Multimodal Acid Communication
of a Politician

Isabella Poggi[1], Francesca D'Errico[2]

[1] Dipartimento di Filosofia, Comunicazione e Spettacolo
Università Roma Tre
Via Ostiense 234 – 00144 – Roma – Italy
[2] Faculty of Psychology
Università UniNettuno – Roma - Italy
isabella.poggi@uniroma3.it,fderrico@uniroma3.it

Abstract. The paper overviews previous works on acidity and acid communication, their nature and causes. Then it presents a qualitative study on a real case of acid communication in an Italian politician. An annotation scheme is proposed to single out ingredients of multimodal acid communication, and the mental ingredients of annoyance, distance, defiance are found as characterizing acidity.

Keywords: Acidity, multimodal communication, politicians, mental ingredients.

1 Introduction

Interpersonal interaction in everyday life – be it at home, on the workplace, or in political communication – is often loaded with conflict: people have contrasting goals and, trying to bear each on one's goal, they may sometimes attack each other, and the outcome of the struggle may leave a trace on their self-image.

Imagine a young woman angry at her cohabitant who always leaves her to clean the house, or who often eats food that she was keeping for herself; a person who repeatedly goes to a public office to have his bureaucratic position fixed and discovers the public officer has not worked on his dossier yet; or a politician who had a bad result in the elections due to having been discredited by another.

In all these cases, a person (the woman, the public office user, or the discredited politician) may feel a victim of injustice, be irritated towards the one he considers guilty of such injustice toward himself, and would like to aggress him or her; but he cannot trigger a deflagrating conflict, because he is in a position of dependency from the other, or anyway he wants or need to keep some relationship with him/her. So he finally performs some act of communicative aggression to the other, but one that is not so violent as to cut off their interpersonal relationship: instead of an insult, he may launch a sarcastic statement, instead of expressing blatant anger, he might express annoyance or irritation.

This is the field of acidity: a way to communicate that is on the one side a symptom of underlying conflict between persons, and on the other a symptom of a person's powerlessness, of an acute awareness of his/her impotence to win in the conflict, possibly linked – as a cause or an effect – to bitterness and depression. Sometimes in such cases people perform communicative acts that aim to aggress another person – to make her feel guilty, to abase her image before others – but do so in a somewhat covert way, because they cannot afford (due to lack of interactional power), or they do not want to attack in a way that could cause conflict deflagration.

In previous works the notions of acidity and acid communication were defined, and some studies investigated how this notion is conceptualized in everyday people and what are its interactional and emotional causes; the typical features of verbal language in acid communication were analyzed, and some first hints were provided on how acidity is expressed in bodily communication, particularly in head, gaze and gestural behavior.

In this paper, after overviewing these aspects of acidity, we present a qualitative analysis of a real case of multimodal acid communication in politics, hence setting the stage for a quantitative study aimed at singling out the most characterizing features of acid communication in face, gaze, gestures and posture.

2 Acidity and Acid Communication

After years of research on basic emotions [1, 2, 3, 4], more subtle affective states are now being studied. Previous works on emotional communication in everyday life proposed the notion of "acid communication" [5]: a type of communication characterized by restrained aggressiveness and expressed through sarcasm, irony or other kinds of rhetorical language, typical of a person that feels she has been an object of injustice and feels emotions like anger, envy, bitterness, grudge or rancor, but that also feels she does not have the power to revenge or even the power to express her anger freely. Such an emotional state is sometimes manifested by a restrained and somewhat inhibited way of attacking other people, that stems from a feeling of anger and injustice, matched to a feeling of impotence, both to recover from the injustice undergone, and to prevent the negative consequences of one's expression.

Acid communication was then defined as a type of communicative acts (either speech acts or communicative nonverbal acts) in which a Sender expresses aggressiveness toward another person (a Target), but does not do so in an explicit way, rather in a covert, yet possibly ostentatious manner, because she feels to have less power than the Target.

More specifically, an acid communicative act is one by which Sender S aggresses a Target, and in particular aims at abasing either the Target's image before an Audience A, or simply the Target's self-image before oneself, but does so in an indirect, subtle, somewhat concealed and understated way.

Actually, the type of aggression brought about in acidity is a blow to the Target's image, an act of discredit. As defined in previous works [6], a discrediting act is one in which the Sender casts doubts over the Target's *competence* (her skills and knowledge) by showing he is stupid or ignorant; over his *benevolence* (willingness to

adopt others' goals, a disposition not to harm nor to cheat) by pointing at his being immoral, dishonest, or cheater; or over her *dominance* (her being helpless, ridiculous or inconsequential). Discredit is generally conveyed by insults, accusations, criticism, and other communicative acts expressing a direct or indirect negative evaluation of the Target.

