

**Abstract**

The purpose of this paper is to present a comparative inventory of false kinesic cognates prevalent both in Turkish and Spanish cultures. As a result of video-interviews based on 151 linguistic functions, which were recorded in Istanbul with 54 informants, 10 gestures were identified as false cognates. The article begins by referring to the importance of non-verbal communication in the interactive communicative action. Following this, the kinesic system and the various signs that it consists of are reviewed, with particular attention to gestures, and more specifically, to emblems. Finally, a cross section of the Spanish and Turkish gestures of the bicultural repertoire is provided.

**Key words**

Nonverbal communication, comparative inventory, kinesics, Spanish as FL, teaching methods of second languages.

**Resumen**

El propósito de este artículo es presentar un inventario comparativo de los falsos cognados kinésicos existentes en la cultura turca y española. Los resultados de las vídeo-entrevistas basadas en 151 funciones de la lengua y grabadas en Estambul con 54 informantes revelan la existencia de 10 falsos cognados kinésicos. En un primer apartado introductorio se hace referencia a la relevancia de la comunicación no verbal en el acto comunicativo interactivo. A continuación, tratamos el sistema kinésico y los diferentes signos que lo integran prestando especial atención a los gestos, y más concretamente, a los emblemas. Presentamos, finalmente, los gestos españoles y turcos que forman parte del repertorio bicultural.

**Palabras Clave**

Comunicación no verbal, inventario comparativo, kinésica, ELE, didáctica segundas lenguas.

Fecha de recepción: 05/04/2018 - Fecha de aceptación: 25/04/2018 – Fecha de publicación: 24/06/2018

<sup>1</sup> The author would like to express thanks to Catherine MacMillan and Mark Woodward for their invaluable corrections in the English version.

## Introduction

The human being is the only living animal that produces a verbal language and communicates by making use of this (Lieberman 1975); however, in addition to verbal expression, many non-verbal forms are also used in interaction. Body movements, for example, are inevitably integrated into the process of communication, and the non-verbal system is prevalent in interaction. Thus, despite the little time we spend using the verbal system, or even when we attempt to disregard it, we continue to transmit a lot of information in our non-verbal behaviour (Birdwhistell 1974). It is impossible to ignore non-verbal behaviour in communicative encounters, as it undoubtedly influences attitudes whilst conditioning perceptions and establishing emotions (Argyle 1972).

Human beings, furthermore, need to communicate, whether through the verbal system, through the non-verbal system on certain occasions, or through a combination of both. In today's society, characterized by multilingualism and multiculturalism, learning the non-verbal specific signs of different cultures or target cultures is therefore vital in order to avoid misunderstandings and to facilitate natural and fluid communication. In this globalized world, where people are defined by their own message, as in a calling card, the ability to communicate using body movements involves a risk of misunderstandings. However, this can be rectified with the inclusion of non-verbal elements in educational programmes.

The systematic analysis of non-verbal elements for their application to the teaching/learning of Spanish as a second and foreign language is relatively recent and requires lines of research in order to focus and demonstrate its inevitable integration into the curriculum and its relation to the current situation of the teachers and students. These reflections are framed in very specific areas of human interaction which are not related exclusively to economic and political matters, given our current system of Government, but which also have social and cultural value, including "preparation for moving away from ethnocentrism, relativisation but also confirmation of the learner's own linguistic and cultural identity" (Common European Framework of Reference for Languages -from now on referred to as CEFR- 2001).

Given that non-verbal communication is devised as a set of social systems, whereby people make gestures to convey and inform (Schefflen 1974), it is therefore dynamic and it is adapted to cultural parameters accordingly. The learners, therefore, must acquire an effective communicative competence, which involves the knowledge and use of the non-verbal system.

We consider, therefore, that every communicative human act is carried out by structuring and co-structuring verbal and non-verbal components (Poyatos 1994a). The need to observe, recognize and interpret non-verbal signs used when providing information and in standard communicative interaction is therefore undeniable. In particular, it is essential to teach and practice them in a setting which is culturally different to a Spanish one. In fact, ignoring them causes serious misunderstandings on a personal level, incidents at a cultural level and failed encounters during communicative exchanges. Consequently, we consider, in concurrence with Poyatos (2017) and Cestero (2017) that non-verbal signs -more specifically, false kinesic cognates- should be part of curricular design and should be included in the development of training programmes for teachers and professionals in the field of teaching second and foreign languages.

## 1. The non-verbal communication

In order to understand what non-verbal communication is, we must first interpret the existing relationship between non-verbal and verbal communication, as they are both components of the same global communication process.

Non-verbal communication is a concomitant discipline of human verbal behaviour, which encodes and decodes even the parameters relating personal objectual and environmental manifestations:

“not only we people as socializing beings, but our natural, modified or built environment, are unceasingly emitting nonverbal signs; hence the interdisciplinarity of nonverbal communication studies responds to their very nature and covers, [...], fields like architecture, landscaping, general medicine and psychotherapy, nursing, business, tourism, painting, photography, interior decoration and furniture design, clothes and fashion, cosmetics and perfumes, sports, law, etc.” (Poyatos 2002: 11-18).

According to some specialists, the confines of significance between non-verbal and verbal communication are not so clear, and both forms of interaction are equally relevant. Because the field of study covered is so expansive the terminology applied is usually more general, for example, *communication* or *face-to-face interaction*, which includes both aspects: verbal and non-verbal. The differentiating parameters between vocal and non-vocal manifestations are very imprecise, as not all acoustic phenomena are vowels (like clicking one's thumb against middle finger or clapping hands), nor are all non-acoustic phenomena non-verbal (as in the case of the sign language for the deaf). Similarly, not all vocal phenomena are the same (some employ a respiratory system and other do not) nor are all words characteristically verbal (as for example, the onomatopoeic considered words: *zas, cuchichear...*) (Knapp 1982: 15-16).

In this regard, Cestero emphasises the definitive non-linguistic quality of non-verbal communication:

“(...) la forma de comunicación humana producida mediante la utilización de signos no lingüísticos. Se incluyen en ella, por tanto, todos los signos y sistemas de signos no lingüísticos que comunican o se utilizan para comunicar, esto es, los hábitos y las costumbres culturales en sentido amplio y los denominados sistemas de comunicación no verbal: paralenguaje, kinésica, proxémica y cronémica” (Cestero 2004: 594).

This definition covers the description of the signs and systems of cultural signs, on the one hand, and non-verbal communication systems, on the other. It is therefore interpreted as the remaining undiluted nature between the communication's ranges of action or, in our case, of non-verbal communication and culture.

### 1.1. Culture and communication

Similarly, in his definition of non-verbal communication, Poyatos (1994a) emphasises the interrelationship between it and culture, defining it as “the emissions of signs by all the nonlexical, artifactual and environmental sensible sign systems contained in the realm of a culture, whether individually or in mutual coconstruction, and whether or not those emissions constitute behavior or generate personal interaction” (Poyatos 2002a:17).

