. Silent habits separate suffering people from those who could help them in their hard time. Besides, people often misunderstand each others' mimic and movements, though the same may happen with words. I.V.Kovalinska [6] argues that nonverbal means of communication, as a rule, can not render the correct meaning (excluding some gestures). To express themselves in silence people use nonverbal signs as the shortest and quickest means. We argue that using nonverbal means is more intentional than impulsive as people are more pragmatic in silent communication and choose the most conventional signs in stereotypical situations to be read directly and at once, e. g., when letting another to pass through the door or showing pleasure or distaste.

Nonverbal means of communication (signals, signs) are considered to approach one million and render 65% of information [22]. The scientists count 16 nonverbal means of communication – body movements, gestures (movements of hands and feet), space field between the speakers, expression of eyes and their direction, face expression, auditory

means, tactile means, smile, cosmetics, skin reaction, smells, clothes and its color, manners, etc. [22]. The complex concept of nonverbal means consists of the visual or acoustic expression, impression (image) and reaction to it grounded on pragmatic evaluation, and falls into subjectively or situationally interconnected number of confirming or contradictory concepts. The generally adopted nonverbal means classification is based on the names of human body parts, their functions and intentions in using conceptualize human image and activity.

The signals concerning human behavior include the system of optic-kinetic system of a person's appearance and motional means of expression, visual contact, proxemics – time and space relations, paralinguistic system including pauses [6 et all]. Both in the animal and human world nonverbal signs are copied, reflected, exchanged like the same coin from one communicant to another, in brief one can get positive reaction for positive stimulus and negative for negative, tit for tat.

Human nonverbal signals are studied in cognitive, social and psychological approaches according to the meanings they express. Mimic and other nonverbal means can reflect one's cognitive level: pragmatic evaluation, ambitions, deep or the surface thinking which can be rendered loosely by spiting, grimacing, turning away, laughing, etc. The nonverbal signs require descriptive, interpretation, intentional, introspective analysis. People intend to choose verbal or nonverbal means leading to their classification by the social stereotypes, such as age, gender, family, colleagues, professions, friends, national groups, etc.

Among the types of nonverbal means of communication the scientists point out the behavioral (physical), habitual and communicative signs [22], which are considered to appear spontaneously, but many people show no extra emotions or motions, their semiotics is restrained by education, experience or just their will. E. g., if the teacher at school reproached a child for shrugging her shoulders in displeasure she will not do it again before her and others after learning that it is punishable. Frowned or angry face is controlled before children not to frighten them and before officials for them not to get angry or copy negative feelings, etc. Nonverbal means of communication comprise both body language and paralinguistic signs in complex of the voice variations, its magnitude and other qualities. V. O. Labunska gives classification of nonverbal communication grounded on the principle attributes of being: matter, its general forms: motion, time and space [9, c. 73]. Classification of gestures (after E. A. Petrova, N. B. Smirnova and al.) counts natural (spontaneous), artificial (mute-deaf, orchestra conductor, etc) signs. T. Hikolayeva

(Current issues in linguistic communications [Aktual'ni pytannja komunikatyvnoi' lingvistyky])

Stimuli and Provocations of Nonverbal Communication (in English)

[Stymuly ta provokacii' neverbal'noi' komunikacii']

© Tkachenko N. D. [Tkachenko N. D.], ibyjpfhhh@.ukr.net

classifies the nonverbal signs after the semantic loading as emotional, directional, rhythmic, demonstrative, conventional and underlying. [12, s. 5]. N. Kolotii defines the nonverbal signs as the system of symbols, signs used in communication for better message understanding, expressivity, influence and variety in speech [6, p. 133]. Kolotii pays attention at the phenomenon of reflexion, imagining oneself in the place of his partner, she also mentions the mechanisms of protecting, identification and empathy, important for the mutual understanding in professions [6, p. 134]. V. O. Labunska dwells on the polyfunctionality of nonverbal devices, including image making, regulating space-time parameters of communication, revealing relations, indicating psychic states, speech economy, underlining or changing in understanding message, raising its emotionality, facilitates and regulates exiting [9].