Actually, the typical communicative acts of acid communication too are aimed at criticizing and accusing the other, making him feel guilty, making specification and pinpointing.

Yet, these attacks to the other's image are not carried on in an explicitly aggressive way, but in a covert manner, typically through indirect communication, often stuffed with rhetorical figures. From a qualitative analysis of verbal acid communication in talk shows and in sms and e-mail messages [5], it resulted that the acid person typically uses irony and sarcasm [7,8], but also euphemism, litotes, oxymoron, allusion, insinuation. In both the speech act types she performs (criticism, accuses) and the sophisticated way in which she phrases them, the acid person on the one side wants to take vengeance of what she feels as injustice undergone, by attacking who is (to her) responsible thereof; but on the other side she aims at projecting the image of herself as a smart and brilliant person, who did not deserve being attacked or abased.

In fact, for the acid communicator her having been subject to injustice has unmasked her impotence vis-à-vis the other (in some sense it has discredited her), hurting her own image; so to take revenge of this she needs to attack the other's image: she discredits the other to overcome her own discredit.

Such a description of acidity and acid communication is confirmed by a survey study [9], showing that people have a shared and quite specific idea of acidity as a peculiar way of interacting and communicating, triggered either by long-term factors like personality traits or previous continued sense of failure, or by contingent frustration and sense of injustice.

Acidity is a way to behave, a stance that one takes while interacting with others that is defined as rude, grumpy, lacking politeness and kindness, unpleasant, disagreeable: the acid person is *"an asocial person… rejecting socialization"*, one who *"does not want to have relationships with others"*, and whose desire not to mix up with others is expressed by behaviors aimed at keeping distance from them. [5] also investigated the emotions connected to acidity and, in scenes of acidity simulated by participants, overviewed some first features characterizing the multimodal communication of acidity.

The study started from the hypothesis that people can feel different emotions and show acid in different ways depending on the types of social relationships they are engaged in. Based on classical differentiations in Social Psychology by distinguishing between interactions within an instrumental vs. affective relationship (e.g. with a public officer vs. with a sister) [10, 11, 12] and within a peer vs. hierarchical relationship (e.g., friend-friend vs. father-daughter), two types of acidity were found out: a more directly aggressive one, typical holding in peer instrumental relationships, linked to emotions like irritation and contempt, and a more depressive one, linked to bitterness, disappointment, more frequent in affective hierarchical relationships, where, not to spoil the relationship, one is more restrained in expressing one's anger. In instrumental relationships, acidity is often expressed by *nods* of revenge, *raised eyebrows*, *high pitch* and *speedy rhythm of voice*, interjections of surprise or request

for confirmation. In the peer relationships, distancing signals are displayed such as *backward postures*, *shoulder shakes*, *averted head* and *gaze*, *looking from down up*, and signals of disgust like *raised upper lip*. The same study also briefly tackled the differences between acidity expressed in an ironic vs. non-ironic way, and found out that in the simulated acidity scene, a typical way in which the acid characters would express ironically was through making a parody of the Target, that is, an exaggerated imitation of the other aimed at stressing his/her potentially ridicule features, often expressed by *head canting*, small *smile*, *eyebrows raised*, *gaze to interlocutor* and a thin *voice* mimicking the Target's voice.

3   Acid Multimodal Communication. A Case Study

To single out the characterizing features of acidity in multimodal communication we have conducted a qualitative analysis of a real case in a TV program.

3.1. Research Questions and Hypothesis

While the works quoted in Section 2. overviewed the features that characterize acid verbal communication in text and speech, in terms of types of speech acts and linguistic style, here our observation aims at answering the following question: since, as seen above, people are clearly aware of when some person is performing acid communication, how can they? Are there some features that characterize acidity in body behavior, what are these features, and in what sense are they a vehicle of acidity?

In the model we adopt [13], we define as *signal* any action or morphological trait S of an Agent X to which some meaning corresponds, such that S allows another Agent Y to assume some belief B; we have a *communicative signal CS* if X performs that action or displays that trait in order to a conscious, unconscious, socially or biologically induced goal of letting Y assume B; and we have an *informative signal IS* if Y can assume B independent on whether X had the goal of conveying B. In this sense, not only a word or sentence but also a gesture, gaze, facial expression, body posture, intonation contour, even a blush or a pale face can be a signal, hence by definition convey meaning.

But what are the meanings of acidity? What are the internal feelings, attitudes and goals that are conveyed by physical aspects of a person's body or body behavior, which thus reveal her being/feeling/conveying acidity?

