it is oriented towards an individual who wishes to at least take their own life under control. »*The change was a matter of choice*« says Salecl, »*but it was also unpredictable and uncontrollable*« (p. 150). Avoiding social change leads to an unproductive society and, in the end, also to an unproductive individual.

Although Salecl's interpretation of the tyranny of choice in late capitalism makes it sound like it is in somewhat of a deadlock, her own position is not pessimistic. Her contribution to solving the problem of choice comes to readers in the form of her elegant and profound explanation of the phenomenon of choice in her slickly written book. However, she does not offer, as one might expect, any magic formula to overcome, change or annihilate the tyranny of choice. One question which may arise is why the author does not fully address the influence of the current world economic crisis? She only mentions it in passing at the end of the book (p. 142). Does she believe it is not so relevant for interpreting the ideology of choice? Or is it simply that the idea for the book came into being well before the crisis broke out? In any case, the book is a very valuable essay on the problem of the ideology of choice in late capitalist society and for that very reason the author should be given full credit.

Katarina MAJERHOLD
Independent researcher

Arvid Kappas, Nicole C. Krammer (eds.)
Face to Face Communication: Emotions in a Web of Culture, Language and Technology
Cambridge University Press, London 2011,
pp. 312, USD 38.99
(ISBN 978-0521619974)

Face to Face Communication, Emotions in a Web of Culture, Language and Technology edited by Arvid Kappas and Nicole C. Krammer is an excellent book that I highly recommend to experts in fields such as sociology, philosophy, psychology, women's studies and IT because on one side it is theoretical and on the other it is very applicable. Besides, it is backed up with a series of the latest studies and confirmatory data about the meanings and cues regarding what and how to understand nonverbal communication in face-to-face communication and how they are effectively being transferred into the computer world. A lot of attention is paid to understanding and effect of positive emotions, such as smiling and happiness. Almost every article (except the first two) deals with smiling in a certain way. Results of different studies show that smiling, happiness and friendly emotions enhance our social, communication and cognitive skills in face-to-face communication as well as when working with computers, that gender also has

an influence in the virtual world and that communication between person and computer can be beneficial for people. There are also other positive practical outcomes of using virtual technological (audio-video) communication, for instance doctors or psychologists who can carry out their sessions and sometimes even help with surgeries. We are provided with the latest extensive research findings, although sometimes with a somewhat dry and repetitive data-information presentation.

In the article *Facing the Future: Emotion Communication and the Presence of Others in the Age of Video-mediated Communication, Manstead*, Lea and Goh claim that non-verbal cues such as voice, posture, facial behaviour and eye gaze have long been regarded as essential lubricants and regulators of social interaction and contributing to impression formation, rapport and acquaintanceship development. Faces are a particularly relevant aspect of non-verbal communication (especially emotion, intimacy and visual identity). First and foremost, they provide an important channel for communicating emotional intimacy in relationships. It was once believed that everything that did not have a physical basis for expressing and communicating those non-verbal emotional cues led to a reduced social presence and reduced communication in face-to-face interaction. But this was proven not to be correct. Why? The social presence approach consists of two aspects: physical and social dimensions. Physical presence refers to the sense of being physically located somewhere; more accurately, it refers to the sense of being located in the same place as another. The lack of co-presence then refers to the awareness of not being in the same location as another person. One can thus have the sense of physically being in the same room as another or of being in a different nearby room, or of being separated by a great physical distance. As the distance between the two locations increases, the likelihood of any communication also increases and media differ in the extent to which they can "transport" someone psychologically to the same place as another. A sense of the physical therefore refers to one's awareness of the capacity to relate to another in the physical space or the technology. In fact, the psychological presence of others plays a key role in shaping facial displays. When others are psychologically present, there is some sense in which we communicate with them through facial behaviours, even if we are not directly interacting with them. The fact that the person with whom you are communicating is in another room, another city or, indeed, another continent or in the virtual world does not mean that one does not smile "'at' him or her, especially if he or she is a friend" (p. 158). Accordingly, experiencing social presence depends on some degree of an actual or implied social interaction – by participating in a certain communal activity, even if it is virtual. Thus the capacity to communicate non-verbally well is of-

ten given a social meaning that can be portrayed as sociable, warm and personal.

Yet another aspect of our face-to-face and computer message communication is taking a person's gender into account. In the article *Gender in to Face to Face Communication* (FTFC) and Computer Message Communication (CMC), Fischer writes about gender differences between FTFC and CMC and asks whether and how the communication of emotions by men and women is different in CMC from FTFC? She presents a great deal of results showing that gender differences are highly variable and depend on the nature of the context and this holds true in both FTFC and CMC. Gender stereotypes suggest that women are more aware of others' needs; more emotionally expressive, warm and understanding, focused on harmony avoid negative emotions while, on the other hand, men are described as more dominant, self-confident, independent, and task-oriented, while inhibiting their emotions. This is assumed due to the social roles people play. Because people have a certain social role their emotions, actions and body movements are shaped accordingly. Studies show that the biggest gender differences in interactive FTFC styles are when interacting with strangers, when being a minority, when interacting with someone of the same sex or when performing a gender-congruent stereotypical task. In addition, the occurrence and size of gender differences depend on the conversational context. For instance, women initiate more tags that reflect solidarity, whereas men initiate more tags that express uncertainty although their tags may express politeness and solidarity.

