



Analyzing the nonverbal culture of consecutive interpreter

Djamilya ABDUGANIEVA¹

Uzbekistan State World Languages University

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received November 2022

Received in revised form

10 November 2022

Accepted 25 December 2022

Available online

25 January 2023

Keywords:

nonverbal communication,
multimodality,
gesticulation,
professional culture,
communicative situation.

ABSTRACT

The non-verbal component in interpretation activity as an object of study is a lacunar area. The three-way interaction of the speaker, interpreter, and listener is considered for the interpretation of their gestures, and the position of the body (and its parts), which are characterized as repetitive. The focus of attention is focused on the multi-channel information processed by the interpreter during work. In the process of translation, a synchrony occurs between the interpreter and the speaker, showing the degree of involvement in communication, which allows the speaker to verify the translation. This indicator gives an understanding of the adequacy of the transmitted meaning since the speaker has the opportunity to evaluate it at the level of non-verbal communication and the listener's response.

2181-3663/© 2023 in Science LLC.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47689/2181-3701-vol1-iss1-pp36-42>

This is an open access article under the Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/deed.ru>)

Ketma-ket tarjimonning noverbal madaniyatini tahlil qilish

Kalit so'zlar:

og'zaki bo'lmagan muloqot,
multimodallik,
imo-ishoralar,
kasbiy madaniyat,
kommunikativ vaziyat.

ANNOTATSIYA

O'rganish ob'ekti sifatida tarjima faoliyatidagi noverbal komponent lakunar maydonidir. Takrorlanuvchi sifatida tavsiflanadigan, ma'ruzachi, tarjimon va tinglovchining uch tomonlama o'zaro ta'siri ularning imo-ishoralarini, tananing holatini (va uning qismlarini) talqin qilish uchun ko'rib chiqilmoqda. Diqqat e'tibori ish vaqtida tarjimon tomonidan qayta ishlanadigan ko'p kanalli ma'lumotlarga qaratilgan. Tarjima jarayonida tarjimon va ma'ruzachi o'rtasida aloqada ishtirok etish darajasini ko'rsatadigan sinxroniya yuzaga keladi, bu ma'ruzachiga tarjimini tekshirishga imkon beradi. Ushbu

¹ PhD in Pedagogical Sciences, Uzbekistan State World Languages University. Tashkent, Uzbekistan.
E-mail: jamilya.valiewa@yandex.com

ko'rsatkich uzatilgan ma'noning adekvatli ekanligig hqida tushuncha beradi, chunki ma'ruzachi uni og'zaki bo'lmagan muloqot va tinglovchining javobi darajasida baholash imkoniyatiga ega.

Анализ невербальной культуры последовательного переводчика

Ключевые слова:

невербальная коммуникация, мультимодальность, жестикуляция, профессиональная культура, коммуникативная ситуация.

АННОТАЦИЯ

Невербальный компонент деятельности переводчика как объект изучения представляет собой лакунарную область. Рассматривается трехстороннее взаимодействие говорящего, переводчика и слушателя при интерпретации их жестов, положения тела (и его частей), которые характеризуются как повторяющиеся. В центре внимания находится многоканальная информация, обрабатываемая переводчиком в процессе работы. В процессе перевода между переводчиком и говорящим возникает синхрония, показывающая степень вовлеченности в общение, что позволяет говорящему проверить перевод. Этот показатель дает понимание адекватности передаваемого смысла, так как говорящий имеет возможность оценить его на уровне невербальной коммуникации и реакции слушающего.

SUMMARY

The non-verbal aspects of the training of interpreters are investigated and the stages of preparation are described, such as third-party observation, when students are asked to analyze the material in the form of images, audio and video fragments, i.e. perform an analysis in two-dimensional and three-dimensional spaces, and then become direct participants in the communication process and evaluate the events and the work of an interpreter in four-dimensional space, while feeling the energy of the event. In the course of the study, it was possible to trace the emergence of synchrony between the interpreter and the speaker, which shows the establishment of a connection and leads to the adoption of certain translation decisions. It was also possible to trace the opposite – when synchrony does not occur, but there are inaccuracies in the translation or incomplete translation. On the basis of the analysis, an understanding of the principles of tripartite interaction in the context of multi-channel information was formed. The similarity of movements, gestures, and body position of the participants in communication is the adaptation of the interlocutors to each other's behavior, which indicates their involvement and coordination of the communicative behavior of the participants. The more participants in communication are immersed in communication, the greater the level of synchrony they demonstrate. Thus, the conducted analysis contributes to understanding the principles of tripartite interaction between the participants of mediated communication, which is the process of translation, as well as

tracing the work of an interpreter in a multi-channel environment for obtaining information.