Cestero (1999b) extends the inevitable analogy between the precepts of culture and non-verbal communication and, like other scholars<sup>2</sup>, she differentiates between *Culture* with uppercase and *culture* with lowercase. She defines *Culture* as:

“el conocimiento humano aprendido, dentro del cual están, indiscutiblemente, las costumbres ambientales y relativas al comportamiento y las creencias, por un lado, que constituyen la cultura (con minúscula) de una comunidad, y los sistemas de comunicación (verbal y no verbales) de dicha comunidad, por otro” (Cestero 1999b: 15).

If we take this connection into consideration, the correlation between culture and communication is emphasized to the point of considering that the closer the culture of the communicative partners, the more effective and simple the interaction between them is, if we understand interaction as the process of transferring and understanding information (Harms 1973). This statement provides our research with its meaning, because it focuses on a comparative study between two cultures with a certain degree of closeness, such as Turkish and Spanish.

The definition of culture provided by Poyatos (1983) is similar to that mentioned above and contributes more precision:

“A series of habits shared by members of a group living in a geographic area, learned but biologically conditioned, such as the means of communication (language being the basis of them all), social relations at different levels, the various activities of daily life, the products of that group and how they are utilized, the peculiar manifestations of both individual and national personalities, and their ideas concerning their own existence and their fellow people” (Poyatos 1983: 3).

However, the analysis and reflections of Martinell (2007) contest the assumption that culture is confined to a specific period of time or geographical area, and also that people don't belong to a unique culture:

“la cultura supera el espacio geográfico concreto, la cultura no tiene por qué ser privativa del mismo grupo a lo largo de generaciones: habrá incorporaciones y habrá deserciones (...) una cultura no se contamina en contacto con otras, simplemente cambia; un individuo no está necesariamente inmerso en una cultura toda su vida” (Martinell 2007: 76).

The scale of the significance of the principles developed by communication and culture lead Bateson (cited in La Barre 1978: 251) to conceive of both aspects as one single entity, “toda cultura es comunicación”. Hall reaffirms this symbiotic concept, stating “I have treated culture as communication” (1959: 186). On this basis, along with the anthropologist Trager, he developed a compelling theoretical approach to culture based on communication models.

<sup>2</sup> Miquel and Sans (2004) distinguish between “cultura a secas” including the operational knowledge and the behaviours shared by members of the same culture, “cultura con mayúsculas”, such as, common knowledge, and “cultura con k”, namely, the adequacy of knowledge to different compartments of the cultural conduct.

Just as each individual claims inexorable differentiation within the community, that is, their own identity, all the members of that culture or group interact, without being aware of it, as belonging to the same social collectivity. There is such a distinctive interaction between humans and their context that everyone is actively involved in and fluently affects the other, creating and shaping the environment with the sole purpose of the other's existence. This reciprocal exchange is conducted not only through the verbal system, which is the main exponent in the formation of thought, but also through non-verbal signs, which have been studied, categorized as the paralinguistic, kinesic, proxemic and cronemic systems.

## 2. The Kinesic system

Non-verbal communication occurs through the use of signs of different systems that act by adding information to the content expressed by the signs of other systems, replacing verbal signs, regulating the interaction, correcting deficiencies or promoting the realization of simultaneous communicative acts (Cestero 2004: 598-599).

Poyatos provided a definition of kinesic much in line with our research, namely:

“Conscious and unconscious psychomuscularly-based body movements and intervening or resulting still positions, either learned or somatogenic, of visual, visual-acoustic and tactile and kinaesthetic perception, which, whether isolated or combined with the linguistic and paralinguistic structures and with other somatic and objectual behavioural systems, possess intended or unintended communicative value” (Poyatos 2002b: 204).

The first scientific reference that we have on emotional expression through the use of the body is the work of Darwin (1872/1955), where the illustrious scientist proves that people from different cultures produce similar gestures and movements when they experience similar emotions<sup>3</sup>. Darwin suggests that all primary human expressions can be linked to some primitive functional act, a premise embraced as a reference in further studies.

A few years later, the anthropologist Birdwhistell, in his work *Introduction to Kinesic* (1952), coined the term *kinesics* to refer to the disciplinary study of the communicative aspects of body movement, since he believes that “language could not be understood until adequate descriptions of spoken language behaviour were developed” (Birdwhistel 1970: 96)<sup>4</sup>. By this time, the basic assumptions that underlie the kinesic analysis were based on the following precepts:

-No movement or body language is devoid of significance in its context;

<sup>3</sup> Currently, research undertaken by psychologists like Fernandez-Dols (2013), that confirm the relevant role of the sender, the receiver and the context, invalidate the mythical teleosemantic evolutionary approach to nonverbal communication espoused by Tomkins (1975).

<sup>4</sup> In the same line of research, some American and European linguists like Bloomfield (1914; 1926; 1933) and Sapir (1927; 1949) invalidate the hitherto predominant maxim that language is systematized and structured regardless of the culture and the idiosyncrasy of the speakers.

- Posture, movement and facial expression are susceptible to a methodical analysis;
- Systematic body movements of the subjects from a community belong to the social system of the same group;
- All visually perceptible body activity undoubtedly influences the behaviour of other members;
- This body behaviour has a communicative value suitable to be studied unless there is evidence to the contrary;
- The idiosyncratic components of the kinesic system shall be taken into account following a more extensive analysis.

The existence of such axioms justifies, without a doubt, the need for a structured and methodical study. In this respect, Birdwhistell (1952) enhances the irrefutable linkages between communicative movement and verbal language, the "linguistic-kinesic analogy". In the same way as an infinite number of anthropokinetically possible sounds are produced, a large number of movements (identified universally and moreover, as exclusive of the cultural repertoire) may also be originated. Birdwhistell grammaticalizes nonverbal communication systematizing the minimum units of body motion (kines), its variations (alokines), its significant combinations (kinemorfos) and its updating (kinemorphemes); thus providing the units or the kinesic constituent with the same peculiarities and formal and functional characteristics of morphemes or phonemes. On the other hand, Kendon (1969) determines a set of kinegraphics for simple transcription of body movement that gives greater depth and systematization to the study of the kinaesthetic.

As mentioned above in the definition of kinesics, the information resulting from the signs from the kinesic system provided during the communicative interaction can be perceived visually (this is the most common, for example, a wink); audibly (such as a language click or a kiss); through touch (such as a pinch on the cheek or a hug); and kinesic (such as a romp with a pencil) (Poyatos 1994a: 187).

The kinesic system is classified into three basic categories "los gestos o movimientos faciales y corporales, las maneras o formas convencionales de realizar las acciones o los movimientos y las posturas o posiciones estáticas comunicativas, resultantes o no de la realización de ciertos movimientos" (Poyatos 1994b; Cestero 1999a: 36).

### 3. Gestures

The concept of gesture has been changing and shaped over the years and its study is linked to sign language. The idea that gesture is a "universal language" and therefore "natural" - thus not requiring teaching - is examined according to the era<sup>5</sup> and the place under analysis.

<sup>5</sup> Ortega and Rodríguez (2007: 62-65) provide an historical overview of studies on Western gesture from classical antiquity -with Cicero- until the end of 20th century, accompanied by Francis Bacon, that includes tools such as guides, observations of travellers abroad or body behaviour in painting and literature.

