**What is the most important contribution of Birdwhistell’s work *Kinesics and context*?**

Connection of research of both verbal and non-verbal elements, an effort to see them in the process of human interaction, but particularly on theoretical-methodological level.

**a) What is his best innovation (comparing to Darwin or Ekman)? b) Is there anything similar to Darwin or Ekman?**

a) How body movements work in the process of face-to-face communication; making videos of people in interaction. He tried to find out, which body movement is of most importance and which is not important. Ekman was, on the contrary, (implicitely) most interested in facial expressions from the beginning. Birdwhistell considered body movements to be culturally specified rather than universal. b) Birdwhistell worked on different experimental researches as well (even i tis not so obvious from Kendon’s article). Darwin, Ekman and Birdwhistell explored speakers of different cultures to observe their nonverbal expressions (but they judged these expressions in quite different way).

**Do you see any limits in Birdwhistell’s description of communication?**

He explored only face-to-face communication, but there are also situations, where only one speaker appears or when there are e.g. two speakers, but i tis not face-to-face communication. He provided only few examples, there are sometimes no examples at all, so only promising theory appears there.

**What is the main difference between Birdwhistell’s approach to study of facial expressions and two mentioned experimental approaches?**

Experimental approaches explored only emotions, which means expressions of people’s inner states in their faces. But Birdwhistell was interested in the structure of different points/parts of the face and particularly in the function of this structure for the process of communication. Inner states are not important for him anymore.

**What do you say on his linguistics analogy in research of nonverbal communication (facial expressions, gestures)? Is that kind of approach useful? And is it consistent from the linguistic viewpoint?**

He only needed to have a structure for description similar like in description of verbal components, so this analogy does not mean that there is something similar in the nature of these different codes. So it is useful in theoretical way of thinking. It is not so clear on higher level of kinemorphic construction – only at level of phonemes and morphemes.

**Is there an obvious parallel to the descrption of sign languages in Birdwhistell’s approach? What about the basic distinction to kinemes, kinemorphs and kinemorphic constructions?**

Well, I think to answer this question is quite complicated. Let us take an example, a sign for „I do not understand“ in Czech Sign Language. “Puckering of eyebrow“ could be a kineme; “Eyebrow…+ puckering of face muscles + shaking of head from the left to the right + shaking of two fingers in front of upper part of the head“ could be a kinemorphic construction – but I am not sure about a kinemorph in this situation – maybe only eyebrow + face muscles?

**What do you think about the concept of “stance“?**

It is an “environment“ for occuring of different displays of human behaviour and this concept of stance enables to connect those different displays of behaviour and enables their mutual exchange as well (Yes, it is very abstract concept, I know).

**What do you think about the Birdwhistell’s book as a whole?**

It is more like “the best of Birdwhistell“ or complex of essays with different topics than a cohesive theory. Regarding the fact that there are not so many examples, his book is useful particularly for some practical attempts, that means for someone who is looking for possible ways how to do empirical research in the area of nonverbal communication.