Psycholinguistic approach to the nonverbal repertoire in similar tv programs on three tv stations: CNN, TV5, BNT

PENKA ILIEVA-BALTOVA
ANDREANA PREDOEVA

0. The reasons for this study give us the argument stated by Prof. Tatiana Slama-Cazacu in her plenary lecture «Nonverbal components of communication and the field of applied linguistics» presented at the second International Congress of Applied Psycholinguistics: «...If psycholinguistics is a field dealing with the relation between messages and interlocutors involved in the real act of (concrete) communication (RAC) – which occurs most frequently in an oral form – and if messages in RAC are composed only in verbal signs (VS), but also in nonverbal signs (NVS), then: Psycholinguistics has to deal with NVS as components of RAC.. Therefore, what I am envisaging as a topic within the field of psycholinguistics is not a study *per se* of "NV communication" as such (though it might be an optional topic of this field too), but the NVS as components of oral messages; this later, according to my opinion, should be obligatorily included within the psycholinguistics» (Slama-Cazacu 1987, 99).

1. From the only one made till now inquiry about the Bulgarian speech practice we know that «...every 83 seconds (approximately one minute and a half) by a communication one nonverbal sign (NVS) gets in use» (Videnov 1979, 83).

Here are some examples how the Bulgarians express nonverbally a state of mind (according to Videnov 1979, 81-84):

– Joy – 5 kinemas (smile, jump, hands clapping, lifting both hands up, the hands widely extended aside);

– Absent-mindness – 9 kinemas (propping the head with both hands, scratching the back of the neck, scrutinising the hands vacantly; scratching the nose, stroking the hair, vacant look, scribbling over a sheet of paper, biting the lower lip, seating restlessly).

2. How the Bulgarians themselves estimate the degree of use of NVS in their own speech communication.

To get the answer we have carried out two separate anonymous inquiries, using a modification of the semantic differential method.

2.a. In the first inquiry have participated 20 persons (10 men and 10 women) aged from 26 to 70 years, all native Bulgarians; 18 from them with high school education, two with secondary school education. They have to answer to the following questions:

A. Which Europeans, according to you, use by speaking most NVS, which less and which are in the middle?

B. The representatives from the USA, according to you, to which group of Europeans could be attached in thus respect?

The following answers were received:

A.a. Max. use of NVS

60% – the Italians	20% – the Spanish	10% – the Greek	5% – the Roumanians	5% – the Balkan Slavs

A.b. Min use of NVS

70% – the Scandinavians	20% – the Englishmen	10% – the Germans

A.c. Moderate use of NVS

40%– the Greek people	32%– the West Slavs	28%– the Frenchmen

B.a. The answer to which group the Americans could be attached was:

10%– to the group with max. use	5%– to the group with moderate use	85%– cannot decide

The result is to be expected since the Americans are strongly mixed ethnoculturally.

2.b. In the second inquiry have participated other 20 persons (10 men and 10 women) nearly in the same age range who have to answer to the question: Having in mind the use of NVS to which the listed below nationality you attach the Bulgarians? – Italians, French, Scandinavians, Greek, Roumanian or others.
The following answers were obtained:

40% – the Italians	20% – the Greek	15% – the Frenchmen	15% – the Americans	10% – the Roumanians

2.c. From the joint comparison of the results of the two inquiries the following was reached:

50% of the Bulgarians consider that they use max. NVS
35% of the Bulgarians consider that they use moderate NVS
15% of the Bulgarians consider that they cannot surely say

4.a. General presentation of the selected programs:

1. All three programs are publicistic.

2. For all three programs there is a tendency to associate them closely with the name of the TV journalists in charge – his/her name and countenance are symbol of the program.

3. Already all of them have a traditions and are well known to the representative audience.

4. All three programs are with wide thematically spectre: economics, politics, culture etc.

5. Their schedule is chosen to coincide with the most appropriate time for the spectator's mood.

4.b The method of inquiry was applied. The inquiry form included 44 kinemas. All of the inquired persons have added further kinemas observed by them during the run by the TV journalists programs (Larry King, Ann Sinclair, Ivan Garelov). So a number of about 50 kinemas were marked.

In the process of an oral communication the used NVS could be separated in three types:

1. NVS which synchronise the oral message;

2. NVS which compensate (replace) the oral messages;

3. NVS which belong to the TV journalist running the program when he/ she is in position of listener during the interview.

