

NONVERBAL COMMUNICATION BETWEEN PEACEWORKERS IN TRAINING: AN INTEGRAL AND CROSS-
CULTURAL PERSPECTIVE

by

Jennifer Ouellette

A Capstone submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts in English as a Second Language

Hamline University

Saint Paul, Minnesota

August 2007

Committee:

Andreas Schramm

George Lakey

Brandy George

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW.....	15
The Integral Approach.....	18
Physiological and Biological Dimensions of Nonverbal Communication.....	27
Nonverbal Communication and the Structure of Human Consciousness.....	35
Cross-Cultural Communication.....	49
Awareness, Identity and Relationship.....	57
Cultural Value Types and Orientations.....	70
Nonverbal Behavior.....	75
Summary.....	105
CHAPTER 3: METHODS.....	107
Setting and Participants.....	107
Study Design.....	108
Data Collection Techniques.....	110
Data Analysis.....	112
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS.....	114
Introduction.....	114
The Data.....	118
Summary.....	171
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION.....	176
Major Findings and Implications.....	176
Limitations and Future Study.....	186

NONVERBAL COMMUNICATION BETWEEN PEACEWORKERS IN TRAINING: AN INTEGRAL AND CROSS-CULTURAL PERSPECTIVE

Ouellette, J. *Nonverbal Communication Between Peaceworkers in Training: An Integral and Cross-Cultural Perspective* (2007)

The purpose of this study on cross-cultural nonverbal communication (NVC) was to better understand what contributes to discord in cross-cultural NVC. Up to 80 percent of face-to-face communication takes place nonverbally. The meanings of nonverbal signals, and the display rules that govern their expression, differ culturally. Ken Wilber's Integral Approach was used to look at the interrelationship between exterior and interior elements of a communicative event.

A conflict negotiation role play was video-taped during a training of international peace workers in Kenya 2006 for the Nonviolent Peaceforce (NP). The study suggests that much nonverbal miscommunication is affective; that nonverbal behaviors can perpetuate conflict; and that much of our nonverbal behavior and interpretation is unconscious. The study also suggests that this lack of awareness may contribute more to discord than cultural differences. Implications for NVC training in NP and in the ESL/EFL classroom are discussed.

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

This study of cross-cultural nonverbal communication was conceived during the formative stages of a project with an organization called the Nonviolent Peace Force (NP), whose mission is “to build a trained, international civilian nonviolent peace force” in unarmed intervention and deploy them to countries struggling with internal conflict situations. Its mission, in part, is to “prevent death and destruction and protect human rights, thus creating the space for local groups to struggle nonviolently, enter into dialog, and seek peaceful resolution.” (Mission statement, 2005, ¶1)

These peace workers are trained to employ nonviolent methodologies to assist the realization of these goals, including:

- Accompanying civil society activists
- Providing protective presence in villages and at public events
- Monitoring demonstrations and other volatile situations
- Connecting people to resources
- Linking local leaders, local authorities, community based organizations (CBOs), and other individuals
- Introducing other NGOs and INGOs to the area
- Consulting with local activists and people in general on options what to do in crisis
- Providing safe places to meet. (Nonviolent Peaceforce, 2005)

In December 2002, the Nonviolent Peace Force identified Sri Lanka for its pilot project. Fifty civilians from different countries went to Sri Lanka to help build a grassroots foundation to sustain the cease fire and support the peace negotiations that had been in place when the project began.

The NP delegate teams are internationally comprised. As a multicultural team interacting in a new cultural environment, it is clear that NP peace workers will be called up on to communicate cross-culturally, daily. Because nonverbal communication constitutes up to 80 percent of communication, the likelihood that they will need to navigate high volumes of cross-cultural nonverbal communication, often under exceptional tension, is inevitable.

Nonverbal communication, even within a culture, is rife with the potential for ambiguity and misinterpretation. For one thing, the number of nonverbal behaviors possible are physically limited, so fewer expressions carry more possible meanings than in verbal lexicons (Hickson, Stacks, & Moore, 2007). Contradictory or incongruous nonverbal and verbal signals can also create ambiguity, and nonverbal signals within a single communicative event can themselves be inconsistent and thereby ambiguous (Knapp & Hall, 2002). Depending upon the personal tendencies and the cultural backgrounds of the communicators in a given situation, as well as the cultural and pragmatic contexts of a communicative event, nonverbal signals can be more or less heavily relied upon to clarify ambiguity and establish credibility or a lack thereof (Knapp & Hall, 2002).

Since NP delegates work in intense and often volatile conflict situations, interactions will often be highly charged with critical stakes, with potentially grim consequences for communicative mishaps or gaps.

Because nonverbal communication is replete with potential for miscommunication, the need for both training in the skills related to, and awareness around the phenomenon of, cross-cultural nonverbal communication for NP workers is vital. In response to the latter, this project endeavors to provide a panorama of, and make explicit, the major components and dynamics thereof that both support and obstruct successful cross-cultural nonverbal communication. The lens then hones in on the use of nonverbal devices, especially posture, gesture, facial expressions and eye movement within the context of a role play by members of an international NP trainee team.

One scenario in which successful nonverbal communication apparently played a role in a communicative interaction on the field in Sri Lanka—successful at least insofar as no errors were made that prevented the resolution of the conflict at hand—is portrayed in the Nonviolent Peace Force 2005 Annual Report (2005):.

“In Trincomalee, an NP vehicle was stopped forcefully by more than 20 highly charged youth. They banged the NP vehicle and accused NP of facilitating a meeting between a Buddhist monk and LTTE (Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam) political head. They criticized NGOs of being biased. Rather than driving away, the NP Field Team members carefully listened to their grievances and clarified the misunderstandings. After an hour of discussions, the mob apologized for their threats and asked NP to visit them anytime.” (p. 2).

It would have been interesting to have been able to observe the nonverbal communication within this exchange. What was happening, particularly with the peace workers, in terms of their posture, gesture,

facial expressions, and eye movement? Did their nonverbal communication help create trust? What was the interplay between verbal and nonverbal expressions? What was the interplay between the nonverbal signals themselves? What made the nonverbal communication 'work'? Was there anything that didn't 'work' and if so how was the miscommunication mitigated? How were potential obstacles for communication mitigated? It would have been illuminating to have been able to look at this information in light of the peace workers' recounting of the extent to which they were aware of their nonverbal expression and what conscious choices they made, and how they felt their nonverbal communication affected the response of the 20 youth, and how the nonverbal signals they used universally or culturally specifically correlated to the conditions that may have been present at some point in the interaction, such as aggression, nonaggression, respect, suspicion, sincerity, fear and confidence. It also may have been illuminating to hear feedback from the youth on what they observed and 'picked up' from the body language of the peace workers, how that affected their perceptions of the interaction, the peace workers and their intentions. It would also have been instructive to have understood the respective cultural pragmatic rules regarding circumstances in which those signals are appropriate, inappropriate, effective or ineffective, and whether any pragmatic incongruity appeared or was navigated in this interaction.

The questions posed above begin to demand a comprehensive vantage point from which to explore the phenomenon of cross-cultural nonverbal communication. Any lens that could capture the essence of nonverbal communication needs to invite and consider the entire spectrum of factors that comprise it, including nonverbal signals within communicative context; the overall system of nonverbal communication itself; the respective interior conditions of the individuals in the communicative event, their perceptive interpretations, and the factors that determine them; the cultural factors influencing

the nonverbal signals and their use, and the intercultural juxtapositions thereof; and the evolutionary and physiological foundation that allows for and demands the phenomenon of nonverbal communication in the first place. Such a lens could at any time hone in on specific elements, but never irrespective of the other elements that they are dynamically interdependent upon and inseparable from.

This inquiry is rooted in the sense that these factors, along with all of the other factors that create and contribute to cross-cultural communication or miscommunication, in any given communicative event, are multifaceted and in dynamic interrelationship with one another; that no particular aspect of any communicative event, including any nonverbal communicative event, is necessarily primary or autonomous; that there are mutually and interdependently co-occurring variables in any given nonverbal communicative event that create and influence the circumstances for communication or miscommunication, and that the general phenomenon of nonverbal communication, and any nonverbal communicative event, can not be reduced to any of the elements that dynamically comprise it.

A theoretical approach that is strikingly capable of holding a space for each of these elements and their interrelationships is the Integral Approach developed by American philosopher Ken Wilber. “Integral” in any context, including the Integral approach, refers to “covering all the bases.” Wilber’s Integral model began as an attempt to fashion a comprehensive map of consciousness, and has, over the course of twenty years of writing and research, evolved into a “comprehensive map of human capacities” ... “created by a cross-cultural comparison of most of the known forms of human inquiry.” (The Integral Approach, 2006, p. 2).

The Integral model recognizes that any phenomenon can be viewed from at least four fundamental perspectives, including:

- the *interior individual* perspective, e.g., personal subjective experience;
- the *exterior individual* perspective, e.g., the physical, tangible correlates of the subjective personal experience, such as a smile that correlates to a happy mood;
- the *interior collective* perspective, including shared personal subjective experience, e.g., culture, and;
- the *exterior collective* perspective, e.g., systems within the physical, manifest world, such as the field of linguistics, or of nonverbal or cross-cultural communication.

It is this model that will provide much of the framework within which to explore the spectrum of elements that comprise the phenomenon of nonverbal communication itself, and any particular instance thereof within a communicative event. Within the exchange between the NP peace workers and Tamil youth in Trincomalee, we could look at the physical nonverbal signals themselves from the *individual exterior* perspective; the interior states, intentions, and perceptions of the peace workers and the youth from the *individual interior* perspective; the shared unshared cultural information and systems of meaning-making in the *collective interior* perspective, and the more general system of nonverbal communication itself from the *collective exterior* perspective.

The Integral approach by definition assumes an All Quadrant All Level All Line (AQAL) perspective. In addition to including the all-quadrant perspectives described above, an AQAL view of any phenomenon also takes levels, lines and types into account. *All-levels* refers to the various orders of complexity within each quadrant. *All-lines* refers to the various distinct capacities that develop through each of these

levels of complexity, e.g., developmental lines along linguistic and interpersonal capacities. *All-states* refers to the temporary occurrence of any aspect of reality within the four quadrants, e.g., an individual's state of emotion, or a country's political state. *All-types* refers to the variety of styles that appear in various domains, e.g., high-context and low-context types of communication within cultures, which are distinguished based on the amount of meaning found in the context versus in the coded message in a communicative interaction. (Leonard, 2004, p. 9).

My research question is rooted in the recognition of the need for awareness for internationally recruited and deployed peace workers around what supports and obstructs cross-cultural nonverbal communication along with a sense that this awareness, in order to be complete, must acknowledge and incorporate the major elements that comprise it. To understand the elements that create successful cross-cultural nonverbal communication, and the points at which the communicative process is most susceptible to breaking down, it is vital that none of the elements be left out that may create, or combine to create, the circumstances for communication or miscommunication. With a lens incorporating the quadrants, levels, lines, states, and types of elements that occur within cross cultural nonverbal communication, an AQAL approach can most inclusively envelop and delineate the phenomenon of communication and miscommunication nonverbally and cross-culturally.

In order to provide a communicative context for looking at cross-cultural communication, and to most relevantly respond to the specific communicative needs of NP, I look at how nonverbal communication functions generally and how it functions cross-culturally. In the data analysis section of this thesis, I examine the role of NVC within the speech event *raising a concern* during a role play at an NP training. Originally, I also intended to examine the role of NVC in the speech event of *projecting confidence* in

another exercise during the training. Training for Change (TFC), whose international peacekeeping curriculum has served as the curricular base for NP and many similar organizations, has identified *projecting confidence* as an intercultural communicative goal for international peace workers, and it is a goal that NP workers will have to apply primarily in relationship to the general public and the people that they come into contact with through their work. The highest-risk activities that peace workers are trained in require the highest levels of confidence to carry out. Projecting confidence occurs largely through nonverbal communication. TFC has identified “projecting confidence and a positive, calming presence to others” as a necessary skill for navigating immediate conflict in nonviolent intervention, and the trainings that their curriculum informs, including the trainings of NP’s peace workers, emphasize this skill and include role plays so that peace workers in training can practice accessing and projecting confidence under high stress. Unfortunately, as explained in Chapter 3, the data collected from this exercise was unsuitable for analysis for this purpose.

Raising a concern is a goal in which trainees develop communication strategies for negotiating conflict with their own team members. The data for this project came from a role play in which participants practiced this exercise during a Nonviolent Peaceforce training in Nairobi, Kenya during November and December of 2006.

My motivation for this research undertaking can be expressed in terms of *what* and *how*.

The *what* aspects include nonverbal communication as a focus, international peace work as a broad context, and projecting confidence and raising a concern as specific communicative environments.

Focusing on nonverbal communication is an attempt to unveil some of the richest, but not necessarily

obvious, elements that contribute to how we communicate – how we achieve, or fail to achieve, shared meaning, as well what types of meaning are generally communicated nonverbally. The context of international peace work provides a communicative environment in which achieving shared meaning is uniquely critical. Yet whatever this research sheds light on, regarding what contributes to and what obstructs shared meaning, can also be applied to any number of communicative environments, including teaching and learning about nonverbal communication cross-culturally in a language teaching environment. Nonverbal communication is rarely an explicit part of a language curriculum, but if a language learner is to successfully communicate with members of another culture, which generally goes hand in hand with another language, they need information on cultural NVC as well as verbal language. The specific speech event *raising a concern* is of interest because of the level of impact that its success or lack thereof could have on high-stakes communication efforts, and because of how failing to achieve shared meaning when negotiating conflict can impede not only communication within that interaction, but communication goals between parties, generally.

The *how* aspects of this research include the approaches that I find most compelling and relevant for looking at what is actually happening during nonverbal communication. At the early stages of forming this project, I considered how nonverbal behaviors might be expressed during specific speech acts that would most likely be relevant in international peace work contexts. During this same time, a friend emailed me a link to photos of women from all over the world who were competing in the 2006 Miss Universe Pageant. I noticed, as I was browsing through the photos, that some of the women struck me as authentically sexy, while others struck me as ‘trying’ to look sexy. Most of the women who struck me as authentically sexy were Latin and Mediterranean, and most of those who struck me as ‘trying’ to look sexy were North American. Although there was nothing in the appearance itself that I could narrow it

down to that would account for this very different sense that I experienced, the sense was very clear, and I would have been willing to bet that if the women's interior states could have been accessed, I'd find a reason that would validate my intuition – namely, that the women who seemed most authentically sexy would turn out to be genuinely more at ease with their sexuality, with themselves, and with sexuality generally, while the ones who looked like they were trying to be sexy would probably turn out to be more self-conscious, affected, or less genuine.

This experience and reflection brought home a few points. First, that looking at nonverbal behavior only in relationship to functions or cultural rules, without taking into account the subjective states of those in communication, would potentially reduce any exploration of NVC to the exterior manifestations of that phenomenon. It would thereby deplete it of any human relevance, or implications for how to successfully communicate and achieve authenticity in NVC. This drove my interest in using an AQAL model for looking at all dimensions of what happens during a NVC interaction. Secondly, the fact that my intuition so strongly affected my impression of these women, and my impression of their affective states, made it clear to me that this level of intuitive conviction regarding how other people feel based on their nonverbal behavior happens all the time, often implicitly and unquestioned. Thirdly, I realized that in order for my convictions to arise regarding what another person is thinking or feeling, I must somehow be referencing my own interior in relationship to what I see in them. This reliance upon intuition could result in me being deeply accurate, or deeply inaccurate, perhaps aware of my process, and perhaps not. In either case, the fact I was making meaning and drawing conclusions from the pageant competitors' nonverbal expressions by referencing my own sense, and the fact that this sense was a process that I couldn't easily define or articulate, but seemed to be something I could simply *feel*, led to the conviction that this type of intuitive process is actually going on all the time, and is quite

influential when we make meaning from each others' nonverbal behaviors. This left me with the impression that if we at least know that this process is happening and a bit about how it works, we may be able to bring it more into conscious awareness, and therefore increase our odds of successfully achieving shared meaning and preventing miscommunication based on unconscious assumptions.

My intention in this research was that looking at all aspects of nonverbal communication within the AQAL framework would reveal not only important elements within nonverbal, cross-cultural communication, but significant inter-dynamics thereof, and that an awareness of these elements and processes can serve anyone who needs to express themselves and understand others in cross-cultural communicative contexts, especially in peace building endeavors such as those undertaken by NP, and clearly also in ESL/EFL teaching contexts.

Toward this aim, I posed the following research statement:

I'm studying nonverbal communication as an AQAL phenomenon because I want to understand the nonverbal communicative devices used within the speech act of projecting confidence and raising concerns in cross-cultural communicative contexts, in relationship to what is mutually and interdependently co-occurring in all four quadrants during the speech event, in order to shed light on the co-occurring variables across the quadrants that create the circumstances for cross-cultural nonverbal communication and miscommunication, with the application of creating more awareness around the variables that cultivate and obstruct successful cross-cultural nonverbal communication.

In this inquiry, I look at the evolution of nonverbal communication, and at nonverbal communication as a psychobiological phenomenon, in order to understand why and how nonverbal communication exists, and what some of its unique characteristics are, and how they operate. I then look at the phenomenon of nonverbal, cross-cultural communication as an AQAL phenomenon, highlighting the main elements that appear in the individual interior, individual exterior, collective interior, and collective exterior quadrants, in order to begin to parse out the dynamic elements that support and obstruct cross-cultural nonverbal communication. I bring some specific major components of cross-cultural nonverbal communication into focus after introducing them through the AQAL model, including nonverbal behaviors and functions, and cross-cultural communication.

In order to address this question, I videotaped a role play during the 2006 Nonviolent Peace Force training, which took place in Nairobi, Kenya. The participants in the training, who will also be the participants in the role play, came from different countries and cultures. All spoke English, and the training and role play were conducted in English.

I video taped workshop participants during a role play in which they are asked to raise a concern to other field team members. I followed up the video-taping session with questions posed to those participating and watching, to look for where and how their interpretations indicate shared meaning, and where and how their interpretations indicate a sense of discord or lack of shared meaning. I then looked at all of the variables in an AQAL framework to provide the fullest possible picture of what is going on, taking nonverbal expressions, verbal communication, subjective interpretations, and cultural communication issues into account.

Where miscommunication occurred in the role play, my expectation was that instead of simply looking at the nonverbal expressions and functions themselves, that looking at all of the dynamics in relationship to each other will provide a richer picture of—or richer information about—what contributes to miscommunication, and how. I hope that what is discovered will have implications for avoiding cross-cultural miscommunication, and cultivating communication, with an emphasis on nonverbal communication. These implications will serve as a foundation for a curricular proposal for the Nonviolent Peace Force with an emphasis on raising awareness around nonverbal communication in cross-cultural interactions.

In the next chapter, I will explore the evolutionary, physiological and biological aspects of NVC, and how they collectively comprise one major vehicle through which nonverbal expression and perception occur. These biological explanations for nonverbal behavior also provide a foundation for looking at models of the structure of consciousness itself. These models provide a meta-level explanation of consciousness and how communication, or shared meaning, can come about in the first place. This chapter will also look at the nature and nurture aspects of what influences NVC. Finally, several prime areas of NVC will be addressed.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter will provide a framework for addressing the research question stated in Chapter 1:

I'm studying nonverbal communication as an AQAL phenomenon because I want to understand the nonverbal communicative devices used within the speech act of projecting confidence and raising concerns in cross-cultural communicative contexts, in relationship to what is mutually and interdependently co-occurring in all four quadrants during the speech event, in order to shed light on the co-occurring variables across the quadrants that create the circumstances for cross-cultural nonverbal communication and miscommunication, with the application of creating more awareness around the variables that cultivate and obstruct successful cross-cultural nonverbal communication.

An additional application of this research will be a curricular proposal for the organization whose training will comprise the data for my research, the Nonviolent Peace Force.

The literature reviewed in this chapter will provide theoretical perspectives for looking at some of the major interdependently co-occurring variables of cross-cultural nonverbal communication (NVC), and the dynamics therein, in order to offer a context for understanding what influences cross-cultural nonverbal communication and miscommunication. Successful communication can be described as achieved shared meaning, in relationship to content and affect, among the individuals in communication, and miscommunication can be described as failure to achieve shared meaning, conscious or unconscious.

This framework for looking at the variables of cross-cultural NVC will also become the foundation for interpreting the communicative dynamics of two specific instances of cross-cultural NVC during role plays among international participants in the Nonviolent Peace Force (NP) 2006 training, which will be examined in chapter 4.

In this chapter, I will explore the evolutionary, physiological and biological aspects of NVC, in order to reveal how they help account for and affect what happens during nonverbal expression and perception, and how they collectively comprise one major vehicle through which nonverbal expression and perception occur. These biological explanations for how nonverbal behavior occurs and is perceived, rooted in the limbic brain, also provide a foundation for looking at models of the structure of consciousness itself as developed in the field of embodied cognitive science. These models provide a meta-level explanation of consciousness and how communication, or shared meaning, can come about in the first place. They also have implications for what happens during nonverbal communication, including yet going beyond what happens on a brain-based physiological level. This chapter will also look at the nature and nurture aspects of what influences NVC. The areas of NVC that will be primarily addressed include:

- body communication
- facial communication
- eye communication
- territoriality (how we create an experience of encroachment in others, and how we experience encroachment, by the use of space in interpersonal interactions)

- paralanguage (how we communicate through variation in pitch, rate, volume, pauses, and other audible nonverbal behaviors)

A more comprehensive discussion of areas of NVC can be found in the section “Nonverbal behavior” further below.

The nature–based influences on nonverbal behaviors will correspond primarily with behaviors insofar as they are evolutionarily and physiologically determined. The nurture based influences include what we learn and incorporate into our meaning-making systems from the outside. This chapter will focus primarily on culture and cultural differences. Finally, this chapter will look at what gets communicated during cross-cultural interactions, and at the role of NVC in those communications.

The Integral Approach

As noted in Chapter 1, any framework that can describe the phenomenon of cross-cultural NVC needs to allow for and be able to integrate the full spectrum of factors that comprise it. This spectrum includes nonverbal signals themselves within communicative context; nonverbal communication as a system; the interior conditions of the individuals in the communicative event, including their perceptive interpretations, and the factors that determine them; cultural and intercultural factors influencing nonverbal signals and their use; and the evolutionary and physiological foundational factors that create the ground for and necessitate the phenomenon of nonverbal communication in the first place.

The Integral Approach developed by American philosopher Ken Wilber provides a framework for dynamically addressing all of these aspects of NVC. Any phenomenon that is examined from an Integral

perspective is recognized as a dynamic event comprised of, and irreducible to, any single one of its co-arising components. The Integral approach attempts to identify all of the important variables that contribute to and create a given phenomenon.

The Integral Institute, a nonprofit organization and global think tank “dedicated to bringing the Integral Approach to bear on personal and global issues” responds to the question, “What’s ‘Integral’?” as follows:

“It simply means more balanced, comprehensive, interconnected, and whole. By using an Integral approach—whether it's in business, personal development, art, education, or spirituality (or any of dozens of other fields)—we can include more aspects of reality, and more of our humanity, in order to become more fully awake and effective in anything we do.” (Integral Institute, 2006, ¶12).

Five major domains comprise the Integral approach: *quadrants, levels, lines, states, and types*. Together, these domains create the All Quadrants, All Levels, All Lines (AQAL) model. I will explore what each of these domains includes, both generally and in relationship to a cross-cultural NVC event.

The *quadrants* aspect of the Integral model recognizes that any phenomenon can be viewed from at least four fundamental perspectives, including its interior, exterior, individual and collective aspects.



Interior-Individual Intentional	Exterior-Individual Behavioral
Lower-Left Quadrant "WE" Interior-Collective Cultural	Lower-Right Quadrant "ITS" Exterior-Collective Social (Systems)

Figure 1: The four quadrants in the Integral Model

On the exterior side of the four quadrant model, the Upper Right and the Lower Right, reside all objective, measurable aspects of a phenomenon, including “physical forms, systems, behaviors, functions, and so on. Exteriors have a ‘simple location’ and can be seen empirically, objectively and behaviorally (Wilber, 1996, p. 90). They are the material manifestations of every phenomenon.” (Leonard, 2004, p. 20).

In the interior-based quadrants, the Upper Left and Lower Left, we see “phenomena such as consciousness, meaning, intention, feeling, value, and interpretation. Unlike exteriors, interiors lack simple location... All psychological and cultural ‘lenses’ through which one engages the communicative process are interiors [including] cultural contexts, affective relationships, psychological levels of development [...] value systems, and cognitive capacity [...]” (Leonard, 2004, p. 20).

The *Upper Left quadrant* represents the interior individual perspective, (i.e., the *I*, or subjective mind); the *Upper Right* quadrant represents exterior individual perspective, (i.e., the *it*, or objective body) e.g., the physical, tangible correlates of the subjective personal experience; the *Lower Left* represents the

interior collective perspective, including shared personal subjective experience, i.e., the *we* or intersubjective reality; and the *Lower Right* represents the exterior collective perspective, e.g., systems within the physical, manifest world, i.e., the *its* (Phipps, 2006, 60).

Any interaction, and any cross-cultural NVC interaction, will dynamically manifest and exhibit correlates across the interior, exterior, individual, and collective quadrants. In the Nonviolent Peaceforce (NP) newsletter account of an interaction between members of NP and the youth members of the Tamil Tigers in Trincomalee, Sri Lanka, the AQAL model helps render some elements of cross-cultural NVC, as they correspond to the quadrants of the Integral model, more tangible and explicit:

“In Trincomalee, an NP vehicle was stopped forcefully by more than 20 highly charged youth. They banged the NP vehicle and accused NP of facilitating a meeting between a Buddhist monk and LTTE (Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam) political head. They criticized NGOs of being biased. Rather than driving away, the NP Field Team members carefully listened to their grievances and clarified the misunderstandings. After an hour of discussions, the mob apologized for their threats and asked NP to visit them anytime.” (Nonviolent Peaceforce 2005 Annual Report, 2005, p. 2).

The *Upper Right*, or individual exterior quadrant, aspects of this event would include the objective, observable and measurable aspects of nonverbal communication such as facial expression, gesture, and body position; the physiological and neurological processes related to nonverbal expression and perception; and the visible contextual elements of the interaction, such as the location and visible objects in it.

The *Lower Right*, or collective exterior quadrant, would include whole-system correlates to what appears in the Upper Right. Here, we would see relevant physiological and neurological systems that correlate to the instance-specific manifestations thereof in the Upper Right; the physical aspects of general and culturally specific systems of nonverbal communication; the measurable aspects of verbal language itself, including sound, some linguistic descriptions, and grammar systems, and the cultural systems that contextualized the communication event. It would also include the observable and measurable aspects of the cultural groups and systems involved in the event, the NP and the LTTE.

The *Upper Left*, or individual interior quadrant, would consist of everything that occurred in relationship to the interaction subjectively for each of the individuals that were in communication. This would have included the evolving intentions and perceptions of each of the NP members and each of the Tamil youth; their levels of interpersonal development; their beliefs in general and about each other; their intuitions about each other; their moods; and their thoughts during the event.

The *Lower Left*, or interior collective quadrant, would consist of any interior, subjective, unseen and unmeasurable events that include two or more of the individuals in communication. In this event, we would see shared and unshared cultural assumptions, modes of meaning-making, and meaning itself. We would also see unmeasurable aspects of the intersubjective structures of consciousness between the individuals participating in the interaction.

The additional five distinctions within the AQAL model help measure and categorize some central aspects of individual and collective subjective experience, along the left half of the four quadrant model. These distinctions are levels, lines, states, stages, and types.

The Integral Institute introduces levels and lines as follows:

“Most natural organisms show a capacity for development—an acorn grows into an oak through various levels or stages of growth. Human beings likewise show various stages of growth, which can occur in many of their innate capacities or functions: humans can evidence cognitive development, moral development, psychosexual development, interpersonal development, and so on. In short, human beings seem to have many developmental lines (cognitive, moral, psychosexual, etc.) that unfold in various levels or stages of development—what we call levels and lines.” (The integral approach, 2006, p. 2).

According to the integral model, there are at least 10 and conceivably limitless lines of intelligence. Within an NVC interaction, the level of development of the interpersonal ‘line’ of the communicators would influence how and what nonverbal signals are successfully perceived and communicated (Knapp & Hall, 2002). The caliber and reach of any individual’s relevant lines of development at the time of a communicative interaction, especially linguistic, interpersonal, cognitive, emotional, and depending on the interaction, perhaps the psychosexual, moral, and even spiritual lines, will directly affect his or her interior condition, in the Upper Left; expressions in the Upper Right; and will influence how the interaction itself unfolds, as the shared experience of the communicative event, in the Lower Left.