For Birdwhistell (1970) gestures are part of a more diverse and complex totality which requires a complete analysis, prior to the interpretation of the "social meaning". Considering such an inclusive interpretation, it can be assumed that the gesture has a specific function in the communication process and we only interpret their communicative value in relation to the context, understanding it as the situational context in a specific culture, on one hand, and as the communicative context -consisting of non-linguistic elements (cronemic, the paralanguage...)- on the other.

According to Kendon's definition gestures are:

"any instance in which visible action is mobilized in the service of producing an explicit communicative act, typically addressed to another, regarded by the other (and by the actor) as being guided by an openly acknowledge intention, and treated as conveying some meaning beyond or apart from the action itself" (Kendon 1984: 81).

The kinesic specialist excludes the emotional reactions of the face and those actions which are part of the performance of a task from this concept, and he also dismisses activity derived from maintaining or changing posture. In summary, the gesture can be defined as an action that must have a communicative intention and whose performance can be avoided by the actor.

On the basis of Cestero's functional cataloguing (1999a: 36), the need to classify gestural behaviours in body and facial movements is established. This classification is substantiated into the following parameters (Ekman 1976: 14): *origin* -that is, how a specific movement became part of the person's repertoire-, *coding* -the existing relationship between non-verbal behaviour and meaning- and *usage* -the circumstances where the non-verbal sign<sup>6</sup> occurs-. Ekman and Friesen (1969: 63-92), based on Efron's studies (1941) and in meetings with Malh (1968), categorized non-verbal, facial and body behaviours into 5 basic types: emotional expressions, regulators, adaptors, illustrators and emblems.

### 3.1. Emblems

Emblems are "a gesture unambiguously represented by a verbal equivalent in a given culture [...] their *coding* can be: *arbitrary* [...] and *intrinsic*" (Poyatos 2002a:167).

Efron (1941) defined emblems as patterns of movement with a precise meaning; their communicative value is so exact that glossaries could be produced visually describing each action and message. However, discussing the greater or lesser need for using signs with the intention of achieving a full and fluid interaction, Kendon (1994) proposes a *continuum*. He places emblems between two basic opposite poles: sign language and gesticulation (both understood as idiosyncratic and spontaneous movements). Ekman and Friesen (1976: 14), for their part, identify them as acts that have an exact verbal translation shared by all the members of a culture, a group or a class. Emblems are employed with a communicative conscious intention towards an addressee, who identifies the purpose and recognizes himself as the receiver; thus, the sender assumes the responsibilities

<sup>6</sup> After reviewing several comparative studies including Efron's, Kendon (1984: 89) concludes that it is vital for the analysis of the communicative value of gesture to study how the interlocutors make use of gesture, that is, functions performed.

arising from the communicative act. Poyatos (2002a: 167) highlights the cultural component, identifying them as “specific equivalents of words within social groups and cultures”<sup>7</sup>.

Emblems are not necessarily dependent on speech. Despite the fact that they can occur during verbal interaction, on numerous occasions emblems are produced when the linguistic equivalent is restricted, hindered or is not available (this is the case of signs made by students when teacher turns around).

Another distinctive feature of emblems is that they convey a precise meaning, or several, moulded by the situational context. The codification of the emblems is often iconic and arbitrary (i.e. placing a hand on the chest with the intention to thank or raising the index and heart fingers as a sign of victory). However, the religious past and the circumstances of each culture that identify and determine the origin and subsequent development of a non-verbal sign should not be ignored.

This research is aimed at emblematic gestures since they are the non-verbal signs that display greater cultural variations, and are specific signs from diverse identities and cultures. They are characterized by being intentional and carry a specific and unique meaning. These conditions define them as substitutes for the linguistic elements. This is the case in Turkish culture, for example, where pulling the ear-lobe three times in a row with the thumb and index finger and simulating three kisses indicates a search for protection or, in Spanish culture, where to tap the cheek with the palm of the hand indicates that someone is cheeky.

#### 4. Methodology

Due to the existence of an extensive bibliography on Spanish gestures and that the study by Nascimento (2007; 2012) on Spanish emblems represents comprehensive and in-depth quantitative and qualitative analysis, we have determined not to repeat the research with regard to Spanish signs and to focus the investigation on Turkish gestures and on the comparative study. Nevertheless, specific and detailed research was conducted in order to elicit the Turkish emblem corpus.

Supporting Poyato’s (1994b: 218-223) and Cestero’s (2004: 606-609) methodological proposals, while adapting them to our particular investigation and its necessities, we have: 1) selected the object of study - emblematic gestures in Spanish and Turkish cultures-; 2) recorded material through introspection and bibliographic reviewing, as well as direct observations -reading books, watching films, witnessing real interactions- and finally, via interviews, including designing a questionnaire, selecting the informants and carrying out surveys-; 3) analysed the data recorded both qualitatively and quantitatively; and 4) presented findings as a bicultural comparative repertoire.

<sup>7</sup> Both Ekman and Friesen and Poyatos emphasize the possibility of performing and systematizing paralinguistic emblems (a sigh of relief signal, a whistle to attract someone’s attention...).



The emblematic gestures to be included in the questionnaire were determined on the basis of data extracted from introspection, specialized references and direct observation.

#### 4.1. Participants

The study involved two sets of informers: one from Spain (Nascimento 2007; 2012) and one from Turkey (Murias 2016).

The Turkish participants were randomly selected from different districts throughout Istanbul, nevertheless they were all born and living in Istanbul and they were willing to take part in the research –all gave informed consent to being audiovisually recorded and all granted permission for usage of their data for research and educational purpose-.

There was a total of fifty-four informants: twenty-seven females and twenty-seven males. Each group included three subjects each from Primary, Secondary and University educational levels; and all sets comprised three subjects each from three different age groups: 20-34 years old, 35-49 years and over 50 years old.

This classification is exemplified as follows:

Level of instruction	Gender	Age		
		20-34 years	35-49 years	+50 years
Primary	women	3	3	3
	men	3	3	3
Secondary	women	3	3	3
	men	3	3	3
University	women	3	3	3
	men	3	3	3

Illustration 1: Categorization of the informants according to the social factor observed.

#### 4.2. Instruments and procedures

The materials used to conduct the 54 interviews were an iPad (Apple model MD513LL/A), a photographic camera (Canon IXUS 105) and a mobile phone (LG Nexus 5) with the accompanying questionnaire resulting from previous phases.

As part of the interview process, participants were asked to answer a sociolinguistic questionnaire. This questionnaire inquired about 151 functions of the language such as *being in a hurry*, *saying sorry*, *interrupting someone's discourse*, *you, being strong*, *being pregnant...* that constituted a corpus of data employed to analyse the use, form of execution and communicative value of the emblematic gestures investigated.

Informants were asked to execute a gesture conveyed by a function of the language providing them with a specific situation or a particular expression. The elicited signs were video-recording -in informal settings- for the duration, between 50-60 minutes, of each interview.

These emblems were then transcribed and analysed for varying sociological patterns such as sex, age and educational levels.

### 4.3. Data analysis procedure

Firstly, each of these videos was viewed with the simple aim of identifying the emblematic gestures performed by the 54 Turkish participants tested. Subsequently, the video footages were reviewed with the objective of establishing the frequency of kinesic sign production, that is to say, the most representative emblems, and the effect of situational and social factors like sex, age and educational level on gesture execution.