When comparing the FTFC and CMC linguistic styles the results were as follows: in different online groups, men and women differed in 7 out of 13 coded variables, whereas the sex composition of the group showed a significant difference between men and women for only two variables (women made more self-disclosure and men made more assertions about facts). This suggests that the sex composition of the group is an important determinant of gender differences in language styles in CMC. When looking at only men's or only women's discussion groups, the results show that women less often expressed views and more often displayed feelings and suggested solutions than men in their own discussion group where the men expressed fewer feelings and more often their own views. When looking at men and women performing different tasks (masculine and feminine content) and different gender compositions (only female, only male, mixed) the results showed that the gender composition of the group was more important than the nature of the task or gender of the participant.

When it comes to emotions in FTFC and CMC – studies have shown that women more overtly express affection and warmth through their body language than with language

itself than men – they keep a closer distance to their interaction partner, lean forward, nod and gaze and smile more than men. Regarding emoticons in CMC it seems that people need to express their emotions not only with words but also with short symbols. In the predominantly female group, the smiley was the most frequently used emoticon and the categories of humour and solidarity were the most frequently coded meanings. The need to tease others was absent. In contrast, in the predominantly male group the only emotional use of the emoticon was to express sarcasm or humour; however, the use of emotions also depended on the topic of conversation. In the mixed-gender groups, women teased and made sarcastic comments, although men again used them more than women, men also used emoticons to apologise for something they had not done when in a predominantly male group. I find Fischer's approach to teamwork helpful.

In the article *Emotions in Human-Computer Communication,* Surraka and Vanhala show in their study that synthetic speech with emotional content can regulate emotional responses and help people to enhance their positive moods, enhance their intellectual capabilities and perform certain tasks better. For instance, they designed a study in which participants experienced emotional feedback messages from a computer while doing a task of solving a serious of relatively simple computations (e.g. 3 ? 3 = 6) in which they had to decide upon the missing + or – operator and press a corresponding key. After each series, a Finnish speech synthesiser called Mikropuhe gave random positive, neutral or negative feedback with emotional content that was independent of the participants' performance, i.e. your result makes me happy or your result was average and so on. The participants thus experienced feedback messages as emotionally negative, positive, neutral and their physiology was consequently affected. These findings also suggested that positive emotional feedback results in improved cognitive performance and faster recovery from physiological arousal than non-emotional feedback. It is worth noting the results suggested that positive feedback was effective regardless of the actual performance of the person. Further, the analysis of the problem-solving performances revealed a better performance following positive rather than negative interventions. Positive emotional feedback was found to enhance, for instance, human mathematical computations. Surraka and Vahala show that emotions evoked by technology are found to be beneficial to humans.

This book is highly informative, applicable and reliable while presenting a lot of the latest research findings. However, what I miss is a presentation and deeper understanding of emotions in general and how they are shown in computer communication. We learn a little more only in the last article *Embodiment and Expressive Communication on the Internet*,

although the authors are mostly concerned with and explain the extent to which the technology of modelling 3D avatars and embodied systems works on pleasure and arousal.

Ana TOMINC
Department of Linguistics and English Language, Lancaster University

Taja Kramberger, Drago Braco Rotar **Misliti družbo, ki (se) sama ne misli** [Thinking society that does not think (itself)] Sophia, Ljubljana 2010, pp. 244, 19,80 EUR
(ISBN 978-961-6768-25)

Thinking society that does not think (itself) is a collection of essays written by two Slovene social scientists, writers and intellectuals that can be associated with the tradition of the French historiography. The majority have been published before and have now been revised. For just one of them, this is a *premi re*. As much as this book provides critique of the society that does not think (itself), at the same time it already contains concrete traces of those social mechanisms which it constantly critically addresses. The authors' open exposal of the processes of censorship that the essays in this collection seem to have undergone, points to their conviction that "writing and action are the same". In this, they follow Foucault's idea of an intellectual, for whom there was on one hand no "real, neutral and pale discourse with guarantees of *l'Académie*" and on the other hand "courage at searching for things" (p.197–8). Like Kramberger and Rotar, Foucault consequently pursued and reflected upon these two inseparable sides of an engaged intellectual. The authors' resistance against the social injustice, particularly the injustice inherent in neoliberal dogmatism, and against academic inability for a reflexive and autonomous science – "imperative parts of one's discipline" (p.xvi) – does not exist just in their texts, but it is also reflected in their daily action. The ways in which this collection of essays also exhibits resistance against various forms of social control that some of these texts have been subjected upon are thus not silenced and hidden into the personal experience of the authors. Rather, they make an effort to express and recognize such censorship, start confronting it, and not just reconcile with it and then 'shut up': exposing the relations between an author's original text and its final printed version uncovers the force of powerful intermediaries that can act as censors.

In many ways, registering such an unauthorised intrusion is already sufficient: this is the first step to a possibility of thinking about it, an activity doomed not to be easy: "it is something like cleaning Augias' stables when there is acute lack of water and *'helping hands',* (p.xv) as authors explain in the introductory chapter.

Censorship is a mechanism of social control as old as societies themselves. It can be manifest in many dif-