All-states refers to the temporary occurrence of any aspect of reality within the four quadrants, e.g., an individual's state of emotion, or a country's political state. States recognize that someone can, at any given moment, reside at a level above or below their center of gravity—the stage of development and its associated capacities at which they generally reside—along any particular lines of development.

States exist in both individual and collective domains. In the individual interior domain, “states inevitably affect how individuals both give and receive communications and the success of mutual understanding.

Communication dynamics will differ, for instance, depending on whether the participants act from a phenomenal state of anger versus love.” In the collective interior domain, “a threatened culture may regress to a lower state of needs, but not a lower level. During a state of war, a culture highly developed along Abraham Maslow's needs hierarchy collectively regresses, for a time, to a joint need for security.

During this particular collective state, communications emphasizing security needs often enjoy a warmer reception than during a state of peace.” (Leonard, 2004, p. 26). In the Trincomalee interaction between NP and LLTE members, the states of each individual, as well as the political state of their shared environment, would have contributed to the outcome of the event.

All-types refers to styles of awareness. One major type distinction, generally, would be masculine and feminine “where the masculine type appears to be more autonomous and analytic, and the feminine type more relational and embodied” (The Integral Approach, 2006, p. 2). Another type distinction is high-context and low-context types of communication within cultures. These cultural communication types are distinguished based on the amount of meaning found in the context versus in the coded message in a communicative interaction.

“American culture exemplifies a low-context type because Americans give more emphasis to the language code, communicating in a more specific, explicit, and detailed manner. High-context cultures, in contrast, communicate more implicitly and meaning appears in contextual cues or internalized in the person. A high-context communication may sound deliberately vague to a low-context listener and a low-context message may sound too specific to a high-context listener” (Leonard, 2004, pp. 27-28).

High-context cultures also rely more heavily on NVC (Ting-Toomey, p. 100).

Leonard also points out Florence Kluckhohn’s distinction between ‘doing’ and ‘being’ cultures, “which loosely correlates to masculine and feminine types respectively” (Kluckhohn, 1956 as cited in Leonard, 2004, p. 28). Doing-oriented cultures place a premium on actions, measurable results, and progress. Conversely, family background, social identity, and relationships carry more weight in being-oriented cultures. Whereas a doing culture associates words with actions, a being culture links words with social relationships.” (Leonard, 2004, p. 28). The communication types of each of the NP workers, and of the LTTE members, as per high versus low context, and being versus doing, could have influenced the ways that nonverbal behavior between the NP workers, and between the NP workers and the LTTE youth members in Trincomalee, was expressed and interpreted.

In summary, an Integral approach “looks at any problem—personal, social, ecological, international—and attempts to identify all of the important variables that are contributing to the problem in each of the five major domains (quadrants, levels, lines, states, and types)” (The Integral Approach, 2006, p. 2).

The Integral model allows us to look at cross-cultural nonverbal communication, and the potential 'problem' of miscommunication, likewise, by identifying the contributing variables in each of the major domains.

Physiological and Biological Dimensions of Nonverbal Communication

Communication and miscommunication, specifically cross-culturally and nonverbally, can be described as the level of shared meaning that occurs during an interaction between people with different cultural frames of reference. The shared meaning that occurs can be identified in the Lower Left quadrant, in the collective interior. The individual experiences of the communication or miscommunication that occur during the event reside in the Upper Left quadrant, the individual subjective. To understand the larger picture of how shared meaning is both cultivated and impeded on the nonverbal and cross-cultural levels, we need to understand what informs and constitutes the channels of expression and perception in nonverbal communication and in cross-cultural communication.

One of the levels in which expression and perception of nonverbal behavior is shaped is physiologically and biologically rooted in the Upper Right quadrant. The activity of the limbic brain and its communication with the brain and body systems help explain how, and how implicitly and instinctively, nonverbal behavior is both expressed and perceived.

The limbic brain, in evolutionary chronology, is the second of three brains, evolving after the reptilian brain and before the cortical and neocortical brains. The reptilian brain "contributes to the background of emotional life" (Lewis, Amini, & Lannon, 2000, p. 48) and "has adapted, changed, and learned to

communicate with the two later brains that followed.” The neocortical brain, most recently developed in humans, is responsible for conscious thought, and is where advanced symbolic systems, most markedly human verbal language, is processed.

The limbic brain’s original purpose “was to monitor the external world and the internal bodily environment, and to orchestrate their congruence. What one sees, hears, feels, and smells is fed into the limbic brain, and so is data about body temperature, blood pressure, heart rate, digestive processes, and scores of other somatic parameters.” The limbic system is a complex set of structures that includes the hypothalamus, the hippocampus, the amygdala, and several other nearby areas (Boeree, 2002). In its present form, the limbic brain is considered “the center of advanced emotionality” (Lewis, et al., 2000, p. 51) because it is the biological seat of the chain of physiological events corresponding to emotion.

The limbic brain is also where the regulation of nonverbal behavior and its interpretation begins, in infancy. Nonverbal communication begins when babies’ survival depends on being able to read their mothers’ faces:

“A typical baby crawls to the edge of a cliff, sees the possible precipice, and then looks at his mother – and makes his assessment of the cliff’s lethality by reading her expression. If she radiates calm, he continues crawling, but if he finds alarm on her face, the baby stops in his tracks and cries. Whether they realize it or not, mothers use the universal signals of emotion to teach their babies about the world. Because their display is inborn, emotions not only reach across the gaps between cultures and species, but they also span the developmental chasm

between mother and infant. Emotionality gives the two of them a common language years before the infant will acquire speech, the arbitrary symbolic system of the neocortical brain” (Lewis, et al., 2000, p. 61).

Limbic resonance, “a symphony of mutual exchange and internal adaptation whereby two mammals become attuned to each other’s inner states,” (Lewis, et al., 2000, p. 63) begins as soon as a baby is born and co-evolves with nonverbal communication. “When babies are born, their brains are only partly grown. Because women’s hips have not kept pace with the increasing size of our brains through evolutionary history, much of the growth of the neocortex—where we reason and speak—takes place after we are born. A baby’s limbic system must resonate with the mother’s for its brain to grow properly.” (The biggest ideas, 2003, ¶14)

This system of communication via the limbic brain forms the biological foundation for processes whereby the intuitive, automatic, and largely unconscious interpretation of nonverbal behavior occurs. Emotional perception and projection of nonverbal behavior occurs very quickly, and generally is not subject to conscious awareness. Dr. Paul Ekman, the professor of psychology who has become a world-famous face reader, (e.g., Ekman, 1972, 1973, 1985; Ekman & Ellsworth, 1972; Ekman, et al., 1987), explains

“Emotions come on much more quickly than awareness does. We evolved emotions to direct us quickly, particularly in danger. Our fear and anger responses can happen in milliseconds, long before we are aware of them. Our awareness takes time to catch up. We become aware that we

are angry when we find our inner landscape already stormy with anger, rather than see it coming from a distance and decide to feel it.

We are always signaling our emotions with our facial expressions and bodily postures. This would have helped in our ancestral jungle. Even now, people's emotions flicker quickly across their faces. When they try to conceal them, an honest display flickers for an instant and we can learn to read it" (The biggest ideas, 2003, ¶16)

This quick, implicit emotional perception is inextricably interlinked with cognitive perception: "Every region of the brain that has been identified with some aspect of emotion has also been identified with aspects of cognition (e.g., Davidson & Irwin 1999). The circuitry that supports affect and the circuitry that supports cognition are completely intertwined." (Ekman, 2005, p. 1).

The communication between the three brains, starting with the limbic brain, within a nonverbal communicative event, is portrayed in the following account of a NVC interaction on a bus:

"A tattooed teenager with a shaven head ... boards the vehicle, glares at the commuter, and bumps by him. That sensory experience flashes to the limbic brain, which will sift the event for its significance and prepare physiology to meet that singular moment. Our man's limbic brain evaluates the nature of the other's intention – is it careless, aggressive, friendly, sexual, submissive, indifferent? A given limbic brain arrives at conclusions based on the collaboration of

this genetically specified wiring scheme and past experience of similar situations. In this case, let us suppose our man's limbic apparatus detects hostility and, to meet the situation, equips him with the emotion of anger.

Once the limbic brain has settled on an emotional state, it sends outputs to the neocortical brain, spawning a conscious thought (*Who the hell does this guy think he is?*). At the same time, limbic outputs to the premotor areas of the neocortex are directing action-planning. Meanwhile, outputs to the endocrine system will alter stress hormone release, which may impact the entire body for hours or days afterward. Limbic instructions to the lower brain centers will cause facial muscles to contract in the configuration of anger: eyes narrowed, brows drawn together, lips pressed, with the edges of the mouth turned down. The limbic brain will direct the reptilian brain to change cardiovascular function. Heart rate will increase, as will blood flow to the arms and hands – because the outcome of anger may be a fight, the limbic brain readies the physiologic systems most suited to fisticuffs. The entire maneuver is executed with the speed and grace of a ballerina's pirouette. One moment a man is minding his own business – two seconds later, anger swells, his brow furrows, and his hands start to clench.

Suppose that a woman follows just behind the belligerent youth. Witnessing the encounter, she shoots our traveler a look of sympathetic recognition and mock exasperation. Can you believe what it's like on the buses these days? She might say, if she were speaking. She isn't. But our commuter's limbic brain will nevertheless discern the message in her eyes and her face. To an emotionally insensate organism, the two interactions look exactly the same: for an instant, a

moving person glanced at another. But the emotional implications of the infinitesimal differences are enormous. Because of the limbic brain's split-second precision, one can successfully distinguish an impending fight from the empathetic communication of kindred spirit." (Lewis, et al., 2000, pp. 53-54).

The processes of the limbic brain and its communication with the other brains and bodily systems shows us, physiologically, how it is that we begin to process and perceive nonverbal behavior, and how extensively and implicitly our limbic brain-based emotional and intuitive read of a situation shapes our perception. This perceptive process is arguably a more deeply implicitly ingrained cognitive process than the process of interpreting verbal language alone. The perception of nonverbal communication as initiated in the limbic brain and continued with the reptilian brain, the cortex, the neocortex, and several body systems is enough to dispel any illusion that intuition could play a merely peripheral role in the perception of nonverbal behavior. As I interpret your nonverbal behavior, my limbic and neocortical brains and several bodily systems are all assessing your intentions and inner states quite instinctively and implicitly, resulting in an inextricably interconnected relationship between intuition and cognition.

Likewise, when I express nonverbal behavior, I don't have cognitive control over the content that I convey as I would in verbal language: "High-speed videography shows that facial expressions begin within milliseconds of a provocative event, and they fade immediately" (Lewis, et al., 2000, p. 43). During nonverbal communication, we can't choose our expressions the way we can choose our words when we speak or write, so it is even more important, in an effort to maximize communication and avoid miscommunication, to be explicitly aware of what is always already happening during our cognitive processing of each others' nonverbal behavior. As we interpret nonverbal behavior, we can be

aware that the same “split-second precision” that allows us to “successfully distinguish an impending fight from the empathetic communication of a kindred spirit” (Lewis, et al., 2000, p. 54) is in operation and forming our perceptions of others’ inner states and intentions continuously. As perceivers of nonverbal behavior we are constantly picking up on very subtle expressions that we aren’t consciously aware of, and when others interpret our nonverbal behavior, they are likewise perceiving subtle and complex expressions that are not under our direct physiological control. Awareness of this biologically-based lens of perception can expand the extent to which NVC can be intentional and skillful. If I know that my intuition and perception of your nonverbal behavior is happening outside of my conscious awareness in my limbic brain before an impression is formed that I have access to, I can have a better sense of the balance of trusting and questioning my own intuition that I’ll have to exercise to understand your intention. If the roles of limbic perception and intuition in meaning-making is reduced or dismissed, the opportunity to become aware of its role, and even to intentionally engage it, is lost.

In order to achieve better communication and avoid miscommunication in cross-cultural interactions, it is helpful to be aware of how much in fact does get expressed and interpreted outside of conscious awareness, and how quickly. When analyzing interactions between NP trainees, and their interpretations of the interactions, it will be helpful to keep in mind how much meaning-making tends to happen outside of conscious awareness. When looking for the causes of miscommunication, it will be helpful to be aware of the meaning-making processes that, by default, occur outside of conscious awareness. Much affective, or emotional, miscommunication may be formed via meaning-making systems originating in the limbic brain. Knowing how this works will also help contextualize what is explicit to NP trainees, what is implicit, and help shed light on the degree of skill and awareness of the

Nonviolent Peace Force trainees in interpreting and producing nonverbal behavior during the training in Nairobi.

Nonverbal Communication and the Structure of Human Consciousness

The significance of practicing awareness of our inner states and the possible inner states of those we are involved in nonverbal communication with becomes especially prominent when looking at recent and evolving models of how individual consciousness itself is constructed (Thompson, 2001). The models are from the fields of embodied cognitive science and European continental phenomenology. These fields offer a more macro explanation of the physiological account of limbic resonance and regulation. According to it, we are inherently open loops, and we function as open loops. The way in which we are inherently open-looped systems is referred to as *intersubjectivity*.

Intersubjectivity emerges from limbic resonance and regulation, which constitute the physical, objective, and measurable means by which we regulate in relationship to each other in a physiologically “open-loop arrangement.” In such an arrangement, nervous systems, hormone levels, cardiovascular functioning, sleep rhythms, immune functioning, and more, reciprocally stabilize in relationship to the corresponding functions and rhythms of the people we are close to or who are in our everyday environment. Contrary to the discrete, detached individuals that we often assume ourselves to be, “we are open systems throughout our lives.” (The biggest ideas, 2003, ¶24). Limbic regulation is an Upper Right biological and measurable explanation of this lack of inherent discreteness. *Intersubjectivity* is a more global explanation of how our very consciousness interpersonally interconnects with each other in

the Lower Left, via the limbic brain, our bodies, and even our environment, in the Upper and Lower Right quadrants.

The context for understanding the global nature of *intersubjectivity* is rooted in the concept of Embodiment, a fundamental tenet of Phenomenology. Embodiment accounts for how “the individual human mind is not confined within the head, but extends throughout the living body, and includes the world beyond the biological membrane of the organism, especially the interpersonal, social world of self and other.” Over the past couple of decades, the “classical, cognitivist view that an inner mind represents an outer world” has evolved into a field of embodied cognitive science, with the view that “mental processes are embodied in the sensorimotor activity of the organism and embedded in the environment” (Thompson, 2001, p. 2).

Another tenet of phenomenology is self and other co-determination, which states that “in social creatures, embodied cognition emerges from the dynamic co-determination of self and other” (Thompson, 2001, p. 3). In self- and other co-determination, self and other influence each other as they do in limbic regulation. This co-determination occurs in the broader context of embodiment, which explicitly includes the brain. The brain in turn holds a relationship to the organism which also holds a relationship to the environment. All elements are, of course, interdependent. In the AQAL framework, we can identify the brain and organism as individually measurable and in the Upper Right quadrant; the plurality of organisms and the environment in the Lower Right; the individual subjective experiences associated with a given brain and organism in the Upper Left; and *intersubjectivity* and the process of co-determination in the Lower Left.

From the perspective of embodied cognitive science, self- and other co-determination through the embodied mind is fundamentally human. The fluid, ever-evolving 'product' of this process of co-determination is the fundamentally open-looped consciousness construction of *intersubjectivity*. Co-determination is the foundation of the human "ability to mentally 'simulate' another person. By mentally simulating another person, "humans use the resources of their own minds to create a model of another person and thereby identify with him or her, thereby projecting oneself imaginatively into his or her situation" (Thompson, 2001, p. 11). This phenomenon of projecting oneself into another and identifying with them is the phenomenon that is at the heart of *intersubjectivity*, and also describes the essence of what happens during nonverbal behavioral perception.

Intersubjectivity can be argued to be structurally innate to human beings. This innateness is evidenced in the early stages of nonverbal communication as it develops in lock step with limbic resonance. The mechanisms for simulation and modeling are already operational at birth. For the capacity for simulation mechanisms to be in place from birth, the self must already be "'intersubjectively open' in its very structure for these mechanisms to function effectively at all" (Thompson, 2001, p. 12). This recognition that this open structure must precede simulation and modeling opposes the earlier, classical assumption that the "concrete perceptual experience of the other" is something that becomes opened from the outside (Thompson, 2001, p. 15). In the current view of Embodied Cognitive Science, the capacity for simulation, already present at birth, reflects an inherent interrelatedness and *a priori* reference to the other.

Nonverbal, and in this case preverbal, behavior is both primary evidence for innate intersubjective openness, also referred to as *open intersubjectivity*, and the first stage in which intersubjective openness

is expressed, also known as *concrete intersubjectivity* (Thompson, 2001, p. 16). Intersubjective openness, or concrete *intersubjectivity*, is an “inherently developmental ... evolved, biological capacity of the human species,” rooted in the mammalian-specific ability for nonverbal communication. It manifests as empathy. Empathy allows humans to infer the mental states of others via the limbic brains.

Nonverbal communication and the stages of empathy that follow from it are therefore not isolated, cognitive events, but exist in the embodied field of the individuals in communication, their shared intersubjective space, and their environments.

Empathy, Affective Comportments, and NVC

The way that communication takes place among individuals via empathy in an embodied field seems to be rooted in the experience of emotion as captured by five affective comportments. These affective comportments have been identified by Jakk Panksepp as primary areas that capture the “panoply of emotional states we experience” and include “seeking/expectancy, rage/anger, fear, nurturance/sexuality, social bonding/separation distress, and play/joy” (Thompson, 2001, p. 4).

Thompson points out that the primacy of affective comportments reinforces the tenets of the embodied mind. On the individual level, we see that experience related to affective comportments affects and is affected by not just the whole brain, but the whole organism, including “the psychosomatic network of the nervous system, immune system, and endocrine system; physiological changes in the autonomic nervous system; the limbic system, and the superior cortex” (Thompson, 2001, p. 4). This reinforces that affective comportments are embodied within the individual. We can see a snapshot of this relationship between experience of affect and the brain and body systems’ affective correlates in the Upper Left and Upper Right quadrants of the AQAL model. This relationship comprises what Thompson calls “a prototypical whole-organism event” (Thompson, 2001, p. 4).

The second tenet of the embodied mind that the primacy of affective compartments points to is an *inter* whole-organism event, which can be described as the process of empathy made possible by the structure of *intersubjectivity*. If there is a direct relationship between individual affective compartment and nonverbal behavior, which seems to be confirmed by Paul Ekman's research on the universality of facial expression that will be expanded on later in the chapter, then we can infer that the process of empathy between individuals, in the Lower Left quadrant of the AQAL model, also occurs via affective compartments. In the process of interpreting others' nonverbal behavior, affective compartments would function as referential touchstones for identifying how others feel, or what their intentions are, based on the perceiver's self-based information on how those nonverbal behaviors correspond to the affective compartments.

The process of Empathy in relation to the affective compartments coupled with the "primordial and preverbal sense of self... that is inseparably coupled to the perceptual recognition of other human beings" (Gallagher & Meltzoff, 1996; Meltzoff & Moore, 1999 as cited in Thompson, 2001, p. 4), that infants are born with, comprise the foundation for our ability to interpret and understand the mental states of others and ourselves (Savage-Rumbaugh, B., Fields, W. & Tagliabue, J., 2001; Smuts, 2001). This ability relies on the same skills and processes that are used during NVC. Studies of communication between primates in connection to affective compartments indicate that "higher primates excel at interpreting others as psychological subjects on the basis of their bodily presence – their facial expressions, postures, vocalizations, and so on (Povinelli & Preus as cited in Thompson, 2001, p. 5). It is here that we see affective compartment blossoming into empathy, in the sense of a meta-affective cognitive capacity for grasping another's point of view" (Thompson, 2001, p. 5).

The process of grasping another's point of view, or the "ability to mentally 'simulate' another person... to use the resources of one's own mind to create a model of another person and thereby identify with him or her, projecting oneself imaginatively into his or her situation" (Thompson, 2001, p. 11) is primary to the perception and interpretation of nonverbal behavior. The process begins in infancy via what developmental psychology recognizes as "invisible imitation", where "the infant uses part of his body invisible to himself to imitate the other's movements." The phenomenon in which an infant uses "proprioceptive awareness" to copy what s/he sees on the face of another "depends upon a 'supramodal' body schema that enables the infant to recognize equivalencies between herself and the other person.

The affective compartments of "seeking/expectancy, rage/anger, fear, nurturance/sexuality, social bonding/separation distress, and play/joy" (Thompson, 2001, p. 4), and the fact that these compartments relate directly to nonverbal behaviors and our interpretations of others' nonverbal behaviors, provide a point of reference to use when interpreting NP trainees' interpretations of each others' intentions and experiences in relationship to their nonverbal behaviors captured on video. It also provides a way of looking at successful communication, or the lack thereof, as achieved shared meaning *in relation to affect specifically*, as opposed to content. As we will see in the cross-cultural section of this chapter, this focus on the degree of shared meaning of *affect* is particularly appropriate for cross-cultural interactions involving nonverbal communication, because the main domains communicated in any cross-cultural interaction – identity and relationship – are in essence comprised of affective states and interpretations thereof.

Empathy and NVC Skills in the Context of Peace Work

The process of indexing one's own body schema to interpret the expressions of another's is the basis for both empathy and nonverbal communication. Nonverbal communication, in a sense, can be understood as an early expression of empathy. Both empathy and nonverbal communication are skills that develop, and can be developed, over time. In that sense, they are what Ken Wilber would call lines of personal development (The Integral Approach, 2006, p. 2). Knapp and Hall likewise refer to the ability to interpret nonverbal behavior as an interpersonal skill, and note that the degree to which that skill is developed in a person interpreting nonverbal behavior will directly affect the degree to which nonverbal communication is successful or unsuccessful (Knapp & Hall, 2002). The skills and areas of understanding that contribute to successful NVC can be looked at from the perspectives of *what* and *how*.

Part of the *what* would include knowledge of the measurable and objective nonverbal behaviors and systems of behavior, located on the right side quadrants of the AQAL model, such as systems of using or avoiding specific gestures and other nonverbal behaviors in particular cultures, and systems of understanding and interpreting emotion through facial expressions, as measurable and observable systems, would appear in the Lower Right. Successful NVC would also depend on an understanding of cultural pragmatic rules that would be found in the Lower Left quadrant, such as what emotions and intentions are and aren't culturally appropriate to express in a given context, along with how that context in turn influences the meaning of what is expressed.

The *how* component of the NVC line of development would include the intentions and experiences of the communicators, on the left hand side of the four quadrant model, and the developmental stages of

the individuals within an NVC event. First, an understanding of the essence of what is always already happening when we communicate nonverbally needs to be developed. This awareness becomes the necessary component for subsequently deepening and refining the capacity for nonverbal communication.

Understanding nonverbal communication as a skill that can be developed provides a foundation for taking an NP trainee's possible skill level into account when looking at their interpretations of another's nonverbal behavior. It also serves as a point of consideration for developing at least one aspect of a curricular piece for cross-cultural NVC training for future NP trainings, which, as referenced in the Introduction, is one intended outcome of this research. Understanding that the skills of inferring another's intentions and emotions is based on referencing one's own interior is foundational to both NVC and empathy, and may also help inform a curricular piece.

Taking NVC and empathy into account as skills that can be developed also makes explicit part of what is happening, or could happen, during certain exercises in the Training For Change (TFC) training manual. This training manual was originally used by the Nonviolent Peace Force's team of peace workers being deployed to Sri Lanka. The cultivation of empathy within the manual appears most directly during exercises related to the cultivation and practice of *presence*.

Presence is described in the manual as a process of "staying grounded and aware even in the midst of a chaotic situation" (Hunter & Lakey, 2004, p. 137). The manual says that "presence relates neither to a person/group, nor to a set of organizational actors who are slightly off stage. The focus of presence is to

influence the immediate conflict field whether the intervener has a relationship with people in the field or not and whether outside actors are going to learn about what happens or not” (Hunter & Lakey, 2004, p. 211). Presence is practiced throughout the TFC curriculum as a way of expressing oneself, communicating with others, and affecting a situation: “Since part of presence is being present (not shut-down) – even in the midst of violent situations – this tool helps participants practice grounding in the face of violence. Experience shows that exposure to the kinds of violent situations one might face in the field results in people being less shocked when they see it in the field. So instead of entering a state of alarm, this tool helps participants continue to act even with violence” (Hunter & Lakey, 2004, p. 138).

One specific practice of presence in the TFC manual includes projecting confidence in an exercise called *walk the line*, which involves alternately sending neutral and indifferent energy, and sending love and support energy, to an individual who is walking through a line of individuals on either side, instructed to project confidence. During *walk the line*, participants are asked, in a sense, to alternately *not* empathize with the person walking the line, by sending “neutral energy”, and, in effect, to *empathize* with that person by “sending love and support energy”. They are asked to affect the energetic space in which the interaction occurs.

Implicit in this exercise is the recognition that there is a certain universally recognizable relationship between the individual’s experience of confidence, in the Upper Left quadrant, and the nonverbal behavior indicating confidence, in the Upper Right quadrant. Also implicit is the need for authenticity. If the person can’t genuinely connect to a sense of confidence, they will not be able to display, or project confidence. This reality is responded to in the manual’s note that in dangerous situations, we all have an inner belief that we will survive (Hunter & Lakey, 2004). Implicitly, this authentic confidence is necessary

to connect to so that the expression of confidence, even in the face of violence will likewise be authentic.

One could reasonably speculate that any experiential difference for the person trying to project confidence between the two situations—as the recipient of alternately sending neutral and indifferent energy, and sending love and support energy—could be accounted for in part by the limbic system and how it facilitates “picking up” intentions from the others.

One could also speculate that there is a literal energetic effect of “sending energy.” This is pointed to in the manual when it describes conflict as “a field of energy” (Hunter & Lakey, 2004, p. 303). When explaining the process of using presence within a field of conflict, the manual says that presence focuses on the “field” of conflict rather than individuals within it, and that “being able to perceive a conflict field is learnable” (Hunter & Lakey, 2004, p. 37). The manual describes a field as follows: “Fields are natural phenomena that include everyone, are omnipresent, and exert forces upon things in their midst... fields can be felt as forces... force fields are felt and experienced through our own emotions... and fields actually create and organize us as much as we organize them. Fields may not be visible to the naked eye, but they can impact our actions or limit our thinking” (Hunter & Lakey, 2004, p. 225).

These descriptions sound very much like the embodied, intersubjective mind in action. Fields can be described as Upper and Lower Left quadrant phenomena, detectable only by their possible affects. These energetic fields are implied to be vehicles through which the subjective mind and subjective experience in the Upper Left, collective minds and subjective experiences in the Lower Left, and

environment, in the Lower Right, converge, dynamically co-create each other, and co-evolve. This dynamic co-evolution amongst the quadrants is characteristic of embodiment and *intersubjectivity* in action.

Another exercise in the TFC manual, called *grounding*, makes a practice of embodiment. In it, participants develop skills for “grounding” themselves in dangerous and uncertain situations where it would be easy to become overwhelmed. Part of the goal of grounding is to be able to maintain presence in high-conflict situations. Maintaining presence not only allows a person to act in the situation, but to communicate something to others in the situation. Again, implicit in this exercise is the need for being able to authentically activate certain states of being in order to nonverbally communicate that state to others. It seems clear that a major aspect of how presence is communicated is through nonverbal behavior.

The need for developing nonverbal expression by authentically and consciously navigating the individual subjective interior, in the Upper Left quadrant, is again referred to in the description of training on maintaining presence:

“In teaching the technique of presence facilitators will see the pay-off of the many days of building a strong container that supports participant authenticity. Improvisation, as a creative act, springs from authenticity. At the same time, participants need to have let go of a sufficient defensiveness to allow feedback on how they come across in their interventions. A participant might come from an authentic place in pursuing a line of action, yet find that their intention cannot be read accurately because of cultural or other cues.”

Clearly, authenticity is called for in communicating affective states to others. Understanding that projecting confidence and presence entails authentic individual subjective experiences in the Upper Left, nonverbal expressions thereof in the Upper Right, and the achievement of shared affective meaning in the Lower Left, and perhaps energetic fields in the Lower Right creates a picture of what needs to happen in order for cross-cultural NVC to be effective and successful. Understanding the physiological basis for presence, via limbic communication and perhaps energetic sensing via embodied cognition, does two things: it illuminates why the exercise that the TFC manual proposes for developing presence can work, and it provides a foundation for how the observed training can be analyzed. It also provides a foundation for how that training can be enhanced and replicated in the future.

