



DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15688/jvolsu2.2019.3.20>

UDC 81'221:001.53
LBC 81.04

Submitted: 04.04.2019
Accepted: 12.09.2019

**A MODEL OF NON-VERBAL COMMUNICATION MEANS STRUCTURING:
AN INTERCULTURAL ASPECT
(ON THE MATERIAL OF THE CZECH AND RUSSIAN CULTURES)**

Vitezslav Vilimek

University of Ostrava, Ostrava, Czech Republic;
Volgograd State University, Volgograd, Russia

Tatyana Yu. Makhortova

Volgograd State University, Volgograd, Russia

Irina G. Sidorova

Volgograd State Medical University, Volgograd, Russia

Abstract. The paper focuses on the problem of structuring of non-verbal communication in the context of studying the process of intercultural contacts. The relevance of the proposed approach to the classification of non-verbal communication means is determined by its complex feature. The authors substantiate the fact that an effective classification should take into account the achievements of several scientific disciplines having the fundamental value to the understanding of the current problem: psychology, psychophysiology, human ethology and linguistics. Also, it is necessary to take into consideration the polycode character of intercultural communication. Based on the previously published classifications, the current state of scientific knowledge on this problem, the experience of a theoretical study of this problem, and practical and didactic applications, the author propose a two-level typological model which is specially designed to compare the non-verbal behaviours of different cultures representatives. Logically, this model comprises the following categories of non-verbal communication means: paraverbal means; kinesic means; sensory perception means of communication; spatial and temporal means. To define the categories and their sub-categories the authors exemplify the means of communication with the context of interactions between representatives of the Czech and Russian cultures. The authors concluded that non-verbal means of communication should be structured taking into account the specific purpose of the study.

Key words: non-verbal communication, typology of non-verbal communication means, intercultural communication, comparative studies, national cultures, intercultural comparison.

Citation. Vilimek V., Makhortova T.Yu., Sidorova I.G. A Model of Non-Verbal Communication Means Structuring: An Intercultural Aspect (On the Material of the Czech and Russian Cultures). *Vestnik Volgogradskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Seriya 2. Yazykoznanie* [Science Journal of Volgograd State University. Linguistics], 2019, vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 239-250. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15688/jvolsu2.2019.3.20>

УДК 81'221:001.53
ББК 81.04

Дата поступления статьи: 04.04.2019
Дата принятия статьи: 12.09.2019

**МОДЕЛЬ СТРУКТУРИРОВАНИЯ НЕВЕРБАЛЬНЫХ СРЕДСТВ
КОММУНИКАЦИИ: МЕЖКУЛЬТУРНЫЙ АСПЕКТ
(НА ПРИМЕРЕ ЧЕШСКОЙ И РУССКОЙ КУЛЬТУР)**

Витезслав Вилимек

Оставский университет, г. Острава, Чехия;
Волгоградский государственный университет, г. Волгоград, Россия

Татьяна Юрьевна Махортова

Волгоградский государственный университет, г. Волгоград, Россия

Ирина Геннадьевна Сидорова

Волгоградский государственный медицинский университет, г. Волгоград, Россия

Аннотация. В центре внимания авторов статьи находится проблема структурирования невербальной коммуникации в контексте изучения процесса межкультурных контактов. Актуальность предлагаемого подхода к классификации средств невербальной коммуникации определяется его комплексным характером. Обосновывается положение о том, что при построении эффективной классификации должны учитываться достижения ряда научных дисциплин, имеющих фундаментальное значение для понимания рассматриваемого вопроса: психологии, психофизиологии, этологии человека и лингвистики, а также поликодовость межкультурной коммуникации. Исходя из уже существующих в науке классификаций, из современного состояния науки, опыта теоретического исследования проблемы, практической и дидактической аппликации, авторы статьи предложили модель двухуровневой типологии, специально разработанную для целей сопоставления невербального поведения представителей различных культур. Эта модель включает в логической последовательности следующие категории средств невербальной коммуникации: паравербальные средства; кинесические средства; средства коммуникации, воспринимаемые при помощи органов чувств; пространственно-временные средства. Даны определения категорий и входящих в них субкатегорий, приведены примеры реализации средств коммуникации в контексте взаимодействия представителей чешской и русской культур. Сделан вывод о необходимости структурирования невербальных средств коммуникации с учетом конкретной цели исследования.

Ключевые слова: невербальная коммуникация, типология невербальных средств, межкультурная коммуникация, сопоставительные исследования, национальные культуры, межкультурное сопоставление.

Цитирование. Вилемек В., Махортова Т. Ю., Сидорова И. Г. Модель структурирования невербальных средств коммуникации: межкультурный аспект (на примере чешской и русской культур) // Вестник Волгоградского государственного университета. Серия 2, Языкознание. – 2019. – Т. 18, № 3. – С. 239–250. – (На англ. яз.). – DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15688/jvolsu2.2019.3.20>

Introduction

Spoken and written speech is rightly considered to be the top of the sign systems that serve people for transmission and preservation of information content. However, we must not forget that together with the information encoded in the form of signs of a language system, the information is always transmitted using non-verbal code, both consciously and subconsciously. It can be perceived by visual, auditory, tactile, olfactory and even taste channels. The wide range of ways to pass the information considerably complicates the scientific definition of non-verbal communication. Often, it can be found in the literature in the form of a non-scientific definition, in the lists of examples of the most typical forms of non-verbal communication. The wide range and the relative heterogeneity of non-verbal communication are one of the reasons why the models of their structure differ from an author to another one.