The results were manually annotated and then introduced into the statistic programme *SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences)*. These were then analysed both quantitatively and qualitatively and finally, compare with the Spanish inventory (Nascimento 2007).

## 5. Results

The Turkish and Spanish verbal systems are so different that we cannot be guided by the syntactic structures or by the lexicon of the mother tongue in order to enable interaction in Spanish as a FL. Nevertheless, if we are not familiar with these, we can utilize the nonverbal system to some extent. The results from the comparative analysis carried out between Turkish and Spanish culture in this study reflect the existence of emblems listed in the four assumptions presented by Poyatos (1994a:24-27). In comparison with the other culture, the kinesic signs may be categorized as:

- A. *homomorphs-synonyms*: gestures with the same performance and communicative value in both cultures -kinesic cognates-. It is the most profuse group of emblematic gestures (82) belonging to the comparative inventory. For example, the way of performing the communicative function of *not to have money* and *to drink* is the same in both cultures studied. Additionally, regarding their communicative value, there is a full equivalence between Turkish and Spanish culture. Hence, these emblematic gestures do not require decoding, and communicative misunderstandings or errors are not made.
- B. *antomorphs-synonyms*: when the way of execution is different in both cultures but the communicative value is exactly the same as the other gesture in the other culture. In the research undertaken, we have also identified *antomorphs-synonyms* kinesic gestures, in other words, gestures with a different form but the same meaning in both studied cultures. For example, the

communicative function of *thanking* has several emblematic gestures as options in Turkish culture; although there is just one choice in Spanish culture. In this case, then, we see different ways of performing a gesture with a single meaning.

- C. *antomorphs-antonyms*: when the way of execution and the meaning are different in both cultures -they are “zero decoding” (gestures which are empty of meaning) and their decoding is therefore non-existent-. The corpus gathered shows that there are 36 gestures belonging to this category. Among them, the Spanish gestural repertoire includes a representative emblem performing the communicative function of *being a soulmate*; this non-verbal sign is non-existent in Turkish culture. Another example is that, in order to perform the communicative function of *being crazy*, the Turkish inventory refers to an emblem which does not reflect formal equivalence with any other kinesic signs belonging to Spanish culture. Therefore, we consider, within the framework of teaching SFL, that the “zero decoding” group must be adapted to the classroom in order to help Turkish learners achieve the necessary cultural and linguistic fluidity.
- D. *homomorphs-antonyms*: when the performance of the gesture is the same in both cultures but the meaning is different -they are called “false cognates” (false kinesic cognates)- and they trigger an incorrect decoding. We were able to determine the existence of a group of 10 kinesic signs that are performed similarly in both Spanish and Turkish cultures; nevertheless, their communicative function differs. The students will misunderstand the message and interferences will be produced in communicative interaction with these emblems.

## 6. The elaboration of the bicultural false kinesic cognates inventory

The most important purpose of this study is to provide a comparative repertoire of Turkish and Spanish false kinesic cognates, organize according to the applications and basic communicative functions of signs. This inventory allows the identification of the emblems specific to the cultures studied and those emblems that present different uses in both cultures. The emblems will be selected to be part of the curriculum design for teaching Spanish as a FL (Foreign Language) to Turkish students.

### 6.1. Structure and characteristics of the inventory

The inventory has been prepared from comparative charts, following the recommendations of the study proposed by Cestero (2016; 2017) and Poyatos (1994). These charts (following the framework set out by Nascimento 2012), which record all the relevant information, are organized according to the basic uses of non-verbal signs and the communicative functions (Cestero 1999a) fulfilled by emblems in order to easily include them in academic curricula and the FL classroom. Comparative charts present the following characteristics:

- Each function has a numbering, that is, in each chart it starts with the Spanish culture and follows with the Turkish.
- The charts are divided into two sections, one for each culture analysed: the left part for Spanish culture and the right for Turkish culture.
- The kinesic signs are accompanied by an image demonstrating the making of the sign. We employ a single photograph as the emblem is equivalent in the two studied cultures.
- The photographs show the main part of the performance of the gesture. In the event that is not possible to illustrate the movement in one single snapshot, more images would be presented. In this way, a sequence of movements that provides accuracy to the gesture performance in question is provided and, moreover, potential misunderstandings or confusions regarding gesture variants from one or both of the cultures in question can be avoided.
- Each photograph is accompanied by a brief description of the way the emblem is executed on the basis of the natural resting position<sup>8</sup>.
- In addition, the linguistic equivalent of the emblem is included. In the case of Turkey, it is reported in Turkish and we provide, between brackets, the literal translation or its equivalent in English. We have decided not to specify if the semantic lexical equivalent is prior, simultaneous or subsequent to the performance of the emblematic gesture since on many occasions it depends on the situational context. The examples given are in both the informal and formal registers.
- Furthermore, the real use or the communicative input of the false kinesic cognate, that is the function that it performs, is also documented on the chart.
- In addressing polysemic gestures, their characteristics are introduced in the *Notations* part.
- The chart continues with a section assigned to *Observations*, where appropriate. That is, clarifications on the context of use, paralinguistics, cronemics or proxemic signs are enclosed with the gesture, along with sociokinesic data that may be relevant.
- Each chart concludes with the section called *Note*, in which the most representative kinesic signs of each culture and the possible existence of other characteristic emblematic gestures are specified, if necessary.

<sup>8</sup> Since right-handedness is more common, definitions and illustrations take the use of the right arm and hand as a reference.

## 6.2. An inventory of false kinesic cognates in Turkish and Spanish cultures

As described above, data presented suggest that most of the emblems from the Turkish and Spanish cultures possessed analogous executive form and common significance or communicative function.

Interestingly, the coexistence of non-verbal elements executed in an identical way but with diverse significance in Turkish and Spanish cultures has been reported. We argue, hence, that these false cognates are the emblematic gestures that present the most difficulties during the intercultural communication and, consequently, they are the first signs to be considered in the learning/teaching of Spanish as a FL to Turkish students. On this basis, they have therefore been selected for our bicultural repertoire.

We will proceed by indexing the most relevant findings of our investigation, in other words, 10 kinesic signs that are performed identically in the Spanish and Turkish cultures but with diverse meaning. Furthermore, we categorize them with the aim of constituting these gestures as potentially responsible for misinterpretations during our students' interactions.

1. In Spanish culture, raising one's chin slightly is defined as a way of *greeting*, nevertheless, in Turkish culture, it is an emblematic c gesture used for *denying*.

## SPAIN

1. To GREET
2. To ANSWER BACK A GREETING
3. (To say) GOODBYE

## TURKEY

4. (To show) DISAGREEMENT



Gesture 1

The head is slightly slanted backwards, and the chin is raised.

**Linguistic equivalent**

- Hola [Hello]
- ¿Qué tal? [How are you?]
- Adiós [Bye]
- Hasta luego [See you]

**Use/meaning**

- It is used to greet, to answer a greeting and to say goodbye to an acquaintance from a distance, in an informal context.