As intimated in the manual's caveat, the fact that a participant may find that despite authenticity in the Upper Left, "their intention cannot be read accurately because of cultural or other cues" points to another domain that must be addressed in order to maximize shared meaning, and that domain is cross-cultural communication.

Cross-Cultural Communication

The story from *A General Theory of Love* describing the nonverbal communication between a tattooed teenager and a man on a bus helps illustrate how implicitly and unconsciously our interpretations of

nonverbal behavior are processed on a physiological level. Another equally implicit and often unconscious level of interpretation of nonverbal behavior is that of culture. Together, our physiological and cultural perceptive filters comprise a nature and nurture perspective on how we implicitly attribute meaning to nonverbal behavior.

The evolutionarily formed and physiologically based influences on nonverbal behaviors and perceptions thereof relate to those which occur more universally. The culturally informed levels through which nonverbal behavior is perceived are, necessarily, no more universal than any one given culture is universal. Culture constitutes the nurture side of the equation.

Linguistically, this nature nurture polarity is unique. Unlike verbal language, in which the relationship between a word or morpheme and its semantic correlate(s) is completely arbitrary, nonverbal signals are informed by a combination of factors from the universal to the arbitrary, and in parallel, from nature to nurture. The physiological influences on nonverbal behavior and interpretation can be argued to influence behaviors and corresponding meanings that are more universal. Knapp and Hall describe the dichotomy as “innate versus learned” (2002, p. 40).

The extent to which a specific nonverbal behavior can be accounted for exclusively and conclusively by genetics or biology is limited and debated within linguistic research (Knapp & Hall, 2002). Inherited components of the species may be responsible for some of the cross-cultural similarities found in nonverbal behavior: “a genetic component passed on to members of the human species” (Knapp & Hall, 2002, p. 67). This “genetic component” however, appears to correlate with different nonverbal signals

to different extents, and any nonverbal signal, no matter how universal, is also interpreted through the context of a cultural lens. The extent to which even the most “biologically universal” nonverbal signals are similarly or differently interpreted cross-culturally varies significantly.

The nature and nurture approaches to nonverbal expression and perception become most distinct in the context of examining facial expression. As Birdwhistell points out, the face is capable of producing around 250,000 expressions (as cited in Ting-Toomey, 1999), and the cultural universalist and cultural relativist approaches are two well-known ways of studying emotional facial expression (Ting-Toomey, 1999). Cultural universalists believe that emotional facial expressions are innate, and that infants know how to use them instinctively and intentionally. Their position is reinforced up by Paul Ekman’s statement on the universality of facial expressions based on his own research.

When asked the question, “More than 100 years ago, Charles Darwin proposed that human facial expressions are universal. Anthropologists like Margaret Mead thought the opposite. What do you think?” Paul Ekman responded:

“Initially, back in 1965, I thought Margaret Mead was probably right. But I decided to get the evidence to settle the argument. I showed pictures of facial expressions to people in the U.S., Japan, Argentina, Chile and Brazil and found that they judged the expressions in the same way.

But this was not conclusive because all these people could have learned the

meaning of expressions by watching Charlie Chaplin and John Wayne. I needed visually isolated people unexposed to the modern world and the media.

I found them in the highlands of Papua New Guinea. They not only judged the expressions in the same way, but their posed expressions, which I recorded with a movie camera, were readily understandable to people in the West.” (World Tibet network news, 2003, ¶ 12).

Cultural relativists, on the other hand, argue that facial expressions are learned: “Through a continuous cultural reinforcement process, individuals internalize the nonverbal rules in their culture without conscious effort. They can respond ‘spontaneously’ with the proper nonverbal cues in accordance to particular situational requirements” (Ting-Toomey, 1999, p. 119).

Cultural universalists and cultural relativists, of course, are both correct. Their differences in emphasis are not mutually exclusive, but point to two distinct yet intertwined levels through which nonverbal behavior is expressed and interpreted. The unification of these views is described as the neuroculture theory of facial expression of emotions. Neuroculture theory acknowledges that the expression and perception of facial expression is informed by both nature and nurture. It emphasizes that while facial expressions in conjunction with particular emotions or affective states themselves are largely universal, culture provides the nonverbal display rules that “shape when, how, what, and with whom certain nonverbal expressions should be displayed or suppressed within a specific cultural context. Cultural values influence the latitude of emotional expressions under particular situational conditions in different cultures” (Ting-Toomey, 1999, p. 120).

These levels—the physiologically based universal, and the culturally informed—are distinct yet equally implicit. Both levels are processed intuitively through the limbic brain, and therefore generally unconsciously projected and perceived.

The extent to which cultural rules are deeply embedded is illustrated in Edward T. Hall's description of "cultural logic" as that which "works at a lower, more basic level in the brain, a part of the brain that synthesizes but does not verbalize" (Hall, 1989, p. 63). In his book *Beyond Culture*, Hall describes the evolution of his meaning-making process during a cross-cultural interaction in Japan.

He recounts that he'd been staying in a hotel in downtown Tokyo. After 11 days of staying at the hotel, he was, without being consulted by the hotel staff, moved to another room. He was told that another guest had a previous booking. His belongings had been moved to another room, and repositioned as he'd left them in his previous room. This happened on several occasions during his stay in Tokyo, and again when he was in Kyoto. He was incredulous when, in Kyoto, his things were moved not only to a new room, but to a completely different hotel. He recalled saying to himself, "They must think we are very low-status people indeed to treat us this way" (Hall, 1989, p. 61).

The new hotel was in a part of the city he hadn't seen before, with no Europeans, and of another class entirely. Hall reflected,

“...the whole matter of being moved like a piece of luggage puzzled me. In the United States, the person who gets moved is often the lowest-ranking individual. This principle applies to all organizations, including the Army. Whether you can be moved or not is a function of your status, your performance, and your value to the organization. To move someone without telling him is almost worse than an insult, because it means that he is below the point at which feelings matter. In these circumstances, moves can be unsettling and damaging to the ego” (Hall, 1989, p. 61).

He proceeded to describe his revelation that in fact, he was not being disrespected by the series of moves at all. Instead, he was being treated as an insider. Some of the strict formalities of Japanese culture can be dropped when someone is regarded as an insider. A Japanese friend of Hall explained that as a guest of a hotel, “as soon as you register at the desk, you are no longer an outsider; instead, for the duration of your stay you are a member of a large, mobile family. You *belong*.” Hall reflects, “the fact that I was moved was tangible evidence that I was being treated as a family member – a relationship in which one can afford to be ‘relaxed and informal and not stand on ceremony” (Hall, 1989, p. 65).

Hall goes on to describe his strongly emotional, and implicitly culturally informed, reaction to the situation. Of his experience, he comments, “I knew that my emotions on being moved out of my room in Tokyo were of the gut type and quite strong. There was nothing intellectual about my initial response. Although I am a professional observer of cultural patterns, I had no notion of the meaning of being moved from hotel to hotel in Kyoto” (Hall, 1989, p. 62).

Hall explained the implicit, and in fact limbic brain-based, aspect of his experience as follows:

“What was happening to me in Japan as I rode up and down in elevators with various keys gripped in my hand was that I was reacting with the cultural part of my brain—the old, mammalian brain. Although my new brain, my symbolic brain—the neocortex—was saying something else, my mammalian brain kept repeating, “You are being treated shabbily.” My neocortex was trying to fathom what was happening. Needless to say, neither part of the brain had been programmed to provide me with the answer in Japanese culture” (Hall, 1989, p. 63).

From Hall’s account, we can reasonably infer that cultural behavior rules, which inform the display rules of nonverbal behavior, are quite deeply implicit.

And although the process of becoming enculturated originates from the outside, the information and rules become stored in the limbic brain. As we saw earlier in the chapter, perception via the limbic system—the seat of emotion—make the perception process much more implicit, emotionally intense, and less conscious. It is therefore more important to intentionally cultivate awareness around cultural rules in order to facilitate communication and avoid miscommunication. Hall reflects on the same phenomenon:

“...according to Powers, man’s nervous system is structured in such a way that the patterns that govern behavior and perception come into consciousness only when there is a deviation from plan. That is why the most important paradigms or rules governing behavior, the ones that control our lives, function below the level of conscious awareness and are not generally

available for analysis. This is an important point, one that is often overlooked or denied. The cultural unconscious, like Freud's unconscious, not only controls man's actions but can be understood only by painstaking processes of detailed analysis. Hence, man automatically treats what is most characteristically his own (the culture of his youth) as though it were innate" (Hall, 1989, p. 43).

He also explains,

"...part of man's nervous system that deals with social behavior is designed according to the principle of negative feedback. That is, one is completely unaware of the fact that there is a system of controls as long as the program is followed. Ironically, this means that the majority of mankind is denied knowledge of important parts of the self by virtue of the way the control systems work. The only time one is aware of the control system is when things don't follow the hidden program. This is most frequent in intercultural encounters" (Hall, 1989, p. 44).

Knowing how automatic and implicit nonverbal behavior and interpretations can be on a cultural level, and how different these interpretations can be from culture to culture, will also be helpful when looking at areas of miscommunication among NP trainees. Awareness of how these differences work, and how they can impede achieving shared meaning, must also be a core part of any curriculum on cross-cultural nonverbal communication.

Awareness, Identity and Relationship

The implicitness of these hidden systems of meaning making, of course, make miscommunication, or a lack of shared meaning, difficult to avoid in cross-cultural interactions. Avoiding miscommunication, or

achieving shared meaning, when communicating with someone operating from a different culturally informed meaning-making system, then, depends on developing awareness within the communication.

The process of cultivating this awareness can be looked at from an AQAL perspective. If I'm going to achieve maximum shared meaning, and avoid misinterpretation, in a cross-cultural NVC interaction, I need to be aware of my own interior state and intentions, in the Upper Left. I need to be aware of the degree to which I share and don't share a meaning-making system with whomever I'm interacting with. That shared meaning resides in the *We*, in the Lower Left. The more I know about the cultural pragmatic rules of the other person's culture, the culturally shared meaning making systems in the *Lower Left*, the more easily I can identify and be aware of what will comprise the meaning that will become, fail to become, or partially become mutually understood. In Hall's description, that content would have included the heart of what failed to become shared meaning in his case—what the hotel staff members were communicating to Hall about how they viewed him when they moved his belongings from room to room and hotel to hotel. It will be helpful if I understand the relationship between what I or someone from another culture is trying to express, and how that might manifest nonverbally. That relationship between subjective intention and nonverbal manifestation is like a dialog between the Upper Left and Upper Right.

The meaning that is communicated in a cross-cultural interaction falls into three general categories. The first is actual content, which is conveyed primarily through verbal language. The other meaning areas are identity and relationship. It seems reasonable to infer that a large part of identity and relationship are comprised of things like attitude and feelings that relate to emotion and affective compartments, and like most affective states, are communicated primarily through nonverbal communication. This

communication can be conscious and intentional, but can also be quite unintentional and unconscious (Ting-Toomey, 1999), as it was in the case with Hall.

Identity, as negotiated and communicated cross-culturally, can be understood from what Stella Ting-Toomey labels identity negotiation theory (1999). Identity negotiation theory holds that the foundation of any intercultural encounter involves identity security and identity vulnerability, and emphasizes the connection between cultural values and self-conception. Identity security, generally, can be understood as the degree to which one's identity is supported in a communicative interaction, and identity vulnerability the degree to which it is threatened or not supported. Cultural values form as collective responses to questions about life that are universally posed, which will be elaborated on later in the chapter.

Identity negotiation theory states that “the core processes of individuals’ reflective self-conceptions are formed via symbolic communication with others. It is through communication that we acquire our generalized views of ourselves and others. It is also through communication with others that we acquire particular ways of thinking about ourselves and others in different situations” (Ting-Toomey, 1999, p. 27). These ways of thinking about ourselves, or identifying ourselves, develop along two lines – our social identity and personal identity.

Social identity refers to “an individual’s conceptualizations of the self that derive from memberships in emotionally significant categories or groups” (Brewer & Miller as cited in Ting-Toomey, 1999, p. 27).

These can include gender, sexual orientation, social class, age, disability, or professional identities (Ting-Toomey, 1999).

Personal identities refer to an individual's self-conceptions that "define the individual in relation to (or in comparison to) other individuals" and can include any characteristics or attributes that we associate with ourselves as distinct from others (Ting-Toomey, 1999, p. 28).

Both social and personal identities are individual subjective phenomena, locatable in the Upper Left (UL). Personal identity can be thought of as an UL an *Upper Left* phenomenon in relationship to other individuals, or *Is.*; social identity can be thought of as an *Upper Left* phenomenon in relationship to a collective, *Lower Left* phenomenon.

Social and personal identity can be viewed as lines of development that co-develop, as no personal identity evolves in a vacuum separate from social identity. They also recognize that they develop "within the larger webs of our culture. Thus, culture is the prime regulator in influencing how we attach meanings, develop labels, and draw boundaries in constructing others' and our own social and personal selves" (Ting-Toomey, 1999, p. 28).

Identity, at the social and personal levels, refers to "our reflective views of ourselves" and falls into eight domains that influence everyday interactions. These eight identities comprise a sort of "composite self-conception" of any individual in any culture. They fall into two general categories, the primary and the

situational. Primary identities are ongoing and impact us throughout our lives, and include cultural, ethnic, gender and personal identity. Situational identities, as the label implies, depend on the given situation, and change from one context to the next. They include role identity, relational identity, facework identity, and symbolic interaction identity. The distinction between primary and situational identities can be thought of in terms of states and stages of identity in the AQAL model. A stage of identity is where identity generally resides in a given individual at a given point in life. A state of identity is influenced by the individual's stage identity, but is also situational. The fact that identity can be situational is an example of the many ways in which *intersubjectivity* manifests—how our experiences shape and are shaped by each others' experiences.

The eight identities in the identity negotiation model, all of which have personal and situational aspects, are as follows:

Cultural identity refers to our sense of affiliation or belonging with a larger cultural group. Culture identity also includes the values of that larger culture, which constitute types in the AQAL model. Two common cultural types are individualistic and collectivist. Individualistic cultures tend to emphasize the importance of individual identity, rights, and interests over their group counterparts. Prototypical individualist cultures are found in Australia, Belgium, Germany, Switzerland, Canada and the U.S. Collectivist cultures such as those found in China, Japan, South Korea, Vietnam, Ghana, Saudi Arabia and Mexico tend to value group identity, rights and interests over the individual. Individualist or collectivist values comprise the content of cultural identity. The salience of cultural identity refers to the degree to which any individual feels connected to the larger culture and its values.

Ethnic identity is also comprised of content and salience. Salience, like in cultural identity, refers to the degree to which an individual identifies with a particular ethnic group. Ethnic identity content areas include objective layers such as race, religion, and language, as well as subjective layers, such as common history and heritage.

Gender identity covers how we see ourselves and others in relationship to 'maleness' and 'femaleness' and is a culturally constructed phenomenon, created in part by our communication with others and reinforced by cultural structures and practices. The implicitness of gender identification is evident in how difficult it is to pin down the effect of gender difference in day to day interactions. "Just as we seldom notice air and fish are unaware of water, for the most part we do not realize the myriad ways in which gender infuses our everyday lives as individuals and our collective life as a culture. This is because the meanings of gender that our [U.S.] society has constructed are normalized, making them a constant taken-for-granted background that can easily escape notice." (Wood as cited in Ting-Toomey, 1999, p. 34).

Personal identities are comprised of "unique life histories, experiences and personality traits" and are defined as "the sentiments and information an individual has regarding her or his personal self-images. Those personal self-images are linked to her or his unique personalities, drives, goals, and values." Personality identities consist of both *actual personal identity* and *desired personal identity*. Actual personal identity "refers to those unique attributes that an individual exhibits frequently and that are also perceived, variably, by others (e.g., traits such as assertiveness, talkativeness, decisiveness). Desired

personal identity includes attributes that an individual considers to be assets. Ting-Toomey points out that “the more others affirm such desired identities in the interaction, the more the person feels that he or she is being understood, respected, and supported. The premise of the identity negotiation approach rests on the importance of supporting the others’ desired, salient identities beyond their actual identities” (1999, p. 35).

Personal identities are also comprised of personality traits. Markus and Kitayama (as cited in Ting-Toomey, 1999, p. 35) distinguish ‘independent construal of the self’ and ‘interdependent construal of self.’ The former is associated with individualistic cultures, while the latter is associated with collectivist cultures. This relates back to the desired identity levels in that individualists tend to feel validated when someone acknowledges their personal attributes and competence while collectivists tend to feel validated through team effort and collective group success (Ting-Toomey, 1999, p. 35).

Ting-Toomey points out that “individuals may change their conceptions of composite identity at different age brackets, at different life stages, and with different life experiences. When one facet of our self-conception encounters stress (e.g., initial cultural identity shock in an overseas assignment), other facets of our composite identity can also experience the vibrations. A threat to our cultural identity can be perceived as a threat to our personal self-esteem level” (1999, p. 36).

Role identity is situational, and refers to “a set of expected behaviors and the values associated with them that a culture or ethnic group defines as proper or acceptable” (Ting-Toomey, 1999, p. 36). Ting-Toomey illustrates that while classrooms in individualistic cultures expect teachers to play a friendly,

democratic role, elicit questions, and create an open atmosphere, and expects students to freely ask questions and express opinions, collectivist cultures expect teachers to be more authoritarian, disseminating information, and students are expected to emphasize team cooperation and obedience.

Relational identity begins in the situational context of the family, and includes the beliefs and values of our culture as related from our family context. Through these processes we learn to negotiate boundary issues such as space and time, and authority issues and power dynamics.

Facework identity refers to identity respect issues and “is tied to a claimed sense of social esteem or regard that a person wants others to have for him or her. It is therefore a vulnerable identity resource in social interaction because it can be threatened, enhanced, undermined, and bargained over. Face is an identity resource that is manifested and co-managed in communication with others” (Ting-Toomey, 1999, p. 38). Of course, while identity respect is desirable in all cultures, what constitutes it is culturally specific and informed.

Symbolic Interaction identity refers to the process in which, through our verbal and nonverbal communication, we “acquire our reflective self-images and the associated values of our group-based and person-based identities” (Blumer, Blumstein, Mead, as cited in Ting-Toomey, 1999, p. 38). It is self-image as it arises within communicative context.

These different identities must have been negotiated in Hall's interaction with his Japanese hosts, and amongst those in communication during the incident in Trincomalee.

It seems that the Japanese collectivist cultural identity influenced the hotel hosts' decisions to move Hall, and their lack of direct communication with him regarding the move could have been partly because of simply not being aware of the individualist cultural values and norms, and the consequent sense of personal insult, that he might experience as a result of their actions. The lack of direct communication about the move could have also been a result of facework identity. Talking directly about moving him may have violated their needs to maintain face and respect for themselves and/or for Hall. Most certainly, Hall and his guests experienced conflicting implicit assumptions about role identity. Clearly, Hall's perception of his role as a guest included having his individual needs met, and to be communicated with. He learned later that in his Japanese guests' perception of his role as a guest, and a guest who has been accepted as an insider instead of just an outsider, meant that he had a role of helping them to accommodate the outsiders by moving rooms.

In Trincomalee, it seems quite likely that the NP peace workers were navigating ethnic identity among the Tamil youth group who approached them. In order to have convinced the youth that they weren't a threat and that they respected them, they must have had to acknowledge and affirm the youths' strong identity with their ethnicity and cause in a way that the youth were able to understand and trust. Originally, the youth thought that the NP workers were supporting their enemies, which arguably conflicted with what they perceived the NP workers' appropriate role to be as outsiders. The NP peace workers were able to communicate their intentions in a way that was congruent with the youths' perceptions of an acceptable role on the part of the NP workers. Finally, there must have been some

sensitive maneuvering of facework identity on the part of the NP workers in order to create the space for the group to as much as admit that their original accusation was wrong, and to in fact go from being accusatory to being welcoming, without 'losing face.'

The eight identity domains—cultural, ethnic, gender, personal, role, relational, facework, and symbolic interaction—in the context of cross-cultural communication, constitute the “nucleus of the identity negotiation framework.”

Ten core theoretical assumptions comprise identity negotiation theory, and form the backbone of what Stella Ting-Toomey describes as “mindful identity negotiation”. Because most of us are not necessarily aware of what we communicate nonverbally, or what we communicate regarding identity, mindful identity negotiation as a concept can serve as a vehicle to make the fact that we are always communicating something about identity explicit, and provide techniques for engaging more consciously and intentionally in this process. Ting-Toomey explains that “while the efforts of both communicators are needed to ensure competent identity negotiation, the effort of one individual can set competent communication in motion.”

“The way in which identity can be supported in cross-cultural interactions corresponds to what are often recognized as universal human needs. These needs include belonging, security, trust, inclusion, connection, being understood, respected and supported. The ten core theoretical assumptions that are foundational to identity negotiation theory articulate these needs in further detail, and “explain the

antecedent, process, and outcome components of intercultural communication” (Ting-Toomey, 1999, p. 40):

1. The core dynamics of peoples’ group membership identities (e.g., cultural and ethnic memberships) and personal identities (e.g., unique attributes) are formed via symbolic communication with others. This illustrates the movement of dynamic reciprocity between the Upper Left and Lower Left that characterizes *intersubjectivity*.
2. Individuals in all cultures or ethnic groups have the basic motivation needs for identity security, trust, inclusion, connection, and stability on both group-based and person-based identity levels.
3. Individuals tend to experience identity security in a culturally familiar environment and experience identity vulnerability in a culturally unfamiliar environment
4. Individuals tend to experience identity trust when communicating with culturally similar others and identity distrust when communicating with culturally dissimilar others; identity familiarity leads to trust, and identity unfamiliarity leads to distrust
5. Individuals tend to feel included when their desired group membership identities are positively endorsed (e.g., in positive in-group contact situations) and experience differentiation when their desired group membership identities are stigmatized (e.g., in hostile out-group contact situations).
6. Individuals tend to desire interpersonal connection via meaningful close relationships (e.g., in close friendship support situations) and experience identity autonomy when they experience relationship separations.
7. Individuals perceive identity stability in predictable cultural situations and detect identity change or chaos in unpredictable cultural situations.

8. Cultural, personal, and situational variability dimensions influence the meanings, interpretations, and evaluations of these identity-related themes.
9. Satisfactory identity negotiation outcomes include the feeling of being understood, respected, and supported.
10. Mindful intercultural communication emphasizes the importance of integrating the necessary intercultural knowledge motivations, and skills to communicate satisfactorily, appropriately, and effectively.

Being aware of all of the different types of identities that need to be supported during cross-cultural interactions provides a thorough and concrete repertoire to check against when analyzing instances in which shared affective meaning has not been maximized during interactions among NP trainees. The ten core theoretical assumptions point to specific questions that can be asked to help pinpoint what may have contributed to miscommunication. In looking at communicative interactions where a sense of affective discord has arisen with NP trainees and peace workers, one can look at how identity needs may or may not have been met via the communication; to what extent the parties seemed to feel understood, supported, and respected; and what cross-cultural factors might have contributed to how identity security and trust materialized.

Awareness of the composite self-conception comprised of the eight different identities allows us to “begin to mindfully listen to the concerns and issues that surround a person’s identity-related stories in a communication episode. We can also learn to reflect back and affirm some of the desired identities of the speaker from another group or culture” (Ting-Toomey, 1999, p. 30). It also empowers the communicators to learn to respond intentionally to these needs in the other person in a cross-cultural

communicative interaction, with the awareness that how any given person will strive to meet these universal needs within the interaction will be culturally shaped. The fact that the way in which universal needs are addressed is culturally conditioned, and becoming aware of what this process might look like in different cultures, seems significant for a curricular piece for cross-cultural peace work. One way to become more aware of styles of making meaning as they differ on a cultural level is to understand more about cultural types and value orientations.

Cultural Value Types and Orientations

As noted in the previous discussion, cultural values and orientations form in response to questions that are asked universally. In the AQAL model, these values and orientations constitute shared points of reference for meaning-making, and would reside as types in the Lower Left, or *WE* quadrant. Any individual could also have a type, or hybrid of types, in the Upper Left. Any individual's levels of salience, or intensity of connectedness, in relationship to types and values as per their individual enculturation process will strongly influence their own identity creation process, and will influence the implicit assumptions that they bring to, and the meaning that they make from others' behavior, in a cross-cultural encounter. These individual culturally specific values and identity informants, residing in the Upper Left quadrant, as they relate to the general values and orientations of their cultures, in the Lower Left, can serve as important guideposts in the process of making implicit processes of meaning making explicit in cross-cultural communication.

Cultural Values

In a large-scale study of a U.S. multinational business corporation, Hofstede (as cited in Ting-Toomey, 1999, p. 66) surveyed 116,000 managers and employees, and from his results, delineated four value patterns across a diverse range of cultures. He emphasized that these dimensions should be used as “a first systematic empirical attempt to compare cultures on an aggregate, group level” and that any given culture will show different configurations of the four value dimensions. He also emphasized that many other factors influenced value patterns. The values that he delineated, however, capture some core values that people have that are culturally informed, as well as the differences between core values that can create implicit assumptions in intercultural communication. Awareness of these potentially implicit assumptions, or theoretical frameworks, can facilitate more intentional and mindful communication by making our own and others’ meaning-making systems more explicit (Ting-Toomey, 1999, p. 66). In the contexts of analyzing any areas of miscommunication between NP trainees, and in developing a cross-cultural nonverbal curriculum, a panorama of general value types, along with the concept of individual salience in relationship to these values, provides a context for understanding some of the core and possibly implicit assumptions that could be in discord during interaction, and impede communication. Within the communicative event of raising a concern, and thus negotiating conflict, the *individual-collective*, *power distance*, and *uncertainty avoidance* value dimensions may particularly influence how aspects of meaning are individually constructed in relationship to conflict.

The first and core value dimension identified by Hofstede is the *individualism-collectivism dimension*. Individualistic cultures emphasize and prioritize the importance of the “I” identity, individual goals, interindividual interaction, and voluntary reciprocity. Collectivistic cultures emphasize and prioritize “We” identity, group goals, in-group interaction, and obligatory reciprocity. Ting-Toomey points out that

individualism-collectivism “provides us with a conceptual grid in explaining why the meaning of self-conception varies across cultures” (1999, p. 69).

Hofstede’s distinction between individualist and collectivist cultures is similar to the high and low-context cultural type distinction that Hall (1989) refers to in describing cultural communicative types. High-context cultures share characteristics with collectivist cultures, and low-context cultures share characteristics with individualistic cultures. Therefore, the heavier reliance on pragmatic context and nonverbal communication that is found in high context cultures will also likely be found in collectivist cultures. Such cultures will be more likely to rely on implicitly communicated information. So in cross-cultural interactions with at least one person who is from or has a high degree of salience in relationship to a collectivist or high context culture, it becomes especially important to be aware of the fact that much of what may be interpreted and assumed by that person will not be explicit or even accessible to the other individuals whose meaning-making system is informed by a different collectivist culture or by a low-context, individualistic culture.

Cultural values help maintain identity and group solidarity, and also reinforce various habitual practices and norms of communicating, and encode many of our implicit beliefs. They also help us to ‘make sense’ of each others behaviors without having to actively and consciously process too much information at once. As Ting-Toomey says, “We can ‘fill in the blank’ of why people behave the way they do in our culture because we can draw from our implicit values and scripts in predicting in-group members’ actions” (1999, p. 59).

The *power distance dimension* of a culture is defined as the “extent to which the less powerful members of institutions... accept that power is distributed unequally (Hofstede and Bond cited in Ting-Toomey, 1999, p. 69). Ting-Toomey comments that in small power distance cultures, in which power differences are less tolerated, it is more acceptable for children to contradict parents, and “the value of respect between unequal status members of the family is taught at a young age” (Ting-Toomey, 1999, p. 70). Power is evenly distributed in small power distance work situations, and the role of the boss is expected to be democratic. In large power distance work environments, the ideal boss “plays the benevolent autocratic role” and “subordinates expect to be told what to do” (Ting-Toomey, 1999, pp. 70-71). Small power distance cultures emphasize and value equal distance, individual credibility, and informality. Large power distance cultures emphasize and value power distance (as opposed to equal distance), seniority, age, rank, title and formality.

Because NP trainees and peace workers are comprised of an international team from both large and small power distance cultures, assumptions about status and role are likely to influence their interactions. Differences in assumptions about role appropriateness, for example, may influence how behavior is perceived between a team member with more authority in a given situation, and someone with less.

