METHODOLOGICAL FOUNDATIONS OF KINESICS IN THE CONTEXT OF COGNITIVE LINGUISTICS

Najimova Gulyaim
assistant, Karakalpak State University,
Nukus, Uzbekistan

Abstract: The work is devoted to the methodological foundations of kinesics, where different views of researchers on the methods of encoding and decoding are considered. And that there is still significant methodological work to be done for body coding.

Key words: kinesics, coding system, decoding, body, non-verbal behavior.

According to the ideas of A.V. Rozinova, D.V. Sorokina, G.G. Molchanova[10;130-132]and V.G. Khlystova kinesicsmeans is as a visual non-verbal means of communication, they are: movements of the head, torso, arms, legs, facial and eye expressions, postures, postures, gait, touch, relative position, eye movements and visual contact.[11;151]

J. Harrigen's point of view is that the predominant object of attention in the studies of kinesics were the hands and head - the two areas with the highest overall frequency of movements. For body movements in general, and for the head and hands in particular, researchers' coding methods are varied, rarely clearly defined, and, with few exceptions, not often conceptually or theoretically organized.[6;116]

S.A. Tikhomirov called any semiotically significant body movement a "sign-gesture" (even those not related to hand movements). In his opinion, a sign-gesture is "this is an action or movement of the human body or part of it, which has a certain meaning or meaning". At the same time, in itself, it is not yet a unit of communication, but becomes such if it is endowed with a "common" meaning for the parties of communication, i.e. understandable for deciphering such a sign by the plan of expression and the plan of content.[12;22]

The field of coding and decoding of such signs belongs to such a scientific discipline as cognitive linguistics. Cognitive linguistics is a scientific discipline that studies the interaction between language and cognitive processes such as perception, thinking, memory and imagination. The methodology of cognitive

linguistics involves the use of cognitive and linguistic theories and methods to analyze language and its use by people in various contexts.[7;352]

The methodology of cognitive linguistics suggests that language is a reflection of our cognitive experience and that language learning can help us better understand our cognitive organization of the world.

A. S. Mikhailova and N. A. Sorvacheva, analyzing the language of visual communications, established the presence of the following components in it:

- communication channel for sending - the channel through which the message of the sender/translator gets to the addressee/recipient;

- encoding/decoding - a process in which communication is possible if the encoder (sender) sends a code known to the decoder (addressee);

- barriers and noise - everything that can interfere with the delivery of a message and its correct decoding;

- a communication channel for acceptance - what our receptors can perceive (vision, touch, etc.)[7; 95-104]

Obviously, for an adequate communicative interaction between the sender and the addressee of messages, the relevance and balance relations must be established: the volume and semantics of information during encoding must reach the recipient of information without significant losses. At the same time, adequate decoding (as well as appropriate encoding) depends on cognitive learning (understanding) and the direct use of the rules governing verbal and non-verbal behavior "so that messages are interpreted in the way in which they were supposed to be conveyed"[8;130]

Probably the first systematic scientific study of kinesics, namely, the expression of facial expressions, began with the work of Charles Darwin "The Expression of Emotions in Humans and Animals"[2]. In this case, the emphasis was on facial expressions of emotions that can be found in both humans and animals.

According to J. Harrigen, in the 1950s a number of creative coding systems

for body positions and actions were developed. Most of them are based on anatomical features and segmentation of the body in relation to the skeletal system. The use of some of these strategies to code non-verbal behavior as a whole has been discontinued because the notation systems are too general[6;116].

S. Frey developed the Berne coding system for non-verbal behavior (later it was developed jointly with von Cranach, as well as with Poole) and described it in his dissertation[4]. This system is designed to capture all sorts of spontaneous movements that occur when the participants are sitting, moving their head, torso, arms, hands, legs and feet.The Berne system is based on the position-time-series-motion principle, which defines numerical codes for various deviations of body parts from basic positions. For example, head tilt to the left and down is assigned a numeric value representing the degree to which the head deviates from the "normal" position when it is upright and pointing straight ahead. The system allows detailed, complete and reliable interpretation of video recordings of behavior in the so-called. "high resolution data protocols". The Berne system encodes poses and movements every 16 seconds (originally based on 16 frames per second of film stock) to represent "fluid motion"[5]. The positions described are created with respect to three axes (horizontal, vertical, and depth) and can represent concepts such as expansiveness, outreach, coherence, imitation, and others.