**Note:**

- The emblem consisting of moving the head slightly backward while raising the chin, is used less assiduously.

**Linguistic equivalent**

- Hayır [No]
- Yok [No]
- Aklından bile geçirme [No way]
- Hiç/hiç olmaz/hiç yok [Not at all]
- Rüyanda görürsün! [Not even in your dreams!]

**Use/meaning**

- It conveys negation, discord.

**Observations**

- Some of the informants recognize G. 1 as being used in more informal situations, among friends and relatives. Nevertheless, many of the participants indicated that G. 1 conveys that something has finished, that it no longer exists; in these cases, the gesture is equivalent of the linguistic expression *yok*. Its use is associated with the level of instruction, that is, the lower the level of education the more G.1 is used.

Figure 1: A gesture performed in the same way though carrying different communicative value: to *greet* (Spanish culture) and to show *disagreement* (Turkish culture).

2. In Spanish culture, to *avoid responsibilities*, the gesture of simulating one hands to be washed is performed; in Turkish culture, nevertheless, this kinesic sign possesses a literal meaning.


SPAIN 5. (To avoid ) RESPONSABILITIES	TURKEY 6. (to) WASH ONE'S HANDS
	
Gesture 2	
Raising one's arms while bending them over the chest. The hands are kept half open with the fingers slightly bent. An encircling movement is made with the hands (simulating washing them).	
<p><b>Linguistic equivalent</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Yo me lavo las manos en ese asunto [I wash my hands of this whole thing]</li> <li>- Eso no es cosa mía [It is not my businesses]</li> <li>- Yo ahí no me meto [I won't get involved in this matter]</li> </ul>	<p><b>Linguistic equivalent</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Haydi, gidip ellerini yıkayalım [Let's go and wash our hands]</li> <li>- Lütfen, yemeden önce ellerini yıka [Please, wash your hands before eating]</li> </ul>
<p><b>Use/meaning</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It conveys that one did not cause anything and therefore, is exempt from any responsibility.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Use/meaning</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It conveys the activity of washing one's hands.</li> </ul>

Figure 2: A gesture executed in an identical way but with a different significance in the Turkish (to *wash* one's hands) and Spanish population (to *avoid responsibilities*).

3. To show *gratitude* and to *swear*, the Turkish participants raise the palm of the hand to the chest; however, the Spanish surveyed use this emblem to define a *best friend*.

SPAIN	TURKEY
7. (To be) BEST FRIEND	8. To PROMISE 9. To THANK



Gesture 3

Raising one's arm and semibending it over the chest where the palm of the hand is placed and held open whilst all fingers are extended together. The head is slightly slanted towards one side or forwards. This position is then held as described for a few seconds.

#### Linguistic equivalent

- Es mi amigo del alma [He is my very close friend]
- Es mi mejor amigo [She is my best friend]

#### Use/meaning

- It conveys that someone is a very dear friend.

#### Notations

- In specific contexts, it can be interpreted as an expression of revenge.

#### Linguistic equivalent

- Sana söz veriyorum [I swear it]
- Yemin ediyorum [I promise it]
- Mersi/Sağol [Thanks]
- Teşekkür ederim [Thank you]
- Çok teşekkürler [Thank you very much]

#### Use/meaning

- It is used with the purpose of swearing an oath.
- It is used to express gratitude.

#### Observations

- The performance of this emblem -expressing *thanks*- is usually combined with the linguistic expression [*eyvallah*].
- If the gratitude is expressed towards a relative or a friend, an embrace is normally preferred.
- The G. 3 -*being grateful*- is more common between men.
- Most religious participants confirm that it is only possible to *swear* before God.

Figure 3: A gesture performed in an identical way while carrying different communicative value in the Turkish (to *promise* and to *thank*) and Spanish communities (to be *best friends*).



4. In Spain, striking a table or a hard surface with one's knuckles means *stubborn*, while in Turkey it is used to request protection.

SPAIN  
10. (To be) STUBBORN

TURKEY  
11. (To neutralise a) SPELL



Gesture 4

Raising one's arm and semibending it, with the back of the hand in a horizontal position. The hand is closed tight with the fingers bent. The knuckles strike a hard surface repeatedly.

#### Linguistic equivalent

- Es un cabezón, terco, obstinado, cabezota, testarudo [(S)He is stubborn, obstinate, pighead]
- ¡Tiene la cabeza más dura! [He's got a hard head!]
- Cuando se le mete algo en la cabeza... [When she sets her mind on something...]

#### Use/meaning

- It shows that someone is too single minded, focused, doesn't like changing one's mind or giving in to other's ideas.

#### Linguistic equivalent

- Allah korusun /maşallah [May God protect me]
- Nazar değmesin [May the evil eye not touch me (you/him/her)]

#### Use/meaning

- It attempts to ward off the evil eye.

#### Observations

- Many people recognize the gesture, nevertheless they do not admit to performing it due to the fact that they deny being superstitious.
- On many occasions, this gesture is the simplified version of a longer one: to pull one's ear and to simulate to give a kiss.

#### Note:

- G. 4 is rarely used, though it is the most common.

Figure 4: This gesture is produced in the same way in both analysed cultures (Turkish and Spanish) but is ascribed diverse meanings: to *defuse a spell* and to be *stubborn*, respectively.

5. Among the Spanish community, a continued wide upwards and downwards movement is executed by the hand, with its edge parallel to the floor, as an intensifier conveying a *large amount*; among the Turkish population, this gesture corresponds to the communicative function of something being *hot* or *wrong*.

SPAIN	TURKEY
12. (To be) A LOT	13. (To be) BAD 14. (To be) HOT



Gesture 5

Raising one's arm, bending it over the chest, with the edge of the hand kept parallel to the floor. The hand is held semiopen with fingers slightly extended. A continued gentle movement upwards and downwards is made with the hand.

#### Linguistic equivalent

- Hay muchos/un montón de libros, tráfico [There are many books, there is a lot of traffic ]
- Hace mucho calor [It is very hot]
- Tiene así de... [He's got so many of ...]

#### Use/meaning

- It is used to specify a large quantity or intensity.

#### Notations

- By extension, it is used, also, to indicate a large quantity of people.
- It conveys the intensity of an action.

#### Observations

- Usually, this gesture is performed together with an upwards movement of the eyebrows, and of the production with the lower and upper lips of a small circle. Likewise, the cheeks can be swollen with air.

#### Linguistic equivalent

- Kendimi kötü hissediyorum [I feel bad]
- Çok kötü/berbat hissediyorum [I feel very bad/awful]
- Çok kötü bir gün geçirdim [It has been a terrible day]

#### Use/meaning

- It is used to state that the person is not feeling good, either physically or emotionally.
- It conveys that something is hot.

#### Observations

- The production of this emblem is performed with the facial expression: wrinkling the whole face towards the nose, lowering the upper lip or biting the lower lip.

Figure 5: A gesture performed identically though meaning *being a lot* in Spanish culture and *being wrong* or *hot* in Turkish culture.

6. In Turkey, pulling the lower part of one's eye with the index finger means you are not going to let yourself to be cheated, but in Spain this gesture is a warning to be careful.