L. Orban-Lembrik classifies all nonverbal means of communication into optokinetic, including mimic, pantomimic; paralinguistic signs including speech vocalization; extralinguistic emotional sign like laughter, pauses; and visual messages at eyes contact; proxemic – space and time contacts – distance, positions. I.V.Kovalinska's classification comprises paralinguistic, prosodic, kinesic, okulesic (looking), proxemic (approaching), khronemic (time), takesic (touching), sensoric, gastic (taste), olfaksic (aroma feeling) signs [8, p. 209]. Z. Matsuik and N. Stankevich detail the nonverbal system of communication referring to optical signs: gestures, mimic, pose, walking, eyes contact, clothes; acoustic signs distinguish tempo, membr, force, amplitude, pauses, intonation; kinesic semiotics combines touch, handshake, kiss, embrasing; space-time signs determine distance, arrangement in space, time of contact [10].

The scientists agree about the similarity of a number of gestures all over the world. Smiling means happiness, frown denotes sadness or anger, nodding – agreement and shaking head from side to side is a sign of negation [after, 14, p. 11]. But originally smile concealed anger [14] and the tradition remained with evil people taking pleasure in someone's grief; nodding can express false confirmation and shaking head horizontally can denote reproach or sympathy situationally and subjectively, each sign can be stimulating or provocative and unsafe. So the social, national and individual decoding of the body language should rely on the situation and intuition and even then it can be mistaken. All nonverbal sign can have common and different functions.

Gestures (from Lat. *Gesta* –“actions”) The language of gestures is the object of kinesics the division of paralinguistics [22; 12; 4; 5; 14; 16]. Gestures as non-verbal means are expressive movements by hands, fingers, head, eye lids. Gestures as impulsive,

PROBLEMS OF SEMANTICS, PRAGMATICS AND COGNITIVE LINGUISTICS

Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Ukraine

<http://semantics.knu.ua/index.php/prblmsemantics>

instinctive or intentional expressive activity often replace words, and have endless discursive pragmatic functions: showing direction, command for stopping, going, running; agreeing, disagreeing or refusing, allowing or prohibiting, provoking, etc.

E. A. Petrova determines the following functions of gestures in communication: affective, cognitive, modal, fatal, conative, informative. A. Shtangl described hands and arms positions in rendering cognitive and emotional information of passivity, distancing, convincing, concentration, etc. N. B. Smirnova gives classification of discursive pragmatic communicative functions of gestures – greeting, parting, etc., describing, modal, regulating, emblems, illustrators, adapters, affectors, evaluative [22; also 8, p. 12].

Gestures during communication are very informative, they give additional information about the psychic state of the interlocutor, the emotional information to the topic and participants of the interaction and can even betray thoughts, allow to understand the demands of a person. Gestures may be provocative, stimulating and mistaken as they may be addressed not to another addresser or have some other meaning. That is why “reading” gestures semantics helps to understand the interlocutor’s address, disposition and intentions. Using gestures consciously people confirm their words, make them more convincing, illustrative and expressive and influence the partner’s consciousness. After I. Saitarli gestures are divided into illustrating, accompanying and reinforcing communication and lacking sense without them; conventional gestures at greeting, inviting, parting can be specified by the national traditions and rituals; modal emotional psychic gestures reveal positive elative feelings, e. g. joy, pleasure, surprise, etc. and negative states of doubt, displeasure, boredom, etc. Gestures kinds comprise

1) communicative (gestures of greeting, parting, attracting attention, forbidding, of satisfaction, negative, questioning, etc.), 2) modal gestures reflect evaluation and attitude (approval, dissatisfaction, trusting and not trusting, loss. etc); 3) descriptive gestures, exclusively contextual [18]. The most varied gestures language of the deaf-mute engages mimics, gestures, eye expression, fingers, hands, feet motions. And the language of the blind relies on feeling the objects and letters by fingers tips.