Bernese spatiotemporal measures capture all changes in moment-to-moment movement, and because they avoid the use of psychological constructs, they are considered less judgmental and subjective than other coding systems.The descriptive accuracy of this system was demonstrated in a study in which coders trained in Frey's system drew model positions from data protocols that were developed from descriptions of the original positions of the models; 98% of the positional codes were identical to the original ones. [5]J. Bente and colleagues developed 3D animation programs based on Frey's decoding of head positions, and further showed that observers' evaluation impressions of faces in 3D

computer animation and original interaction videos were almost identical[1;151-166].

The evolution of methodological strategies for coding body movements has focused mainly on the behavior of "action", i.e. discrete units of body action that 1) are not part of the body position, 2) have relatively clear points of "reference" (start) and "offset" (end), and 3) may or may not be intentional or interpreted by others. These body actions are represented by the head, shoulders, arms, and legs and include actions such as nodding, shrugging, gesturing, scratching, and kicking. These actions are supported by "positional". behavior, i.e. movements associated with the position of the body, which are less subject to frequent changes and are easier to codify.

Manifestations of affect are actions that carry emotional content.

In the future, researchers, while building classifications of gestures, used the model of P. Ekman and V. Friesen to modify their own classes[3;49-98].So, N. I. Smirnova divides gestures into four main groups, depending on their communicative function, into:

- gestures used instead of spoken words (eg greetings and farewells);
- gestures accompanied by the words: (eg, gestures of comparison);
- modal gestures: (eg, agree-disagree, believe-don't believe),
- emotional gestures: gestures, facial expressions and body movements that express the emotional state of a person[7].

It appears that there is still significant methodological work to be done for body coding on the following aspects:

- precise definitions and designations of encoded behavior,
- greater uniformity in the methodology and process of coding different types of behavior to ensure comparability of research results,
- development of methods for training and retraining coders,
- greater uniformity in establishing the reliability of coded behaviors, to name but a few areas requiring further development.

The list of used literatures:

1. Bente, G., Kramer, N.C., Petersen, A. & de Ruiter, J.P. Computer animated movement and person perception.: Methodological advances in nonverbal behavioral research//Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 2001.25. pp. 151-166.
2. Darwin Ch. The Expression of the Emotions in Man and Animals – New York: Philosophical Library, 1872 [3rd ed. – 1965].
3. Ekman P., Friesen W.V. The repertoire of nonverbal behavior: Categories, origins, usage, and coding // Semiotica, 1969. 1., pp. 49-98.
4. Frey S. Eine MethodezurquantitativenBestimmung der Variabilitat des Bewegungsverhaltens. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Regensburg.1971.
5. Frey S., Pool J. A new approach to the analysis of visible behavior. Research – Reports from the Department of Psychology at the University of Berne. 1976.
6. Harrigan, J.A. Proxemics, kinesics, and gaze/ J.A. Harrigan, R. Rosenthal, & K.R. Scherer. (Eds.). The new handbook of methods in nonverbal behavior research. (Chapter 1). NY: Oxford. 2005. 116 p.
7. Михайлова А.С., Сорвачева Н.А. Современный язык визуальных коммуникаций // Дизайн-ревю. 2012. № 1-2. С. 95-1048. Олянич А.В. Презентационная теория дискурса: монография. – М.: Гнозис, 2007. С.130.
8. Сапаров Ш. Когнитивная лингвистика. – Ташкент : Фан, 2009. – 400 с.; Шафриёр С. Семантика. – Ташкент : Фан, 2007. – 352 с.
9. Розинова А.В., Сорокина Д.В. Невербальная коммуникация // Актуальные научные исследования в современном мире. 2021. № 10-4 (78). С. 130-132
10. Хлыстова В.Г. Функционально-структурная и семантическая характеристика кинематических речений, отражающих коммуникативный аспект кинесики: Дис. канд. филол. наук. НижнийНовгород: НГЛУ, 2005. 151 с.
11. Тихомиров С.А. Знак-жест, гипербола и символический обмен: практика и коммуникация // Экономические и гуманитарные науки. – 2014. – № 8 (271). – С. 22.