Generally, non-verbal communication is defined as “communication without words”

[DeVito, 2005, p. 105]; “communication without words through a variety of communication channels” [Ting-Toomey, 1999, p. 200]; “messages expressed by non-linguistic means” [Adler, Proctor, 2010, p. 200]; and also as “all behaviours, attributes and objects (not related to words) that transmit messages and have a common social meaning” [Morreale, Spitzberg, Barge, 2007, p. 110]. However, such a broad interpretation of non-verbal communication contributes little to the study and clarification of the essence of this particular cultural and historical phenomenon. We consider that it is important to realize that not all non-verbal manifestations accompanying some verbal messages can be a means of communication, but only those that have a meaning, can act as a sign and perform the function of a message.

More logical and reasonable for our study is the definition of A.P. Sadokhin, who notes that the non-verbal communication implies a set of non-linguistic means, symbols and signs used for transmitting information and messages in the communication process [Sadokhin, 2004, p. 152].

I.N. Gorelov emphasizing the symbolic essence of non-verbal communication implies that a non-verbal component of the speech act is the thought of as an improper linguistic sign because of its difference from the actual one. Also, the researcher mentions that this fact can be understood by the originality of substance and structure and by the special, different from other linguistic signs, possibilities to designate and abilities to mix with the similar signs and others [Gorelov, 2003, p. 173].

Non-verbal communication is the exchange of non-verbal messages between people, the understanding and interpretation of these messages. This may be considered as because the non-verbal manifestations of human behaviour have a certain meaning, understandable to others. People can use non-verbal communication to express their thoughts, feelings and emotions more fully, more accurately and more clearly. However, it is important to consider that in different cultures some non-verbal signs may have different meanings, and they may be given different meanings. Thus, we can confirm that non-verbal messages are analogous to speech and writing in some ways, as every word, posture or gesture, have the appropriate a particular culture values [Sadokhin, 2004, p. 154-155].

In our opinion, it is very important to realize that the study of non-verbal means accompanying language communication is as necessary as the study of languages since non-verbal means are an integral part of human communication. Non-verbal communication is a type of human communication, closely related to and interacting with speech communication. However, being different from the speech communication the non-verbal means of information transmitting have been insufficiently studied. Significantly, this is because the body language became the subject of scientific studies starting from the 50s of the 20th century. This explains, for example, the lack of a unified scientific methodology, some terminological distinguishing, as well as shortcomings in the description of the structure of the subject.

Nevertheless, the issues of non-verbal communication concerned and continue to concern many researchers from different countries, among which the most famous ones are R.L. Birdwhistell, M. Argyle, A.S. Hayes,

P. Ekman, W.V. Friesen, D. Crystal, M.L. Knapp, T.M. Nikolaeva, E.A. Uspensky, G.V. Kolshansky, A.A. Akishina, I.N. Gorelov, V.A. Labunskaya, G.E. Craidlin and etc.

According to the widening and deepening of the intercultural contacts, the studies of non-verbal communication in the national and cultural aspect have become particularly important. Even in the 60s of the 20th century researcher A.S. Hayes noted that “the study of conventional gestures, without which it is indispensable for representatives of different peoples to understand each other, is of the same importance as the knowledge of culture, geography, history, economy, lifestyle, way of life and morals of the target language country” [Hayes, 1964, p. 146]. Among the language experts who study national peculiarities of non-verbal communication, we can refer to some of them: E.T. Hall, M. Argyle, E. Apeltauer, J.H. Heringer, E. Broszinsky-Schwabe, S. Ting-Toomey, E.M. Vereschagin, V.G. Kostomarov, A.P. Sadokhin, J.E. Prokhorov, A.S. Gerd, V.I. Tkhoryk, etc.

The means of non-verbal communication play a very important role for purposes of intercultural communication. The effectiveness of communication depends not only on how the spoken words are clear, but also on the ability to interpret adequately the information transmitted by gestures, facial expressions, body movements, voice tone and other non-verbal means of communication. We should state that the study of non-verbal communication means contributes to a more effective understanding of the meaning of communication process since they can transmit the information about the communicator’s personality, the attitude of communicators to each other, and the attitude of them to the certain situation. L.V. Kulikova rightly remarks that the study of verbal and non-verbal signals of different cultures, the correct understanding of communicative signs of a foreign cultural area and the communicators’ activities adequately organized to achieve a pragmatic result provide a mechanism for the intercultural communication success [Kulikova, 2004, p. 6]. Nowadays most of the researchers agree that any non-verbal signs and signals should be considered in dedicated consistency with verbal messages accompanying them since verbal and non-verbal channels to transmit information are closely related and interdependent.

The problem of non-verbal communication means structuring

Because of the wide range and heterogeneity of non-verbal communication means, to create an ordered system of non-verbal communication is quite a difficult task. Also, non-verbal means transmitting information are the subject of the study of many sciences, including biology, psychology, sociology, anthropology, ethology, linguistics, etc., so there are many approaches to classify the components of non-verbal communication, which are quite diverse.

