**1) To Ekman:**

**What do you think about the development of different types of body movements and facial expressions by Ekman?**

I am so sorry, this question was a bit tricky, much better would be “what do you think about Ekman’s classification of body movement types and facial expressions?“

Nevertheless, some of you were courageous and tried to answer anyway, thank you for that!

I have to agree that Ekman’s classification is unbalanced.

Emblems are very similar to symbols (e.g. in Peircean theory of sign), they are socially learned, arbitrarily coded. I think i tis not a good idea to include „iconic emblems“ into this group, because a terminological confusion could arise. So everything of iconic nature should be move to illustrators. As you can see, we can call illustrators as semantic gestures (at least inthe sense of Hogrefe’s classification, we will definiitely discuss it in the future). Manipulators and regulators are not so important for Ekman, I think because they do not have a potential to transmit a meaning, they only express/reflect nervousness (manipulators) or e.g. signalize that you should speak louder, you should stop talking et. (regulators). As it was expectable, he dedicates a lot of attention to emotional expressions. It is quite confusing that we do not know precisely, how much important are emotional expression important in his classification (well, we may say that i tis the most important group for him, because we can derive it from this paper as well as from his review of Darwin’s book), but if anyone else would read the paper „Emotional and conversional nonverbal signals“, s/he could presume emblems are on the first place, then illustrators etc. Even though emotional expressions are mentioned on the last place, they are described on three pages, so it seems they are of significant importance, above all other groups – you may think “instead of proper conclusion“ 😊

That is also a pitty, he does not differ conversational and emotional elements properly and, above all, we do not know if there is a difference between them or if emotional are more important than conversational (or vice versa). Ekman claims you may decide about people emotions based on their facial expressions, so there is an information expressed about given person, but I think these emotion signals cannot be of the same importance as e.g. illustrators are.

**What are the main shifts in Ekman‘s theory (or in collaboration with Friesen)?**

I think this part was quite easy to answer.

Main shifts are:

Third group (manipulators) was called “adapters“ earlier, but Ekman claims it was not so descriptively correct as adapters are.

Fifth group (emotional expressions) was called “affective displays“ earlier, but Ekman decided to revise this, because “affect“ has a more extensive meaning than “emotion“, and, regarding the word “displays“, he claims that “expression“ is 1) not worse and 2) can be understood as a link to Darwin’s work.

**In which way Ekman follows Darwin's theory?**

Ekman follows Darwin not only in a terminological sense (see above), but also in his strong belief that emotional expressions are universal to our species (and some of them shared with other species). They also used a very similar method – collection of big data, observations from different places/cultures to support their theories. So they are convinced that their results are truthful because of large amount of data.

**2) Try to find some parallels between Ekman's classification and components/units of sign languages.**

Facial expressions also play a role in sign language grammars, but I think they are of more considerable importance, e.g. if you use your eyebrows to indicate whether the sentence ends with a question mark, exclamation mark, or period. Then you can express a concrete emotion with a given facial expression, but what is very important, your facial expression must match the sign, otherwise is not transmitted (and perceived) correctly. You can also use a facial expression as a tone – to emphasize something (by making the sign bigger, signing it for a shorter amount of time, or changing the movement of the sign).

I think you can find the other groups from Ekman’s classification in sign languages, but they are of different importance. One the one hand hand, there are manipulators and regulators definitely present in sign language communication, e.g. the regulator “to stamp on the floor“ when you want to catch sb’s attention. One the other hand, there are emblems (= ca. symbols) and illustrators as well and they constitute an essential part of given sign language.

It is kind a mystery for me (and I hope we will discuss it some day), why signs of iconic nature are not used in situations, where would be good fitting (a kiss, to stink, to sleep etc.) and signs of symbolic nature (or symbolic mixed with iconic) are used instead.