Gestures are rhythmically agreed with intonation, stresses and pauses [22], help to concentrate on the accentuated parts of the speech; gestures may provoke various states and relations of the interlocutors, being sometimes more influential than speaking, expressing evaluation, approving, disapproving, encouraging and forbidding, directing and warning. There are gestures understood by everyone, as waving a car to pass or stopping it by a raised hand; and there are personal and secret gestures for only close people to understand

(Current issues in linguistic communications [Aktual'ni pytannja komunikatyvnoi' lingvistyky])

Stimuli and Provocations of Nonverbal Communication (in English)

[Stymuly ta provokacii' neverbal'noi' komunikaciii']

© Tkachenko N. D. [Tkachenko N. D.], lbypfdhh@.ukr.net

and react. There are specific professional gestures of sailors, builders, pilots, military, sports (beisball, crocket, cricket, football, voleyball gestures), orchestra conductor gestures, etc. In any function gestures may be stimulating or provocative, deceiving and their understanding depends on the knowledge of the addressant, situation, place, time and other conditions. Usually we understand gestures and other nonverbal signs matching them in our memory to make a conclusion for people's pragmatic or just emotional behavior, though the cultural variety of gestures can confuse their information to the opposite.

Body language can also distinguish different cultures, as for example, “the cultural interpretations and implications of three common hand gestures: the ring gesture, the thumb-up and V sign” depend on origin and meaning in different countries. In America it can stand for ““all correct” in France it also means ‘zero’ or ‘nothing’; in Japan it can mean ‘money’, in some Mediterranean countries it is an orifice signal, often used to infer that a man is homosexual” [12]. Many traditions are connected with distance in space [22; 2; 19] which can be comfortable or uncomfortable for the citizens of different countries.

Mimic or facial expression reflects the person's emotions, mimic is always observed first of all. The word mimic comes from the Greek *mimicos* – movements of the human's face muscles according to his feelings, disposition, reflecting his perceptions, imagining, pondering, recollecting, etc. [22; 11; 12]. Usually, the compressed lips express displeasure or anger, put up nose as well as highly raised head show self-esteem and pride, distaste is expressed with moving nose, people open throat in surprise, admiration or fear. Face is the visiting card of a human, a mirror of the soul, though it can also be deceiving. Face expression can provoke other people's reaction: gloomy face can provoke mocking, and the radiant expression pleases everyone. The face formation also impresses as mimic, it can please or displease, scare or relax. Small children are afraid of ugly faces, and cinema demonstrated the images of beautiful stars and ugly traitors, spies, robbers and killers, and the tradition is kept until now; but in pantomime mimic is the necessary expressive means. It is noticeable that very intensive mimic is unpopular, especially with women because it distorts face, even broad smile is not preferable, someone can say “don't make faces”.

Eyes expression is historically the tool influencing communication. Contacting people look each other in the eyes to read cognitive and emotional information about a person and the reaction to the spoken words [22]. The lexical functional paradigm of eyes activity includes the verbs *look*, *gaze*, *gape*, *glance*, *peep*, *observe* and the phrases: *have/take a look/a peep*, *throw a glance*, etc. Eyes conceptualize beauty and honesty, when requiring truth people say “look me straight in the eye”. It is not always true that honesty is

rendered by the direct and longtime eye contact, people are able to lie just in face. People can avoid looking in the eyes because it may distract, make one feel nervous or shy (after G.Nilson), uncomfortable, one can forget the idea or information, and there is risk to catch infection in close contact. Look direction, frequency of the eyes contact also give information, show attention and establish back contact to a person's attitude to information. Women prefer to speak with a man looking at him from time to time, woman's longtime gazing may provoke a man to follow her in the street or invite a woman to more intimate contact. Contacts start with looking at each other, they say that when there is no sight there is no bite. With unequal relations and criticizing eye contacts reinforce unpleasant feelings and may provoke more sharp defensive behavior not in favor of business. I.M.Gullberg points out "the strong influence of the task, the activity type, and the context on gaze behaviour". He also highlights the contextual constraints created "by factors such as social norms for interaction, the status of the human face, and even kinaesthetic knowledge about body movements" [4, p. 698]. The problem of constraints due to the physical and social factors can be expanded to all nonverbal signs.

Reaction of eyes pupils is especially uncontrolled, by enlarging and contracting they reflect information about your reaction to what is heard, they are enlarged in cheerful elevation and are contracted in gloomy state. "Time of eye contact and look direction to different body parts are also of importance. Business polite and concentrating look is directed at the listener's forehead and should be copied by him; "svetsky" (society) look below the eyes, relaxing and comforting, is concentrated on the triangle between the eyes and lips. The intimate look is fixed in between the chest and eyes demonstrating the person's interest" [22]. Provocative looks are focussed on the lower part of the body and down to the feet and may be taken for abuse. Derision, despise, hatred, indifference, interest, strain, self-respect are easily read in the eyes though love is hard to recognize and each expression can be provocative. The concept "eyes" plays an important role in the love songs as a symbol of beauty, love, belief and loyalty. People practicing psychology may turn the look of other people's eyes to wherewer they want with the idea of joke or interest. Many people are noticed to feel gazing at them with their spine and turn around.