One of the widely known classification of non-verbal signals is that one of American researchers M. Knapp and D. Hall, who refer to the sphere of non-verbal communication *environmental factors and conditions of communication* (furniture, architectural style, interior, lighting, colours, noise or music, as well as area in communication); *physical characteristics of communicators* (figure, facial features, general physical attractiveness, height, weight, hair, skin colour, voice tone, and etc., as well as the objects associated with communicators (artefacts) – clothing, cosmetics, glasses, wigs and hairpieces, false eyelashes, jewellery and accessories); *human behaviours in the process of communication* (gestures, poses, touches, facial expressions, gaze, voice characteristics) [Knapp, Hall, 2007, p. 21-24].

Many researchers, who describe non-verbal communication means, unfortunately, do not indicate their approach or the principle according to which, in their opinion, the individual components are organized within the framework of the whole system. We consider that it is a marked disadvantage of such classifications. So, the Czech psychologist Z. Vybíral gives an accent to the following means by which a person communicates in a non-verbal way: 1) gestures, head movements and other body movements; 2) postures; 3) facial expressions (mimics); 4) gaze; 5) the distance and the occupation of location in the space; 6) bodily contact; 7) the tone of voice and other non-verbal aspects of speech; 8) clothing, jewellery, and other physical aspects of their appearance [Vybíral, 2000, p. 64-66]. Another psychologist, J. DeVito, who refers to non-verbal means the communicative meaning of time, smell, colour and handling of objects,

guesses them more widely, although he does not represent a systematic list of non-verbal means in his work [DeVito, 2001, p. 136-151].

E. Broszinsky-Schwabe refers to the language of non-verbal communication body postures, gestures, facial expressions, eye contact, touches, smells, and the usage of space (distance and proximity). Besides, referring to the signs of non-verbal communication the researcher adds clothes, hair, body hygiene, body decoration (piercing, tattoos), artefacts of watches and jewellery, colour and graphic symbols, as well as gifts and flowers [Broszinsky-Schwabe, 2017, p. 133]. Unfortunately, the author does not give any signs structuring these components in the system of non-verbal communication.

A more acceptable example in terms of systematization of non-verbal communication means is the concept of M.L. Butovskaya, who classifies non-verbal signals according to the communication channels: the olfactory channel – smells; the visual channel – facial expressions, gestures, postures; the tactile channel – tactile contact; the sound channel – the tone and emotional modulation of the voice; the symbolic channel – clothes, jewellery, tattoos, perfumeries and other externally observable manipulations with the body [Butovskaya, 2004, p. 24].

M.S. Andrianov mentions that, by the different sensory channels involved in the implementation of non-verbal communication, some researchers divide the system of non-verbal communication means into separate *substructures*:

– *visual or optical substructure* – including physiognomy, body peculiarities, ways to modify the appearance (clothing, cosmetics, glasses, jewellery, beard, moustache, tattoos, and etc.); skin and physiological reactions (sweating, redness, pupil dilation, and etc.); kinesics – movements of the hands, legs, head, torso, facial expressions and pantomimic, eye expression, gaze direction and visual contact, manner of walking, posture, and etc.;

– *acoustic, or sound substructure* – prosodics (tempo, timbre, the pitch of the tone, volume, rhythm, intonation, speech pauses and their localization in the text) and extra-linguistic means (laughter, crying, coughing, sigh, grinding of teeth, etc.);

– *kinesthetically tactile and thermoreceptor substructure* – takesics (static and dynamic touch – a handshake, a kiss, a caress, a patting,

etc.), physical force (pushing, hitting, keeping hand contact dance, etc.), as well as temperature sensation and impacts;

– *olfactory and chemoreceptor substructure* – the system of odours (pleasant and unpleasant odours of the environment, natural and artificial body odours), as well as special odours caused by specific substances for men and women – pheromones that affect the human subconscious;

– *proximal or distant substructure* – spatial and temporal organization of communication (the distance to the communicator, the angle of rotation to him, personal space, etc.) [Andreyeva, 1988; Andrianov, 2007; Krysko, 2004; Labunskaya, 1986].

Thus, the polysensory nature of non-verbal communication makes it possible for a person to perceive almost all biologically and socially significant types of information from the outside world. It is also important that in the process of direct communication some activities can occur, such as: a) the interaction of all types of non-verbal information transmitted through channels of different sensory modalities, and b) its interaction with the actual speech verbal information. This ensures high reliability of perception and understanding of people [Morozov, 1998, p. 20].

However, it should be noted that most classifications of non-verbal means presented in the scientific publications are based only on biological and psychophysiological parameters of a person. This fact is quite insufficient to establish the specifics of non-verbal signs in the context of intercultural communication. Therefore, we would like to offer our model to structure non-verbal means of communication, which can be applied to the study and description of the specifics of the intercultural aspect of communication, including crosslingual communication.

Generally, non-verbal communication is the result of as culture influencing, memorizing of signs and behavioural patterns, as natural reactions or state expressions. Depending on the situational and psychological factors in some cases, an individual's non-verbal behaviour is influenced by natural and universal factors, to a greater extent.

On the contrary, non-verbal communication is typically involved in the process of messages

transmission related to emotions or an internal essence. Therefore, to structure non-verbal means it is necessary to take into account both psychological and ethological aspects of communication.

Based on our analysis of intercultural communication, the results of that are presented in some publications, for example [Vilimek, 2011a; 2011b], we confirm that creating a classification relevant to the study of non-verbal communication in the intercultural aspect, it is necessary to be based on its simultaneous attention in several areas, specifically in terms of psychology, psychophysiology, ethology and linguistics.