The *uncertainty avoidance dimension* of a culture, Ting-Toomey explains, “refers to the extent to which the members of a culture feel threatened by uncertain situations and the extent to which they try to avoid these situations. The stronger the uncertainty avoidance, the greater the feeling of threat” (1999, p. 71). Weak uncertainty avoidance cultures tend to value uncertainty, career change, risk taking, and innovation and conflict can be viewed as positive. Strong uncertainty avoidance cultures tend to

perceive uncertainty as a threat, value career stability, expect clear procedures, value preserving the status quo, and conflict is necessarily viewed as negative. Because part of the essence of negotiating conflict is also encountering uncertainty of outcome in a situation where each party is invested in a particular outcome, uncertainty avoidance may factor into individual experiences during conflict in the NP training exercise, *raising a concern*.

NP trainees and Peace Workers themselves come from different cultural value backgrounds, and each will come with their own degree of salience regarding any particular value that they were encultured in relationship to. Implicit assumptions in any domain shaped by those values and orientations could be a cause of miscommunication between team members themselves, or between team members and members of any of the subcultures of the countries they are deployed to. An understanding of the different value types provides pointers and landmarks for locating differences in assumptions that are not explicit or easily accessible.

Nonverbal Behavior

If a primary goal of individuals communicating across cultures is to maximize shared meaning, it is important to be aware of what types of meaning generally transpire in cross-cultural interactions, and how that meaning is created. The meaning that is conveyed in any cross-cultural encounter includes content, identity meaning, and relational meaning. Identity and relational meaning are primarily communicated nonverbally, and negotiated implicitly (Ting-Toomey, 1999). Like all arenas communicated even partly through NVC, identity is quite susceptible to misinterpretation between members of different cultural groups. Attitudes toward others, and our perceptions of others' attitudes

toward us, are subtly and complexly communicated within a culture or even a subculture. Failure to achieve shared affective meaning, particularly in relationship to identity, can prevent rapport and trust from forming, effectively blocking much of the critical communication that makes peace work possible. Creating shared meaning in relationship to identity is therefore critical to successful communication in international peace work. Because identity is communicated primarily through nonverbal communication, it is helpful to be aware of how the relationship between nonverbal behavior and identity negotiation tends to work. Because we are looking at identity negotiation across cultures, it is also helpful to understand how the nonverbal behaviors most relevant to identity negotiation can sometimes carry different meanings in different cultures. We will also look at these behaviors as they occur, again through a cross-cultural lens, in relationship to the nonverbal functions that manage identity and relationship, especially in the context of negotiating conflict. Finally, we will look at the role of each nonverbal behavior within typical nonverbal communicative functions.

Nonverbal behaviors exist in relationship to the spectrum of meanings they express and are interpreted to express. Part of the meaning of any nonverbal behavior is its *function*. From an AQAL perspective, individual nonverbal behaviors themselves exist in the Upper Right, which is also comprised, in this context, of the entirety of the nonverbal and verbal behaviors expressed by an individual in a given communicative moment. Any nonverbal behavior can be the visible, objective correlate to the meaning that that behavior communicates to the individuals in the interaction, which is necessarily subjective, and located in the Upper Left quadrant. The shared meaning of the combined verbal and nonverbal expressions resides in the Lower Left quadrant. Also in the Lower Left quadrant are cultural and sub-cultural systems of creating or interpreting meaning in relationship to the nonverbal behaviors in the Upper Right, and systems of nonverbal behaviors in the Lower Right. Meaning can only, of course, be

made in context, which implicitly acknowledges the fact that meaning does not exist objectively in relationship to verbal or nonverbal systems, but within the subjective realm, which is always within a context. The context of a given subjective meaning-making resides in the Lower Left, as a subjective phenomenon involving a group of people, and the visible objective aspects of this context reside in the Lower Right.

In this section, I will concentrate on the relationship between specific meanings, and meaning *functions* in particular, in the Upper Left, and their nonverbal behavioral correlates, in the Upper Right. I will also look at some examples of differences in cultural meaning-making systems in relationship to these behaviors in the Lower Left.

There are several communicative functions that our nonverbal behavior is generally associated with.

These include:

1. *to accent*: to highlight, to stress, to emphasize some part of the verbal message, for example, to speak a key word at a high volume or to open our eyes especially wide while asking a question
2. *to complement*: to complete, to supplement, to add to the verbal message, for example, to speak of hatred with clenched teeth and a tense and serious body posture
3. *to contradict*: to communicate messages nonverbally that are opposite to the verbal messages, or example, to say "I love you" while avoiding eye contact or to say "I'm really interested in what you're saying" while yawning.

4. *to regulate*: to control, to coordinate the flow of verbal messages, for example, to purse your lips and move your head toward the speaker when you wish to say something or to shake your head in approval to indicate to the speaker that you wish to hear more
5. *to repeat*: to restate, to reinforce the verbal messages, for example, to point a finger at someone while saying, "he's the one" or to make the O.K. sign with our fingers while saying "okay"
6. *to substitute*: to take the place of a verbal message, for example, nodding your head instead of verbalizing "yes" or waving goodbye instead of saying anything (DeVito, 1989, p. 6)

Commonly distinguished categories of nonverbal behaviors, which of course express a wide array of meanings including the functions listed above, include:

1. *body communication*: how our body type communicates impressions concerning our personality and general behavior patterns and how our gestures and gross body movements communicate
2. *facial communication*: how our facial movements communicate meanings
3. *eye communication*: how we communicate through the type and length of eye contact and eye avoidance and how the dilation and constriction of pupils communicate different meanings
4. *artifactual communication*: how clothing, hair style, jewelry, home furnishings, office decoration, and colors communicate
5. *spatial communication (proxemics)*: how our use of space in our interpersonal interactions and in the arrangement of our homes and offices communicate
6. *territoriality*: how our ownership-like reactions to areas of space influence our behaviors, how we may encroach upon the territory of others, and how we may react to such encroachments
7. *tactile communication (haptics)*: how we communicate by touch

8. *paralanguage*: how we communicate through changes in rate, volume, quality, resonance, pitch, and pauses and hesitations and the impressions that we formulate on the basis of these variations

(DeVito, 1989, p. 3-4).

Stella Ting-Toomey identifies specific functions of nonverbal behavior that are especially relevant during cross-cultural communication. In the context of maximizing shared meaning, especially shared affective meaning, in a communicative event involving conflict between people with different cultural backgrounds, such as the NP training exercise *raising a concern*, three particularly significant functions are: *reflecting identities, expressing emotions, and managing conversations*.

The nonverbal behaviors that Stella Ting-Toomey identifies as being particularly relevant during cross-cultural communication include *proxemics* (special communication); *kinesics* (body communication) which can also include *oculesics* (eye communication); and *vocalics* (tone of voice and volume).

Proxemics

Proxemics, and the way in which behavior in relationship to personal space communicates affective information is universal in its intensity but culturally specific in terms of how it works, and therefore prone to creating misunderstanding in cross-cultural encounters.

Distance, which is closely related to proxemics, communicates relational content very strongly and also very culturally specifically. Hall has defined four types of distance: intimate, personal, social and public distance. Intimate distance is reserved for family members or romantic partners whose presence is psychologically pleasing, ranging from body contact to about 18 inches (Yong, 2003). Personal distance, which ranges from about 18 inches to 4 feet, is the distance in which we are comfortable with acquaintances we know well but who are not among those we prefer to have in intimate space. The distance that we maintain when interacting with others, then, can communicate information about how we perceive our relationship to them.

It is in part through personal boundaries that protection of the self, or primary identity, is managed.

“Our primary identities are tied closely with our claimed territories. When our territories (e.g., extending from our home down to our personal space) are ‘invaded,’ our identities perceive threats and experience emotional vulnerability. Protective territory or sacred space satisfies our needs for human security, trust, inclusion, connection, and stability” (Ting-Toomey, 1999, p. 127).

Obviously, differences in norms defining intimate, personal and public distance could create a sense of violation or of aloofness. In the study between Arab and American students, it was found that “for Arabs it is normal to stay close to and touch strangers. The distance they keep in ordinary social conversations is the same as what Westerners use in intimate conversations” (Yong, 2003, p. 123). Public distance is the range we feel comfortable for strangers or people we encounter by chance and ranges from 20 to 24 feet. High-contact cultures, such as Arabs, Latin Americans, Greeks, Turks, French and Italians keep relatively small distances compared to low-contact cultures, such as the Japanese, Thai, Germans, Dutch and North Americans, who stand further apart (Yong, 2003).

Cultural differences in what constitutes intimate space versus personal space lead to the most potent and the most common spatial violations, and personal space violations are a common “hidden dimension” of misunderstanding and discomfort between cultures (Hall as cited in Ting-Toomey, 1999, p. 128). Ting-Toomey again cites Arab versus North American cultural norms. In many Arab cultures, the ideal conversational distance is 9-10 inches (Ferraro as cited in Ting-Toomey, 1999, 128), and violations on either side can result in impressions of intrusiveness or standoffishness. Likewise, cultural norm differences of haptics between Arab and North Americans can be considerable. Same-sex touching is much more common in Arab than North American cultures, and “the tendency for North Americans to remain outside the appropriate haptic zone of Arabs often leads to the Arabs suspecting the speakers’ intentions. Arabs tend to see such distancing nonverbal acts as ‘insincere’ and ‘cold.’ Conversely, the need for close contact of Arabs often constitutes a violation of the personal space and privacy of most North Americans, who tend to consider such nonverbal intrusive acts as ‘aggressive’ and ‘belligerent’ “(Ting-Toomey, 1999, p. 131).

Environmental boundary regulation occurs on both physical and psychological levels. Critical affective states such as sense of security, trust, predictability and inclusion are managed by physical boundaries and offered by what are considered primary territories. Primary territories are spaces that are central to our lives, such as our homes and secondary territories are more public and tangential, such as work space. Psychological boundaries protect needs for privacy, information privacy, and “psychological quietness between self and others” (Ting-Toomey, 1999, p. 133) and are more critical in some cultures than others. While they are critical in many Western cultures, they are less important in some collectivist cultures such as Chinese culture, where “relational interconnection should override the

importance of personal privacy” and in Arab cultures, where the concept of privacy is close to the concept of loneliness. “To the extent that we perceive territorial safety, we feel comfortable in our interaction with others. To the extent that we perceive identity threat, we build up defenses via physical or symbolic means” (Ting-Toomey, 1999, p. 134).

Kinesics

Kinesics focuses on movement itself, of the face and body, and also includes gesture, posture, leaning, and body orientation, i.e., the degree to which a communicator’s shoulders and legs are turned in the direction of, rather than away from, the addressee. (Hickson, Stacks, & Moore, 2007), as well as a phenomenon known as syncing, further described below.

Kinesics is regarded as a particularly implicit level of nonverbal behavior that varies significantly from culture to culture (Hickson, et al., 2007). For example, regulators can differ substantially between subcultural groups in North America. Behaviors such as changing body posture, using terminating gestures, and breaking off eye contact are some examples of turn-yielding cues in typical European American cultural interactions, but differ in other North American ethnic groups. “African Americans tend to maintain eye contact when speaking and break off eye contact when listening” while “European Americans tend to break off eye contact when speaking and maintain eye contact when listening” (LaFrance & Mayo as cited in Ting-Toomey, 1999). Between European and African Americans, then, affective discord could easily arise. The norms of the former could appear as “‘nonresponsiveness’ and ‘indifference’ cues, while the norms of the latter could appear as ‘confrontational and aggressive’.

Because the use of nonverbal cues can be influenced by “status position, gender role, and situational norms” (Ting-Toomey, 1999, p. 126) miscommunication due to differences in cultural norms could result in potent miscommunication around identity.

These nonverbal cues are especially prone to creating miscommunication because we learn them at a very young age and “use them at a very low level of awareness.” Ting-Toomey states that “while individuals from contrastive cultures may experience... interaction frustrations, they may not be able to articulate the reasons for them” (1999, p. 125).

The categories of kinesic behavior identified by Morris (as cited in Hickson, et al., 2007, p. 210) span the spectrum of universality to cultural specificity that kinesic behavior itself seems to span. Morris distinguishes five categories of action, including *inborn*, *discovered*, *absorbed*, *trained*, and *mixed*. An example of an inborn behavior is a baby reacting to its mother’s nipple by sucking. An example of a discovered behavior is folding one’s arms. An absorbed action is any that we acquire from others in “an unconscious attempt to synchronize our actions when we are with others; in short, we have a tendency to use the same behaviors that our companions use” (Hickson, et al., 2007, p. 208). Trained actions are those that have to be explicitly learned, such as walking on one’s hands. The fifth category, mixed, acknowledges that any one behavior can result as a combination of more than one of the above.

The phenomenon of absorbed action has also been labeled as ‘postural echo’ and ‘postural congruence’. Hall discusses the same phenomenon at some length in his book *Beyond Culture*. His research has led him to conclude, “People in interactions either move together (in whole or in part) or they don’t and in

failing to do so are disruptive to others around them” (Hall 71). Hall calls this phenomenon of moving together *syncing*, and his research has shown that it happens all the time:

“Movies taken by Condon and Birdwhistell, as well as my own, taken in a variety of settings and circumstances, reveal that when two people talk to each other their movements are synchronized. Sometimes this occurs in barely perceptible ways, when finger, eyelid (blinking), and head movements occur simultaneously and in sync with specific parts of the verbal code (the words, with pitches and stresses) as it unwinds. In other cases, the whole body moves as though the two were under the control of a master choreographer who has written what Lawrence Halprin calls “an open score.” Viewing movies in very slow motion, looking for synchrony, one realizes that what we know as dance is really a slowed-down, stylized version of what human beings do whenever they interact” (Hall, 1989, p. 72).

Hall goes on to discuss synchrony as revealed in a video tape of children “dancing and skipping together during their lunch hour” (1989, p. 76). In analyzing this tape, it was revealed that there was a definite rhythm synchronizing the movements of all of the children, and that the most active child functioned as the ‘conductor’ of the rhythm.

Syncing appears to be a direct function of limbic regulation. Hall notes that “after more than a decade of work with a time/motion analyzer... [Condon] thinks of the process as operating at many levels in which two nervous systems ‘drive’ each other.” He goes on to exemplify:

“In one striking experiment, two people in conversation were wired to electroencephalographs to see if there was any comparability in brain waves. Two cameras were set up so that one

focused on the speakers, the other on the EEG recording pens. When the two people talked, the recording pens moved together as though driven by a single brain. When one of the individuals was called out of the conversation by a third person, the pens no longer moved together” (Hall, 1989, p. 73).

As a limbic phenomenon, syncing is clearly universal, but the way in which it occurs is determined by culture. Hall explains,

“Syncing is panhuman. It appears to be innate, being well established by the second day of life, and may be present as early as the first hour after birth. What is more, stop motion and slow motion studies of movies of newborn children made by Condon and his associates revealed that the newborn infants initially synchronized the movement of their bodies to speech regardless of the language. American children, for example, synced with Chinese just as well as they did with English. From this, it appears that synchrony is perhaps the most basic element of speech and the foundation on which all subsequent speech behavior rests” (Hall, 1989, p. 73).

Hall believes that lack of syncing in an interaction creates disruption— affective discord—and that differences in kinesic behavior between blacks and whites “may well be one of the sources of what blacks feel is the basic racism of white society” (Hall, 1989, p. 74) especially given the “built-in tendency for all groups to interpret their own nonverbal communicative patterns as though they were universal” (Hall, 1989, p. 75).

The possibility that the lack of syncing between blacks and whites creates affective discord and perceptions of racism also translates, of course, to situations in which there is a lack of syncing among members of different cultures and subcultures, particularly where there is a high degree of individual salience in relationship to the culture. Syncing or the lack thereof appears to be a significant avenue for communicating affective information regarding identity and relationship within an interaction. Being 'in sync' appears to help create a sense of communicative cohesion, of being 'with' the other person or people in the interaction. A lack of it, as Hall suggests, communicates separation and can create relational discord, and perhaps implicitly fail to affirm identity or desired identity.

Kinesics and Function

Affective states have also been related to kinesic behaviors, particularly body posture and positioning (Mehrabian as cited in Hickson, et al., 2007). This affective information also seems to carry significant information about identity and relationship. Mehrabian categorized kinesic behavior into functional groups. Two of these functions are particularly relevant to identity and relationship information as it might be communicated through kinesics in a conflict situation such as the exercise *raising a concern*. They can also be seen as subfunctions within Ting-Toomey's functions of *reflecting identities*, *expressing emotions*, and *managing conversations*. They consist of the pleasure-displeasure dimension, or *liking*, and the dominance-submissiveness dimension, or *status or power difference*.

In the *pleasure-displeasure* domain, Mehrabian found differences in body positioning reflecting the degree to which the communicator liked the addressee, with variation between the sexes. The tendencies he noted in women were to use "indirect orientation with intensely disliked persons,

relatively direct with persons they liked, and the most direct with neutrally liked persons". The tendencies he noted in men were, when interacting with another male, to "use less direct body orientation with a well-liked person." He also noted that with both men and women, "body posture is extremely low when one is talking to a disliked person; relaxation is moderate when one is talking with a friend" (Hickson, et al., 2007, p. 210).

Nonverbal cues are used to establish equal status or non-equal status by members of small power distance and large power distance cultures, respectively (Ting-Toomey, 1999, p. 120) and attitude regarding power plays a very important role in the process of identity management in cross-cultural communication. In the *dominance-submissiveness* domain, body orientation differs depending on how communicators perceive the power difference between themselves and their addressees. "People stand with a more direct body orientation when talking to a higher-status person. People in inferior roles lower their heads more often. Individuals' legs and hands are more relaxed when they are of higher status talking with a lower-status person. A higher-status person uses a sideways leaning posture more often when talking to a subordinate" (Hickson, et al., 2007, p. 210). Neither a cultural group nor cultural differences are addressed with these results.

Kinesic behavioral differences within the *dominance-submissiveness* domain according to status have also been hypothesized according to sex and minority. Male posture has been found to be more expansive and dominant, "especially in bigendered situations" whereas "women have been found to use more shrinkage behaviors, taking up less space" (p. 211). Hickson et al suggest:

“Ask women how they feel about being placed in airplane seats next to men who expand their posture into the women’s seats. You might be surprised at how women respond to this invasion of space, and how often men are oblivious to the encroachment since they are just using their normal posture in this setting. The findings about expansive male posture seem to occur over and over again in each subsequent study conducted over the years” (p. 211).

Expanding on the observation that females tend to nonverbally communicate from a lower-status position, while men “gain and maintain their higher status through the use of nonverbal symbols” (Henley as cited in Hickson, et al., 2007, 211), Argyle and Williams note that differences between status behavior according to sex “may be derived from the perception of where the nonverbal behaviors are *attributed*. They believe that females generally attribute nonverbal actions as feedback from themselves. That is, they take the perceiver role; they take responsibility for their nonverbal actions. Males tend to attribute nonverbal actions to others or to the environment. That is, they take on a perceiver role; they think their nonverbal actions are caused by outside sources. This line of reasoning could be further extended to infer that any minority (implying here that females may perceive themselves as a ‘minority’ in terms of status, equated with, for example, blacks, Hispanics, or others) might classify the nonverbal actions as feedback from themselves, as feedback from powerless, low-status people” (Hickson, et al., 2007, p. 211).

Researchers have associated kinesic behavior with several related language functions, including the three that Ting-Toomey has identified as particularly relevant to cross-cultural communication, *reflecting identities*, *expressing emotions*, and *managing conversations*. Behaviors connected with *reflecting identities* include status-related kinesic cues, posture and eye gaze. For some examples of

status cues, "...look at your professors. Most times, their postures are ones where they stand over you, because you are usually sitting in a class. They also may use a more expansive torso position, such as their hands on their hips with their elbows away from the body" (Hickson, et al., 2007, p. 244). In higher status people, where status refers to "a person's social position and judgments made of the person by his or her social group" (Henley as cited in Hickson, et al., 2007, p. 245) posture has been discovered to be more erect. In lower status people, sometimes the head is lowered. Relaxed limbs are typically associated with higher status people but can also indicate confidence in lower status people. Dominance and persuasiveness tends to be expressed through "more eye contact (especially if the person being persuaded is a female), more head nods, more gesturing (especially if the person persuading is a female), slightly more relaxation (but if the person to be persuaded is a female, slightly more tense posture), smaller reclining angles, and differences in body orientation. Male persuaders use indirect orientation; female persuaders use direct orientation, but if the person to be persuaded is male, more indirect orientation. Finally, persuaders try to use some 'open' gestures—postures that are outward rather than inward (Hickson, et al., 2007, p. 246).

Another function that occurs largely through kinesics and is particularly relevant in cross-cultural nonverbal communication is *expressing emotions* (Ting-Toomey, 1999). As described earlier in the chapter, seven universally expressed affective states have been identified: *fear, anger, surprise, disgust, contempt, sadness and happiness* (previous researchers have categorized these emotions slightly differently). Emotions are expressed primarily through facial expressions, but also through the body, which tends to tense as the emotion becomes greater. Ekman and Friesen refer to techniques for reading facial emotion by looking at the area of the face in which the emotional nonverbal cue originates. One technique, called the *Facial Meaning Sensitivity Test* (FMST) looks at the meaning within

the emotional category identified in the *Facial Affect Scoring Technique* (FAST). The facial areas investigated using FAST are Region I, containing the eyebrows and forehead; Region II, including the area from the eyelids to the bridge of the nose; and Region III, comprised of the nose, cheeks, mouth and jaw.

Each of the seven emotional compartments are said to manifest first in one of these three regions. *Fear* manifests first in the eyes and eyelids, “the upper eyelid usually being raised and the lower eyelid tensed and drawn up” (Hickson, et al., 2007, pp. 218-19). *Anger* is often ambiguous unless it arises in each of the areas that it can arise in, the cheeks, mouth, brows and forehead. *Surprise* is usually followed by another emotion, which casts a positive or negative tone on the surprise. Surprise can also be used to conceal another emotion. It most often shows up in the eye region and eyebrows and the mouth area. *Disgust* and *contempt* are two closely related emotions, distinguished primarily by their objects. Disgust generally involves “getting-rid-of and getting-away-from responses” and relates to “people, ideas, actions, situations, oneself, or in reaction to the sight, taste, smell, or touch of something” (Hickson, et al., 2007, p. 219). Contempt indicates “‘I’m not going to do what you ask me to do’” or “‘What you are saying is ridiculous’”. Associated facial expressions of disgust and contempt were eye gape, nose crinkling and a raised upper lip. Sadness is shown when the “‘inner corners of the eyebrows are drawn up. The skin below the eyebrow is triangulated, with the inner corner up. The upper eyelid inner corner is raised. The corner of the lips are down or the lip is trembling’” (Ekman and Friesen as cited in Hickson, et al., 2007, p. 220). *Happiness* is displayed when the “‘[c]orners of the lips are drawn back and up. The mouth may or may not be parted, with the teeth exposed or not. A wrinkle... runs down from the nose to the outer edge beyond the lip corners. The cheeks are raised. The lower eyelid shows wrinkles below it, and may be raised but not tense. Crows-feet wrinkles go outward

from the outer corners of the eyes’” (Hickson, et al., 2007, p. 112). Finally, Ekman and Friesen identify the phenomenon of *affect blends*, when two or more expressions are displayed at the same time. They also identify a *neutral* expression, which will be different for any given person.

Facial expressions carry more meaning than any other nonverbal behavior regarding affect, and our face responds very instinctively to our affective states. In response to this phenomenon, we have developed *facial management techniques* “designed to communicate something a bit differently from what we are really feeling” (Devito, 1989, p. 66). These techniques, as identified by Ekman and Friesen, are *intensifying, deintensifying, neutralizing, and masking*.

Intensifying is the act of trying to “exaggerate an expression of emotion that we are feeling.” DeVito exemplifies intensifying by suggesting, “Let’s say Grandma gives you a \$50 Savings Bond. Though you expected more, you are pleased and want to let Grandma feel extra good and so exaggerate your joy at getting the Bond. Your eyes grow wider than they would normally and you smile more broadly than you would if it arrived in the mail where no one would see your response” (DeVito, 1989, p. 66).

Deintensifying occurs when we want to reduce the strength of the facial expression of the emotion that we feel. *Neutralizing* is when we “try to hide any outward expression of felt emotions.” Men, in North American culture, are generally expected to neutralize emotions more than women are. *Masking* is when we attempt to display an emotion that is altogether different than the one we are feeling (DeVito, 1989, p. 66).

Ekman and Friesen also identify eight general categories that people fall into in regards to their facial expressions. These are:

"The Withholder. This person displays little to no emotion. It has been argued that this lack of expression reinforces the behavior and becomes a contributing factor in inhibiting the experiencing of various emotions.

The Revealer. This person, the opposite of the withholder, displays all emotional feelings without any attempt to engage in any of the facial management techniques.

The Unwitting Expressor. This person displays feelings without realizing it. Often this person assumes that he or she was effective in hiding any expression of the felt emotions and frequently wonders how others knew how they were feeling.

The Blanked Expressor. Whereas the unwitting expressor expresses feelings without wishing to, the blanked expressor wishes to but doesn't. This person thinks he or she is expressing the felt emotions but only a relatively blank expression is actually displayed.

The Substitute Expressor. The person thinks he or she is communicating one emotion but is actually communicating a very different emotion. Whether this person is really feeling both

emotions, only the emotion he or she is consciously aware of, or the only emotion that is actually expressed does not seem clear at this time.

The Frozen-Affect Expressor. This person has the same particular expression ready for initial display at all times. Regardless of the circumstances or the appropriateness of the expression, this person responds first and always with the same emotion. This is then followed by a more appropriate expression.

The Flooded-Affect Expressor. In all circumstances, this person displays one emotion (that is generally characteristic of the individual) mixed with another (usually more appropriate) emotion. For example, the person might display annoyance and, when feeling surprise, would display both annoyance and surprise" (DeVito, 1989, p. 69).

Eye movements are also an important part of *expressing emotions* through facial expression, and constitute their own nonverbal behavioral category previously identified, which is *oculesics*. Because I don't expect to capture detailed eye movements on video during the exercise *raising a concern*, I will mention only some general information about the meaning functions associated with eye behavior. *Eye contact* can seek feedback from the other about what was said, or operate as a conversational turn cue. Eye avoidance is used when we want to avoid an interaction or signal disinterest, unwillingness to engage with a particular individual, or indifference toward them. Functions such as seeking and giving feedback and signaling turn-taking fall into another category identified as particularly significant in cross-cultural nonverbal communication, *managing conversations* (Ting-Toomey, 1999).

Nonverbal behaviors that function to manage conversations are also known as *regulators*. Regulators regulate the pace and flow of verbal interaction and govern conversational turn-taking. The major strategies around conversational turns include:

Turn-maintaining: the speaker wishes to maintain the role of speaker.

Turn-yielding: the speaker announces to others in the conversation that the speaker has finished and it is now someone else's turn to speak

Turn-requesting: the listener wishes to speak, the listener wishes to assume the role of speaker

Turn-denying: the listener does not wish to assume to role of speaker

Back-channeling: the listener wants the speaker to continue in the role of speaker; the listener wishes to indicate a recognition of something the speaker says; (as a turn-denying cure) the listener indicates the unwillingness to exchange the role of listener for that of speaker.

Kinesic behaviors associated with turn-taking cues differ greatly from culture to culture and always operate in the context of a given norm for cultural turn-taking. In North American culture, this norm is "me-you-me-you-me-you" and this flow is typically managed through gaze direction, head nods, forward leans, gesturing, and facing the other or turning away. These behaviors can "indicate a desire to continue with the conversation if you are speaking; they may signal a desire to turn the conversation over to you if you are listening; or you may use them to keep the other person talking. You may also signal a desire to take over the conversation (or a desire to enter)" (Hickson, et al., 2007, p. 216). Kinesic

behaviors indicating the desire to take a turn in conversation are turn-taking cues, and include eye contact, facing behavior, leaning, raised hand or finger, straightening of the back (Hickson, et al., 2007, p. 283). Back-channeling is expressed by responding to the speaker in some way, most often through head nods, often accompanied by 'um-hmmms'. All of these conversational management functions are also accomplished largely through another nonverbal behavior that can be identified in relationship to cross-cultural nonverbal communication, *vocalics*.

Vocalics

Vocalics refers to the use of voice qualifiers. Voice qualifiers include accent, emphasis, vocal quality, pitch, rate, and pause (including silence). A second form of vocalics, vocalizations, include sounds or noises independent of speech, such as throat clearing, yawns, screams, laughs, etc, and can be looked at as any messages in the voice that carry meaning.