Pantomimic (e. g. Michael Argyle) – the science of expressive body movements, space behavior, poses in direction to the interlocutor's body, reflects the senses similar to gestures and other. There are traditionally allowed and forbidden poses grounded on place, time and people around, the classifications of body poses and movements includes, e. g.: "closed defensive, open relaxed and friendly poses" [22]. Pantomimic may demonstrate the

whole scenes, e. g., the scene of anger, joy or distress, provocations or stimuli, which recreate one's image, culture and way of life. Pantomimic is brightly represented in dancing, each movement of which is rendering cognitive and emotional information. Pantomimic may distinguish children of different gender: girls are more static, and boys dynamic.

Listening is a silent process of the directed perception of auditory stimuli and ascribing meaning to them. It can be attentive or inattentive, reactive and unreactive. Lecturing, as a rule, is accompanied with mimic and gestures and the listeners' expression is reflected in mimic [22]. Listening reflexions are so varied that the observer cannot always guess or match them with something similar in his mind, and observations *in vivo* are the infinite source of facial expressions while listening. These may also be mistaken for others and provoke a favorable or negative reaction of the speaker, like ignoring, humiliating, punishing, irritating or scaring him.

Walking. Walking is informative of the person's physical and emotional state – “light of happiness, tense of suffering, hard of rage, long steps of pride; walking speed betrays the interlocutor's temperament” [22]. The term kinesics was used first by Ray Birdwistell in 1922 and later by Margaret Mid and Gregory Bateson. Proxemic nonverbal signs are of high importance in distinguishing cultural specifics [1; 19]. Men can provoke a woman for conversation by persecuting her along the street at the minimal distance behind her back, and turning around she may collide with him for him to blame her and feel pleasure. People often express silently their desire to contact by standing or walking close to us. Emotions or nervousness is evident in people with rude and abrupt manners rushing along the street, past other buyers in the shop, pushing in transport or other public places. Womenly manners require moving elegantly, showing their plastics, lightly and cautiously making way in the crowded places. In the street passers-by and motorists communiate silently by feelings and moving cautiously to prevent an accident.

Touching people during communication is not accepted in many cultures as irritating or provocative, and some nations may consider it normal. Handshake is usual with men in many countries and is ignored by women. Touching body is referred mostly to the intimate contacts to express positive emotions and physical abuse is a legal crime.

Speech cognitive and emotional characteristics include paralinguistic and extra-linguistic systems [22; 15; 11]. M. I. Zabolotna pays attention to the importance of pause in conversation [21, p. 23]. Paralinguistic system is the system of the voice vocalization, including voice quality, its register, tone, expressing the person's feelings and state. Extra-

linguistic speech system includes also coughing, laughing, speech tempo and other non-lingual elements [22]. The voice register is changed rather socially than nationally in the state of anger, displeasure, fear or, on the contrary, in great joy, happiness, surprise, etc.; special short laughing is the typical women's derisive device.

Objects as signs. People can intentionally or unintentionally express their message with an object. Waving handkerchief can be taken for attracting attention, an invitation to contact or expression of parting. Money in hand are a clear sign for a seller or taxi driver, dress is functionally determined, motor- or electronic devices are attraction and signs of possession, activity, etc.; toys and prams tell about children. Ethnic semiotics disappears in the mixed population, some nonverbal communication traditions are misunderstood, e. g. *twisting hands* to a girl is a misunderstood Ukrainian tradition of wrapping a towel over the bride's and her groom's hands. Embroidered blouses can be worn by everyone. Ukrainian borsch is mentioned with reference to Ukrainians (she is the one who cooks borsch), and pizza has become globally adopted for treating guests.