Also, it is necessary to imply a modern vector of language and culture research, specifically their multimodal orientation, specified by the complex multidimensional reality which is constantly updated with new verbal and non-verbal means. The researchers register the transition to a new interdisciplinary model of knowledge transfer, which is naturally polycode since it involves such types of knowledge as visual, auditory, synaesthetic, etc. This fact is associated with the study of communication processes in their semiotic integrity. In linguistics and linguocultural studies, there is a focus on communication polycodity (polymode, multimediality and multimodality), especially on intercultural one. It is emphasized that it is necessary to take into account the variety of semiotic means used by communicants, both verbal and almost unstudied non-verbal ones (gesture, intonation, colour, size, body movements, etc.), assessing the significance and difference of their contribution to the communication process [Molchanova, 2014, p. 14-15].

In line with the above, we decided to propose our classification of non-verbal communication means developed on the basis of structuring non-verbal communication, offered in the publication of J. DeVito [DeVito, 2001, p. 123-151]. This classification is the revised version of the model, previously developed by one of the authors of the current research [Vilimek, 2011b]. The requirement for clarity for any classification and the need to avoid inaccuracies in the structuring of definitions – all of them are reflected in the division of non-verbal communication into two levels: categories and sub-categories. Categories denote specific sections of non-verbal means which are different in, generally, by the

used means, the method of their production and perception. Sub-categories, therefore, denote smaller divisions of related means of communication.

So, non-verbal human communication in the context of intercultural can be structured as:

1. *Non-verbal means of speech production:*
– paralinguistics (non-verbal characteristics of spoken speech);

– paragraphemics (non-verbal characteristics of written speech).

2. *Non-verbal means of body language, or kinesics:*

– posturology (body position as a whole);
– gestures (movements of separate parts of the body);

– facial expressions (expressions on the face);

– oculusics (gazes);

– haptics (touchings).

3. *Sensory perception means of non-verbal communication:*

– olfactics (olfactory signals);
– gastics (communication properties of taste perception);

– appearance (ways of personal appearance modification).

4. *Spatial and temporal non-verbal means:*
– proxemics (the use of distance in communication and territorial behaviour);

– chronemics (orientation in time and its disposal).

In the following, we give a brief interpretation of mentioned elements and consider their realization in intercultural media on the example of interrelations of the representatives of the Czech and Russian cultures.

Implementation of non-verbal communication means in the intercultural context

The study of intercultural interaction was conducted on the example of two culture groups – Czech majoritarian and Russian minority, which are non-traditional for the Czech culture and belong to the Slavic language group. We analysed non-verbal means of communication in terms of distinguishes in the behaviours of Czechs and Russians who are long-term or permanent residents of the Czech Republic. The examples

and comments are based on our observations made throughout long-term studies of the Czech and Russian non-verbal communication.

1. Non-verbal means of speech production

Paralinguistics includes several specifics of the sound speech, phrasing, dynamics, in general, pronouncing of separate sounds and words, etc. These factors are most closely related to psychology, but their assessment and understanding are determined by the phonetic norm, which is inherent in a particular national language. So, it is especially important, in the context of intercultural communication, to observe for linguistic usage, which is inherent in a particular society and serving as an indicator of belonging to it. Therefore, violations by a foreigner, not speaking the native language, often lead to the communication barrier.

According to paralinguistic communication plan, we should mention that many supra-segmental phenomena, which differ in Russians living in the Czech Republic from the native Czech people. The Russian roots are transferred with the Russian phonetic patterns into the Czech language (whereby we identify reduction, a brighter melody of sentences, etc.), and these peculiarities compose the samples of speech melodies which are typical for this group of foreigners. They are also manifested, for example, in the efficacy of sounding in certain speech situations: at the act of arguing, defending one's point of view, exclaiming, congratulating, expressing astonishment, etc.

As an analogue of the paralinguistic characteristics of the oral text, it should also be noted *the paragraphemic means* that are associated with the visual design of the written text. The concept and its content are used according to the principles of Josef Mistrik [Mistrik, 1999]. In his manuscript, they are mostly subject to the influence of psychological factors than culture. However, paragraphemic means are also used in the printed text. As an example, we can mention the use of historicizing Church Slavonic font in the Orthodox press, which gives the text a certain solemnity and uniquely identifies it with traditional Church texts. The importance of paragraphemic means was also paid attention to by G.V. Kolshansky [Kolshansky, 1974] and

T.M. Nikolaeva with B.A. Uspensky [Nikolaeva, Uspensky, 1966].

2. Non-verbal means of body language, or kinesics

Posturology is the posture of the whole body, i.e. the body position, posture and mutual configuration of its separate parts. These non-verbal means are more defined by the impact of the psyche and natural reactions of the body than by culturally oriented behavioural patterns. However, even here there are differences between related cultures: the position, in which the man spreads his legs and rests the palms of his hands on his hips with widely spreading the elbows, has the value of determination in the Czech culture and is commonly used in many more situations than in the Russians, who condemn it because of its too strong aggressiveness.

The sub-category of *gestures* includes movements of separate parts of the body (the head and the neck, shoulders, legs, etc.) oftener than hands. In the process of communication, they often complement, clarify or emphasize the verbal information. However, in many contexts they are used as a substitute for the natural language, i.e. spoken speech. There are two specific groups of gestures – the emblem gestures that have a double meaning: on the one hand, they are defined as the list of gestures, and on the other hand, they function as a language and are similar to a word [Ekman, Friesen, 1969]. At present the researchers discuss not only the semantics of gestures but also the special syntactic rules that the gestures use [Kreydlin, 2004, p. 126-131]. At the same time, it should be mentioned that not all means of gesturing are ‘culturally standardized movements’, as some linguists note [Mistrik, 1999, p. 51].

