

nonverbal communication discipline already owes a great debt to Professor Ekman for conceptual clarifications between nonverbal communication and nonverbal behavior (1, 2). I think that the article reacted to here could add to that debt if read by others with the different emphasis suggested in this brief rejoinder.

**REFERENCES**

1. Ekman, Paul. "Communication through Nonverbal Behavior: A Source of Information about an Interpersonal Relationship." In S. S. Tomkins and C. E. Izard (Eds.) *Affect, Cognition, and Personality*. New York: Springer, 1965.
2. Ekman, Paul and Wallace V. Friesen. "The Repertoire of Nonverbal Behavior: Categories, Origins, Usage and Coding." *Semiotica* 1(1), 1969, pp. 49-98.
3. Koneya, Mele and Alton Barbour. *Louder than Words: Nonverbal Communication*. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1976.

MELE KONEYA  
*University of Oregon*

*Author's reply:*

*What's in a Name?*

It seems an odd preoccupation for students of "nonverbal communication" to be concerned with a name. My purpose is to better understand facial and body movement, and in order to do so I believe it is important to distinguish symbolic movements (emblems) from other activities.

Koneya fails to understand my criticism of those scientists who ignore the distinction between emblems and illustrators in their research on body movement. Koneya would have them exclude emblems from consideration, a strategy equally misguided as the unwitting lumping of emblems and illustrators into a single measure of "gesture," "gesticulation," or "object-focused movements." To exclude emblems is to not learn about important human activities, and to obscure the understanding of movements which are not emblems. To not distinguish emblems from other body movements in measurement of hand in space activity can hide important findings.

Let me briefly describe a series of findings which would not have emerged from the data analysis if we had combined emblems with other hand in space activity as was done by Kendon, Knapp, Mahl, Mehrabian, and Rosenfeld. In studies of deceptive interactions we have found: illustrators decreased and an emblem (the shrug) increased from the honest to deceptive session; shifts in illustrators but not emblems correlated with shifts in voice pitch; illustrators but not emblems correlated with dominance; illustrators not emblems correlated with the observer's impression that the person is outgoing and sociable (5).

I do not believe that emblems stand for words in "the same way that configurations of written letters and spaces or spoken sounds can stand for words," a belief Koneya suspects I hold. There may be some resemblances, but I doubt there is an identity between how the face and body may be employed to signify in a precise way a word or phrase, and how that is done

with the alphabet, smoke signals, or the graphic symbols that Koneya wants to group together. I think it mistaken to start with the assumption of similarity. We should instead seek to discover if there are properties which are unique to each activity.

Koneya is intent on purifying the realm of nonverbal communication, ridding from the ranks anything which smacks of the verbal or symbolic. I can see no reason to do so, even if it might help undergraduates obtain a "palatable" definition. Koneya would divide human behavior into two domains—nonverbal and verbal. Emblems and any other signs which are symbolic he would assign to the verbal domain. This reminds me of the distinction I proposed nearly twenty years ago between nonverbal, vocal and verbal behavior (2). I no longer think it too useful to try to so divide the realm. Surely we must recognize that people speak, write, dream, sign, and move their face and body (to name just some observable behaviors). Friesen and I have argued (4) that if we consider the origin, coding and usage of body and facial movements we will find not one type of activity, but many different types of activities, of which emblems are but one. I see no easy way to divide the phenomena into but two or three groups, lumping together activities which may be quite different. Nor do I think we should advocate the development of specialists who consider but one activity or another. Certainly it is legitimate to study any one activity—emblems, illustrators, facial expressions, adaptors, regulators, speech content, paralanguage, etc. It is legitimate to study them all. It depends upon one's interest or objective. If one is interested in the phenomena of emotion, for example, then one would be likely to want to include all the behaviors just listed plus such nonobservables as electrical and biochemical measures of the state of the organism. If one is interested in social interaction, then face, body, voice, speech, paralinguistic phenomena might all be considered as well as measures of role, status, and other indices of the structure of the interaction.