SPAIN	TURKEY
15. To ADVICE, (To be) CAREFULL, (To pay) ATTENTION	16. (To show) DISTRUST, MISTRUST



Gesture 6

Raising one's arm, semibending it, till the eye with the back of the hand kept vertical. The hand is kept open with the fingers slightly bent except for the index finger which is kept extended. The finger, placed on the lower part of the eye, makes a gentle downwards movement.

#### Linguistic equivalent

- ¡Ten cuidado! [Be careful!]
- ¡Atención, cuidado! [Caution! Mind...!]
- ¡Ojo! [Watch out!]

#### Use/meaning

- It cautions against a potential danger, urges to be careful.

#### Observations

- This gesture is habitually performed together with raising the eyebrows.

#### Linguistic equivalent

- Hiç güvenme [Do not trust him]
- Beni kandiramazsın [I won't be tricked]

#### Use/meaning

- It is used to warn the interlocutor that one will not be deceived by what one is told.

#### Observations

- G. 6 can be performed in a funny context or among children.
- It is mostly produced along the paralinguistic signal [pissikkk].

Figure 6: A gesture produced in the same way but carrying the communicative value of paying *attention* among the Spanish population and *mistrust* among the Turkish population.

7. The emblem involving the extension of the index and heart fingers in Spanish culture refers to a victory, an achievement, while in Turkish culture it represents the Kurdish Party.

SPAIN	TURKEY
17. To WIN, SUCCEED	18. (To support) KURDISH PARTY



Gesture 7

The arm is raised and half bent; the hand is kept closed with the fingers bent except for the index and heart fingers, which are kept extended. This position is then held as described for a few seconds.

**Linguistic equivalent**

- ¡Lo conseguimos! [We got it!]
- ¡Lo he logrado! [I did it!/I manage it!]
- ¡Hemos ganado! [We won!]

**Use/meaning**

- It is used to indicate that an aim has been obtained, a goal has been attained or that its successful achievement is foreseen.

**Linguistic equivalent**

**Use/meaning**

- It is used to indicate the identity of the Kurdish Party.

Figure 7: A gesture made in an identical way but holding a different communicative meaning among the Turkish (refers to *Kurdish Party*) and the Spanish populations (to *win*).

8. In Turkey, the gesture involving the execution of a continuous opening and closing movement with the index and heart fingers (emulating a pair of scissors) literally refers to cutting something, more specifically, to male circumcision. In Spain, instead, this kinesic sign would be decoded as a request to someone in order *to stop speaking*.


SPAIN 19. To STOP TALKING	TURKEY 20. To CUT
	
Gesture 8	
<p>The arm is raised and bent, with the edge of the hand parallel to the floor. The hand is kept half closed with the fingers clenched, except the index and heart fingers, which are kept extended. A continuous opening and closing motion is made with the index and heart fingers (simulating a pair of scissors).</p>	
<b>Linguistic equivalent</b>	<b>Linguistic equivalent</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- ¡Cállate (ya)! [Be quiet now!]</li> <li>- ¡Corta el rollo! [Shut up!/Cut it out!]</li> <li>- ¡Déjalo ya! [Leave it!]</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- O sünnetli [He is circumcised]</li> <li>- Ben kumaşı keseceğim [I will cut the fabric]</li> </ul>
<b>Use/meaning</b>	<b>Use/meaning</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It asks for the ending of a conversation or the suspension of the speaker's speech.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It conveys the act of cutting.</li> </ul>
<b>Observations</b>	<b>Observations</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- G. 8 is most common among teenagers.</li> </ul>	

Figure 8: This gesture performed in the same way though engaging multiple meanings in Turkish (to *cut*) and Spanish culture (to *stop talking*).

9. Pretending to write on a surface is interpreted in both analysed cultures as *asking for the bill*, nevertheless, in Turkish culture, it also carries the communicative value of *studying*.

SPAIN 21. (To ask for) THE BILL	TURKEY 22. To STUDY
------------------------------------	------------------------



Gesture 9

The arm is raised and bent with the edge of the hand vertical. The hand is kept half closed, with the fingers half bent, except the thumb and the index fingers, which are stretched, and the fingertips are kept together. The hand makes a gentle upwards and downwards movement towards the outside.

#### Linguistic equivalent

- La cuenta, por favor [The bill, please]
- ¿Me trae la cuenta, por favor? [Could you bring the bill, please?]
- Por favor, tráigame la cuenta [Please, bring me the bill]

#### Use/meaning

- It is used to request the bill in a bar or restaurant.

#### Observations

- In an informal context, the kinesic sign of money or the gesture that something is expensive can both be performed.

#### Linguistic equivalent

- Ders çalışıyorum [I'm studying]
- Ders çalışmam lazım [I have to study]
- İnek gibi çalışacağım/ İnekleyeceğim [Lit. I study as a cow]

#### Use/meaning

- It conveys the act of studying.

#### Observations

#### Note:

- It can be equally used with the communicative value of *requesting the bill*; nevertheless, unlike the gesture produced to indicate the act of *studying* which is performed with fingers pointing at a surface such as a table and with the arm semibent, when asking for the bill writing towards a person is simulated, and with the arm more stretched.

Figure 9: The gesture is executed in an identical way but carries diverse communicative value among the Turkish (to *study*) and Spanish populations (to ask for the *bill*).

10. Performing a circular motion with the extended index finger at the temple, in the Spanish community, specifies someone is *mad*; however, in the Turkish community, this emblem is minimally identified with this significance. On the contrary, it is associated with having a *good idea* or being *intelligent*.

SPAIN  
23. (To be) CRAZY

TURKEY  
24. (To be) INTELLIGENT



Gesture 10

The arm is raised and half bent until the head, with the back of the hand placed horizontally. The hand is kept closed with fingers clenched except the forefinger that is straightened and pointed towards the temple. The hand makes a continuous circular motion or it remains in this position for a few seconds.

#### Linguistic equivalent

- Está...(loco) [He is...(crazy)]
- No está bien de la cabeza/no está en sus cabales [He is off his nut/He is insane]
- Está un poco majara, pirado, chiflado [She went a little nutty/she's gone bonkers/she is a loon/she is a little cuckoo]

#### Use/meaning

- It conveys that someone is not in his/her right mind that (s)he is foolish, mad or is mentally disturbed.

#### Linguistic equivalent

- Çok zeki/ akıllı [(S)he is intelligent]
- Muhteşem [(S)he is brilliant]
- Zeka küpü [Lit. [(S)he is a cup of knowledge]

#### Use/meaning

- It conveys that someone is clever, shrewd and has got brilliant ideas.

#### Notations

- It can describe someone who does not use the brain or whose brain does not work.

#### Note:

- G. 10 is less recognized by the Turkish population with the communicative value of being *mad*. Raising one's arm until the head with the hand half opened and the fingers slightly bent and making a continuous circular motion with the hand is selected as the preferred one.

Figure 10: This gesture is performed in the same way in both cultures studied, though it is ascribed different meanings: being *intelligent* (Turkish community) and being *crazy* (Spanish community).