Also, we should note that the list of gestures and their meanings in individual nations and social groups is quite wide and specific. One of the examples of gesture that can differ in meanings in different cultures is ‘dulya’ or ‘kukish’ (fig sign). It means a refusal (for example, in Russia, Poland and Slovakia), a lucky symbol (in Portugal and Brazil), a playful gesture (in the UK), and denotes sexual relationship (in Denmark, Netherlands, Germany, France, Turkey, Greece), or it is almost completely out of use in modern society (for

example, in the Czech Republic) [Jarzabek, Pintarić, 2012; Klein, 1998; Klokova, Dmitrieva, Pavlova, 2003; Ružičková, 2001].

The gesture of handshaking is known to be a typical example of etiquette gestures, and there are plenty of studies regarding the use of which by representatives of different ethnic cultures; and the results of them can convincingly complement the field of the problems of intercultural differences related to gestures. Trying to shake hands greeting or making the acquaintance there happens to be a communication barrier between the Czech men and the Russian women: the Czechs feel embarrassed and aggrievedly, as the Russian women avoid shaking hands. This is explained by the Russian cultural canons according to which the women do not shake hands with someone. Contrastingly, in European society, when not responding to the handshake, it is considered as an offence. Following this behavioural habit, especially in business relations, may be considered one of the features of foreigner exhibiting.

Kinesic behaviour of the Russians differs from the Czechs mostly by more being emotional expressed. This emotionality manifests itself in the extent of use and the visibility of the gestures (i.e., the range of motions). If the adopted postures are dominantly identical, there is a great difference in the field of gestures, especially among emblem gestures that have a culturally fixed symbolic meaning. Among them, there are not only gestures with partial deviations (e.g., with its stylistic connotation), but also “lacuna” gestures or forms that are completely or noticeably the same in their execution, but differ in their meaning. As examples we cite the following Russian lacunae: ‘dulya’ or ‘shish’ (a fig sign), ‘raspaltsovka’ (a gang sing) and almost all the gestures associated with the culture of alcohol-drinking: flicking a finger on the neck, ‘figure it out for three people’ (index and middle fingers are straightened and moved away from each other, the other fingers are clenched into a fist, the arm is bent at the elbow and pressed to the body) [Akishina, Kano, 1980; Grigorieva, Grigoriev, Kreydlin, 2001].

The Czech lacunae are: “A je to” (henceforward, in Czech) is an abrupt vertical movement on the stomach level by the arm, bent in the elbow with the hand clenched in a fist, and means being satisfied with the work done; “Držet

palce / pěsti” is a gesture when the thumb is clenched within the fist and means to wish good luck for a sport competition or exam; “Strouhat mrkvičku / křen” is a gesture of repetitive rapid short movements in the direction of the communicator with the tip of a straightened index finger of one hand on the index finger of another (whereby, all the other fingers are clenched in a fist) and means sneering (it is a child gesture) and bullying “Serves you right!”; “Tůdle” is a gesture when a person retracts a lower eyelid by an index finger and means a vulgar refusal and disrespect.

The concept of *facial expressions* involves the movement of facial muscles. Since facial expressions reflect the inner feelings, emotions and moods of a person and the culture regulates, first of all, the relevance or compatibility of the manifestation of these emotions in society, it is impossible to assume any special differences in this sphere. The nationalities, which we analyse, are related, and both belong to so-called ‘unsmiling cultures’. However, Czech-residents of the province, unlike with Russians, love to smile and greet, even unfamiliar passers-by in the street. We consider that the difference between these cultures is in that fact that the Russian women are at liberty to use strong facial signals (for example, crying or pained expression); but it leads to a mistaken interpretation of the same behavioural habits which are assumed as feigned or immature in the Czech cultural norms.

The controversial issue is what place *oculesics* is taken in the models of non-verbal communication. This term is meant by visual contact. This is a variety of eye movements as well as the intensity and number of views given to individuals or objects. Most authors consider this area as kinesics, whereas V.V. Kochetkov [Kochetkov, 2002, p. 327] includes it together with the structure of facial features (as opposed to facial expressions as facial muscle movements) into the section of physiognomy. The allocation of oculesics from the section of kinesics and placing it on the same level of the independent category of the non-verbal communication means are proved by the fact that in contrast to the own movements and body position, which is engaged in kinesics, the eye is the organ of vision that also provides the perception of the environment.

The means and mechanisms of action of oculesics are innate and universal for all ethnic groups; however, the culture determines the relevance or irrelevance of using a particular signal in a particular situation. We think that there are no big differences in oculesics among Czechs and Russians, but it is worth considering that the observation of these non-verbal means implementing is quite difficult.

A typical example of intercultural differences in eye contact is the Japanese, who do not look straight into each other’s eyes, and the Russians, who are even encouraged to stare into each other’s eyes. T.G. Stefanenko notes that Japan is one of the least ‘staring’ cultures, whereas the Russian culture is ‘gawking’ compared to Anglo-Saxon cultures [Stefanenko, 2004, p. 173].