There are eight areas of sound that contribute to vocalic meaning. They are *loudness, pitch, duration, quality, regularity, articulation, pronunciation, and silence*. *Loudness* includes volume and voice intensity, such as raising and lowering the voice. *Pitch* is the range of the voice within a conversation. Sometimes a higher pitch, for example, expresses excitement. *Duration* refers to the length of time that a sound is produced. Voice *quality* is comprised of the speaker's "timbre, tonality and production of airflow through the glottis (opening in the throat where the sound is made). Regularity is the rate at which we speak and includes stress within the speech, which is defined as "increase or decrease of loudness within the speech clause). *Articulation* refers to the clearness and control of the sounds being

produced, and *pronunciation* also includes the rhythm and rate of speech. *Silence* refers to the absence of sound.

The rules governing vocalics also differ from culture to culture. Affective discord can easily arise when a vocalization that is circumstantially acceptable in one culture is considered inappropriate in another.

One example of a cultural tendency that often results in miscommunication is when “U.S. Americans... interpret the clipped speech of some Britons as ‘arrogant’ and ‘pompous’ whereas some Britons would consider U.S. Americans’ speech style as ‘too casual’ or and as having ‘no class’”. (Ting-Toomey, 1999, p. 118). More subtle discord can also arise. For example, while the hesitation function of “um” and “uh-huh” in North American culture is commonly accepted as a way of pacing speech, in Germany, it can signal incompetence or a lack of cohesion in thought process. (Schramm, personal communication, February 2007).

Cultural norms for using voice qualifiers can result in miscommunication, and Ting-Toomey points out that “cultural group members often tend to use their own vocal qualifiers and rules to evaluate others’ vocalic signals” (Ting-Toomey, 1999, p. 118). In my own teaching of Hmong adult refugees in Minnesota, it has become apparent to the North American teaching staff that in Hmong culture, it is normal to exhibit a wide range of bodily functions in public, including belching, throat clearing, and spitting. In middle class Midwest North American culture, of course, this is not the norm, and creates an impression of rudeness and lack of sophistication. These instances of miscommunication can be particularly powerful because they are often implicit and unintentional. As Ting-Toomey points out, “we encode our sense of self via different nonverbal features and behaviors” (1999, p. 119).

When I was in college, a Minnesotan girlfriend of mine went to Jerusalem to study for a semester. She was standing on a street corner on their first day of walking around the city, watching two men engage in a loud, vigorous, and intense discussion. They were raising their voices and waving their arms. She said to her professor, "Wow, they must be really upset!" He responded that they were talking about the weather.

Vocalics and Function

The vocalic functions that are most relevant to cross-cultural nonverbal communication include *identification and self-presentation, displaying affective information, and controlling the interaction, or regulating* (Ting-Toomey, 1999). In order to establish some sort of baseline from which to judge the variations that constitute vocalic meaning, voice types and normal speech have been investigated. Some speech characteristics that can contribute to a voice type include a demanding voice, deep voice, high pitch, persuasive manner while speaking, and dominating, relaxed, friendly, emotional, authoritarian, enthusiastic, patient, polite, nervous, and casual speech, and the tendency to show anger rather than conceal it. (Hickson, et al., 2007, p. 265). All of these qualities, and more, comprise in any individual what is known as a *voiceprint*. The concept of the voiceprint is that each individual's voice is unique, much like a fingerprint.

The voiceprint is part of what constitutes the vocalic function of *identification and self-preservation*. People fall into one or more different voice types, which have been found to have characteristics of vocal attractiveness and unattractiveness. Vocalic variables can influence others' perceptions of the speaker. Louder and faster speech has been found to create an impression of greater confidence and

more credibility. It has also been found that many people prefer speech rates similar to their own. Medium and high pitch ranges have been found to make a person appear more dynamic.

Evaluating affective information as carried by vocalics appears to be among the most dependent on context and individual differences. In an experiment, DeVito (1989) asked students to repeat the same two sentences with six different affective expressions. The sentence reads: "There is no other answer. You've asked me that question a thousand times and my answer has always been the same; it will always be the same." He suggests saying these sentences with vocalics that express love, happiness, indifference, sadness, fear, and anger. Part of what he is trying to illustrate is that negative emotions can generally be more difficult to perceive than positive emotions. One also has to imagine that any given person would read the sentences with any given affective emphasis differently, and yet that there would be some similarities as well. The relationship between vocalics and affective states has been described emphasizing the need for context in order to evaluate: "...our vocal tone can tell others how we feel physically or psychologically, in essence, our emotional state. Certainly we can tell when someone we know is intoxicated, through vocal intonation, slurs, and the like. We can also usually tell when another is depressed, if we have a normal baseline from which to operate. Screams of anger, fear, joy, and surprise all differ from one another" (Hickson, et al., 2007, p. 290).

The third vocalic function, *regulating conversation*, is considered to be a major function of vocalics. As explained under the kinesics section, the major conversational turn-taking strategies include *turn-maintaining*, *turn-yielding*, *turn-requesting*, *turn-denying*, and *back-channeling*. The context in which these cues occur is the culturally prescribed rhythm of sequencing, which in North America follows a default turn-taking pattern of me-you-me-you-me-you.

Turn-maintaining vocalic cues are used when the speaker is talking and wishes to suppress the listener's cues to take a turn. These cues include "taking an audible breath, using a sustained intonation pattern (falling or rising intonation patterns, such as at the end of sentences of questions signal a willingness to stop talking), speeding up your rate, and using vocalized for filled pauses" (Hickson, et al., 2007, p. 282).

Turn-yielding vocalic cues are used when the speaker wishes to stop speaking. They include creating a rising intonation pattern, suggesting that a question has been asked, or using a falling intonation pattern or drawing out the final syllable at the end of a clause or statement. In Western culture one can also use silence to invite another to take a turn (Hickson, et al., 2007).

Turn-suppressing cues are used when a conversational participant doesn't have anything to add to the conversation or is afraid to speak. In this case, back-channeling cues can be used, and sometimes at a slower rate, to encourage the speaker to continue. This can be done by using 'non-words' such as *uh-huh, yep, or ahhh*.

Turn-taking cues are used when a conversational participant wants to say something but is not given an 'in' by the speaker. Kinesic turn-taking cues have been discussed above. Vocalic cues that can be used include the 'stutter-start' in which "you try to break in with a "b,b,b, but" or similar cue." Interruption is the second cue, "in which you cross over into the speaker's turn and continue speaking. The third is to "increase the rate of the vocal segregates you are using for back-channeling purposes. Just as slowing

down the rate of them denies (or suppresses) your turn, speeding them up indicates a desire to say something, or take your turn” (Hickson, et al., 2007, p. 283).

Turns help determine conversational synchrony, and conversational coherence is picked up early on in life. Culturally appropriate turn-taking is connected to personality traits, including “interpersonal orientation” or what could be looked at as interpersonal lines of development. People who are “lower” in interpersonal orientation tend to be “less vocally active and engage in less consistent communication (as measured by turn duration and backchannel responses). Their speech fails to converge with the other person’s speech. The implications of this are twofold. First, a person’s interpersonal orientation is expressed through paralinguistic cues, which are directly related to the structure of the interaction. Second, highly interpersonal-oriented people “may be able to perform some behaviors, such as vocal and certain nonverbal behaviors, more consistently and to modify others’ behaviors, such as self-disclosures, to a greater extent than individuals less concerned with self-presentations [low interpersonal-oriented people or low self-monitors]” (Hickson, et al., 2007, p. 284).

It seems that a person with a higher level of ‘interpersonal orientation’ or interpersonal development can more naturally ‘sync’ with others and orchestrate syncing within an interaction. This harkens back to the idea discussed earlier of nonverbal communication development, interpersonal development, and empathy being one and the same, or very closely intertwined, lines of development.

Regulating, too, is a culturally specific phenomenon. I have discussed turn-taking cues in relationship to the North American sequencing norm of me-you-me-you-me-you, but Brazilians tend to interrupt twice

as much as either Japanese or U.S. Americans during international business negotiations; and French tend to use interruptions to create “fireworks” in their serious conversations, which “often baffles U.S. Americans” (Ting-Toomey, 1999, p. 125).

This information should help navigate what is happening when looking at the degree of shared meaning that is achieved during cross-cultural interactions during the NP training, and in turn can inform what might be likely to happen during cross-cultural interactions among peace workers in the field. This is significant because failure to achieve shared affective meaning, particularly in the domains of relationship and identity, can prevent rapport and trust from forming, effectively blocking much of the critical communication that is the foundation of peace work. Creating shared meaning in the domains of relationship and identity therefore is critical to successful communication in international peace work.

Summary

Throughout this chapter the extent to which nonverbal behavior and perception can occur outside of our conscious awareness comes up repeatedly. That which transpires in cross-cultural interactions includes content and affect, or information and feeling. Content is communicated primarily through verbal language and gesture, while affect is communicated primarily through nonverbal behaviors other than gesture. The way in which meaning becomes shared meaning, or fails to become shared meaning, is negotiated through a number of dimensions. One major influence on the negotiation of shared meaning is physiologically based, another is culturally based. Both are deeply ingrained and largely implicit, and intertwined.

This chapter has attempted to make the how and what of nonverbal behavior and perception more explicit.

Effective engagement in cross-cultural communication—with the goal of achieving a high degree of shared meaning, especially around affective states—also involves making the implicit explicit. On a general, pan-cultural level, this explicit meaning could consist of a theoretical understanding of what is actually happening intersubjectively during the process of negotiating shared meaning by understanding the role of the limbic brain and empathy during nonverbal expression and perception; an understanding of what that meaning consists of, including content, identity, and relationship, and the realization “that the fundamental functions and interpretations of any nonverbal cues are closely tied to identity, emotional expression, conversational management, impression formation, and boundary regulation functions” (Ting-Toomey, 1999, p. 140-141); an understanding of nonverbal behavior as located in the AQAL model, manifesting in the Upper Right as a result of affective states in the Upper Left; and how nonverbal behavior is interpreted, or how meaning is made, as a result of the degree and arenas of shared meaning making systems between those in communication, or access to each others’ meaning making systems. This understanding can come about by being aware of what types of behaviors regulate the way we communicate identity, and what cultural factors influence the way we interpret these behaviors.

On a culturally specific level, further areas of awareness can be helpful. Ting-Toomey recommends being able to “identify appropriate nonverbal display rules in different cultures”; “understand the cultural

values and attributions that are attached to different nonverbal norms and rules”; and using “culture-sensitive perception checking statements” (Ting-Toomey, 1999, p. 141).

In the next chapter, I will describe the design of the study, the participants and setting of the Nairobi workshop, and the data collection techniques that were used.

CHAPTER 3: METHODS

This chapter describes the setting, participants, study design, data collection techniques and analysis used in this study.

Setting and Participants

The data for this study was collected at a training workshop held in Nairobi, Kenya in November and December 2006. The site was selected by the Nonviolent Peaceforce (NP) and the physical setting was at the Shalom House, a hotel and conference center in Nairobi. The purpose of the training program was to develop a team of deployable peace workers for 2007 upcoming NP initiatives in the Philippines, Uganda and Columbia. Participants were trained in NP philosophies and policies, peace work strategies, and in some communication strategies. NP's mission is "to build a trained, international civilian nonviolent peace force" in unarmed intervention and deploy them to countries struggling with internal conflict situations (Mission statement, 2005, ¶1).

The training consisted of theoretical and practical components. Theoretical components took place in a large classroom environment at the Shalom House. Practical components required trainees to enact role plays around conflict resolution practices. Role plays took place on the Shalom House grounds and courtyard, and were video-taped. There were also three large-scale simulations as part of the training.

One communication goal that training participants practiced was *raising a concern*. In the role play that I video-taped, participants were assigned roles as NP team members with two major conflicting urgent

priorities involving a need to use the same, and only, computer. The role play required them to negotiate these conflicting priorities under pressures of time and conflicting needs.

Study Design

The purpose of collecting this data was to respond to the following research question:

I'm studying nonverbal communication as an AQAL phenomenon because I want to understand the nonverbal communicative devices used within the speech act of raising concerns in cross-cultural communicative contexts, in relationship to what is mutually and interdependently co-occurring in all four quadrants during the speech event, in order to shed light on the co-occurring variables across the quadrants that create the circumstances for cross-cultural nonverbal communication and miscommunication, with the application of creating more awareness around the variables that cultivate and obstruct successful cross-cultural nonverbal communication.

The object of study, "nonverbal communication as an AQAL phenomenon" includes nonverbal communication as it occurred in the role play, through the integral lens of the AQAL model outlined in Chapter 2. The nonverbal behavioral data collected consists of the nonverbal behaviors and functions, along with those behaviors and functions *in relationship to* the verbal behavior, exhibited by the role play participants. Studying this data "as an AQAL phenomenon" means looking at the data from the perspectives of what is dynamically occurring during the interaction from the perspectives of the interior, exterior, individual and collective. Chapter two describes the AQAL model and these

perspectives in detail. This comprehensive approach provides an excellent fit for a qualitative research approach. Nonverbal data is observed in its natural context, and no attempts were made to create a controlled experimental environment. (Mackey & Gass, 2005).

The communicative context of study, the communicative event of 'raising concerns', corresponds to the video-taped role play, *raising a concern*. As discussed in Chapter 1, I had originally intended to also look at data from the role play *projecting confidence*, in which team members would walk down a line of other team member observers with the intention of projecting confidence, while the observers set the intention of alternately sending indifferent and empathic, loving energy. However, during this exercise, participants had already build such a rapport with each other and seemed in execution, and in later reflection on the exercise, not to genuinely try to project confidence, but to be funny. Because I am interested in nonverbal behaviors and correlating subjective experiences in the context of genuine engagement in communicative events that are likely to be highly relevant in the field in nonviolent conflict intervention, the data from this *projecting confidence* exercise no longer met this criterion.

The cross-cultural specification corresponds to the different cultural backgrounds of the training participants who took part in the role play and exercise, and the role of those different cultures within the communicative events. The future application refers to the cross-cultural nonverbal curricular proposal that this research will inform. The curricular proposal will be tailored to the communication goals of NP and the NP training, based in part on the findings of this research.

Data Collection Techniques

In order to respond to this research question through the lens of an AQAL perspective, I needed to capture objective, measurable data and subjective, interior data. My objective, measurable data was collected by video-taping the role play itself, with a particular goal of capturing nonverbal behaviors. My subjective, interior data was collected by video-taping a debriefing that took place after the role play, and by conducting a focus group about the role play later that same day. I had hoped to also conduct individual interviews with primary role play participants, but the intensive schedule of the capacity building training did not allow this. The following subsection details the questions that were asked in the focus group.

Focus group

The questions posed specifically to the participant who had the role of raising a concern or initiating communication in a conflict situation, were:

1. What was your intention – message and sentiment – that you had or were trying to convey?
2. Did it feel like the listener understood you? Why or why not?

The questions posed to the person who was being 'confronted' in the role play were:

3. Did you feel like you understood the intention of the person raising a concern to you?
4. How did you interpret his/her message and sentiment?

After this discussion, I posed the following questions to be considered while watching the video itself.

The video that we watched for this purpose was the second take of the two role plays.

5. Can you identify specific instances of good matches or mismatches between the nonverbal part of the communication and what the messages and sentiments seemed to be?
6. Does it seem like there were any cultural factors that affected the communication?

After watching the video and using questions 5 and 6 and discussion launch points, we divided the participants into teams and gave them each a nonverbal behavior or function to look for during the role play and watched the role play again. Our discussion questions after this final viewing were:

7. What's happening with the nonverbal behavior or function that you're watching for?
8. Do there seem to be cultural factors influencing what's happening?

Nearly all of the data from the focus group that is actually used in the analysis comes from the first four questions. Because there was much more data in the focus group than was relevant to my research question, I do not transcribe the session, but extract relevant quotations from it in my presentation and discussion of the data in Chapter 4.

Data Analysis

In Chapter 4, I present and analyze the data. I look first at comments in the debriefing and focus group that point to what the participants' individual subjective experiences were during the role play. From their individual subjective experiences, I identify areas of miscommunication, or communicative discord, in the arenas of both content and affect. I then look at the nonverbal behavior in the role play itself. I

focus particularly on *vocalic* and *kinesic* behavior, as discussed in Chapter 2. I then bring this behavior in relationship to the communicative functions it seems to perform. The primary functions that I investigate, as discussed in Chapter 2, are *emotional display*, *reflecting identity and relationship*, and *regulating conversation*. Finally, I look at how the nonverbal and behavioral functions identified appear to relate to the areas of affective discord—pressure and empathy—that came up in the role play.

This chapter described the qualitative research approach used in the current study. The next chapter will present and discuss the data collected.

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

Introduction

The data presented in this chapter consists of a video-taped role play by participants of the Nonviolent Peaceforce's (NP) 2006 training program in Nairobi, Kenya, and a tape recorded question and answer session with the participants and observers following the role play and exercise.

The purpose of the training program was to develop a team of deployable peace workers for 2007 upcoming NP initiatives in the Philippines, Uganda and Columbia. Participants were trained in NP philosophies and policies, peace work strategies, and in some communication strategies. One communication goal that they practiced was *raising a concern*. In the role play that I video-taped, participants were assigned roles as NP team members with two major conflicting urgent priorities involving a need to use the same, and only, computer. The role play required them to negotiate these conflicting priorities under pressures of time and conflicting needs.

The purpose of collecting this data was to respond to the following research question:

I'm studying nonverbal communication as an AQAL phenomenon because I want to understand the nonverbal communicative devices used within the speech act of raising concerns in cross-cultural communicative contexts, in relationship to what is mutually and interdependently co-occurring in all four quadrants during the speech event, in order to shed light on the co-

occurring variables across the quadrants that create the circumstances for cross-cultural nonverbal communication and miscommunication, with the application of creating more awareness around the variables that cultivate and obstruct successful cross-cultural nonverbal communication.

The object of study, “nonverbal communication as an AQAL phenomenon” includes nonverbal communication as it occurred in the role play, through the integral lens of the AQAL model outlined in Chapter 2. The nonverbal behavioral data collected consists of the nonverbal behaviors and functions, along with those behaviors and functions *in relationship to* the verbal behavior, exhibited by the role play participants. Studying this data “as an AQAL phenomenon” means looking at the data from the perspectives of what is dynamically occurring during the interaction from the perspectives of the interior, exterior, individual and collective. Chapter two describes the AQAL model and these perspectives in detail.

The communicative context of study, ‘the speech act of raising concerns’, corresponds to the video-taped role play, *raising a concern*. The cross-cultural specification corresponds to the different cultural backgrounds of the training participants who took part in the role play and exercise, and the role of those different cultures within the communicative events.

The future application refers to the cross-cultural nonverbal curricular proposal that this research will inform. The curricular proposal will be tailored to the communication goals of NP and the NP training, based in part on the findings of this research.

Data in the AQAL Model

As discussed in Chapter 2, the AQAL, or Integral model, can be applied to any dynamic phenomenon in order to explicitly observe all aspects that comprise the event. The Integral Institute broadly defines the Integral Approach as follows:

“It simply means more balanced, comprehensive, interconnected, and whole. By using an Integral approach—whether it's in business, personal development, art, education, or spirituality (or any of dozens of other fields)—we can include more aspects of reality, and more of our humanity, in order to become more fully awake and effective in anything we do.” (Integral Institute, 2006, ¶12)

In the case of this research, the field of application, in general, is communication, and in particular, the interaction within the role play *raising a concern*. As in all Integral Approaches, the aspects of reality included in this approach are based in the perspectives of the four quadrants. The quadrants aspect of the Integral model recognizes that any phenomenon can be viewed from at least four fundamental perspectives, including its interior, exterior, individual and collective aspects.

As stated in Chapter 2, The *Upper Left* quadrant represents the interior individual perspective, (i.e., the *I*, or subjective mind); the *Upper Right* quadrant represents exterior individual perspective (i.e., the *it*, or objective body) e.g., the physical, tangible correlates of the subjective personal experience; the *Lower Left* represents the interior collective perspective, including shared personal subjective experience, i.e.,

the *we* or intersubjective reality; and the *Lower Right* represents the exterior collective perspective (i.e., the *its*), e.g., systems within the physical, manifest world (*What is Enlightenment* 60).

The role play data that I collected will be presented, and later discussed, within the framework of the AQAL four-quadrant perspective. The video tape and transcription of *raising a concern* constitute the *Upper Right* data, and includes the nonverbal expressions of the individuals in the role play as well as their verbal expressions.

The *Lower Right* quadrant consists of system correlates to the individual correlates in the *Upper Right*, e.g., such as nonverbal behavior systems and cross-cultural communication systems, which were already discussed in Chapter 2. The *Lower Right* quadrant will also include the visible nonverbal behavior that happens during syncing, in which two individuals mirror each other and allow their nonverbal behavior to get 'in sync.' (Hall).

The *Upper Left* includes the individual subjective interpretations and feelings that participants experienced during the role play. This data will include the reflections of the individual role play participants as expressed on video tape immediately after the role play, captured on video, and during a tape recorded focus group later on that same day.

The domain of shared and unshared meaning, between individuals in the role play as illuminated by the data, resides in the *Lower Left*. The individual experiences and interpretations expressed in the *Upper*

Left should point to areas of shared and unshared meaning in the role play and reveal areas of discord, or miscommunication, in the *Lower Left* quadrant. In this section I will identify these areas of discord or miscommunication, and discuss them in connection with identity and relationship within cross-cultural nonverbal communication, as explored in Chapter 2.

The Data

Upper Right: Role Play Background

In this role play, two NP trainees, Bernadette and Shez, were given active roles in the conflict. Other members were given supporting roles. Wolf and Joel were to act as Shez' advisors, and Natasha and Chandan were to act as Bernadette's advisors.

The role play was set up in order that Shez and Bernadette would have to navigate a conflict over using a computer. Bernadette was asked to play a member of an NP team who had been out in the field for two weeks. She had survived a recent attack, but her family hadn't been notified that she'd survived. She hadn't been able to update her blog in some time. Her friends and family members would have only heard reports that many people had been killed and would only know that Bernadette had survived once they heard from her.

In the scenario that she was given, cell phones are down. Bernadette gets up early to go to the office to finish a blog entry to family and friends. She knows that family and friends have been worried about her, because she hasn't been able to communicate due to power outages and because of being away on

accompaniment, which is a primary activity of NP, in which peace workers physically accompany people to conduct discussions that without a neutral third party would be less safe or even impossible.

Shez was asked to play another member of the team who had been based at the NP office. She is under pressure to send an emergency update to a project coordinator at the NP headquarters level in time for an upcoming emergency meeting. She is under pressure to finish it this morning because there will be a follow-up meeting in the afternoon with a local non-governmental organization.

Before the role play, the two sides met separately and discussed their goals for the interaction. Wolf and Joel said that they would support Shez. They discussed why they had a 'right' to use the computer and cited that the report took precedence because of its emergency nature and ASAP priority. On the other side, one of the trainers, explained to Bernadette that she needed to email her family and that she had a lot of work to do.

This transcript constitutes the verbal communication that took place in the role play, raising a concern. Nonverbal aspects of the communication will be extracted from the video and discussed later, but will necessarily constitute only a portion of the nonverbal communication that took place.

Upper Right: Transcription

Bernadette is sitting at the table, along with her supporter, Natasha. Her other support person, Chandan, is standing nearby, as is one of the trainer who is also supporting her. Shez approaches the table.

Shez: Hi Bernadette! (default chipper tone throughout the greeting)

Bernadette: Hi!

Shez: How are you?

Bernadette: Good! How are you?

Shez: What are you doing?

Bernadette: Sorry?

Shez: What are you doing?

Bernadette: Oh, I'm just emailing my sister.

Shez: Oh, really. I think that, ah, the headquarter in Colombo ... Colombo asked me to send the report. Do you remember that, for the committee members? The project committee report?

Bernadette: Yeah...

Shez: (laugh) So, do you mind giving me the computer?

Bernadette: Yeah, just give me maybe two minutes, 'n... I'll try to get this finished up. Okay?

Shez: Okay, sure.

Natasha (sitting across from Bernadette) – [muddled] ... with your emails personal, [muddled] in general get the feeling that her stuff [muddled] and we prefer to [muddled] in this moment, is more important...

Joel: (walking up to the table) Hello Shez...

Shez: Hi.

Joel: Have you managed to send the report?

Shez: Yeah, ah, I will in a minute, um, she will finish it in one minute... I hope so... (looking at Bernadette). So...

Bernadette: Yeah, it'll just be a couple more minutes.

Joel: This one is urgent. They need it, please, if you don't mind.

Shez: (to Bernadette) Can you save it, and give it to me, the computer?

Bernadette: (Looks directly at Shez, turns body toward her [wind muddled].) I'll finish this, and then...

Joel: (Leaning in) Can you do that... you can do that during lunch. We need that for the meeting, for the meeting in the afternoon. And they needed the report before we go.

Bernadette: Okay. (makes a motion to save the document). Now, when can I use it again, 'cuz I'm *not* entirely finished.

Joel: Half an hour.

Shez: It's just, half an hour? (looks toward Bernadette).

Trainer 1: (from the background, addressing Bernadette, but not officially part of the role play)

The power is very unreliable, so if you give up your computer, you won't see it again.

Bernadette: Oh. Um, okay, I guess, yeah...

Joel: This is a matter of life and death. You can *always* send your sister... (shakes his head and smiles as if to entreat reason). Please.

Bernadette: Yeah yeah yeah. (quickly, laughs). Of course, of course, go ahead. Maybe if you can just be as fast as possible (hand motion – muddled) ...in a half hour again.

Shez: Sure, no worries. (suddenly chipper) Thank you very much!

Bernadette: (also more chipper) You're welcome!

Joel: (approaches Shez) [muffled] You are going to send, that that that report

Wolf: the incidence that we just observed

Joel: that we couldn't make it on time because we were dealing with an urgent matter.

Luliu: I'm not really sure what the report is about.

Shez: It is about the [muffled] committee report...

Joel: We're supposed to have a meeting in the afternoon.

Shez: (panicky vocalics) Yeah, yeah (moving hands as if trying to say something more) it's the NGO meeting, and I'll just quickly finish it (hands flying, rising intonation).

Joel: [muffled]

[role play continues as Shez writes the report, Trainer 1 announces that there's a warning that power will go away in ten minutes for three days, and there is a communication that has come internationally, that three international staff of an NGO are dead]

Trainer 1: And so Bernadette, you need to send...

Joel: You need to notify your family.

Bernadette: I do need to notify them. I do... Bernadette goes on to ask Shez if anyone is going to Colombo tonight for a meeting (so that she might find Internet access there). Trainer 1 then asks the two sides to consult about the situation, and they continue the role play.

Break: Here, participants break into their original teams to privately convene before continuing the role play.

Shez: (approaches the table) Hi.

Bernadette: Hi.

Shez: (low tones) Do you mind... if I use the computer?

Bernadette: (flustered, pushing hair behind ears) Well, how – how urgent is yours? Because I've been in the field for *two weeks*, and I haven't been able to [check a/ touch a] computer, and my parents, with the, ah, recent deaths of the NGO workers, they – they think it's me. So I, I *have* to get this out to them (looking down) before the power goes down.

Shez: (sits down, exhales, lowers voice) I think that this is very urgent... priority on this...

Joel: (approaches Shez with a clipboard) [muffled] ...*quickly*.

Shez: (to Joel) Okay okay okay, I will I will I will *do* that. (to Bernadette) It's just, it's just, we have to send the report, and (hand gesturing quickly)...

Bernadette: When, when does this report have to be sent?

Shez: Today, today.

Bernadette: And you couldn't have done it a couple of days ago?

Shez: It's urgent...

Joel: Actually this is the situation. Columbo wants this report, urgently, because they are going for the emergency meeting in the afternoon.

Bernadette: Okay okay.

Shez: [muffled] And we gathered this information in the morning, and that's why I really want to...

Trainer 1: You have only 5 minutes before the power outage.

Joel: We are going for the emergency meeting at the MOD in Colombo, in the NGO.

Bernadette: Okay, just let me quickly email my parents, and let them know...

Shez: Do you mind sending an instant message or something like that?

Joel: You can text them...

Bernadette: All the cell phones are broken.

Joel: You can call from the land line. Please.

Wolf: You can be back on the computer in 10/15 minutes.

Shez: Yeah, 10/15 minutes.

Bernadette [objects – something about the power].