Space psychology The term proxemics (the use of space) [22; 2; 19; 20] was proposed by the cultural anthropologist E. T. Hall in 1959 and defined by him culturally as "the interrelated observations and theories of humans' use of space", "a hidden component of interpersonal communication that is uncovered through observation and strongly influenced by culture" [5; 16]. Hall investigated the impact of proxemic behavior on interpersonal communication and the organization of space in houses and towns. Hall distinguished 4 human's private space zones: intimate (15 to 45 sm) for close people, personal (46 to 120 sm) for officials and friends, social1 (20 to 360 sm) for strangers and discomforting people, social or public zone (more than 360 sm) observed when addressing a large group of people [22].

Distance in space is a cultural general and national norm minded and observed by people [22]. We can agree with I.V. Kovalinska that perceiving and using time differs in cultures, e. g. in civilized nations and in wild tribes, but it is doubtful that every nation has his own speed of perceiving and processing information which defines his rhythm and tempo of his life [8]. It rather depends on the personal activity and the nation status in the state context, the thieves are quick everywhere. General rule has it that distance between people should be kept wherever possible. Historically the common people were required to keep distance from the rich. In politics the leaders of the countries arrange meetings and talks to overcome physical and mental distance, gathering for agreements on international problems though close distance does not always help in politics. Distance makes people

feel safe from abuse and violence, fighting new viruses require distance. Distance is one of the factors influencing the course and results of communication [22]. Some nations confront new people at the distance and condescend to talk in closer space. Some people like to stand face to face when speaking, probably for influence, but many people prefer to keep distance and turn their face to the side when speaking which is sanitary and comfortable, and close space will not overcome the distance in opinions and tastes. Gender spaces in public are regulated by women, they dislike standing or sitting close to men or in front of them; men, on the contrary, are interested to sit near or in front of women or just don't care.

Space relations are the object of architecture, traffic, town planning, diplomacy, etc. M. I. Zabolotna, N. V. Kolotii, Y. Radkevich-Vinnitskii, T. K. Chmut, G. L. Chaika, M. P. Lukashevich, etc. [21; 6; 10; 3; 12; 13; 17; 18], in describing functioning of nonverbals in business attach importance to space and time as components of the communicative situations adding semantically valuable information. For example, coming in time to the appointed meeting such as diplomatic negotiations demonstrates respect and being late is interpreted as displaying disrespect. Proxemic communication behavior includes both distance between people and their orientation, an arrangement of furniture and people in business space [22].

Social distinctions in nonverbal devices include gender, age, social strata and ethnicity. Children's nonverbal behavior is imposed by grownups. The social nonverbal is a commonly preferable silence, e. g. in numerous stereotypical situations of giving way or place to somebody in transport, silently insisting on having it by standing near or close by. Gender nonverbal behavior specifies men as preferring silent communication: silently asking for explanation, offering help or way, ordering, permitting, inviting, etc. counting on people's understanding. Women, and men prefer to attract each other silently: by mimics, eye contact, approach; and close contacts can allow touching, hugging, embrasing, kissing which influence psychologically more than speaking, believed humiliating and attracting public attention. Women learn their art to provoke men by the body cult, garment, cosmetics, eye contact, laughing, smile, mocking, pose, etc. Women's typical gestures in speaking are crossing fingers or just joining palms or pressing them to the breast and joining knees when sitting which expresses a closed aura and modesty. Men like to sit with knees apart and hands on the knees for comfort, expressing comfort, power and openness.

Women are imposed numerous unwritten restrictions by men and have special mimic for men, known and unknown people, and their nonverbal arsenal can be shorter

than men's and is usually expressed by soothing, merry, obedient mimic and behavior with men. Women should lower their eyes when talking with men, keep their faces unemotional, for a man could take a look, a smile of a woman may be taken for an invitation. Some women use whaling, praying, pleading look in the eyes when speaking with men that may save them from quarreling. It is said that a woman can fuss, plead, but only a man has the right to shout [22]. Women can narrow their eyes with hatred when looking at another woman, both men and women express displeasure or hatred by their tense look and frown. Men may spit when passing by a woman, which jest may denote lack of her attention to him, despise, her unhappy or unattractive look, not his type, etc.