The emblems described above are of both the Spanish and Turkish gestural repertoires; however, the communicative value given to them by each community differs. As the meaning of an emblematic gesture differs between Spanish and Turkish cultures, it is not possible to decode such a kinesic sign. Even in the event that there is a decoding, misinterpretations and communicative mistakes would occur. We consider, therefore, that the false kinesic cognates should be included in the teaching/learning of Spanish as a foreign language.

The results from the collected data could not be more revealing. The latter group of gestures (*homomorph-antonyms*), specially, is the one that should be introduced in the teaching of SFL to Turkish students, due to the fact that it would not be feasible for them to interpret such emblems otherwise.

We are conscious that the systematic creation of inventories has emerged during the last few years<sup>9</sup>, focusing on the identification, description, classification and levelling of the non-verbal signs. The design of the contrastive repertoire of false kinesic cognates is decisive for the learning/teaching of the emblems; unfortunately, however, this is not enough. Apart from the illustration, characterization and the communicative function of the gestures, a series of adequately sequenced exercises is required in order to teach the nonverbal behaviour in the classroom with an integrated approach.

In this investigation, particular emblematic gestures belonging to the Spanish and Turkish cultures have been analysed for the purpose of creating a repertoire of false kinesic cognates to facilitate the learning/teaching process of non-verbal Spanish signs to Turkish students.

## Conclusions

The study of non-verbal communication and its impact on human behaviour has only recently considered a specific discipline, and it covers an infinity of fields. In such a versatile framework, there has been a lot of reflection on the implications of non-verbal communication in a globalized world, and about its local impact on our daily life.

Currently, there is a rising tide of greater confidence in visual elements and increasing distrust and susceptibility towards the employment of particular linguistic uses. Steiner sequentially connects the decrease in the employment of language with the many areas of meaning belonging the non-verbal language while defending a more introspective exploration:

“This diminution –the fact that the image of the world is receding from the communicative grasp of the word- has had its impact on the quality of language. As Western consciousness has become less dependent on the resources

<sup>9</sup> For example, in Europe, we have comparative studies of gestures between Spanish culture and French (Rogerio 2015), German (Saldaña Rosique 2002; Springer 2010; Ascaso 2014), British (Montero 2009), Portuguese (Núñez 2010), Rumanian (Moreno 2011; Bóveda 2015), Italian (León 2008) and Greek (Fernández 2011; Barroso 2012; Pérez-Cecilia 2014; Pappá 2015). Referring to Asian continent, there are contrastive repertoires between Spanish and Bahreini (Guerrero 2014), Israeli (Torollo 2011), Chinese (Feng 2006; Xia 2007; Torres 2010; Rodríguez 2013), Japanese (Quintero 2005; Suzuki 2007), Vietnamese (de Pablo, 2012) and Philippine (Aragónés 2013).



of language to order experience and conduct the business of the mind, the words themselves seem to have lost some of their precision and vitality" (Steiner 1998:25).

Shifting from an emphasis on «nos-otros» to an emphasis on «los-otros» while preserving the perspective of plurality and similarity with the interlocutor is a real challenge both in everyday life and in the field of education. We live in a globalized world where migration, technology and tourism, among other factors, shape our negative or positive prejudices about culture. Thus, on the one hand, it is necessary to educate ourselves to participate in multicultural and non-hierarchical societies and, on the other hand, to plead for an exchange which is neither presumptuous nor ethnocentric.

For all these reasons, we promote the connection of the mother culture with the target one and the development of an affinity with the foreign culture. In consequence, the "intercultural speaker"<sup>10</sup> is provided with strategies that will facilitate their contact with other societies and allow him/her to be a cultural intermediary for dealing with intercultural misunderstandings and conflicts arising from interaction. Developing the "intercultural awareness" (CEFR 2001: 103) involves mastering both verbal and non-verbal communicative strategies and implies, in addition, the acceptance of established codes in a respectful way without slipping into stereotypes.

The present article demonstrates the conclusions of the results elicited by the comparison of the Turkish gesture corpus recorded as a paragon with the already existing one for Spanish culture (Nascimento 2012). The study, in addition to verifying the existence of particular and specific gestures from each culture, allows us to know which kinesic elements could imply greater difficulty and potentially cause misinterpretations in communication, because they possess a formal equivalence in both two cultures while possessing a different communicative value -they are the false kinesic cognates-. At the same time, we have been able to identify the existence of non-verbal components with the same meaning in both Turkish and Spanish cultures which are, nevertheless, performed differently. In the light of these results, the existence of synonym and polysemy paradigms among the basic kinesic signs in Spanish and Turkish cultures is established.

To summarize, after the study and the analysis of the corpus of emblematic gestures belonging to both Spanish (Nascimento 2012) and Turkish cultures (Murias 2016), we have been able to corroborate the occurrence of non-verbal signs that require special treatment in second and foreign language education programs -false kinesic cognates-. The findings presented here may be applied to diverse fields in the educational sphere, such as, the teaching of Spanish as a foreign language or the training of teachers in Turkey, through employing the bicultural inventory, and the development of materials and handbooks where basic non-verbal signs are included or emphasised.

Being aware of the importance of non-verbal behaviour and the recent interest in its application to the teaching of Spanish, we would like to conclude this paper with the hope and the desire that the research presented here encourages teachers and teacher-trainers to undertake analogous studies. Additionally, we hope

<sup>10</sup> Byram and Fleming (2001) question the term native speaker, and explicitly doubt whether it can only be applied to a person who was born where the language is spoken, or if it can also be used for someone who has learnt it throughout his/her life.

the study contributes sufficient and meaningful knowledge about the characteristics and the employment of Turkish and Spanish gestures so that it can be applied to the teaching of Spanish as a second and foreign language.

**Ruth Murias Román**

Universidad Internacional de la Rioja

[ruthmurias@gmail.com](mailto:ruthmurias@gmail.com)