INTRODUCTION

Until the 21st century consecutive interpreting was studied exclusively from the point of view of transcoding units of translation from language A to language B, taking into account only the verbal component of the translation act. However, people interact with each other not only with the help of verbal signals but also with the help of facial expressions, gestures, gaze, and body position, which play an important role in conveying meaning and achieving the goal of communication. The non-verbal component in interpreting appeared in articles as a subject of research not so long ago, but still represents a research gap in interpreting discourse. The work aimed at the study of the non-verbal component and the development of gestural communication was presented by E. Moshchanskaya in 2016. It highlights the national and cultural specificity of gestures-emblems, presents tasks for preparing students for understanding gestures in the act of interpreting, presents a classification of gestures, and created a section dedicated to the culture of non-verbal behavior of an interpreter (Moshchanskaya, 2016).

A. Meyerabian statistically calculated and derived a model of the ratio of verbal and non-verbal means in interpersonal communication, which later became known as the 55-38-7 rule, where body movements convey 55% of information, voice – 38%, and words – 7% (Cooper, 2019).

In real life, we rarely receive information from only one channel or one modality. According to E.V. Chistova, visual information facilitates the understanding of speech by ear, especially in a noisy environment (Chistova, 2019). The Multiple Source Theory [4], which states that “humans have the ability to multitask, arising from separate limited mental resources associated with four dimensions: processing step, code choice, response type, and modality”, conceptually explains the advantage of multimodal processing in the audiovisual perception of information (Chistova, 2019; Lu et. al, 2013).

Following A. Kibrik, “to create a realistic idea of language as a central ability of a person, several more circumstances must be taken into account: (1) language units are not only stored as elements of a system but are also used online to form thoughts. (2) In addition to verbal components, sound includes intonation, emphasis, tempo, loudness, etc. These elements are closely related to verbal ones. (3) The speaker not only reproduces the sound, which is subsequently perceived by ear but also makes movements that are perceived by the interlocutor visually. The approach, in which different types of communicative behavior are considered together, is called multimodal” (Kibrik, 2018).

A feature of the act of consecutive translation is the very execution of the translation using various communication channels (Chistova, 2019). During the act of consecutive translation, the interpreter has the opportunity to translate the claim information by hand and subsequently use the notes to reproduce the words of the speaker. It is important that during the recording (s)he needs to follow the speaker’s speech, its pace, tone of voice and maintain the necessary eye contact.

Despite the little-studied non-verbal communication in translation, much attention is paid to this issue in linguistics. So, G. Kreidlin believes that the kinetic aspects of people’s behavior – their gestures and postures, how people stand or sit, how they are

located in relation to each other, how they exchange views – play a decisive role in oral communication (Kreydlin, 2002).

However, despite their importance, they cannot be taught, since they arise subconsciously and cannot be controlled (A. Merabian, D. Morris, S. Ter-Minasova, P. Ekman) (Kreydlin, 2002). According to D. Burgun, D. Buller and D. Woodall, non-verbal communication is “unspoken dialogue”, which includes “all messages that people exchange other than words” (Kreydlin, 2002).

M. Knapp associates non-verbal communication with “all those human reactions that are not described as explicit words (oral or written)” (Kreydlin, 2002). Taking into account the use of non-verbal signals in computer communication, B. De Paulo and G. Friedman believe that “non-verbal communication is a dynamic, mostly personal exchange of information through signals other than words” (Kreydlin, 2002).

Following the opinion of E. Moshchanskaya, non-verbal means that we use in our speech act as a kind of indicator of the internal mental state, relationships and personal qualities, thereby creating a subtext for verbal communication (Moshchanskaya, 2016). It is impossible to consider the non-verbal component of communication in a situation of translation in isolation from other communicative methods of the speaker since non-verbal signals affect the interpreter, speaker, and other participants in communication both at the conscious and unconscious levels (Poyatos, 2007).

One of the most exciting features of human communication is the precise timing and coordination of participants’ communicative behavior. In non-verbal communication, one of the interesting phenomena is synchrony, which we understand as “coordination of people’s movements in the process of interaction” (Bernieri, 2001). One of the manifestations of synchrony is the similarity of movements, and gestures, “mirroring” the position of the interlocutor’s body. Interlocutors respond to each other’s actions and are able to coordinate to exchange roles as “interlocutor-listener”. They also tend to anticipate each other’s next steps and follow each other’s behavior, so interaction and signaling occur simultaneously and can be termed synchronous activity. This kind of adaptation of interlocutors to each other’s behavior is often called “leveling” (Pickering, 2004; Katagiri, 2005). Other terms that are used to describe and refer to synchronous behavior are copying or mimicry. Interaction can range from unintentionally copying another person’s behavior to deliberate imitation.