Ethnical semiotic communication renders the traditions and habits of nations. O. O. Baibakova [1], L. M. Korneva [7], B. Presnukhin [16] described functioning of nonverbal semiotics in different countries and in cross-culture communication. Northern people like enough space around them, minimal gesticulation, sufficient distance in communication, restrained face and suspicious eye look and hate close physical contacts in transport and other public and in official places. Southerners prefer close contacts in minimal space, much gesticulating, rather intensive mimics, smiles and very expressive looking.

It can be problematic to await or words in exchange to someone's mimic, time and space conditions as well as the persons' desire can be the factors. To make people speak one can jester intensively, but he can be taken for a deaf and mute and reacted inadequately. People can speak out at the sight of one meddling under the street lights with the green light on, but many people do not care. Verbal communication requires stimulation, special conditions like arranging tables and benches units outdoors (observed practice) for the local people and passers-by to have a rest, meals or play table games.

Conclusion. Nonverbal means are indispensable sources of information in communication, especially silent. They are traditionally classified according to the parts of the body, people's activity and intentions. The social classification includes age, gender, social, national distinctions. The body parts conceptualize the social, psychological individual and national stereotypes. Well-known classifications include physical, psychological, pragmatic, conventional and discursive. In the introspective aspect the nonverbals can be distinguished as intentional and unintentional, (impulsive), provocative and unprovocative, informative and playful, distinct and not distinct, forced and not forced, obligatory and nonobligatory, descent and indescent, relaxing and straining, etc. The

intentional analysis of the nonverbal semiotic signs reveals their pragmatic aim of rendering cognitive, space, time, behavior, emotional information.

Prospects for further research will be the verbal and nonverbal means of communication in everyday speech and functional styles of the English language.

Література:

1. Байбакова, О. О. · Невербалльні засоби спілкування вміжкультурній комунікації. Науковий вісник УжНУ Педагогіка. Соціальна робота Випуск 35. 2015. Електронний репозитарій ДВНЗ "УжНУ" 2015. 48 с.
2. Заболотня, ·М. Ю. · Невербалльна комунікація як складова процесу спілкування. 2019. <http://ir.librarynmu.com> › bitstream
3. Ковалинська, І В Невербалльна комунікація: Київський Університет імені Бориса Грінченка. К.: Вид-во "Освіта України", 2014. 289 с. <https://elibrary.kubg.edu.ua> › I_Kovalynska_NC_GI
4. Колотій, Н. В. Роль невербалльних засобів комунікації у формуванні іміджу майбутніх фахівців ІТ індустрії. Актуальні питання гуманітарних наук. Вип 38. Том 2, 2021. С. 132-137. <http://www.aphn-journal.in.ua> › archive › part_2
5. Корнєва, Л. М. ·Невербалльні засоби в міжкультурній комунікації. Культура народов Причорномор'я. Національна бібліотека України. 2004. № 49, Т.1. С. 88-90. <http://dspace.nbuu.gov.ua> › handle › -
6. Лабунская, В. А. Невербальное поведение / Ростов-на-Дону: издательство Ростовского университета. 1986. 135 с.
7. Мацюк, З. Українська мова професійного спілкування: Навч.посібн. / З.Мацюк, Н.Станкевич, К.: Каравела, 2010. 352 с.
8. Мусієнко А. Паралінгвістичні засоби спілкування. Невербалльні засоби комунікації як запорука успіху оратора (тези магістрантів слов'янського відділення Інституту філології). / за ред. В. В. Герман та Н. Соларської. Суми: Вид-во СумДПУ імені А. С. Макаренка. 2014. 48 с. https://library.sspu.edu.ua/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/Neverbalny_zasobi_komunikacii.pdf. 19-26.
9. Николаева, Т. М. Жест и мимика в лекции. М., 1972.
10. Орбан-Лембrik Л.Е. Психологія управління. К.: Академвидав, 2003. 568 с.
11. Погосова, В. В., Лобунько, Л. Н. К вопросу о паралингвистических средствах в языковой коммуникации. Сопоставительное изучение языков и культур. Ставрополь, 2000. С.231-236.
12. Преснухін, Б. Жести в різних країнах світу. Правила і поради з теми Невербалльна культура вчителя-оратора. Невербалльні засоби комунікації як запорука успіху оратора (тези магістрантів слов'янського відділення Інституту філології). Суми: Вид-во СумДПУ імені А. С. Макаренка. 2014. 38-42. https://library.sspu.edu.ua/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/Neverbalny_zasobi_komunikatsii.pdf.
13. Радевич-Винницький, Я. Етикет і культура спілкування. Львів, 2001.
14. Сайтарли, І. А. Культура міжособистісних стосунків: Навч.посібн./ І. А. Сайтарли. К: Академвидав. 240 с.