4.c. The inquiry done with five native speakers of Bulgarian language who also know and use English and French. They have received the following numbers of kinemas for each of the observed TV journalist:

Larry King (CNN) – 50	Ann Sinclair (TV5) – 24	Ivan Garelov (BNT) – 10

Their distribution is given below in table 1 in percentage. Here are some illustrations about the marked down kinemas:

(1) Pointing with finger; raising the brows; rotating movements of the hand etc.;

(2) Supporting gestures, emphasising the words with hands;

(3) Knitted fingers with raised thumbs, movements with stretched hands;

(4) Moving the head, raising the hands, rotating the palms, the palms put in front, nodding etc.;

(5) Resting the chin or head on the hand, meaningful glances, smiles, knitted fingers, concealing partially the face, distracting movements with a pen or sheet of paper, leaning on the desk, nodding etc.;

(6) Smiles, frowns, skulls, eyes' movements.

Table 1. Distribution of kinemas according to their type during the speech communication

NVS Repertoire	STATIONS		
	CNN (USA)	TV5 (France)	BNT (Bulg.)
NVS synchronising the oral messages as (1), (2), (3)	30%	38%	12%
NVS compensating the oral messages as (4)	22%	30%	20%
NVS of the TV journalist as listener as (5), (6)	48%	32%	67%

4.d. Inquiry done with five native speakers of English (Americans) who know Bulgarian language and are living temporarily on Bulgaria. They indicate for the use of NVS by the TV journalists the following:

Larry King (CNN)	Ann Sinclair (TV5)	Ivan Garelov (BNT)
19 kinemas	20 kinemas	26 kinemas

Table 2. Distrbuting of kinemas according to their type during the speech communication

NVS Repertoire	STATIONS		
	CNN (USA)	TV5 (France)	BNT (Bulg.)
NVS synchronising the oral messages	26%	35%	39%
NVS compensating the oral messages	30%	23%	21%
NVS of the TV jouralist as listener	44%	42%	40%

4.e. Inquiry done with five native speakers of French language who know Bulgarian language, English too and are living temporarily in Bulgaria. They indicate for the use of NVS by the TV journalists from three TV stations the following:

CNN – 33 kinemas	TV5 – 18 kinemas	BNT – 18 kinemas

Table 3. Distributing of kinemas according to their type during the speech communication

NVS Repertoire	STATIONS		
	CNN (USA)	TV5 (France)	BNT (Bulg.)
NVS synchronising the oral messages	38 %	36%	30%
NVS compensating the oral messages	32%	30%	24%
NVS of the TV journalist as listener	30%	34%	46%

5. Analysis and discussion of the results.

CONCLUSIONS.

5.a. The following general conclusions could be drawn from the data obtained:

Native speakers, when observing representatives from their own language group, tend not to remark the whole natively possessed arsenal of NVS, that could be seen from the answers about the NVS of the TV journalists:

The native speakers of Bulgarian give less number of kinemas to Bulgarian Garelov (BNT) than to the American and French journalists.

The Americans, to our surprise, consider that the Bulgarian journalist use most NVS, followed by the French one.

The native speakers of French evaluate the NVS use so: first Larry King (CNN) and the Bulgarian and French journalists share equally the second place.

5.b. The established differences could be interpreted so:

1) Because for the goals of this paper, in the inquiry form the frequency of the use of NVS are not taken into consideration, this facts could influence the genuine picture.

2) Not native speakers notice and mark down more details from the nonverbal repertoire when represent at a discourse in a foreign to them language. That obviously shows how important for an effective speech communication is the aquaintance with the NVS used by the bearer of the foreign language.

3) It is worthy to think of the inquiry which show that the Bulgarians set themselves and their speech practice as such with rich use of NVS. In the same time they marked the Bulgarian journalist as one with less use of NVS in comparison with the other two. According to us this demonstrates the real fact that by everyday face-to-face and small group communication the Bulgarians use perhaps not so many variety of NVS but their intensity and frequency is high. There is most probably one another reason, because during any official or serious event the normal use of NVS in Bulgarian speech practice get instinctively restricted (an ethnocultural feature), although to many foreigners it may not look so.

5.c. The reported here results are part of a study based on the gathered archive of data and we intend to continue the analyses, may be explaining the meaning of each separate NVS, as well as their frequency and intensity of use especially by the TV speakers in Bulgarian, French and English languages. Naturally that requires more and varied additional observations. Only that way we could depict a more complete picture of the use of NVS as a part of the oral communication for these selected by us cases.

6. This study could contribute to the understandings of a more precise and accurate image of the man and image of the world in languages consciousness of representatives of different ethnocultures. In the practice that means a supplementary help for the needs of LSP, foreign language learning (FLL), interpreting etc.

REFERENCES

Slama-Cazacu, T. 1987. Nonverbal components of communication and the field of applied psycholinguistics. *Abstracts from Second International Congress of Applied psycholinguistics,* Kassel, July 27-31, 1987, 99.
Videnov M. 1979. Kam Bulgarskata paralingvistika. *Year-book of Sofia University, Faculty of Slavonic Philology 72,* 1979, no 1, 3-94.