Haptics is the language of touches and tactile communication. It is known that Russians belong to high-context culture. Especially, in the case of a ‘heart to heart’ talking or in friendly and family relations, they tend to use more touches than the Czechs. These can be not only friendly hugs or touches to the communicator but also two or three kisses on the cheeks when greeting, taking leave or congratulating. Russian residents of the Czech Republic are aware of this difference, and in order not to cause discomfort, they try to restrain their behavioural habits, but in the case of heightened emotions, the patterns of ‘mother culture’ may appear.

3. Sensory perception means of non-verbal communication

Compared with the previous categories, communication means, perceived by smell and taste, have much less importance in the communication of modern human. Observations in the field of olfaction and olfactory organs used in the communication process [Mistrik, 1999, p. 68] are called *olfactics*. The example of intercultural differences in the olfactory sphere is the increased tolerance to the natural smell of the human body in the Russians and the preference for artificial smells in the Germans [Kochetkov, 2002, p. 191].

Hasticsis defined as the transmission of information content using taste perception, which can be carried out through the symbolic and communicative function of food, drinks and meals,

through the cultural and communicative function of refreshments, through the specificity of taste preferences within the national cuisine. National peculiarities in taste perception and preference of some taste characteristics and combinations of tastes are preserved in Russians, living in the Czech Republic for a long time, and very slowly and poorly influenced by the new environment. As an example of the Czech-Russian taste differences, we can mention about the preferences for the sweeter taste of drinks and sweet things among the Russians than among the Czechs.

The sub-category of *appearance* implies externally observable manipulations with the body, transformations of appearance and their role in communication. This includes clothing, jewellery, makeup, beard, moustache, tattoos, etc. We consider that the cultural conditionality of manifestations and perceptions several elements of appearance justifies this category construction in the means of non-verbal communication.

The ways of body decoration and the style of clothing are one of the characteristic differences between male and female representatives of the Czech and Russian cultures. So, the Russians, living in the Czech Republic for a long time, turn to the ideals of fashion, relevant in Russia. This is reflected in the style of the clothes, the choice of material and its colours, the choice of clothing for particular events, haircutting, jewellery, noticeable due to the intricacy of the design, etc. Besides, the degree of brightness of colours used in clothing, decoration of housing or workplace, the colour combination of women's clothing, jewellery, makeup and manicure are different. It should be noted that the pattern of a well-groomed and unkempt woman, has a very strong meaning in the Russians, and most cases for many years, or even a lifetime, it is not changed not only about himself but also in the assessment of others.

4. *Spatial and temporal non-verbal means*

Proxemics is defined by its founder E.T. Hall as "interrelated observations and theories of human use of space mediated by culture" [Hall, 1963, p. 1003]. This is not only a horizontal distance in the process of communication and the well-known four zones (intimate, personal, social and public) used in communication, but also the

understanding and structuring of space, in general, and the vertical plane of communication.

Until now we have not identified the clear differences in proxemics peculiarities which are the basis of the Czech or Russian cultures. As a typical example of intercultural differences, we can provide the average metric values of the above-mentioned zones, which are narrower for the Russian residents than for the Czechs or Germans, but much wider than for citizens living in East Asian megalopolises.

Chronemics considers the communicative role of understanding the time and orientation in it. This category is regulated by the culture, i.e. by belonging to a certain society, and it is very different in particular ethnic groups and social groups. The field of study of chronemics includes as the usual units of the time change, units of the 'informal' quantification of time, and also ideas about the typical development of human life, the flow of time, the attitude to time as a limited resource, etc. Subconsciously, the time understanding is perceived as something natural and universal for all, however, it entails the appearance of communication barriers.

It is logically to cite the example illustrating the differences in the time understanding which can lead to difficulties in communication. Originally, the Russians, living in the Czech Republic, are confused about why the Czechs, beginning from 9 am, usually say "Good afternoon!" not "Good morning!". The fact is that in the Czech mind the day begins at 6 or even 5 o'clock, so most the Czechs from 9 am rather say "Dobrý den" (Good afternoon!) and it is strange for them to hear at 10-11 o'clock in the morning "Dobré ráno!" (Good morning!). This cultural tradition dates back to the historical traditions of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, and at that time any work began very early. It was maintained for centuries, especially during the regime of Franz Joseph.

Intercultural differences are observed in the understanding of time at the global and ideological level, and also in the organization of working and free time, to the extent of agreements obligation regarding the time and the allowability to being late. The great permissive freedom of Russians associated with this fact is often interpreted as unreliability or disrespect for the partner.

Conclusion

The national culture is known to be manifested not only in the material and linguistic signs but also in the forms of non-verbal behaviour of members of a certain ethnic group. And also non-verbal communication comprises a very extensive set of various means, signs, signals that can transmit information and messages wordlessly. This phenomenon is in the focus of research interest of many scientists; however, nowadays non-verbal communication remains poorly studied: the actual research methodology has not developed, and there is no unified terminological apparatus and a clear structuring of the subject of the systematic study.

Besides, under modern conditions of multidimensional reality, new verbal and non-verbal means of information transmitting are constantly emerging. The modern interdisciplinary model of knowledge transfer is polycode, involving visual, auditory, synaesthetic and other types of knowledge. In this regard, we draw the conclusion that conducting linguocultural studies it is necessary to take into account the polycode character of intercultural communication. Also, it is important to take into consideration the diversity of both verbal and non-verbal means used by communicators, to assess the significance of their role in the communication process and to study the communication processes in their semiotic integrity.