Trainer 1: The telephone system has been jammed for intelligence reasons.

Wolf: I think we have to – it's just a matter of priority, and work will always have priority...

Shez: Exactly.

Wolf: No matter ...

Shez (to Bernadette): I know how you feel, but this (hands up, looks at Bernadette like, c'mon).

Wolf: It's just urgent.

Joel: It's urgent. (waves hand). They are calling every 15 minutes to find out what's happening.

Bernadette: Is it possible, if our location is out, can you run down the street, and ...

Joel: All the business shops are closed [muffled] it's a general strike; [muffled] is not working.

Bernadette: But are there other NGOs that we can go to.

Joel: And you know our fax machine is not working.

(all talk over each other about options for exploring resources from another NGO.)

Shez: It's not, it's not (hand on Bernadette's knee) our mandate that ...

Joel: [talks over Shez, both are inaudible]

Wolf: If we can do this now, I'll go with you, we'll take one of the cars and go to other NGOs and see if we can borrow a laptop somewhere else, and you can send the email.

Shez: Yeah?

Bernadette: Okay, then,

Trainer 1: How long will that take and the power will be off in ten minutes.

Bernadette: Will the power be off ...

Wolf: The thing is, we'll work something out. We really need to send this [muffled] off as soon as possible.

Bernadette: (Pushing the computer away). I can maybe go to Colombo, if I have to, and send... email them from there.

Wolf: I'll go with you.

Joel: I hope you don't take it personally.

Bernadette: No, no, I know, work is important.

Joel: You seem, you seem annoyed.

Bernadette: Well, it's just, it's frustrating for me, I've been out in the field for two weeks, this is the first time

Joel: It's only that they are calling every 10 minutes.

Bernadette: Yeah. But,

Joel: They are waiting for this, our lives rely on *this report*. Please [muffled] understand.

Bernadette: I think it's very difficult that this report...

Trainer 1: The media, back home, in your home country, has already given your name as one of the people who are missing.

Bernadette: Okay I need to leave.

Trainer 1: You need to change that.

Bernadette: I need to ... need to leave immediately to go to another place to email them.

Wolf: Well, I'll, I will come with you. We'll branch with the driver, and I'll come with you and help you out.

Joel: I have an idea. We'll take you to the office where they have the satellite phones.

Bernadette: Let's go right now then. Thank you.

Upper Left

The *Upper Left* or individual subjective data consists of individual accounts of subjective experiences during the interaction, which express individual subjective experiences that appear to point toward discord between the role play participants, which will be discussed in the *Lower Left* analysis below. Some of this data was captured by video, immediately after the role play, as the participants debriefed. The rest was audio-taped during a focus group.

Below are quotations from the debriefing and focus group that describe or point to individual experiences of affective discord within the role play.

Bernadette's Comments

1. Responding to a muffled question from Joel: *"... I felt like I had a lot of negativity coming from you, and it was very confrontational. I felt like I had three people against me"* (debriefing).
2. To Joel: *"[Our individual well-being] is very important, and (hand to heart) if my parents think that I'm dead, it's going to be very hard on me."*
3. To Joel: *"I also felt that I didn't get any, not until later, any empathy, especially from you. You're standing up tall, and like, yelling at her [Shez], and "Do this now!" It was like, "Oh my god, okay!"* (debriefing)
4. Responding to my question during the focus group if she felt pressure from everyone at the same time, *"Absolutely!"* (focus group)
5. During the group discussion in response to focus group questions 1 and 2, "What was your intention – message and sentiment – that you had or were trying to convey?" and "Did it feel like the listener understood you? Why or why not?": *"I got that it was urgent – both of our issues were urgent – I was... [looking down] ...we both got very anxious – needed to complete our tasks."*
6. In response to my question, "How did it seem like [Shez] felt?" Bernadette said, *"[Shez] was understanding. But her other counterparts were..."* [laughter].
7. In response to my question, "How did you feel in response to [Shez] and to [Shez' other counterparts]?" Bernadette responded, *"Like I wasn't supported."*

Joel's Comments

1. Responding to Luliu's communication suggestion that Shez could have simply included the message that Bernadette was okay in the report: *"It's not as straightforward [muffled] as that argument. I need to use the computer, I also need... it's not a matter of [muffled] put these two lines in the email..."*
2. Joel: *"... in a few more minutes, and within five minutes, the power will be off. So it's a matter of deciding whether to be friendly and waste these ten minutes ..."*

Shez' Comments

1. *"I felt pressure for the report but also felt bad for Bernadette"*
2. Shez – talked about time pressure... the first time... [something 11:56]
3. [muffled response to the questions, "What was your intention – message and sentiment – that you had or were trying to convey?" and "Did it feel like the listener understood you? Why or why not?"] To her muffled response, I recasted, "So the content was conveyed, but not the feeling," and Shez responded, *"Yeah."*
4. During the focus group, Shez recalled that at one point during the role play she considered suggesting including a note in the report regarding Bernadette's safety, but didn't make the suggestion because she felt 'confused' and 'pressured'.

Joel's comments are the least transparent to what his subjective experience was during the role play. He talks about what he *did* in the context of what he identified as necessary in the situation, does not reference direct affective or emotional experience. In fact, his comments seem to pit emotional and affective experience as separate from and secondary to the task at hand. He states that the option of 'being nice' is a mutually exclusive option from accomplishing the necessary goal.

Lower Left

The Lower Left quadrant is the domain of interior subjective experience that is experienced between or amongst more than one individual. In this role play, collective interior subjective experience falls into the areas of *content* and *affect*. *Content* refers to *what* is said, and is primarily communicated verbally. *Affect* refers to *how* something is said, and conveys feelings, emotions, and attitudes. Content is primarily conveyed verbally. Affect can be conveyed verbally as well, but is primarily expressed nonverbally. In this role play, conflict regarding content was the precedent and springboard for the role play itself. A primary domain of content conflict in this role play can be described as *individual need vs. collective need*. The interest in individual need was represented by Bernadette and her predicament, and the interest in collective need by Joel and Shez.

Individual vs. Collective Need

During the debriefing, Bernadette and Joel exchange the following disagreement about individual versus collective need:

Joel: *...you have to separate your personal issues in the office from the professional. You are not dead yet, so you can always notify your parents tomorrow... to say "I was not a part of that". But this is a report that was to be used in the afternoon.*

Bernadette: *But we have to realize that our personal well-being is (smiles)*

Joel: *Yeah, it is important.*

Bernadette: *It's very important, and (hand to heart) if my parents think that I'm dead, it's going to be very hard on me.*

Joel: *You are still there... It makes all the difference... [you will be able to say] I was not part of that (the killings). But this is a report that could change a lot of things. NP is normally relied by all the other organizations to know what is happening. So if we don't send this report on time, there will be a lot of confusion and problems, which normally aggravate the problem further.*

Bernadette: *But also, NP, I think realizes that there are power outages and things aren't necessarily going to be right on time.*

Bernadette seems to be arguing for the primary importance of individual need, while Joel seems to be arguing for the primary importance of collective need, and they are also weighing out the gravity of the outcomes of not prioritizing their respective priorities. Bernadette emphasizes the gravity of not communicating to her family that she is alive, and in turn Joel de-emphasizes that importance, saying that because she is still alive, she will be able to get the message to them eventually. He doesn't register or acknowledge the cost of waiting for Bernadette or for her family. Similarly, Joel emphasizes the gravity of not meeting the deadline for the report, and what's at stake. Bernadette de-emphasizes that point, arguing that the NP office will understand if the report is late, without acknowledging the possible consequences—the confusion and problems—that could ensue from not getting the report in on time. Joel seems to be pointing to what he articulated in the role play as potential life-and-death consequences, which Bernadette does not go very far in explicitly acknowledging.

The tension between individual and collective need was built into the role play itself, and the participants were assigned their roles within the conflict. As far as I know, they weren't assigned their roles based on cultural background, though that may have been taken into consideration by the trainers. As we learned in Chapter 2, however, individual vs. collectivist need is a tension that shows up in two main and distinct cultural types, individualist and collectivist. Bernadette, as a Canadian, comes from a distinctly individualistic culture. Individualistic cultures emphasize the importance of individual identity, rights, and interests over their group counterparts. Shez, from Sri Lanka, and Joel, from Kenya, come from cultures that are considered collectivist (Ting-Toomey, 1999, p. 67).

Collectivist cultures characteristically value the 'we' identity over the 'I' identity, group rights over individual rights, and in-group-oriented needs over individual wants and desires. The degree to which these cultural orientations may have played a role in the way that Bernadette, Joel and Shez connected to their roles would depend in part on the level of salience that each experienced in relationship to the individualistic or collectivist cultures that they were encultured in. However, the fact that Bernadette continued to advocate for her individual need and its priority over the group need would indicate that she may have a relatively high degree of salience to individualistic cultural values. At the very least, she does not display an inclination toward the collectivist value of prioritizing group need over that of the individual. This is probably at least partly because in this case the individual is *her*, but it could also be that if Joel or Shez had been assigned Bernadette's role, their stances may have been less individualistic, or perhaps they may have initiated some sort of a compromise. Joel's clear stance is that the need for the report is more urgent than Bernadette's need, which indicates at least some level of salience with collectivist cultural values. Shez' stance in the role play leaned more toward collectivist cultural value orientation. When her advisor Wolf came in to say that work needs will always take priority over

individual needs, Shez said, “Exactly,” which seems to indicate that for her, work, also a domain of collective need, is the bottom line.

As discussed in Chapter 2, cultural identity also influences personal identity. Personal identity exists on the level of primary and situational identity. In this case, we are looking at situational identity—personal identity as it unfolds within the situation, or the context of the role play. Individualists tend to feel validated when someone acknowledges their personal attributes and competence, while collectivists tend to feel validated through team effort and collective group success (Ting-Toomey, 1999, p. 35). In this scenario, it could have been that Bernadette’s identity experience was not validated, or invalidated, insofar as her sense of personal attribute and competence may have been threatened. In the role play, neither her need, nor her position in advocating for her need, seemed to be reflected by the others, except a bit by Shez. In all likelihood, none of the role play participants’ identities were comprised only or purely by salience to collectivist or individualistic cultural values. It could be that within advocating for collective need, Joel was also advocating for his own sense of identity validation, as realizable through collective group success. Shez may also have felt a sense of identity investment in a positive team effort and group success.

The *individual vs. collective need* content conflict constituted one primary aspect of the discord within the role play. It also became the ground in which *affective discord* unfolded between the participants. Comments from Bernadette, Joel and Shez pointed toward at least two major domains of affective discord within the role play, *pressure* and *empathy*.

It seems as though the content conflict is almost bound in a cycle that is compounded energy of the affective discord that is unfolding, but not yet being explicitly addressed. Within the two primary areas of affective discord that seem to be emerging, *pressure* and *empathy*, pressure dynamics seem to be gaining momentum as Bernadette, Joel and Shez try to leverage power and influence through the urgency of their respective priorities. As each continues to stress the urgency of their own side, none of them seems to express or receive much empathy from the others.

Pressure

During the debriefing and the focus group, Bernadette and Shez reference feeling pressured in the role play. Both reported feeling pressured by Joel in particular, and Bernadette reported feeling pressured by virtue of having so many people 'against' her. During the debriefing she expressed, *"... it was very confrontational. I felt like I had three people against me."* She also said to Joel, *"You're standing up tall, and like, yelling at her [Shez], and "Do this now!" It was like, "Oh my god, okay!"* In response to my question during the focus group as to whether she felt pressure from everyone at the same time, she said *"Absolutely!"*

Shez also expresses that she felt pressured by Joel. During the focus group, she expressed, *"I felt pressure for the report but also felt bad for Bernadette."* She mentions the word *pressure* in a couple of other sentences that were muffled in the conversation. Perhaps most significantly, when Lulu asks them why they didn't just include a note regarding Bernadette's safety in the report itself, Shez reflects that she *did* consider the option of including a message in the report itself about Bernadette being okay,

which could then get forwarded to her family, but that she became too 'pressured' and 'confused' to communicate that possible solution.

Joel does not respond directly to Bernadette and Shez' comments about feeling pressured. When he does respond, he stays in the domain of content, referring back to why it was important to send the report.

Shez and Bernadette's experience of feeling pressured, and Joel's lack of feeling pressured, point to relational dynamics that can be looked at in terms of *power*. Within the framework of identity negotiation, power dynamics and authority are what negotiate the phenomenon of *relational identity*. Relational identity is situational by nature, and has to do with the way an individual's identity is shaped by a particular interaction. Situationally, it seems here that Bernadette is the most powerless, in advocating for herself, by herself, 'against' two others. Joel appears to be situationally the most powerful. His desired outcome—that the report is prioritized—is what they ultimately all agree on, and he doesn't, or doesn't report, having felt pressured. Shez seems to be situated somewhere in the middle-lower end of the power spectrum. She is more supported than Bernadette in her outcome goal, yet is very much directed, or pressured, by Joel. Until he came into the scene shortly after the role play began and started pressing her for the report, Shez seemed to be trying to compromise with Bernadette, by agreeing that she could finish her email quickly before Shez used the computer, even though she seemed somewhat conflicted about this decision.

As discussed in Chapter 2, power distance dimension is a distinguishing cultural value type, and is defined as the extent to which the less powerful members of institutions accept that power is distributed unequally. As a Canadian, Bernadette is from a low power distance culture, where equality of power is strongly valued, and even authority figures are expected to operate democratically. Shez and Joel are from high power distance cultures (Ting-Toomey, 1999), in which power discrepancies are considered more acceptable. It could be that Bernadette expects more democratic decision-making to take place than Joel or Shez might, and she may have a particularly low tolerance for finding herself situationally disempowered, or to take that situational positioning more personally, since it is likely not, for her, the norm.

Two levels of identity negotiation may also have been occurring in relationship to the pressure that Bernadette and Shez describe. One is facework identity, and the other is gender identity. *Facework identity*, as described in Chapter 2, refers to identity respect issues and “is tied to a claimed sense of social esteem or regard that a person wants others to have for him or her. It is therefore a vulnerable identity resource in social interaction because it can be threatened, enhanced, undermined, and bargained over. Face is an identity resource that is manifested and co-managed in communication with others” (Ting-Toomey, 1999, p. 38). Bernadette and Joel seemed particularly invested in the outcome of their arguments, perhaps even more than Shez, who seemed to want resolution as much as any particular outcome. Although Bernadette’s and Joel’s investments in their positions could have been based primarily on the outcome itself, the charge behind it may also have been related to the process of negotiating facework identity, since both of their ‘face’ identities were vulnerable in the interaction. If Bernadette ‘loses’ she might look incompetent, or unable to defend her position adequately, or not important. If Joel ‘loses’, he may look ineffective in his attempts at persuasion.

Gender identity, as discussed in Chapter 2, is how we see ourselves and others in relationship to ‘maleness’ and ‘femaleness’ and is a culturally constructed phenomenon, created in part by our communication with others and reinforced by cultural structures and practices. It is considered a very implicitly negotiated form of identity, evidenced by how difficult it is to pin down the effect of gender difference in day-to-day interactions. In this role play, the fact that the two women are the ones who feel pressured, and the one man does not report feeling pressured, and ultimately seems to influence both women in the outcome or solution of the conflict, suggests that gender dynamics or gender identity negotiation may also be at play. Power and dominance are typically associated with gender. Cross-culturally, maleness is typically associated with the more dominant behavior exhibited by Joel. Femaleness is typically associated with the softness or diplomatic situationally exhibited by Shez, or emotionality expressed by Bernadette. During the focus group, after we watched the second take of the role play as a group, one of the NP trainees who’d been in a different role play—an outgoing Italian female—announced, “This is male dominance!” and everyone laughed.

Empathy

Perhaps the most significant area of affective discord expressed by the role play participants was in the domain of *empathy*. Bernadette very clearly expresses that she felt “very little” empathy, and then qualified that she felt some from Shez. In the debriefing, Bernadette seems to almost entreat empathy from Joel when she says “[*Our individual well-being*] is very important, and (hand to heart) if my parents think that I’m dead, it’s going to be very hard on me.” She later reiterated, “I also felt that I didn’t get any, not until later, any empathy, especially from you.” When I asked Bernadette during the focus group,

“How did it seem like [Shez] felt?” Bernadette said, “[*Shez*] was understanding. But her other counterparts were...” and everyone laughed.

Then, even though she said that Shez was understanding, she said that in response to Shez, she felt “*Like [she] wasn’t supported.*” So it seems that while she cognitively recognized that Shez was somewhat empathetic to her experience, her prevailing feeling, even in response to Shez, was one of not being supported. This could be a result of what may have been the prevailing tone or energy that she experienced from Joel. It is also in alignment, to a certain degree, with what Shez expressed regarding her experience of empathy toward Bernadette. In the focus group, Shez said, “*I felt pressure for the report but also felt bad for Bernadette.*” I also recast a question to Shez about how it seemed like Bernadette interpreted her by asking, “*So the content was conveyed, but not the feeling?*” and Shez responded, “*Yeah.*” There appears to be a direct relationship between Shez’ difficulty conveying empathy, and perhaps to stay present with the empathy she does feel, and her experience of feeling pressured. We saw above that because she felt pressured and confused, she lost connection with and did not express the potential ‘win-win’ solution that had occurred to her.

In expressing his intention in the role play, Joel doesn’t reference empathy or a lack thereof. Empathy, for him, seems to be experienced as not only irrelevant to, but mutually exclusive with, achieving the necessary goal of sending the report. Bernadette stressed during the debriefing that it was important to understand that their individual needs were important, and the significant difficulty that she would have to bear by knowing her family thought she might be dead. Although Joel at one point echoes to Bernadette that their individual needs are important, it seems clear that they are important only as secondary to the needs of NP, or of the group, or of ‘work’.

Joel seems to feel as though he had to choose between advocating what to him was the clear priority that the situation called for—getting the report out as soon as possible— or ‘being nice.’ He also continually tries to explain the situation to Bernadette as he believes and experiences it to be—why in fact the report was more important than her communication with her parents. To the degree that he feels personally invested in this point of view, he may also feel misunderstood, or not understood, in the interaction. He appears to ascribe less importance to understanding and feeling understood than Bernadette and Shez, who actively express distress over it. Bernadette expresses distress over not being understood, and Shez expresses distress over not being able to communicate more empathy to Bernadette or to help her more, and over the pressure she felt from Joel.

From the perspective of identity management theory, a feeling of no empathy harkens the concept of identity vulnerability. As discussed in Chapter 2, identity negotiation theory holds that the foundation of any intercultural encounter involves identity security and identity vulnerability. Identity security refers to the degree to which one’s identity is supported in a communicative interaction, and identity vulnerability refers to the degree to which it is threatened or not supported. The possibility and process of identity vulnerability and security lie on the tenet that “the core processes of individuals’ reflective self-conceptions are formed via symbolic communication with others. It is through communication that we acquire our generalized views of ourselves and others. It is also through communication with others that we acquire particular ways of thinking about ourselves and others in different situations” (Ting-Toomey, 1999, p. 27). Identity is supported or threatened based on communication being aligned with the ten core theoretical assumptions that comprise the backbone of identity negotiation theory. The way in which identity can be supported in cross-cultural interactions, according to the ten core

theoretical assumptions that comprise the backbone of identity negotiation theory and which are discussed in Chapter 2, corresponds to what are in several schools of thought recognized as universal human needs. These needs include belonging, security, trust, inclusion, connection, being understood, respected and supported.

In this role play, although we don't know the extent to which these intentions may have been present or available in Shez and Joel's subjective interior experience, it seems from the role play that they weren't strongly or explicitly expressed, and it is clear that these sentiments were not experienced by Bernadette. It seems that if belonging, inclusion, respect or support were explicitly expressed, Bernadette would have felt very differently about the extent to which she was empathized with. If she had experienced any of the above, not only would she likely have felt more empathized with, but it seems like the tenor would have been such that she and Shez also felt less pressured.

The difference in affective display that would have affected such a tenor, of course, would have necessitated specific interior subjective states and intentions on the part of all three participants. Whether these states would have been available with specific tools or explicit communicative approaches is not known. Stella Ting-Toomey states that "while the efforts of both communicators are needed to ensure competent identity negotiation, the effort of one individual can set competent communication in motion" (40), and her guidelines for mindful cross-cultural verbal and nonverbal communication provide ways of intentionally engaging communication in a way that facilitates identity security, and by extension, facilitates a certain degree of empathy. Before considering how this type of engagement in the role play *raising a concern* may have affected the subjective experiences, shared

meaning, and verbal and nonverbal expression between Bernadette, Joel and Shez, I will look at how these dynamics of affective discord and nonverbal expression transpired in the role play as it occurred.

Cross-Quadrant Dynamics: Nonverbal Behavior, Function, and Affective Discord

In this section of data presentation and analysis, I will look at the interdynamics of what is transpiring in the role play *raising a concern* in relationship to affective discord at three junctures. I will present nonverbal vignettes from the role play under the nonverbal behavioral categories of *vocalics* and *kinesics*, describing what I saw. Because I am looking at nonverbal behaviors at a macro level, this presentation process is already highly subjective. I am not, for example, looking at the subtlety of mechanical facial movements and expressions that comprise an angry facial expression. Instead, I will present the nonverbal data as it appeared to me, in the case of this example, as ‘an angry facial expression’.

As I present these nonverbal behaviors, I will code them for the nonverbal functions that they seem to be performing. I will limit the functions that I look at to those discussed in Chapter 2 as being particularly relevant to cross-cultural nonverbal communication: *emotional display*, *regulating conversation*, and *reflecting identities and relationship*. At the end of each nonverbal vignette, I will use the code *ED* for *emotional display*, *RC* for *regulating conversation* and *RIR* for *reflecting identities and relationship*. I will code a ‘vignette’ for *emotional display* where nonverbal behavior seems to express a particular emotion or emotions. I will code a vignette for *regulating conversation* where the nonverbal behavior seems to function to cue conversational turns discussed in Chapter 2, which include *turn-maintaining*, *turn-yielding*, *turn-requesting*, *turn-denying*, and *back-channeling*, or where these turns are notably missing

from the interaction. I will code a vignette for *reflecting identities and relationship* where the nonverbal behavior seems to relate to the processes that contribute to situational identity formation as discussed in Chapter 2, where that situational identity seems potentially relevant to the affective discord—pressure and empathy—that evolved. Situational identity, as discussed in Chapter 2, is comprised of the concepts of *identity security* and *identity vulnerability*, where identity security can be understood as the degree to which one’s identity is supported in a communicative interaction, and identity vulnerability the degree to which it is threatened or not supported. It is also comprised of the concept of *personal identity* as comprised of *actual personal identity* and *desired personal identity*, where actual personal identity “refers to those unique attributes that an individual exhibits frequently and that are also perceived, variably, by others (e.g., traits such as assertiveness, talkativeness, decisiveness), and desired personal identity as comprised of attributes that an individual considers to be assets. Ting-Toomey points out that “the more others affirm such desired identities in the interaction, the more the person feels that he or she is being understood, respected, and supported.

Finally, I will look at the nonverbal behavioral and functional phenomenon in relationship to the affective discord domains of pressure and empathy, as discussed above.

Section 1: Dialog (00:00 to 00:11)

1. S: Hi
2. B: Hi!
3. S: How are you?
4. B: Good! How are you?

5. S: What are you doing?
6. B: Sorry?
7. S: What are you doing?
8. B: Oh, I'm just emailing my sister, 'n...

Section 1: Nonverbal Behaviors and Functions

Section 1 vocalics.

- S: Her vocalics through line 5 sound chipper and *contradict* her facial expression. (ED)
- S: Walks to table where Bernadette is sitting and stands next to her. (RIR)
- B: Her vocalics sound almost affectedly casual, as if anticipating conflict and trying to neutralize it.
(ED)

Section 1 kinesics.

- S: Has a tense facial expression both before and during the greeting. (ED)
- B: Is sitting, hunched/contracted (throughout role play). At line 6, turns head to face S; at line 8, moves her head quickly back to face the computer screen. (RIR)

Section 1 function discussion. Through her vocalic and kinesic expressions, Shez and Bernadette both exhibit two contradictory emotions. Shez' vocalic tone sounds chipper, but her facial expression is tense. Bernadette sounds casual and also chipper, but affectedly so. I suspect that just as facial expression

conveying an emotion is comprised of a combination of many subtle sub-expressions, a vocal tone conveying an emotion is likewise a composite of many subtle tones and inflections, and that the meta-perception of a particular tone sounding 'affected', from the observable and measurable perspective, would be a result of perceiving some of the more salient and therefore 'fake-able' tones and inflections, with some of the 'subtler' ones missing.

In this section, Bernadette's seemingly guarded postural behavior seems to express wanting to engage Shez only minimally, which helps set a relational tone of unease. Bernadette has not yet sat down with Bernadette, and by standing seems to retain a certain relational distance.

Section 1 nonverbals and pressure. Although Bernadette and Shez both talked about feeling pressure in relationship to Joel specifically, their *emotional displays* of nervousness and tension seem to point to a sense of pressure already present, although the conflict is not yet verbally explicit in the interaction. This already present tension or pressure may be due to pressure anxiety over the impending conflict, or a sense of external or internal pressure to achieve a particular outcome

This already present tension is displayed through the contradiction between Shez' facial expression and vocalic tone, and within Bernadette's vocalic tone, during the greeting. The tension in Shez' facial expression contradicts her chipper vocalic tone. The casual tone in Bernadette's vocalic expression seems affected. Contradictory emotional expressions such as tense vs. chipper and casual versus stressed point to emotional display management technique. As discussed in Chapter 2, facial management techniques include *intensifying*, *deintensifying*, *neutralizing*, and *masking*, and this looks

like it could be a *vocalic* equivalent of masking as understood through facial management technique. *Masking* is when we attempt to display an emotion that is altogether different than the one we are feeling (DeVito, 1989). Research has shown that when more than one emotion is being expressed, we tend to 'believe' the more 'negative' one, probably because it is much more likely that someone would try to mask a negative emotion with a positive one than to mask a positive emotion with a negative one. Here, it seems that Shez may be trying to mask tension with chipperness, and that Bernadette may be trying to mask stress with casualness. This masking in and of itself seems to create an air of tension within the interaction that serves to perpetuate pressure.

From Bernadette's *kinesic* behavior, she appears to feel guarded from the beginning. She is hunched almost protectively over her computer, which might indicate that she is significantly invested in a favorable outcome for herself and perhaps anticipating friction at the start. The way she very quickly looks at Shez and then directly back to her computer makes it seem like she wants to engage Shez as minimally as possible, and as though she feels a need to protect both the computer itself, and her time on it. This behavior also seems related to the experience of feeling pressured that she expresses. Because this sense of pressure seems to be present before Joel enters the scene, it again appears that the foundation for the feeling of pressure has already been laid.

It may be *facework identity negotiation* is already underway here, in an attempt by Bernadette and Shez respectively to create a sense of identity security in the face of impending identity vulnerability. Facework identity, as described in Chapter 2, refers to identity respect issues and "is tied to a claimed sense of social esteem or regard that a person wants others to have for him or her. It is therefore a vulnerable identity resource in social interaction because it can be threatened, enhanced, undermined,

and bargained over. Face is an identity resource that is manifested and co-managed in communication with others” (Ting-Toomey, 1999, p. 38). To the extent that Bernadette and Shez feel pressured by others or themselves to achieve a certain outcome in this conflict, they may also be identified with achieving this outcome, which would put their face identity in a vulnerable position until the impending conflict is resolved.

It seems as though the presence of the nonverbal behaviors that *mask* the tension, or that *contradict* the tension, serve to make the ground for further tension even more fertile. This situation seems to invite the voice of common wisdom to comment that avoiding conflict can make it ‘worse’. From the lens of nonverbal behavior, one could postulate that nonverbally avoiding tension with masking has the power to create a dynamic that perpetuates the already existing tension.

Section 1 nonverbals and empathy. The tension already present in the role play seems, by its contractive nature, to be antithetical to the expansiveness demanded by empathy. If empathy is in large part the ability and practice of putting yourself in another’s position, it seems like that kind of ‘movement’ is blocked here already, perhaps by an assumption that each side can’t afford to consider the other’s position, since their respective needs are seen as contradictory.

Bernadette’s nonverbal behavior already appears somewhat defensive and protective, or contracted, a stance from which having psychic ‘room’ for the other person’s feelings or position is arguably more difficult. The tension in Shez’ face, and the contradiction between her seemingly felt tension and her projected chipper vocalics, also seems to perpetuate a sense of unease.