Scientists also talk about the transfer of human behavior to characters created in the virtual space, paying special attention to facial expressions and their expressiveness (Caridakis et al., 2007). Researchers analyze the movements of the human body for a more detailed study of virtual agents (Caridakis et al., 2007). They must respond appropriately when interacting with a live interlocutor. In their work, an important role is played by the interpretation and perception of facial expressions, the prediction of emotions shown by a living person. The character is designed not to exactly duplicate the emotions that (s)he sees, but to be based on models that represent the original expressive behavior of the user. Such synchrony is more directed toward the recipient.

We can also distinguish between a synchronicity that is more oriented towards the agent rather than the recipient of the communication. It also requires the agent to perceive and interpret the behavior of the interlocutor. However, such synchrony suggests that the agent exhibits behavior similar to the recipient in a natural way. This means that the simultaneous response is the result of the agent waiting for the recipient’s response. The agent evaluates the behavior of the interlocutor in relation to his/her

(agent's) goals and intentions. Synchrony is the unconscious planning of behavior, and it is not intentional copying from the interlocutor (Jokinen, Parkson, 2011).

The difference between mimicry and synchrony is hardly visible at the descriptive level. However, according to Natalie Sebants, this difference is related to the expectation and coordination of communicative actions: in synchrony, the action arises from the partner's intention to present something in a manner that matches his/her behavior, while in mimicry only the external manifestation of the partner's behavior is copied (Sebanz et al., 2006).

In general, any gestures can be of communicative importance, it all depends on the interpretation of the interlocutor. Sometimes it is difficult to give unambiguous meaning to gestures and body movements, and often it is even impossible. From the point of view of synchrony, it is not necessary to look for semantic similarity in gestures and movements. Since it is necessary to convey not a specific conceptual meaning but to point to a kind of "cooperation" established between the speakers. Thus, any movement can serve as the starting point for a chain of "joint" gestures, as listeners unconsciously respond to the speaker's gestures. The speaker also unconsciously reacts to the behavior of the listener. In the future, it is possible to further study the roles of the speaker and listener, as well as to trace the changes in synchrony when changing roles.

In this study, research attention is focused on the phenomenon of synchrony that occurs between participants, since it signals that all interlocutors are involved in communication and can predict each other's behavior (Jokinen, Parkson, 2011). The hypothesis of this study is that the manifestation of synchrony indicates the emergence of cooperation and understanding between the participants: the better they understand each other and the more they are immersed in communication, the more synchronous behavior they will demonstrate unconsciously (subconsciously).

Due to the little-studied area described, it is assumed that the data obtained will help to better understand the functions of synchrony in communication and translation. Filling in the research gaps will create a basis for further more detailed research, apply the acquired knowledge in practice, and create teaching aids.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The material of the study was publicly available videos with the participation of speakers, interpreters and journalists from different countries, with a total duration of 2 h 37 min 12 s.

Each video is an interview and negotiations at different levels. The working languages of the event are Russian, and English.

Annotation of the micro composition of the multimodal context was used as the main method, which allows us to visually demonstrate the phenomenon of synchrony and highlight the factors that affect the success of communication.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the analysis of works on cognitive linguistics in the field of translation, much attention is paid to the "declassification" of the interpreter's thought processes in the course of decoding a message in language A and recoding it into language B, describing what contributes to achieving equivalence in translation (Chistova, 2020). In the analyzed works, the authors mainly focus on the verbal component of translation, drawing conclusions about the adoption of translation decisions based on the text-centric approach (Chistova, 2019). In this paper, we shift the focus from the verbal to the non-

verbal component, trying to understand how important non-verbal semiotics is in the translation process and what functions it can perform.

According to G. Kreydlin, the semiotic classification of gestures begins with the division of all gestures into three large classes. These are (a) emblems or emblematic gestures – units that have an independent lexical meaning and are capable of conveying meaning regardless of the speech context; (b) illustrators or illustrative gestures – units accompanying some speech or other fragment of communication or illustrating some object or aspect of communication.

In turn, they are divided into two subclasses: illustrators proper – gestures that actually illustrate something, and accompanists – gestures that accompany speech and structure or rhythmize it; (c) regulators or regulatory gestures – units that control the course of the communicative process, that is, establish, maintain or complete communication (Kreydlin, 2014).