The widest range and heterogeneity of means of non-verbal communication significantly complicate the creation of an ordered system of non-verbal means of communication. Moreover, the undertaken review of scientific publications showed that there are many approaches to their classification (from quite broad to quite narrow). And, in our opinion, it is necessary to structure non-verbal means taking into account the specific purpose of the study. Based on our experience of practical analysis of intercultural communication, we concluded that the typology of non-verbal means meeting the objectives of the study of non-verbal communication in the context of intercultural communication should be built on the psychological, psychophysiological, ethological and linguistic aspects.

The model of non-verbal communication means structuring proposed in this paper is based on previously published classifications, which are

partially out of date due to the limited range of the described means. The relevance of this typology involves its complex nature: a two-level division of means of non-verbal communication into categories and sub-categories allows separating clearly specific sections of non-verbal means which differ in the used means, a way of their production and perception from all others. We carried out the study of peculiarities of the prominent non-verbal communication means manifestation in an intercultural medium based on the interaction between representatives of the Czech and Russian cultures. Initially, we assumed that each of the separated categories has space for intercultural differences. However, in the result of our research we concluded that the size of this space is not the same and depends primarily on the degree of connectivity with the national language (e.g., paralinguistics), national etiquette and rules of good behaviour (e.g., haptics, chronemics), and material culture (e.g., appearance).

We presume that the discussion in the scientific community and the experience of its application in the future can show, to what degree the proposed typology can be applied as a guide for a comprehensive analysis of non-verbal behaviour of an individual or an ethnic group, and to what degree it can meet the researchers interests of different profiles in the field of intercultural communication.

REFERENCES

- Adler R.B., Proctor R.F., 2010. *Looking out, Looking in*. Australia, Boston, Wadsworth/Cengage Learning. 462 p.
- Akishina A.A., Kano H., 1980. *Slovar russkikh zhestov i mimiki* [The Dictionary of Russian Gestures and Facial Expressions]. Tokio, Nauka Publ. 345 p.
- Andreeva G.M., 1988. *Sotsialnaya psikhologiya* [Social Psychology]. Moscow, Izd-vo MGU. 429 p.
- Andrianov M.S., 2007. *Neverbalnaya kommunikatsiya: psikhologiya i pravo* [Non-Verbal Communication: Psychology and Law]. Moscow, The Institute of Humanities Research. 256 p.
- Broszinsky-Schwabe E., 2017. *Interkulturelle Kommunikation: Missverständnisse und Verständigung*. Springer-Verlag. 288 p.
- Butovskaya M.L., 2004. *Yazyk tela: priroda i kultura* [The Language of the Body: Nature and Culture]. Moscow, Nauchnyy mir Publ. 440 p.