It seems that in Shez' case, this unease might be in part symptomatic of potential empathy that got collapsed instead of nurtured toward expression. The very fact that she seems already stressed points to her probable awareness of the different needs that are on the table, which is part of the foundation for feeling empathy. And we know from her comments in the focus group that she felt empathetic toward Bernadette to at least a certain degree. As will be obvious as the role play continues, however, a mutually fulfilling solution is not apparent to either, which would render the process of engaging Bernadette's need stressful and contracted rather than potentially empathetic and open. So although the 'raw material' needed for empathy at this point—the ability to see or feel another's perspective or situation—and in Shez' case, a certain wanting to express that—may be available, the frame from which she experiences this 'raw material' seems to lack the belief that there could be a solution that could respond to both seemingly incompatible needs. One could argue that this seemingly closed or defensive stance, if picked up on even unconsciously from the others, could perpetuate and co-create an interpersonal, or intersubjective state, in which giving and receiving empathy is more difficult, because the openness for the flow of that energy is not present. The mutuality that seems to be the necessary ground for the energetic flow of empathy hearkens back to the concepts of embodiment and intersubjectivity discussed in Chapter 2.

Section 2: Dialog (00:11 to 00:50)

9. S: Oh, really. I think that, ah, the headquarter in Colombo ... Colombo asked me to send the report. Do you remember that, for the committee members? The project committee report?
10. B: Yeah...
11. S: (laugh) So, do you mind giving me the computer?
12. B: Yeah, just give me maybe two minutes, 'n... I'll try to get this finished up. Okay?
13. S: Okay, sure.
14. B: (sitting across from Bernadette) – [muddled] ... with your emails personal, [muddled] in general get the feeling that her stuff [muddled] and we prefer to [muddled] in this moment, is more important...

Section 2: Nonverbal Behaviors and Functions

Section 2 vocalics.

- S: At line 11, laughs slightly. Appears to be nervous laughter, perhaps in an attempt to soften what might be perceived as the harsh nature of the request. (ED, RIR)
- B: At line 12, something in the intonation continues to sound a little affectedly light-hearted, yet something else in the voice sounds tense or uncomfortable. (ED)
- S: So (line 11) is lengthened/drawn out, with eyes looking momentarily away. Sits down, faces B, and looks her in the eye during line 9. (RC, RIR)

Section 2 kinesics.

- S: At line 9, raises her hand to her brow. Facial expression appears stressed or concerned. At line 12, looks up with a nervous expression at Bernadette, and then glances back down. (ED, RIR)
- S: At line 13, nods head; vocalics casual, comfortable during the verbal expression. Immediately after, however, she looks away towards advisors as if stressed and concerned and questioning, as if to say, "*What can I do?*" (ED, RIR)
- S: At line 11, her head is slightly down and eyes looking up toward Bernadette, perhaps as if to create a sense of deference within her request. (RIR)
- B: At line 9, looks up and away from S as she begins talking, then looks directly at her. (RIR)

Section 2 function discussion. The emotional display in this section continues in a similar vein as in Section 1. Shez's behavior seems increasingly nervous in relationship to Bernadette, and continues to seem tense. Bernadette continues to sound like she wants to appear light-hearted, but doesn't feel light-hearted.

The relational reflection is also tense here, with seeming attempts to soften the tenseness. Shez seems to try to create a sense of equality and engagement with Bernadette when sitting down and looking her in the eye, and even appears to try to create a sense of deference within her request for the computer, but these relational tones are undermined by her nervous and stressed emotional displays, and by the way she looks at Joel and her advisors as though highly stressed by the response that Bernadette gave her, which she backchannelled as if she was comfortable with it.

Section 2 nonverbals and pressure. The content conflict is still not verbally explicit in this section, but affective tension is continuing to gain momentum. Shez' stressed or nervous facial emotional display still seems to anticipate the impending conflict. Although a certain degree of discomfort around conflict may be universal, it is also worth noting that Shez is from a high uncertainty avoidance culture, which may make the prospect of explicit conflict under pressure to achieve a certain outcome especially uncomfortable. As discussed in Chapter 2, the *uncertainty avoidance dimension* of a culture refers to the extent to which the members of that culture feel threatened by uncertain situations, and the extent to which they try to avoid these situations. Strong uncertainty avoidance cultures tend to perceive uncertainty as a threat, whereas they value preserving the status quo, and generally view conflict as negative.

As Bernadette and Shez negotiate the use of the computer over the next few minutes and come to a verbal agreement, Shez' facial tension appears to relax, but once they finish talking she looks anxiously toward Joel and her advisors. This contradiction could mean that she herself was comfortable with the negotiation, but was worried that it wouldn't satisfy Joel and her advisors. It could have meant that she felt anxious even in negotiating the resolution with Bernadette but that her apparent relaxation indicated the facial management technique of *deintensifying* or *neutralizing*. As discussed in Chapter 2, deintensifying occurs when we want to reduce the strength of the facial expression of the emotion that we feel. Neutralizing is when we "try to hide any outward expression of felt emotions" (DeVito 66). It seems that the tension that is being expressed, and the additional tension created in the contradictions between the tense emotion and the attempts to deintensify or neutralize, perpetuate the dynamic that fosters a situation in which one would be more likely to feel pressured.

Section 2 nonverbals and empathy. Although Shez seems generally uncomfortable with the situation at this point, it is notable that when it is time for her to confront Bernadette with content conflict, she sits down, faces Bernadette, and looks her in the eye. This seems to be some attempt to acknowledge a sense of equality between her and Bernadette, to level the playing field in a sense. This of course relates to pressure and power and could work toward alleviating a certain degree of pressure, and toward equalizing power. It also seems related to empathy and seems to communicate a certain degree of initial empathy from Shez toward Bernadette.

At line 11, when Shez' head is slightly down with her eyes looking up toward Bernadette, perhaps as if to create a sense of deference within her request, this seems again like a possible gesture of empathy from Shez toward Bernadette via equalizing power. This may be part of the reason that Bernadette reported experiencing a certain degree of empathy from Shez.

Section 3: Dialog (00:50 to 1:56)

15. J: Hello Shez...

16. S: Hi.

17. J: Have you managed to send the report?

18. S: Yeah, ah, I will in a minute, um, she will finish it in one minute... I hope so... So...

19. B: Yeah, it'll just be a couple more minutes.

20. J: This one is urgent. They need it, please, if you don't mind.

21. S: Can you save it, and give it to me, the computer?

22. B: I'll finish this, and then...

23. J: Can you do that... you can do that during lunch.
24. B: Yeah yeah yeah.
25. J: We need that for the meeting, for the meeting in the afternoon. And they needed the report before we go.
26. B: Okay. Now, when can I use it again, 'cuz I'm not entirely finished.
27. J: Half an hour.
28. S: It's just, half an hour?
29. T1: The power is very unreliable, so if you give up your computer, you won't see it again.
30. B: Oh. Um, okay, I guess, yeah...
31. J: This is a matter of life and death. You can always send your sister... Please.
32. B: Yeah yeah yeah. Of course, of course, go ahead. Maybe if you can just be as fast as possible
(hand motion – muddled) ...in a half hour again.
33. S: Sure, no worries. Thank you very much!
34. B: You're welcome!

Section 3: Nonverbal Behaviors and Functions

Section 3 vocalics.

- S: In response to Bernadette's nervous laughter in line 32, also laughs. This laughter seems like an attempt to backchannel Bernadette's apparent attempt to mask the discomfort of the situation.
(ED, RIR)
- S: In line 33, vocalics sound affectedly chipper – as if relieved at some semblance of a 'solution' being reached, and from being out of the position of being put in the middle, and therefore occupying a vocalic style that confirms that much-wanted sense of solution or resolution. (ED)

- B: At line 19, something in her voice still sounds almost affectedly casual, and something sounds like it's beginning to get exasperated. Vocalics stressed and defensive-sounding at line 24. (ED)
- B: In line 32, her vocalics again sound almost unnaturally casual, as if they had been talking about ordering a pizza and acquiesced to simply ordering pepperoni because it was relatively amenable to everyone. The chipper tone of line 34 contrasts the previous tenor of conversation quite markedly and seems to be an attempt to backchannel the affected chippiness of line 33. (ED, RC, RIR)
- J: Vocalics sound urgent, pressing (ED,RIR)
- J: Line 31 sounds like an interruption of line 30, where Bernadette's vocalics seem to indicate that she is holding the space to think through her response. (RC, RIR)

Section 3 kinesics.

- S: Facial expression slightly nervous; hands flying as if to express panic or stress. A questioning and nervous expression is on her face and she scratches lightly at her neck with "I hope so." Glances down as if nervous or uncomfortable at line 23. Mouth comes into an almost-smile of uncomfortable anticipation as Bernadette begins to respond to Joel. Seems slightly more relaxed at line 26, as if anticipating some relief or resolution. (ED)
- B: Makes a hand motion at line 22 that appears flustered or agitated. Between lines 25 and 26, she closes her document with distinctive anger or agitation. (ED, Substitution)
- B: She smiles tensely as she looks back up to Joel in line 26. (ED, RIR)

J: Maintains default grin throughout. Sunglasses make eye behavior impossible to observe. (ED, RIR)

J: Approaches the table and continues to stand while S and B sit. Flips hand at line 20 with, "...if you don't mind." Leans further and jerkily in, putting more physical weight on his arm, supporting himself on the table, at line 23. Shifts weight again at line 23 with "...and we need the report..." (RC, RIR)

S: Looking directly at Bernadette when she addresses her. When speaking to Joel, she turns her head toward him only. When speaking to B her shoulders face slightly toward her. (RIR)

B: At line 24 does not look at Joel while she responds to him. Looks directly toward S and J as she makes her request in line 26. Looks toward and away, toward and away from Joel in line 26, as if trying to acknowledge and appease, while still smiling uncomfortably. (ED, RIR)

Section 3 function discussion. Bernadette and Shez' emotional expression continues in the same vein as in Section 1 and 2, but intensifies. Shez' tenseness, in this section, seems almost panicked, as soon as Joel comes in and asks her about the report. Bernadette seems to continue to mask her upset, at least partially, in her interaction with Shez, and now with Joel as well, for example in her tense smile toward him. Joel's emotional expression is very difficult to read. His smile seems to be that of the "frozen affect expressor" discussed in Chapter 2, who has a default expression for every situation. He wears the same smile from the time the role play starts until the time it finishes—it seems to actually bypass emotional expression and go directly to facial management technique. Since the same smile occurs no matter what other emotion he might be experiencing, it seems like it is most likely to be *masking*, which seems to be more of a pan-function than *de-intensifying* or *neutralizing*. As Joel enters, he seems to regulate the

conversation with interruption. There is little back-channeling between the three of them, and no evidence of syncing, or being in sync.

The communication about relationship between Bernadette and Shez stays close to the same as it was in Section 2. By continuing to stand while Bernadette and Shez sit, and accenting his persuasive or aggressive verbal behavior with gesture and leaning in, he seems to create a relational identity of being in authority. Shez and Bernadette's increased respective nervousness and tenseness in response to this seems to confirm that they are responding accordingly, and feeling perhaps hierarchically 'under' Joel. Both Bernadette and Shez also have 'disliking' posture toward Joel, which was discussed according to gender in Chapter 2, and again below.

Section 3 nonverbals and pressure. Bernadette's emotional display does not prove, but is certainly in alignment with, with her reported experience of feeling pressured. She appears to feel agitated and defensive. Her apparent vocalic *masking* and its attendant tension continues from section 2. Her vocalics at one point sound exasperated, at others stressed and defensive. Her agitated hand movement and closing of the computer seem to function as a 'passive' aggression, in that they are expressed when her verbal behavior is more compliant. Her identity reflection behavior—avoiding looking directly at Joel—seems in alignment with feeling pressured. It also relates to the kinesic function domain of pleasure-displeasure, or *liking*, as discussed in Chapter 2, which noted that women in particular tend to use “indirect orientation with intensely disliked persons, relatively direct with persons they liked, and the most direct with neutrally liked persons” (Hickson, et al., 2007, p. 210). Although 'liked' and 'disliked' is distinct from feeling pressured, it seems fair to presume that one would not be likely to display 'liking' behavior toward someone they felt situationally pressured by, and vice versa. Where she looks toward

and away, toward and away from Joel in line 26, she still smiles uncomfortably, perhaps managing face identity by trying not to appear upset. The contradiction between her emotional display indicating upsetness, identity communication indicating not liking, and her attempts to smile, laugh and sound chipper seem to indicate that she would like, if possible, to resolve the content conflict without having to explicitly address the increasingly uncomfortable affective discord that is forming.

Shez's emotional display seems palpably stressed and in alignment with her reported experience of feeling pressured. As soon as Joel approaches, her hands are flying and she is stuttering. Her facial expression appears very nervous and tense, and at one point, with emotional display alone, she appears to desperately implore Bernadette for resolution. The panicked and seemingly personal nature of her expression suggests that her upset may have to do not only with the urgency of the report. She may be engaged in some degree of identity management, or perhaps the position of being in increasingly explicit conflict is getting even more difficult for her. She definitely seems to be experiencing pressure in direct response to her experience with Joel. She now seems invested not only the urgency of the report, but in how soon Bernadette gives up the computer, which is a change that occurs as Joel comes onto the scene.

Joel's verbal expression, as presented in Chapter 4, is already direct, persuasive, and arguably aggressive, and it doesn't seem surprising that one could experience pressure based on the verbal behavior alone. Much of his nonverbal behavior seems to *accent* his verbal expression by making it more explicitly persuasive or aggressive, leaning in toward Bernadette and Shez, putting more physical weight on his arm as he leans in, and interrupting. This sense of aggression, of course, is in alignment with Bernadette and Shez's experiences of feeling pressured. It also seems to cast Joel in a situational *role*

identity of authority, although according to the role play he had no more seniority in the NP team than Bernadette or Shez. As discussed in Chapter 2, *role identity* is situational, and refers to “a set of expected behaviors and the values associated with them that a culture or ethnic group defines as proper or acceptable” (36).

Section 3 nonverbals and empathy. As was the case when the role play began, the dynamics in this section of the role play are such that each person seems invested in their own immediate need in a way that empathy doesn't become explicitly engaged, because no one seems to see a resolution, on a content level, that responds to all the needs that are being expressed. The mutual exclusivity of each of their respective priorities seems to be getting perpetuated and cemented. While little empathy seems to be expressed at this stage, some degree of entreating empathy seems to be expressed from all three participants. Shez' almost desperate facial expression can be seen, on one level, as entreating Bernadette for empathy for the situational pressure she is under. Bernadette's frustration can also be seen as entreating empathy for her predicament. Joel's attempts at persuasion may or may not be motivated in part by a desire to be heard and understood for not only his position but his *experience*, which would be a way of entreating empathy. In each of these cases, the same nonverbal behavior that functions to persuade the others can also be seen as a request for empathy from the others.

Section 4: Dialog (3:37 to 4:35)

[note: lines 35 to 40 do not appear on the video clip included in this thesis; they were extracted from a second video-taping of the role play. Thus the nonverbal behavior exhibited in these lines is not recorded or discussed.]

35. S: Hi.

36. A: Hi.

37. S: Do you mind... if I use the computer?

38. A: Well, how – how urgent is yours? Because I've been in the field for two weeks, and I haven't been able to [check a/ touch a] computer, and my parents, with the, ah, recent deaths of the NGO workers, they – they think it's me. So I, I have to get this out to them (looking down) before the power goes down.

39. S: I think that this is very urgent... priority on this...

40. D: [muffled] ...quickly.

41. S: (to Joel) Okay okay okay, I will I will I will *do* that. (to Bernadette) [section in blue from second video and not included in nonverbal behavior data.] It's just, it's just, we have to send the report, and...

42. A: When, when does this report have to be sent?

43. S: Today, today.

44. A: And you couldn't have done it a couple of days ago?

45. S: It's urgent...

46. D: Actually this is the situation. Colombo wants this report, urgently, because they are going for the emergency meeting in the afternoon.

47. A: Okay okay.

48. S: [muffled] And we gathered this information in the morning, and that's why I really want to...

49. O: You have only 5 minutes before the power outage.

50. D: We are going for the emergency meeting at the MOD in Colombo, in the NGO.

51. A: Okay, just let me quickly email my parents, and let them know...

52. S: Do you mind sending an instant message or something like that?

53. D: You can text them...
54. A: All the cell phones are broken.
55. D: You can call from the land line. Please.
56. O: You can be back on the computer in 10/15 minutes.
57. S: Yeah, 10/15 minutes.
58. A: [objects – something about the power].
59. O: The telephone system has been jammed for intelligence reasons.
60. U: I think we have to – it's just a matter of priority, and work will always have priority...
61. S: Exactly.
62. U: No matter ...

Section 4: Nonverbal Behaviors and Functions

Section 4 vocalics.

- B: In line 51 sounds exasperated and perhaps appealing for empathy. Laughs in line 56 perhaps in attempt to simply entreat some empathy, or perhaps at the seeming futility of her position. (ED)
- J: Vocalics sound impatient in line 55. (ED, RIR)

Section 4 kinesics.

- S: In response to Bernadette in line 51, tenses up and hands begin to flail in her response and attempt to persuade Bernadette. (ED, RIR)
- J: Shifts and waves hands for persuasive emphasis in line 46 and 50. (ED, RIR)

J: In line 4 appears to jump in or interrupt as Shez 'looks for words'. Leans in heavily on the table at line 53, perhaps in an attempt to aggressively *request* a turn, while *denying* Shez a turn. Leans in again at line 55. (RIR)

Section 4 function discussion. In this section, Bernadette and Shez' emotional expression continues, and Bernadette begins to express exasperation. Joel's accenting behavior is becoming more aggressive.

Section 4 nonverbals and pressure. The pressure and power dynamics that got traction in Section 3 continue here and seem to gain momentum. Bernadette and Shez' emotional displays continue to indicate that they are feeling pressured, and Joel's nonverbal behavior continues to be consistent with behavior that one might expect to be associated with dominance or aggression.

As in Section 3, Shez' hand gestures seem to express a sense of panic as she tells Bernadette that they need to send the report. This panic, as discussed in Section 3, could be a result of increasing identity vulnerability. Until the conflict is resolved, and by virtue thereof, the fate of her situational face and relational identities are resolved, her identity security remains in jeopardy. She may be under a certain degree of self-pressure to 'save' her situational identity, in addition to feeling under pressure by Joel to complete the report, and perhaps under pressure by Bernadette to acquiesce the use of the computer until she's succeeded in contacting her family. Bernadette's emotional display through her vocalics seems to indicate a sense of exasperation or defeat. Her situational face and relational identities are also vulnerable, and the outcome of the situation is still uncertain.

She also seems to be trying to leverage some power for herself through her verbal behavior. In asking Shez when the report needs to be in, and if they couldn't have done it before, she seems to be taking an angle not yet expressed—that she should perhaps have a certain degree of priority based on the fact that she could not have been more proactive about contacting her family, while they perhaps could have been more proactive about getting the report in. Her stressed and exasperated intonation in asking this question seemed in part emotional expression, and in part to lay emotional pressure on to the request.

Joel seems to maintain the seat of situational power by continuing to exert pressure on Shez and Bernadette and by them continuing to be subject to it. His lack of emotional transparency also seems to leverage his power position in the situation. By not expressing much emotion, he doesn't seem to become as emotionally vulnerable as the others. He also interrupts Shez again, not to contradict her, but to speak, perhaps more persuasively, instead of her. Both interrupting and interrupting in order to persuade can be interpreted as aggressive, and are likely contributing to the pressure dynamics expressed by Bernadette and Shez.

Section 4 nonverbals and empathy. Bernadette's emotional display of exasperation seems to relate directly to what she will, in the debriefing, describe as not feeling empathized with. In turn, one could argue that she still doesn't seem to empathize toward the others' or toward the significance or urgency of the report. It could be that because her own needs aren't being met, she isn't able to make the space to empathize with needs beyond her own. It could also be that the pressure she feels under prevents her from being able to 'afford' to take the others' point of view. She may feel that because they are not

empathizing with or seeing her need, that if she lets go long enough to see or feel their side, that she'll be defeated.

Section 5: Dialog (4:35 to 6:19)

63. S: (to Bernadette) I know how you feel, but this (hands up, looks at Bernadette like, c'mon).

64. J: Please.

65. W: It's just urgent.

66. J: It's urgent. (waves hand). They are calling every 15 minutes to find out what's happening.

67. B: Is it possible, if our location is out, can you run down the street, and ...

68. J: All the business shops are closed [muffled] it's a general strike; [muffled] is not working.

69. B: But are there other NGOs that we can go to.

70. J: And you know our fax machine is not working.

(all talk over each other about options for exploring resources from another NGO.)

71. S: It's not, it's not (hand on Bernadette's knee) our mandate that ...

[talks over Shez, both are inaudible]

72. W: If we can do this now, I'll go with you, we'll take one of the cars and go to other NGOs and see if we can borrow a laptop somewhere else, and you can send the email.

73. S: Yeah?

74. B: Okay, then,

75. T1: How long will that take and the power will be off in ten minutes.

76. B: Will the power be off ...

77. W: The thing is, we'll work something out. We really need to send this [muffled] off as soon as possible.
78. B: I can maybe go to Colombo, if I have to, and send... email them from there.
79. W: I'll go with you.
80. J: I hope you don't take it personally.
81. B: No, no, I know, work is important.
82. J: You seem, you seem annoyed.
83. B: Well, it's just, it's frustrating for me, I've been out in the field for two weeks, this is the first time
84. J: It's only that they are calling every 10 minutes.
85. B: Yeah. But,
86. J: They are waiting for this, our lives rely on *this report*. Please [muffled] understand.
87. B: I think it's very difficult that this report...
88. T1: The media, back home, in your home country, has already given your name as one of the people who are missing.
89. B: Okay I need to leave.
90. T1: You need to change that.
91. B: I need to ... need to leave immediately to go to another place to email them.
92. W: Well, I'll, I will come with you. We'll branch with the driver, and I'll come with you and help you out.
93. J: I have an idea. We'll take you to the office where they have the satellite phones.
94. B: Let's go right now then. Thank you.

Section 5: Nonverbal Behaviors and Functions

Section 5 Vocalics.

- B: In line 80, responding to D., her vocalics shift dramatically, as if to assure him that she is not upset. Sounds angry in line 94, during what is supposed to be the resolution. (ED, RIR)
- B: In line 83, she puts her hand to her heart, as if to express her sincere frustration, without raising her voice. It appears as though the gesture is in part an attempt to elicit empathy. (ED)
- J: In line 64 vocalics emphasize the request, with a tinge of something that sounds borderline condescending, as though acknowledging that reason isn't working and a more child-like appeal must be resorted to. (ED, RIR)

Section 5 kinesics.

- S: At line 63, makes eye contact with a compassionate facial expression toward B., but it's quickly replaced by an anxious-looking expression. (ED, RIR)
- B: Sounds close to the verge of tears in line 78, with eyes cast down, and physically removing herself from the table. (ED, RIR)
- J: In line 66 emphasizes request with hand gesture. Continues to emphasize persuasion and requests by leaning forward and with hand gestures. In line 84 emphasizes with a more aggressive hand gesture. Continues to use the same style of gesturing (line 86) when responding to Bernadette's appeal for empathy (line 83). (ED, RC)

Section 5 function discussion. In this final section, Bernadette's emotional expression seems to be at its most raw and vulnerable. Her frustration is most unguardedly expressed, and her upset and vulnerability are more directly expressed in line 78, where her voice sounds on the verge of tears. It seems here that perhaps the intensity of emotion has made it more difficult to mask her upset. Joel's relational communication in this section seems to have an added strain that is almost condescending.

Section 5 nonverbals and pressure. Bernadette's verbal expression and emotional display seem markedly contradictory in this final section. She both assures Joel that she's not taking the resolution 'personally' and says that 'work is important' while at the same time comes back to express her frustration with how she's being treated and how the situation is evolving. In her emotional display, she sounds on the verge of tears at one point, and seconds later laughs and assures Joel that of course work is important. Her laughter here seems to be functioning in order to *neutralize* or *mask* her upset, perhaps in an attempt to negotiation facework identity. Via facework identity, she may also be trying to leverage some situational power for herself, by appearing to be in alignment with the outcome that seems to be evolving against her wishes and attempts to advocate for her own side. Joel's aggressive and persuasive speech and nonverbals continue, as does the power dynamic.

Section 5 nonverbals and empathy. The possibilities for and limitations of realized empathy here seem to peak. Perhaps it is the 'resolution' of the content conflict within the role play that allows empathy to come into the picture here as an explicit possibility. Shez says to Bernadette, "I know how you feel, but..." and in the debriefing shortly after, the compassion in her voice as she expresses the same sentiment is deep enough that it seems she may be experiencing it here too, more than she is able to yet convey. Joel also for the first time engages Bernadette on the level of how she feels. Perhaps in his mind, this couldn't be engaged before the problem was solved because taking her feelings into account could theoretically jeopardize prioritizing the urgency of the report.

Summary

Several themes and implications emerge from the ways in which nonverbal behavior and function evolved and operated within the role play *raising a concern*, and from the ways in which the behaviors and functions co-evolved with the affective discord.

From Joel's nonverbal and verbal behavior, it appears that a lack of emotional display, or transparency, coupled with aggressive verbal and nonverbal expression, can corroboratively comprise a situational personal identity of authority and can create a dynamic of control and power within relational communication. Complicit in maintaining this control seems to be others' drive to avoid or resolve conflict, which seems motivated in large part by identity negotiation. It appears that the very nature of conflict and the movement toward conflict resolution is significantly driven by identity negotiation—striving for and trying to stabilize an identity security that supports desired personal identity. As discussed in the five sections above, it seems that much of the nonverbal expression connected to

discord was connected to how each participant seemed to try not only to resolve the conflict of who would use the computer, but the issue of maintaining their own desired identities and identity security within the conflict.

From Bernadette and Shez' nonverbal and verbal behavior, we can see several instances of emotional display and what appears to be emotional *masking*. The primary uncomfortable emotion that is displayed seems to be either stress/anxiety, anger, or hurt. The masking, or secondary emotion seems to be either chipperness or nonchalance.

Where uncomfortable emotions were expressed in conjunction with masking behavior, the contradictory nonverbal behaviors simultaneously seem to root and solidify the interior sense of unease around the original uncomfortable emotion. This in turn seems to make nonverbal behavior not only an expression, or result, of interior subjective experience, but a cause of it. It's role as cause and effect seems to be in dynamic interplay with, and co-evolving with, the interior subjective experience, which also becomes illuminated here as both cause and effect of the sense of pressure and tension occurring.

The very way in which nonverbal behaviors both express and perpetuate the energetic of a dynamic within an interaction, from an AQAL perspective, illustrates how *Upper Right* nonverbal expressions and *Upper Left* emotions co-create meaning-making activity in the *Upper and Lower Left* quadrants. This dynamic evolution of meaning-making and experience echoes the phenomenon of embodiment as described in Chapter 2, which holds the view that "mental processes are embodied in the sensorimotor activity of the organism and embedded in the environment" (Thompson, 2001, p. 2). Similarly, the

phenomenon of the co-creation of identity as it evolved in *raising a concern* echoes the concept of co-determination as rooted in intersubjectivity, discussed in Chapter 2.

The research question aimed to “shed light on the co-occurring variables across the quadrants that create the circumstances for cross-cultural nonverbal communication and miscommunication,” with an emphasis on the role of nonverbal behavior within miscommunication. In this role play, the domain of miscommunication that has been examined within the cross-cultural communication context of *raising a concern* has been affective discord, and the sub-domains of affective discord have been *pressure* and *empathy*. The analysis of the role of nonverbal behavior in relationship to *pressure* and *empathy* suggests that nonverbal behavior expresses emotion within conflict and reveals masking attempts; that it can regulate conversation in a way that contributes to power dynamics; that relationship and identity management functions express and create identity negotiation dynamics. It seems to operate as an *Upper Right* quadrant index to some of the *Upper and Lower Left* interior dynamics that evolve within a communicative interaction.

The data analysis also indicates that as suggested by Chapter 2, much of our nonverbal behavior and perception occurs outside of our conscious awareness. It seemed that while all of the participants wanted a certain resolution of conflict, their nonverbal behavior in some way contributed to perpetuating conflict. There is the idea that our nonverbal behavior reveals part of what we ‘really’ feel and want, which is why, when verbal and nonverbal messages conflict, we tend to rely on the nonverbal behaviors as a more dependable index to what is really going on in another person.