(Актуальні питання комунікативної лінгвістики [Aktual'ni pytannja komunikatyvnoi' lingvistyky])

Стимули та провокації невербалальної комунікації (Англійською)

[Stymuly ta provokacii' neverbal'noi' komunikacii']

© Ткаченко Н. Д. [Tkachenko N. D.], lbvypfdhh@.ukr.net

PROBLEMS OF SEMANTICS, PRAGMATICS AND COGNITIVE LINGUISTICS

Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Ukraine

<http://semantics.knu.ua/index.php/prblmsemantics>

16. Терехова, С. І. Тенденції розвитку репрезентацій просторових і часових указувань (на матеріалі української, російської та англійської мов. Типологія мовних значень у діахронічному та зіставному аспектах: Зб. наук. пр. /Ред. кол. В.Д. Каліущенкота ін. Донецьк: ДонНУ, 2006. Вип. 13. С. 201-209.
17. Тимкова, В. Проксемічні особливості невербального ділового спілкування менеджера. Гуманітарна освіта в технічних вищих навчальних закладах.: зб. наук. пр. № 37, Київ, 2018. С. 80-86.
18. Чаєвська, Т. Проксеміка. Невербальні засоби комунікації як запорука успіху оратора (тези магістрантів слов'янського відділення Інституту філології) / за ред. В. В. Герман та Н. Соларсьової. Суми : Вид-во СумДПУ імені А. С. Макаренка, 2014. 48 с.
19. Чмут, Т. К., Чайка Г.Л., Лукашевич М.П. Етика ділового спілкування. К. 2003.
20. Gulberg, I. Eye Movements and Gestures in Human Face-to-Face Interaction /The Mind's Eye: Cognitive and Applied Aspects of Eye Movement Research / Edited by Hyona J., Radach R., Deubel H. North Holland. 2003. Chapter 32. P. 685-704.
21. Hall, E. T. The Hidden Dimension. Anchor Books. (1966).
22. Pease, A. Language of gestures: how to read the thoughts of other people by their gestures. M.: Ai-Kiu, 1995. 257 s.
23. https://pidru4niki.com/83358/psihologiya/monologichne_dialogichne_movlennya

References:

1. Baibakova, O. O. (2015). Neverbalny zasoby spilkuvannia v mizhkulturnii komunikatsii [Nonverbal means in cross-culture communication]. Naukovii visnik UzhNU. Pedagogika. Sotsialna robota. V. 35. Electrnnyy repositarii DVNz "UzhNU" 48 p.
2. Chaievskaya, T. (2014). Proksemika. Neverbalni zasobi komunikatsii [Nonverbal means of communication] Neverbalny zasoby komunikatsii yak zaporka uspikhu oratora (tezi magistrantiv slovianskogo viddilennia institutu filologii) / edited by V. V. German and N. Solarova. Sumi: Vidavnitstvo SumDPU im. A. S. Makarenko. 48 p.
3. Chmut, T. K., Chaika, G. L., Lukashevich, M. P. (2003). Etika dilovogo spilkuvannia [Ethics of business communication]. Kyiv.
4. Gulberg, I. M. (2003). Eye Movements and Gestures in Human Face-to-Face Interaction / The Mind's Eye : Cognitive and Applied Aspects of Eye Movement Research / Edited by Hyona J., Radach R., Deubel H. North Holland, Chapter 32 Eye P. 685-704.
5. Hall, E. T. (1966). The Hidden Dimension. Anchor Books. ISBN 978-0-385-08476-5
6. Kolotii, N. V. (2021). Rol neverbalnih zasobiv komunikatsii u formuvanni imidzhu maibutnih fakhivtsiv IT industrii [The role of the nonverbal means in forming the image of the former specialists of IT industry]. Aktualni pytannia humanitarnikh nauk. 132. http://www.aphn-journal.in.ua › archive › part_2
7. Korneva, L.M. (2004). · Neverbalny zasoby v mizhkulturnii komunikatsii. [Nonverbal means in the intercultural communication] Natsionalna biblioteka Ukrainsi <http://dspace.nbuvgov.ua › handle › 26-Korneva>