- DeVito J.A., 2001. *Základy mezilidské komunikace*. Praha, Grada Publishing. 420 p.
- DeVito J.A., 2005. *Human Communication: The Basic Course*. Boston, London, Pearson/Allyn & Bacon. 480 p.
- Ekman P., Friesen W.V., 1969. The Repertoire of Non-Verbal Behaviour: Categories, Usage and Coding. *Semiotica*, vol. 1, pp. 49-98.
- Gorelov I.N., 2003. *Izbrannye trudy po psikholingvistike* [Selected Studies in Psycholinguistics]. Moscow, Labirint Publ. 320 p.
- Grigoryeva S.A., Grigoryev N.V., Kreydlin G.E., 2001. *Slovar yazyka russkikh zhestov* [The Dictionary of Russian Gestures]. Moscow, Yazyki russkoy kultury Publ., Vienna, Wiener Slavistischer Almanach. 256 p.
- Hall E.T., 1963. A System for the Notation of Proxemic Behaviour. *American Anthropologist*, vol. 65, iss. 5, pp. 1003-1026.
- Hayes A.S., 1964. Paralinguistics and Kinesics: Pedagogical Perspectives. Sebeok T.A., Hayes A.S., Bateson M.C., eds. *Approaches to Semiotics: Cultural Anthropology, Education, Linguistics, Psychiatry, Psychology*. Hague, Mouton and Co., pp. 145-172.
- Jarząbek K., Pintarić N., 2012. *Polsko-chorwacki słownik gestykulacji, mimiki i postaw ciała – Poljsko-hrvatski rječnik gestikulacije, mimike i stava tijela*. Katowice, Akant Publ. 171 p.
- Klein Z., 1998. *Atlas sémantických gest*. Praha, HZ editio. 201 p.
- Kloková L.N., Dmitrieva L.I., Pavlova V.V., 2003. *Slovar yazyka zhestov* [The Dictionary of the Language of Gestures]. Moscow, Astrel Publ. 320 p.
- Knapp M., Hall J., 2007. *Neverbalnoe obshchenie: mimika, dvizheniya, pozy i ikh znacheniya* [Non-Verbal Communication: Mimics, Gestures, Motions, Poses and Their Meanings]. Saint Petesburg, Prime-Evroznak Publ. 512 p.
- Kochetkov V.V., 2002. *Psikhologia mezhkulturnykh razlichiy* [Psychology of the Intercultural Differences]. Moscow, PER SE Publ. 416 p.
- Kolshansky G.V., 1974. *Paralingvistika* [Paralinguistics]. Moscow, Nauka Publ. 80 p.
- Kreydlin G.E., 2004. *Neverbalnaya semiotika: Yazyk tela i estestvennyy yazyk* [Non-Verbal Semiotics: The Language of the Body and the Natural Language]. Moscow, Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie Publ. 581 p.
- Krysko V.G., 2004. *Sotsialnaya psikhologiya: slovar-spravochnik* [Social Psychology: Dictionary]. Minsk, Kharvest Publ. 688 p.
- Kulikova L.V., 2004. *Mezhkulturnaya kommunikatsiya: teoreticheskie i prikladnye aspekty. Na materiale russkoy i nemetskoy lingvokultur* [Intercultural Communication: Theoretical and Practical Aspects. On the Material the Russian and German Lingvocultures]. Krasnoyarsk, RIO KSPU Publ. 196 p.
- Labunskaya V.A., 1986. *Neverbalnoe povedenie (sotsialno-pertseptivnyy podkhod)* [Non-Verbal Behaviour (A Social and Perceptive Approach)]. Rostov-on-Don, Rostov University Publ. 135 p.
- Mistrik J., 1999. *Vektory komunikácie*. Bratislava, Univerzita Komenského. 80 p.
- Molchanova G.G., 2014. Kognitivnaya neverbalika kak polikodovoe sredstvo mezhkulturnoy kommunikatsii: kinesika [Cognitive Body Language as a Poly-Code Means of Intercultural Communication: Kinesics]. *Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta. Seriya 19, Lingvistika i mezhkulturnaya kommunikatsiya* [Bulletin of Moscow University. Series 19. Linguistics and Intercultural Communication], no. 2, pp. 13-30.
- Morozov V.P., 1998. *Iskusstvo i nauka obshcheniya: neverbalnaya kommunikatsiya* [The Art and the Science of Communication: Non-Verbal Communication]. Moscow, Iskusstvo i nauka Publ. 189 p.
- Morreale S.P., Spitzberg B.H., Barge J.K., 2007. *Human Communication: Motivation, Knowledge, and Skills*. Belmont, CA, Thomson Wadsworth. 490 p.
- Nikolaeva T.M., Uspensky B.A., 1966. Yazykoznanie i paralingvistika [Linguistics and Paralinguistics]. *Lingvisticheskie issledovaniya po obshchey slavyanskoy tipologii* [Linguistic Research in General Slavic Typology]. Moscow, Nauka Publ, pp. 63-74.
- Ružičková E., 2001. *Picture Dictionary of Gestures. American, Slovak, Japanese and Chinese*. Bratislava, Comenius University Publishing House. 195 p.
- Sadokhin A.P., 2004. *Mezhkulturnaya kommunikatsiya* [Intercultural Communication]. Moscow, Alfa-M Publ., INFRA-M Publ. 195 p.
- Stefanenko T.G., 2004. *Etnopsikhologiya* [Ethnopsychology]. Moscow, Aspect Press Publ. 368 p.
- Ting-Toomey S., 1999. *Communicating Across Cultures*. New York, London, The Guilford Press. 261 p.
- Vilimek V., 2011a. Otrazhenie etnicheskoy prinadlezhnosti v neverbalnom plane obshcheniya [The Reflection of the Ethnical Identity in Non-Verbal Communication]. *Tozsamosť na styku kultur*. Vilnius, Edukologija Publ., vol. 2, pp. 284-292.
- Vilimek V., 2011b. *Sémantické gestá v interlingválnej komunikácii*. Nitra, Univerzita Konštantína Filozofa Publ. 156 p.
- Vybíral Z., 2000. *Psychologie lidské komunikace*. Praha, Portál Publ. 263 p.

Information about the Authors

Vitezslav Vilimek, PhD (Translation Studies), Senior Lecturer, Department of Slavonic Studies, University of Ostrava, Realni St., 3, 70103 Ostrava, Czech Republic; Associate Professor, Department of Translation Theory and Practice, Volgograd State University, Prosp. Universitetsky, 100, 400062 Volgograd, Russia, vitezslav.vilimek@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9289-494X>

Tatyana Yu. Makhortova, Candidate of Sciences (Philology), Associate Professor, Department of Translation Theory and Practice, Volgograd State University, Prosp. Universitetsky, 100, 400062 Volgograd, Russia, machortova@volsu.ru, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5984-5735>

Irina G. Sidorova, Candidate of Sciences (Philology), Associate Professor, Department of Foreign Languages with a Course of Latin, Volgograd State Medical University, Pavshikh Bortsov Sq., 1, 400131 Volgograd, Russia, ira.sidorovafomicheva@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6153-6798>

Информация об авторах

Витезслав Вилимек, PhD (переводоведение), старший преподаватель кафедры славистики, Остравский университет, ул. Реални, 3, 70103 г. Острава, Чехия; доцент кафедры теории и практики перевода, Волгоградский государственный университет, просп. Университетский, 100, 400062 г. Волгоград, Россия, vitezslav.vilimek@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9289-494X>

Татьяна Юрьевна Махортова, кандидат филологических наук, доцент кафедры теории и практики перевода, Волгоградский государственный университет, просп. Университетский, 100, 400062 г. Волгоград, Россия, machortova@volsu.ru, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5984-5735>

Ирина Геннадьевна Сидорова, кандидат филологических наук, доцент кафедры иностранных языков с курсом латинского языка, Волгоградский государственный медицинский университет, пл. Павших Борцов, 1, 400131 г. Волгоград, Россия, ira.sidorovafomicheva@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6153-6798>