The phenomenon of contradictory wants is echoed in Robert Kegan's model of commitments and competing commitments, (Kegan & Lahey, 2001). In this model, there is a more conscious level of motivation, and an often-times less conscious level of motivation within a person. It appears that our nonverbal behavior can serve as an index to not only our conscious motivations, but also our 'competing commitments', or secondary motivations and feelings, that may or may not be conscious, or may be only murkily conscious. In this sense, it seems that the process of becoming more aware how we express nonverbal behavior—in the *Upper Right* quadrant of the AQAL model—could also engender a process of becoming more aware of our layers of feelings and motivations that they express in the *Upper and Lower Left* interior subjective quadrants.

This proposition begs the question of what steps or activities might lead toward a greater awareness of nonverbal behavioral and corresponding interior states, how this awareness would influence conflict negotiation, how that type of awareness engagement may have influenced the participants' experiences in raising a concern, and what that may have looked like, especially from the nonverbal behavioral perspective. These questions will be discussed in the consideration of future applications of this research in Chapter 5.

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION

The research, data collection, and analysis of the previous chapters have served as a response to the following question:

I'm studying nonverbal communication as an AQAL phenomenon because I want to understand the nonverbal communicative devices used within the speech act of raising concerns in cross-cultural communicative contexts, in relationship to what is mutually and interdependently co-occurring in all four quadrants during the speech event, in order to shed light on the co-occurring variables across the quadrants that create the circumstances for cross-cultural nonverbal communication and miscommunication, with the application of creating more awareness around the variables that cultivate and obstruct successful cross-cultural nonverbal communication.

Major Findings and Implications

In Chapter 2, I introduced and discussed the AQAL framework and the concept of looking at any dynamic process, including a communication event, from an Integral perspective. An AQAL, or Integral perspective recognizes any phenomenon—in this case, a cross-cultural communicative event—as a dynamic event comprised of, and irreducible to, any single one of its co-arising components. It also recognizes that within any phenomenon, these components can arise from at least four fundamental perspectives, including the interior, exterior, individual and collective. As stated in Chapter 2, The *Upper Left* quadrant of the AQAL model represents the interior individual perspective (i.e., the *I*, or subjective

mind); the *Upper Right* quadrant represents exterior individual perspective (i.e., the *it*, or objective body), e.g., the physical, tangible correlates of the subjective personal experience; the *Lower Left* represents the interior collective perspective, including shared personal subjective experience, i.e., the *we* or intersubjective reality; and the *Lower Right* represents the exterior collective perspective (i.e., the *its*), e.g., systems within the physical, manifest world (Phipps, 2006, 60).

In this study, I wanted to see what role or roles nonverbal behavior would play within miscommunication that might occur in the cross-cultural communicative event of the role play *raising a concern*. The 'miscommunication' areas that I noted within the role play fell into two categories, *content* and *affect*. The content conflict domain that I discussed in Chapter 4 was *individual vs. collective need*. The two domains of affective discord that I discussed were *pressure* and *empathy*.

My data and analysis in Chapter 4 suggest that nonverbal behavior is both an expression—or effect—of subjective experience, and a cause of it. In the case of *raising a concern*, nonverbal behaviors seemed to both express emotions and intentions of the participants, and, in turn, to feed the affective discord that was present at the onset and continued to develop throughout the role play, thereby both expressing and perpetuating the energetic discord throughout the interaction. Although conflict was, on a surface level, resolved when the role play ended, the discord around pressure and empathy was not. On the contrary, the affective discord remained quite strong, and it was an emotive topic of conversation between the participants during both the debriefing and the focus group.

The data and analysis also illuminated how, as the literature in Chapter 2 suggested, much of our nonverbal behavior and perception occurs outside of our conscious awareness. It seemed, during the role play, that while all of the participants were on one level trying to resolve the conflict, Bernadette and Shez both displayed contradictory emotions that pointed toward *masking*, or attempting to display an emotion that is altogether different than the one we are feeling (DeVito, 1989). In raising a concern, it seemed that Shez may have been trying to mask tension with chipperness, and that Bernadette may have been trying to mask stress with casualness. The masking seemed to be in the service of trying to resolve the content of the conflict at the expense of resolving the affective discord. Both the pressure and the masking seem to have solidified and perpetuated the affective tension between the participants. This suggests that to avoid affective discord within cross-cultural communication, affective discord and its dynamics need to be on the conscious radar of the interactants, or an object of attention and awareness in and of itself. It appears that affective resolution also needs to be a primary outcome goal, along with content resolution, in order to help keep them from becoming mutually exclusive goals in the conflict negotiation.

From the nonverbal behaviors within the role play, we can see that masking serves as an attempt to manipulate our exterior behavior in order to conceal our interior states. From the effect that it had on the affective discord in the role play, it appears that neither masking nor any other nonverbal behavioral communication management endeavor with an “outside in” approach would likely result in genuine, mutual, interior affective discord resolution. That is, any attempt to prevent affective discord by placing attention on the exterior as divorced from the interior would likely prove futile. As Ekman’s research suggested in Chapter 2, much of our nonverbal expression is not under our control, as it is very intricate, deeply ingrained, largely unconscious, and our expression and perception occur in time increments too

small to track without special equipment. However, we can trust that to a certain degree, what we are feeling and perceiving is consciously or unconsciously going to be perceptible to and perceived by others, whether we use masking strategies or not. This suggests that perhaps a critical aspect of avoiding affective discord with others is to place attention on the interior states and intentions, the seat of what generates the nonverbal expressions that can perpetuate affective discord.

This interior object of attention would lie largely in the Upper Left, that is, on our own individual subjective experience and intentions at any given moment in a communicative interaction, as well as our individual subjective meaning-making systems that will influence how we perceive another's communication—our own identity management techniques and desired identities, our cultural values, salience thereof, etc. In order to facilitate effective affective communication in the Lower Left, it also seems important to have an understanding of how identity management works in *others'* subjective interiors. This would call for communication guidelines that will allow communication to become the vehicle for a shared experience of mutual respect and understanding that would lead to affective resonance and avoid affective discord around issues such as *pressure* and *empathy*.

Such guidelines have been made explicit in Stella Ting-Toomey's book, *Communicating Across Cultures*. She offers several recommendations for mindful intercultural nonverbal communication. Three recommendations that may have served the participants of *raising a concern* are:

1. Understand the cultural values and attributions that are attached to different nonverbal norms and rules.

2. Realize that the fundamental functions and interpretations of any nonverbal cues are tied closely to identity, emotional expression, conversational management, impression formation, and boundary regulation functions.
3. Use culture-sensitive perception checking statements. Perception checking skills help individuals make sure they are interpreting the speaker's nonverbal behavior accurately. It is a skill that can be used anytime when individuals are unsure they are understanding the meaning of the nonverbal behavior. Perception checking involves the use of clear, perceptual eyewitness statements and perceptual verification questions. For example, statements such as "From your tired facial expression, I can see that you need a break right now. Do you?" and "You have a confused look and it seems like you want me to slow down. Should I?" are clear perception checking statements. Perception checking is part of mindful observation and mindful listening skills (pp. 140-141).

It seems that if consciously employed, these guidelines may have made the fact explicit to Joel, Shez and Bernadette that their conflict negotiation would necessarily also involve identity negotiation, and that this identity negotiation would be revealed through their nonverbal behavior whether they were aware of it or not.

As discussed in Chapter 2, and as seen in the data and analysis of this research, most of us are not necessarily aware of what we communicate nonverbally, or what we communicate regarding identity nonverbally. Mindful identity negotiation as a concept may help serve as a vehicle to make the fact that we are always communicating something about identity explicit and provide techniques for engaging more consciously and intentionally in this process. Exactly how an exercise like the role play *raising a*

concern might transpire with explicit engagement of these mindful nonverbal communication guidelines, of course, would be a topic for future research. How it would have looked nonverbally, and how it would have been subjectively recounted, in this case can only be speculated on.

As mentioned in Chapter 1, an example of a situation in which communication skills *did* help transform a situation from severe and life-threatening affective discord to one of trust, respect and rapport was portrayed in the Nonviolent Peaceforce (NP) Annual Report (2005):

“In Trincomalee, an NP vehicle was stopped forcefully by more than 20 highly charged youth. They banged the NP vehicle and accused NP of facilitating a meeting between a Buddhist monk and LTTE (Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam) political head. They criticized NGOs of being biased. Rather than driving away, the NP Field Team members carefully listened to their grievances and clarified the misunderstandings. After an hour of discussions, the mob apologized for their threats and asked NP to visit them anytime.” (Nonviolent Peaceforce 2005 Annual Report, 2005, p. 2).

In Chapter 1 I wondered how nonverbal communication and its role evolved within this event, and what the subjective interior account of the event by both the NP members and the LTTE youth might have looked like. In Nairobi, I had the opportunity to talk with a visiting trainer who was from the Sri Lanka team and who was one of the NP members who was in this vehicle at the time. He said that when the LTTE youth initially approached the NP vehicle, they were drunk and taunting the NP members with a knife and a hand grenade. The content of this conflict was that the LTTE youth group was aware of an

accompaniment activity that NP had undertaken with a Buddhist monk, and accused them of being partisan.

This NP member chose to feel out whom within the LTTE group he could try to talk to, with the goal of making NP sustainably trustworthy to all parties, including the LTTE. In navigating the content of the initial conflict, this NP member explained to two of the LTTE youth that NP actually was explicitly non-partisan and explained the reasoning behind their accompaniment activities. Clearly, though, this message could have been expressed through a spectrum of possible tones and via a number of possible intentions in the Upper Left, all of which would have had an array of possible nonverbal expression correlates in the Upper Right. This NP team member described his interior subjective experience and intention by saying that he engaged the LTTE members by practicing “deep listening and respect”—with the understanding that if the youth have the “feeling that they are being heard” they can also experience “relief and satisfaction” (Anonymous, personal communication, December 2006).

He described the ‘guidelines’ that informed his communicative practice as informed by his spiritual practice, which was Sufism. He said, “each characteristic that I see [in others] is also in me,” and, “I work on heart-mind-spirit identity consciousness. The power of nonviolence is connected to super-consciousness. I work with the power of oneness. We are not alone.” Perhaps most significant to the implications for avoiding affective discord and facilitating affective resonance, he concluded, “I see a human face in everyone. [If I can] make them *feel* that, it creates space for negotiation.”

Although we don't know if this NP team member consciously or intuitively employed any of Ting-Toomey's recommendations for mindful intercultural nonverbal communication, it seems that his approach implicitly embodied what may be the most significant among Stella Ting-Toomey's recommendations for establishing trust. Implicit in his description, it seems, is an understanding that by communicating with the LTTE at all, he is necessarily communicating something about identity, emotional expression, impression formation, and boundary regulation. Although he may not have been explicitly aware of what his nonverbal communication might have been saying, it seems as though his sincerity came through, and somehow these youth felt listened to. They felt empathized with. The failure to give and receive empathy appeared to be the most singular downfall of the efforts to resolve conflict in the role play, *raising a concern*. The success of giving and receiving empathy also seems to be the foundation of what allowed this NP member to connect with and create the space for a resolution with the LTTE youth.

As discussed in Chapter 2, the foundation of both empathy and successful nonverbal perception can be described as the process of grasping another's point of view, or the "ability to mentally 'simulate' another person... to use the resources of one's own mind to create a model of another person and thereby identify with him or her, projecting oneself imaginatively into his or her situation" (Thompson, 2001, p. 11). Chapter 2 proposed that empathy and nonverbal communicative competence would comprise the same, or two very closely related, lines of personal development. This NP member's recognition that "each characteristic that I see [in others] is also in me," seems to be indicative of a deeply practiced line of empathetic development. It seems that just as affective states such as anger and stress are difficult to *fully* mask, affective states such as deep empathy are also hard to hide. It seems

that if the space is created, as the NP member put it, empathy can, at least in some initially unpromising situations, be received.

Perhaps it is not coincidental that the explicit practice of empathy—for oneself, and empathic listening to others—is also the foundation of the practice of nonviolent communication, as developed by Marshall Rosenberg (2005). This practice, which has been used internationally in situations from interpersonal to political conflict, is based on the premise that as soon as each party can recognize and say what the others' needs are, the space for resolution opens up. Nonviolent communication includes a practice of recognizing feelings, identifying how they correspond with needs, and communicating these feelings and needs in a four-step process that aims to make requests without blame or demands. Also germane to this practice is learning to practice empathic listening, which involves listening for the feelings and needs that are being expressed within a person's words and nonverbal behavior.

It would be interesting to see whether, if Joel, Bernadette and Chez had been actively trying to practice empathic listening as developed in the practice of Nonviolent Communication, the dynamics would have changed, or if the affective discord around pressure and empathy would have shifted. Perhaps Bernadette and Chez would have guessed that Joel was feeling impatient because his need for interdependence or understanding weren't being met; perhaps Joel and Chez would have guessed that Bernadette was feeling overwhelmed and frustrated because her need for understanding and empathy wasn't being met; perhaps Joel and Bernadette would have guessed that Chez was feeling confused, nervous or uncomfortable because her need for community and empathy wasn't being met. If these guesses had been posed as questions, e.g., "are you feeling overwhelmed because you feel like your need for understanding or emotional safety isn't being met?" the door for more affective resolution

would have been opened. This kind of speculative guesswork, of course, could only be tested in future study.

Limitations and Future Study

Some of the limitations of this research are inherent in its scope and invite an expanded framework for looking at the present data. Some of the limitations are due to the depth of the present analysis. Some are intrinsic to the data itself and some pose questions or suggestions that provide directionality for future application.

One limitation that invites an expanded framework for analysis is that while the literature review concludes, at several junctures, that awareness around cross-cultural nonverbal communication is vital, and the data analysis suggests that this awareness is not only vital but needs to span both the exterior (nonverbal behavior) but the subjective interior (subjective feelings, intentions, and assumptions), it was not within the scope of this research and analysis to explicitly address what *is* necessary for this awareness to develop, except to suggest that it is a developmental line that is similar to or the same as the developmental line for empathy. Empathy, and the ability to take on another's perspective at an even more fundamental level than the degree to which it was exhibited by the NP member in Trincomalee, is a skill that develops over a lifetime. One possible future study or application to address this shortcoming would be to measure a person's cognitive complexity or empathic abilities based on a test, and to look at their nonverbal behaviors and perception in relationship to their cognitive complexity, or in relationship to a measurable line of development. Another possible study is, whether we have measured a person's cognitive complexity or lines of development or not, how best to *activate*

and make *accessible* a person's capacity for empathy, whatever that capacity is. This question could be responded to by testing the effectiveness of explicitly engaging guidelines and techniques such as those offered in Rosenberg's system of nonviolent communication.

Two other limitations that invite a more expansive framework for looking at this data are pointed to by the possibility of a deeper and more thorough context for understanding what comprised the domains of affective discord that were prominent in the role play, *pressure* and *empathy*. The fact that a lack of empathy was quite distinctive in *raising a concern*, where affective discord was never resolved, and that empathy was explicitly engaged on the ground in Trincomalee, where affective discord was resolved against great odds, begs for a more thorough investigation into empathy as a capacity, a line of development, and the effectiveness of intentionally engaging it in activities such as the role play *raising a concern*.

Also, the fact that *pressure* was a primary area of affective discord amongst the role play participants, and the fact that feeling heavily pressured and deeply empathized with are likely mutually exclusive, suggests that such pressure between interactants poses a significant obstacle to empathic communication. Clearly, the phenomenon of pressure in the role play pointed to dynamics of situational power. *Power* seems to be a domain in and of itself in which awareness is crucial in order to avoid affective discord in any type of communication, verbal and nonverbal.

Power struggles and "using rank consciously" are ubiquitous (Mindell, 1995, p. 53). It is extremely easy to use one's power to someone else's disadvantage without being conscious of it. Power is also tied into

nonverbal communication and into what can be described as primary and secondary signals, which echo Kegan's description of commitments and counter-commitments in Chapter 4. Both concepts rest on the fact that as humans, we usually have more than one course of motivation driving us at any given time, and these different motivations are often in conflict with each other. During communication, "some of your messages and signals are unintended; others are unconscious." "If you try to act happy when you are unhappy, you send double signals. The intended message may be a smile or a little laugh; the double signal may be hanging your head or speaking in a low tone". One nonverbal expression may be a primary signal, and the other a secondary signal, or the "unintended double-signal" (Mindell, 1995, p. 54). Bringing awareness to the primary and secondary motivations on the subjective interior that prompt the primary and secondary signals on the exterior is another domain of potential research. This area of research would also invite the broader theoretical context of cognitive complexity and advancement of lines of development, as mentioned above.

Another limitation built into the data itself is that it is a role play. The role play was chosen because, as an activity of a capacity building training for nonviolent peace work, the data analysis could more directly inform a curricular piece around cross-cultural nonverbal awareness training that could be integrated into a future NP training, which has been one outcome goal of this research. It was also chosen because the role plays were meant to pose trainees with genuine conflicts and issues that they could expect to encounter in the field. Hopefully, then, materials that were informed by this research might also be more organically relevant to situations that peace workers might encounter on the field. Also, from a practical perspective, the data I was looking for—nonverbal behaviors in conjunction with miscommunication or affective discord—was more likely to come up in the training than in an uncontrolled context. However, by virtue of being a role play, the participants' nonverbal behaviors and

inner states and experiences are also necessarily informed by the fact that it *is* a role play, and influences may come into play that would not be at play in the authentic situation that the role play simulated. For example, the identity negotiation processes of all the participants may have been also influenced by the desire to 'succeed' in resolving the conflict.

Another limitation of this research inherent in the depth of the analysis is that because this research set out to identify the most relevant contributors to affective discord in each of the four quadrants of the AQAL model, in order to paint a fuller picture of what creates affective discord, it was not, by design, a detailed inquiry into one aspect or quadrant of the discord alone. One could have, and still could in a future study, look more closely at any one of the quadrants. One could also look more deeply into only one aspect of kinesic or vocalic behavior, or one of the nonverbal functions such as *emotional display*, *reflecting identity and relationship*, or *managing conversation*, in relationship to affective discord generally, or pressure or empathy specifically.

Of course, due to the subjective nature of the data analysis in this research, my own blind spots, biases, and enculturation posed inevitable limitations to this research. A future study could involve showing this role play to many different people, ideally from several different cultures and cultural value types, including those of the participants, and calibrating an array of interpretations.

An extension of such a future study would be to not only ask a multi-cultural pool of observers to interpret the role of nonverbal behavior and function within this role play, but to show the role play first without sound and ask observers to surmise what might be going on. They could, before hearing the

content of the role play, speculate on affective resonance or discord within the role play and respond to questions designed to capture their interpretations of what is going on in terms of relationship and identity, or even pressure and empathy.

During the final committee meeting for this thesis, several suggestions regarding the implications of this research and future study emerged.

Throughout Chapters 2 and 4, my peer reviewer contextualized many of the issues that I discussed within the context of constructivist development theory. This theory explains capacities and limitations of orders of complexity of meaning-making systems, and how they relate to the skills that were called upon within this role play, and within conflict negotiation generally. It emerged that certain skills are available in people to different degrees at different levels of complexity of meaning-making. These skills are linked to the capacity to take another's point of view, to empathize even if one's own needs aren't being met, to be aware of one's internal state and be able to have a relationship to that state. The state becomes an object rather than being operated from only; one isn't simply subject to it any longer. It also emerged that some of these abilities, such as presenting oneself intentionally, taking another's point of view, and avoiding falling unconsciously into archetypal roles within conflict, thus perpetuating conflict unintentionally and unconsciously, are tasks that are beyond the scope of the average adult with what constructivist-development theory would call *conventional* meaning-making. Most of these skills, according to the theory, require a more complex meaning-making system, such as *post-conventional* meaning-making or higher. Anecdotally, as we discussed problems that have come up in other nonviolent conflict intervention trainings, especially in the arena of practicing conflict negotiation, it seemed to be the case that seemingly unconscious assumptions and unconscious archetypal role

acquisition within conflict were at the root of difficulty in negotiating conflict successfully. This suggests that it might be essential, in order to maximize the actualization potential of the goals of international nonviolent conflict intervention, to train peace workers with the capacities of post-conventional meaning-making structures. Also, studies have indicated that indeed trainings in general are more likely to fail when the trainers themselves are not operating with at least a *post-conventional* meaning-making system. Because it is possible to screen and test for complexity of meaning-making systems, and some organizations do so, we discussed the practicability of this kind of screening.

This also raised questions for potential future research. I felt that it would be interesting to explore the limitations and capacities of different meaning-making systems in relationship to the way that the role play participants expressed themselves and expressed their interpretations of each other. Since in this situation, affective resonance was not achieved, it would be interesting to understand, from the perspective of our assumptions and how we make meaning from our interactions, what degree of shared affective meaning may have been possible, and what may not have been possible. A deeper understanding of what may have been possible, and the question of how that potential could be maximized during an exercise such as raising a concern, would, of course, render curricular implications for future trainings.

I expect to use the model of viewing a role play without sound and observing nonverbal behaviors in future applications that this research will inform. One upcoming application will be a joint project with my advisor and one of the Kenyan NP trainers in Nairobi in September 2007. We will co-design a two to three day workshop on nonviolent communication with a focus on nonverbal communication. This workshop will be offered to youth in Kibera, a large slum in Nairobi and the second largest slum in Africa

after Soweto. In order to organically raise awareness around how nonverbal behavior can communicate messages when we try to communicate nonviolently, I plan to video tape role plays in which participants practice nonviolent communication strategies. In the debriefings afterwards, I will play back the video for participants and ask reflective questions around what was happening, from observing the nonverbal behavior alone. My hope is that seeing how much they think and believe about what is going on without hearing the verbal content will create a more direct experience of how pregnant with meaning our nonverbal behavior can be, and how much it can help or hinder conflict resolution.

I will use a similar model to be integrated into the curricular design pieces that will be offered to NP for future capacity building trainings. In one exercise in the *Training for Change* manual that was discussed in Chapter 2, *Walk the line*, I would like participants to write down how they felt, and how they felt they appeared to others, when attempting to project confidence first in a group of indifferent observers and then in a group of observers who were consciously empathizing with them. Following, they could view themselves on video and see if their nonverbal behavior in their mind matched how they felt, if they were surprised by anything, and if they would change anything next time, either internally or externally.

In addition to creating curricular pieces to raise awareness around nonverbal communication in the field of international peace work, I also expect to develop activities in my Functional Work English classroom with the Minnesota Literacy Council that will help raise learner awareness around cultural differences in nonverbal behavioral norms, especially differences that could cause others to view them negatively, and in turn possibly prevent them from becoming employed or retaining employment. My understanding is that in Hmong culture, one nonverbal behavioral rule is that it is considered disrespectful to look someone in the eyes, particularly a superior. In North American culture, this behavior is almost essential

to forming trust and rapport. I would like, with my class, to explicitly draw attention to cultural differences around some of these important behaviors and practice differences in a safer classroom environment, with the feeling that if they have practiced a behavior in class and know how to do it, they will have the option of adopting that behavior in certain contexts.

Finally, it would be fun, if somewhat impractical, to bring this research back to the original arena that ignited my sense that nonverbal behavior expresses internal states in a way that we intuitively but very subtly perceive—the Miss Universe Pageant, as described in Chapter 1. I noticed that some of the pageant competitors, to me, looked more authentically sexy than others and guessed that if I had the chance to access what their subjective experiences were during the pageant, and in general, in relationship to feeling sexy, that I would find some consistent Upper Left data congruent with what I observed in the Upper Right.

Perhaps such a study would also render a common strain between the *raising a concern* data, the recounting of the interaction in Trincomalee, and the Miss Universe Pageant contestants' nonverbal expressions and subjective experiences. I suspect that they would all point, in some way, to the primacy of not only awareness, but sincerity, as that which can best ensure that we nonverbally express what we really want to express, and that we most accurately perceive what is really going on. That is, we can only express in the Upper Right what is sincerely available in the Upper Left. We don't know what would have been available in the way of empathy and equitable relating from Joel, Bernadette, or Chez' experiences and intentions, if that aspect of their interiors had been explicitly and skillfully engaged. It does seem fair to guess, however, that we can better access the empathy that is available, develop our own capacities for empathy, and better communicate empathy—just as one could better access feelings of

sexiness, capacities for feeling sexy, or techniques for better communicating sexiness, or any other interior state such as confidence—but that all techniques and nonverbal behavioral expressions are ultimately limited by or possible only in relationship to sincere experience.

REFERENCES

- Boeree, G. (2002). *General psychology: The emotional nervous system*. Retrieved March 7, 2007, from <http://webspaceship.edu/cgboer/limbicsystem.html>.
- DeVito, J. (1989). *The nonverbal communication workbook*. Prospect Heights, Ill., Waveland Press.
- Ekman, P. (1972). Universals and cultural differences in facial expressions of emotion. In J. Cole (Ed.), *Nebraska symposium on motivation, 1971*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Ekman, P. (1973). *Darwin and facial expression: A century of research in review*. New York: Academic Press.
- Ekman, P. (1985). *Telling lies: Clues to deceit in the marketplace, politics, and marriage*. New York: Norton.
- Ekman, P. (2005). Buddhist and psychological perspectives on emotions and well-being. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 14 (2), Retrieved March 4, 2007, from http://brainimaging.waisman.wisc.edu/publications/2005/Ekmanet.al_CurrDirPsychSci.pdf.
- Ekman, P. & Ellsworth, P. (1972). *Emotion in the human face*. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Ekman, P. et al. (1987). Universals and cultural differences in the judgment of facial expressions of emotions. *Journal of Personality and Psychology*, 53, 712-717.
- Gallagher, S. & Meltzoff, A. (1996). The earliest sense of self and other: Merleau-Ponty and recent developmental studies. *Philosophical Psychology*, 9, 211-233.

Hall, E. (1989). *Beyond culture*. New York: Doubleday.

Hickson, M., Stacks, D., Moore, N. (2007). *Nonverbal communication: Studies and applications*. Los Angeles: Roxbury.

Hunter, D. & Lakey, G. (2004). *Open space for democracy: Third-party nonviolent intervention*. Philadelphia: Training for Change.

Kegan, R. & Lahey, L. (2001). *How the way we talk can change the way we work*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Knapp, J. & Hall, E. (2002). *Nonverbal communication in human interaction*. Australia; U.S.: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.

Leonard, A. (2004). *Integral communication*. Retrieved 10 January, 2007, from <http://www.echochamberproject.com/files/IntegralCommunicationThesis.pdf>

Lewis, T., Amini, F., and Lannon, R.. (2000). *A general theory of love*. New York: Random House.

Mackey, A. & Gass, S. (2005). *Second language research: Methodology and design*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Mindell, A. (1995). *Sitting in the fire*. Portland: Lao Tse Press.

Mission statement. (2005). Retrieved 10 January, 2007, from <http://nvpf.org/np/english/mission/statement.asp.html>

Nonviolent peaceforce. (n.d.). Retrieved 10 January 2007, from <http://www.nonviolentpeaceforce.org/>

Nonviolent peaceforce 2005 annual report. (2005). Retrieved 10 January 2007, from <http://nvpf.org/np/english/resources/documents/AR2005.pdf>

Phipps, C. (2006). A philosopher of everything. *What Is Enlightenment?*, 33, 54-65.

Rosenberg, M. (2005). *Nonviolent communication: A language of life* (2nd ed.). Encinitas: PuddleDancer Press.

Savage-Rumbaugh, S., Fields, W., & Tagliatela, J. (2001). Language, speech, tools and writing: A cultural imperative. *Journal of Consciousness Study. Special Issue: Between ourselves*, 8, 273-292.

Smuts, B. (2001). Encounters with animal minds. *Journal of Consciousness Study. Special Issue: Between ourselves*, 8, 293-309.

The biggest ideas. (2003). Retrieved 25 February 2007, from http://www.thebiggestideas.com/cgi-bin/viewps.cgi?your_emotionsps.txt

The integral approach. (2006). Retrieved 10 January 2007, from <http://www.integralinstitute.org/public/static/abtapproach.aspx>

Thompson, E. (2001). Empathy and consciousness. *Journal of Consciousness Study. Special Issue: Between ourselves*, 8, 1-32.

Ting-Toomey, S. (1999). *Communicating across cultures*. New York: Guilford Press.

Wilber, K. (1996). *A brief history of everything*. Boston: Shambhala.

World Tibet network news. (2003). Retrieved 5 June 2007, from
http://www.tibet.ca/en/wtnarchive/2003/8/4_2.html

Yong, X. (2003). Nonverbal communication and its cross-cultural differences. *Journal of Zhuzhou Institute of Technology*, 17 (6), 121-126.