REFERENCES:

1. Caridakis G., Raouzaiou A., Bevacqua E., Mancini M., Karpouzis K., Malatesta L., Pelachaud C. Virtual Agent Multi-modal Mimicry of Humans. *Language Resources and Evaluation*, 2007, no. 41 (3-4), PP. 367–388.

2. Chistova E. Modeli vzaimodeystviya sinkhroykh perevodchikov kak aktorov kognitivnogo sobytiya [Interactivity of simultaneous interpreters as actors of a cognitive event]. *Zhurnal Sibirskogo federal'm'nog universiteta. Gumanitarnye nauki – Journal of Siberian Federal University. Humanities and Social Sciences*, 2020, Vol. 13, No. 3, – PP. 375–384 (in Russian).

3. Chistova E.V. Mul'tikanal'nost' i mul'timodal'nost' vospriyatiya v kognitivnoy deyatel'nosti perevodchika-sinkhronista [Multichannel and multimodality of perception in the cognitive activity of a simultaneous interpreter]. *Filologicheskiye nauki. Voprosy teorii i praktiki – Philology. Theory and Practice*, 2019, Vol. 12, No. 9, – PP. 337–342 (in Russian).

4. Cooper K. *Nonverbal Communication for business success*. New York, AMACOM Publ., 2009.

5. Chistova E.V. Predmetnoye pole otechestvennogo kognitivnogo perevodovedeniya: klyuchevye tochki i vektory razvitiya [The subject field of Russian cognitive translation studies: key points and vectors of development]. *Vestnik Tomskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogicheskogo universiteta – TSPU Bulletin*, 2019, Vol. 9 (206), – PP. 64–71 (in Russian).

6. Jokinen K., Parkson S. Synchrony and Copying in Conversational Interactions. *The 3rd Nordic Symposium on Multimodal Communication*, Helsinki, 2011, Vol. 15, – PP. 18–24.

7. Kibrik A.A. Russky mul'timodal'ny diskurs. Chast' 1. Postanovka problem [Russian multichannel discourse. Part 1. Statement of problems]. *Psikhologicheskiy zhurnal – Psychological Journal*, 2018, Vol. 39, No. 1, – PP. 70–80 (in Russian).

8. Kreydlin G.Ye. Neverbal'naya semiotika: Yazyk tela i yestestvenny yazyk [Non-Verbal Semiotics: Body Language and Natural Language]. Moscow, *Novoye literaturnoye obozreniye Publ.*, 2002. – 592 p. (in Russian).

9. Kreydlin G.Ye. Semioticheskaya kontseptualizatsiya tela i problema mul'timodal'nosti [The semiotic conceptualization of the human body and the question of

multimodality]. *Ecologiya yazyka i kommunikativnaya praktika – Ecology of language and communicative practice*, 2014, No. 2, PP. 100–120 (in Russian).

10. Lu S.A., Wickens C.D., Prinett J.C., Hutchins S.D., Sarter N., Sebok A. Supporting interpretation management and multimodal interface design: Three meta-analyses of task performance as a function of interrupting task modality. *Human Factors*, 2013, Vol. 55 (4), – PP. 697–724.

11. Moshchanskaaya Ye. Neverbal'nyy component obshcheniya v ustnom perevodcheskom diskurse: uchebno-metodicheskoye posobiye [The non-verbal component of communication in interpretation discourse, teaching aid]. Perm, Perm National Research Polytechnic University Publ., 2016. – 122 p. (in Russian).

12. Pickering M.J., Garrod S. Towards a Mechanistic Psychology of Dialogue. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 2004, Vol. 27, Issue 2, – PP. 169–226.

13. Poyatos F. The reality of multichannel verbal-nonverbal communication in simultaneous and consecutive interpretation. In: *Nonverbal Communication and Translation, New Perspectives and challenges in literature, interpretation and media*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia, John Benjamins Publishing Company Publ., 2007. – PP. 249–282.

14. Sebanz N., Bekkering H., Knoblich G. Joint Action: Bodies and Minds Moving Together. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 2006, Vol. 10, No. 2, – PP. 70–76.

15. Wickens C.D. Processing resources in attention. In: *Varieties of Attention*. Ed. by R. Parasuraman, R. Davies. N.Y., Academic Press Publ., 1984. – PP. 63–101.

16. Yasuhiro Katagiri, Interactional alignment in collaborative problem-solving dialogues. In: *Proceedings of the 9th International Pragmatics Conference, Riva del Garda Italy, 2005*.