## Referencias bibliográficas

- Argyle, Michael (1972): "Nonverbal communication in human social interaction", Robert A. Hinde (ed.), *Nonverbal Communication*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 243-269.
- Birdwhistell, Ray L. (1952): *Introduction to kinesics: An annotated system for analysis of body motion and gesture*, Washington, D. C.: Dept. of State, Foreign Service Institute.
- Birdwhistell, Ray L. (1970): *Kinesics and context. Essays on body motion communication*, New York: Ballantine Books.
- Birdwhistell, Ray L. (1974): "The language of the body: the natural environment of words", Albert Silverstein (ed.), *Human communication*, Hillsdale, N. J.: Lawrence Erlbaum, pp. 203-220.
- Bloomfield, Leonard (1914): *An introduction to the study of language*, New York: Holt.
- Bloomfield, Leonard (1926): "A set of postulates for the science of language", *Language*, 2 (3), pp. 153-164.
- Bloomfield, Leonard (1933): *Language*, New York: Holt.
- Byram, Michael & Fleming, Michael (2001): *Perspectivas interculturales en el aprendizaje de idiomas. Enfoques a través del teatro y la etnografía*, Madrid: Cambridge University Press.
- Cestero Mancera, Ana M. (1999a): *Comunicación no verbal y enseñanza de lenguas extranjeras*, Madrid: Arco/Libros.
- Cestero Mancera, Ana M. (1999b): *Repertorio básico de signos no verbales del español*, Madrid: Arco/Libros.
- Cestero Mancera, Ana M. (2004): "La comunicación no verbal y el aprendizaje de lenguas extranjeras", J. Sánchez Lobato & I. Santos Gargallo (dirs.), *Vademécum para la formación de profesores. Enseñar español como segunda lengua/lengua extranjera*, Madrid: SGEL, pp. 593-616.
- Cestero Mancera, Ana M. (2016): "La comunicación no verbal: propuestas metodológicas para su estudio", *Lingüística en la Red*. Monograph XIV (1), pp. 1-25. [Retrieved from: [http://www.linred.es/numero13\\_2\\_monografico\\_Art1.html](http://www.linred.es/numero13_2_monografico_Art1.html)]
- Cestero Mancera, Ana M. (2017): "La comunicación no verbal", Ana M. Cestero Mancera & Inmaculada Penadés (eds.), *Manual del profesor de E/LE*, Alcalá de Henares: Universidad de Alcalá.
- Council of Europe (2001): *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Darwin, Charles (1955, repub.): *The expression of the emotions in man and animals*, New York: Philosophical Library.
- Efron, David (1941): *Gestures and environment*, New York: King's Crown. [Repub. *Gesture, Race and Culture*, The Hague: Mouton Publishers, 1972. Span. Trans. : *Gesto, raza y cultura*, Buenos Aires: Nueva Visión, 1970].
- Ekman, Paul (1976): "Movements with precise meanings", *Journal of Communication*, 26 (3) pp. 14-26.
- Ekman, Paul & Friesen Wallace (1969): "The repertoire of nonverbal behavior: categories, origins, usage, and coding", Adam Kendon (ed.), *Non-verbal communication, interaction, and gesture. Selections from Semiotica*, The Hague: Mouton Publishers, pp. 49-98.
- Fernández-Dols, José Miguel (2013): "Nonverbal communication: origins, adaptation, and functionality", Judith A. Hall, & Mark L. Knapp (eds.), *Nonverbal communication (Handbooks of Communication Science, HOCS 2.)*, Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, pp. 69-92.

- Hall, Edward (1959): *The Silent Language*, Garden City: Doubleday and Company.
- Harms, Leroy S. (1973): *International communication*, New York: Harper and Row.
- Kendon, Adam (1969): "Progress report of an investigation into aspects of the structure and function of the social performance in two-person encounters", in Michael Argyle: *Social Interaction*, New York: Atherton.
- Kendon, Adam (1984): "Did gesture escape the curse of Babel", Aaron Wolfgang (ed.), *Nonverbal Behavior. Perspectives, Applications, Intercultural Insights*, Lewiston: C. J. Hogrefe, pp. 75-114.
- Kendon, Adam (1994): "Do gestures communicate. A review", *Research on language and social interaction*, 27, pp. 175-200.
- Knapp, Mark L. (1982): *La comunicación no verbal. El cuerpo y el entorno*, Barcelona: Paidós.
- La Barre, Weston (1978): "Paralingüística, cinésica y antropología cultural", Thomas. A. Sebeok, Alfred Hayes, & Mary C. Bateson, (comp.), *Semiótica Aplicada*, Buenos Aires: Ediciones Nueva Visión, pp. 251-290.
- Lieberman, Philip (1975): *On the origins of language: an introduction to the evolution of human speech*, New York: Macmillan Publishing Co.
- Malh, George (1968): "Gestures and body movement", John Shlein (ed.), *Research in Psychotherapy, Volume 3*. Washington D.C.: American Psychological Association, pp. 295-346.
- Martinell Gifre, Emma. (2007): "La gestualidad hoy, en el marco de la competencia intercultural y de la tendencia a la globalización", *Actas del XVII Congreso de ASELE*. [Retrieved from: [http://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/fichero\\_articulo?codigo=2413987&orden=0](http://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/fichero_articulo?codigo=2413987&orden=0)]
- Miquel, Lourdes & Sans, Neus (2004): "El componente cultural: un ingrediente más en las clases de lengua", *RedELE*, 0. [Retrieved from: [http://www.mecd.gob.es/dctm/redele/MaterialRedEle/Revista/2004\\_00/2004\\_redELE\\_0\\_22Miquel.pdf?documentId=0901e72b80e0c8d9](http://www.mecd.gob.es/dctm/redele/MaterialRedEle/Revista/2004_00/2004_redELE_0_22Miquel.pdf?documentId=0901e72b80e0c8d9)]
- Murias Román, Ruth (2016): *Signos no verbales españoles y turcos: estudio comparativo para su aplicación a la enseñanza de ELE*, unpublished doctoral thesis, Alcalá de Henares: Universidad de Alcalá.
- Nascimento Dominique, Nilma (2007): *Emblemas gestuales españoles y brasileños: estudio comparativo*, unpublished doctoral thesis, Alcalá de Henares: Universidad de Alcalá.
- Nascimento Dominique, Nilma (2012): *La comunicación sin palabras. Estudio comparativo de gestos usados en España y Brasil*, Alcalá de Henares: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Alcalá.
- Ortega y Rodríguez, Sergio (2007): "Lenguaje no verbal y gestualidad: dos vertientes en los estudios del lenguaje", *Graffylia: Revista de la Facultad de Filosofía y Letras*, 7, pp. 61-70. [Retrieved from: <http://www.filosofia.buap.mx/Graffylia/7/61.pdf>]
- Poyatos, Fernando (ed.) (1983): *New perspectives in nonverbal communication: Studies in Cultural Anthropology, Social Psychology, Linguistics, Literature and Semiotics*, Ontario: Pergamon Press.
- Poyatos, Fernando (1994a): *La comunicación no verbal. Cultura, lenguaje y conversación*, Madrid: Istmo.
- Poyatos, Fernando (1994b): *La comunicación no verbal. Paralenguaje, kinésica e interacción*, Madrid: Istmo.
- Poyatos, Fernando (2002a): *Nonverbal Communication across Disciplines, Vol. I: Culture, Sensory Interaction, Speech, Conversation*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins.
- Poyatos, Fernando (2002b): *Nonverbal Communication across Disciplines, Vol. II: Paralanguage, Kinesics, Silence, Personal and Environmental Interaction*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins.

- Poyatos, Fernando (2017): *La comunicación no verbal en la enseñanza integral del Español como Lengua Extranjera*, E-eleando. ELE en Red. Monograph 1. [Retrieved from: <http://www.meleuah.es/e-eleando/>]
- Sapir, Edward (1927): "Speech as a personality trait", David G. Mandelbaum (ed.), *Selected Writings of Edward Sapir in language, culture and presonality*, Berkeley: University of California Press, pp. 533-543.
- Sapir, Edward (1949): "The unconscious patterning of behavior in society", David G. Mandelbaum (ed.), *Culture, Language and Personality: Selected Essays*, Berkeley: University of California Press, pp. 544-560.
- Scheflen, Albert E. (1974): *How behavior means*, New York: Anchor Press.
- Steiner, George (1998): *Language and silence. Essays on Language, Literature and the Inhuman*, New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Tomkins, Silvan (1975): "The fantasy behind the face", *Journal of Personality Assesment*, 39, pp. 551-560.