My own interest for many years has been peculiarly focused on an attempt to understand what people do with their face and body when alone and with others, as these behaviors relate to emotion, mood, personality, and social interaction. I doubt that I can exclude from my consideration any one type of facial and bodily activity if I am to reach understanding of the others, nor can I exclude speech or voice. Theory about one of these activities requires theoretical consideration of the others. I can ill afford to exclude emblems, for example, if I wish to understand facial expressions of emotion; (see discussion of the confusion between emblematic facial expressions and felt facial expressions, 3, pp. 180-185).

Perhaps the issues raised by Koneya arise because there is no suitable name for the endeavor of those whose interest is in facial and body movement. Certainly those last five words are an awkward way to define the scope of the phenomena examined. And, they imply a disinterest in such static matters as posture. But what shall we call it?

*Nonverbal behavior*: that implies that what distinguishes the phenomena is that it isn't words, and that is not necessarily what motivates much of the interest or theory; further, it is strange to use a term that defines a phenomenon by what it is not (see 6).

*Motor behavior*: that implies an interest in skills.

*Kinesics*: that is identified with but one theoretical and methodological viewpoint (1).

Exp  
some in  
approp  
Vis:  
phenor

Let  
is imp  
plexity  
and be  
activity

#### REFER

1. Birdv  
P:
2. Ekm.  
P:
3. Ekm.  
D  
A:
4. Ekm.  
g:
5. Ekm.  
D
6. Sebe

IC  
d  
ti  
s  
I  
F  
R  
II  
A  
E  
I  
A  
S

*Expressive behavior:* that term implies the action is a manifestation of some internal affective state of personality characteristic, which is probably appropriate for only some facial or body movements.

*Visually observed behavior:* awkward and odd to define a range of phenomena by how they are sensed.

Let us not worry about what we call the study of the face or body. What is important is that those who do so seek to illuminate the possible complexity and variety of activities, not neglecting how the actions of the face and body interrelate with other behavior of the organism and with the activity of other persons.

**REFERENCES**

1. Birdwhistell, R. L. *Kinesics and Context*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1970.
2. Ekman, P. "A Methodological Discussion of Nonverbal Behavior." *Journal of Psychology* 43, 1957, pp. 141-149.
3. Ekman, P. "Cross Cultural Studies of Facial Expression." In P. Ekman (Ed.) *Darwin and Facial Expression: A Century of Research in Review*. New York: Academic Press, 1973.
4. Ekman, P. and W. V. Friesen. "The Repertoire of Nonverbal Behavior: Categories, Origins, Usage, and Coding." *Semiotica* 1 (1), 1969, pp. 49-98.
5. Ekman, P., W. V. Friesen, and K. Scherer. "Body Movement and Voice Pitch in Deceptive Interaction." *Semiotica*, 1976, in press.
6. Sebeok, T. A. "The Semiotic Web: A Chronicle of Prejudices." *Semiotica*, in press.

PAUL EKMAN

University of California, San Francisco

**THE 27TH ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL COMMUNICATION ASSOCIATION  
&  
AN INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE  
ON COMMUNICATION SCIENCES**

ICA invites you to participate in its 1977 Annual Conference. The event is designed to blend the best of the European and American scholarly traditions into a week-long meeting at Berlin's Kongresshalle. Communication scholars from all parts of the world will participate from May 29/June 4, 1977.

For additional information, please contact:

**Robert L. Cox, Executive Secretary**  
INTERNATIONAL COMMUNICATION  
ASSOCIATION  
Balcones Research Center  
10,100 Burnet Road  
Austin, Texas 78758  
512/836-0440 ext. 225

**Ulrich Neveling**  
Freie Universitat Berlin  
Institut fur Publizistik  
1 Berlin 33  
Hagenstrasse 56 (Am Roseneck)  
GERMANY