(Current issues in linguistic communications [Aktual'ni pytannja komunikatyvnoi' lingvistyky])

Stimuli and Provocations of Nonverbal Communication (in English)

[Stymuly ta provokacii' neverbal'noi' komunikacii']

© Tkachenko N. D. [Tkachenko N. D.], lbypfdhh@ukr.net

8. Kovalinska, I. V. (2014). ·Neverbalna kommunikatsiia [Nonverbal communication] Kyivsky universit imeni Borisa Grinchenka. 289 pages <https://elibrary.kubg.edu.ua> › I._ Kovalynska_NC_GI
9. Labunskaia, V. A. (1986). Neverbalnoe povedenie [Non-verbal behavior]. Rostov-na-Donu: Izdatelstvo Rostovskoho universiteta. 135 s.
10. Matsiuk, Z. (2010). Ukrainian language of professional communication: tutorial [Ukrainska mova profesiinoho spilkuvannia: navch. posib.] / Z. Matsiuk, N. Stankevych. K.: Karavela. 352 s.
11. Musiyenko, A. (2018). Mimika oblichia. [Mimics of face]. Neverbalny zasoby komunikatsii yak zaporuka uspikhu oratora (tezi magistrantiv slovianskogo viddilennia institutu filologii). Vidavnitstvo SumDPU imeni A.s.Makarenka. 19-26.
12. Nikolayeva, T. M. (1972). Zhest i mimika v lektsii [Jesture and mimics in lecture]. Moscow.
13. Orban-Lembrik. L. E. (2003). Psikhologija upravlinnia [Psychology of management]. Kyiv: Akademvidav. 568 p.
14. Pease, A. Language of gestures: how to read the thoughts of other people by their gestures. Moscow: Ai-Kiu, 1995. 257 s.
15. Pogosova, V. V., Lobunko V.V. (2000). K voprosu o paralinguisticheskikh sredstvah v yazikovoi kommunikatsii [On the problem of the paralinguistic means in verbal communication]. Sopostavitelnoe izuchenie yazikov i kultur. Stavropol. S. 231-236.
16. Presnukhin, B. (2014). Zhesti v riznih krainah svitu. Pravila i poradi z temi “Neverbalna kultura vchitela-oratora” [Gestures in different counties. The rules and advices on the topic “Nonverbal culture of the teacher-speaker”]. Neverbalny zasoby komunikatsii yak zaporuka uspikhu oratora (tezi magistrantiv slovianskogo viddilennia institutu filologii). Vidavnitstvo SumDPU im. A.S.Makarenka. P. 38-42.
17. Radkevich-Vinnitskii, Ya. (2001). Etiket i kultura spilkuvannia [Etiquette and culture of communication]. Lviv. 2001.
18. Saitarli, I. A. Kultura mizhosobistih stosunkiv [Culture of interpersonal contacts]: tutorial. Kyiv: Akademvidav. 240 p.
19. Terekhova, S.. I. (2006). Tendentsii rozvitu representatsii prostorovih i chasovih ukazuvan (na materiali ukrainskoi, rosiiskoi ta angliiskoi mov). Tipolohia movnih znachen u diachronocnomu ta sinhronichnomu aspektah: Zbirnyk nauk. prats / Editor V.D.Kaliushchenko et all. Donetsk: DonetskNU. 13. S. 201-209.
20. Timkova, V .V. Proksemichi ocoblivosty neverbalnogo dilovoho spilkuvannia menedzhera [Proxemic specifics of nonverbal business communication of a menedger]. Humanitarna osvita v tekhnichnih vischoih navchalnih zakladah: zb. nauk pr. № 37, Kyiv, 2018. 80-86.
21. Zabolotna, M. Y. (2019). Neverbalna komunikatsia yak skladova protsesu spilkuvannia [Nonverbal communication as the component of the communication process]. <http://ir.librarynu.com/bitstream>
22. https://pidru4niki.com/83358/psihologiya/monologichne_dialogichne_movlenna