In other words, while previous work found the signals of acidity in verbal behavior, in this work we want to single out not only the signals (in body behavior), but also the meanings whose communication is the bulk of acidity, of both verbal and body signals.

In a previous work [14], by investigating persuasive gestures, it was made the hypothesis that there are no single gestures that are persuasive *per se*, but rather there may be some aspects in gestures (for instance, their velocity, energy or amplitude), that contain/convey "persuasive" elements, i.e., some beliefs that typically make part of the persuasive process.

For example, since to persuade one must trigger the audience's emotions, say, by transmitting one's emotions through contagion, a gesture, or even simply the hectic or fluid movement of that gesture, by expressing the persuader's emotion, "contains" – and conveys – such persuasive element. Again, since the audience is also persuaded by the orator's "ethos", that is, not only by what he says, but what/how he is, and a persuasive orator must project benevolence (orientation to the audience's interests) and competence (expertise), persuasive gestures are those from which the orator's morality and intelligence leak.

To sum up, that work showed that gestures are persuasive inasmuch as they convey, in their meanings, those elements that are necessary for persuasion.

The notion of "elements" launched in that work, and somewhat similar to that of [15], can now be assimilated to the notion of "mental ingredients". In other works [16, 17] this notion has been used to analyze emotions. The mental ingredients of an emotion are the beliefs and goals that are supposed to be represented in the mind of a person who is feeling that emotion. For example, if an Agent A feels the emotion of pride, this entails the ingredients: 1. that A has done or has been X (ACTION or PROPERTY); 2. that being or doing X causes that goal G of A has been fulfilled (CAUSE, and GOAL ACHIEVEMENT), 3. that G is A's goal of evaluating oneself positively (GOAL OF SELF-ESTEEM). Difference in ingredients results in different emotions: for example, if an ACTION or PROPERTY of A CAUSES that A's GOAL OF SELF-ESTEEM is THWARTED, A experiences shame instead of pride.

By exploiting the notion of ingredient, we can now account not only for the components of an internal state, but also for how an internal state may be externally expressed by a particular physical feature. In the case of acid communication, our question is: what are the ingredients of acidity? And what are the signals that contain/convey such ingredients, that is, those from which acidity is caught?

To answer the former question we may resort to the results of the above mentioned questionnaire: acid behavior is one in which a person is somewhat annoyed by the other, she does not want to have a pleasant and welcoming interaction with him, and hence tries to keep distance, possibly even being impolite or offensive. So the major ingredients of acidity will be those of ANNOYANCE, DISTANCE, OFFENCE, and one will feel a behavior as acid when some signals in the other's verbal and/or body language convey such ingredients. Our prediction is, in addition, that the more acid a person is felt, the more we will find this sort of signals in her behavior.

3.2. Method

To find out the features that typically characterize acidity in communication you first have to single out one or more cases that are typical representatives of this kind of communication. Actually, this is not that difficult in everyday life, because sometimes you immediately feel that a certain communicative or non-communicative behavior is "acid".

For our present data collection and analysis, we rely on Chomsky's notion of "Speaker's Judgments" [13], according to which to find out the grammatical or syntactic rules underlying the Speaker's competence the first step is to resort to the judgments of a native Speaker, that is, to his/her *linguistic intuition* concerning which sentences are acceptable or unacceptable, ambiguous or paraphrases of one another.

Based on these judgments, a Linguist makes hypotheses about the possible rules – the underlying linguistic mechanisms – that allow to account for the judgments given.

Here we rely on the *communicative intuition* of the "Native Multimodal Speaker", any person who is competent in the use of communicative systems in all modalities, e.g., in the meanings of facial expression, gaze, gestures…. Thus, based on our own "Multimodal Speaker's judgments", by navigating in YouTube we chose a videorecorded interaction (`http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lQHcBgeXYUs`) that according to our linguistic/multimodal intuition looked particularly acid to the Authors of this work. We took this as a prototypical case of acid communication, and we analyzed it with the aim of discovering what, in that way of communicating, was so typically acid.

The fragment to be analyzed was taken from an interview (1 minute 43 seconds) to Massimo D'Alema, a leading figure of PD, the Italian Democratic Party, while he was going to vote at the Primary elections of his party.

(1) D'Alema (63 years old) has been recently confronted by a young leader, Matteo Renzi (37), contending that the party must be renewed and its older members – especially those like D'Alema – should be replaced by younger ones. Such a struggle has been so effective that D'Alema finally decided not to be a candidate for primary elections: the candidates are Pier Luigi Bersani (same age and political side as D'Alema) and Matteo Renzi. Of course, D'Alema has some reasons for hostility towards Renzi. On the first evening of the elections, while coming out of his home to go for the vote, D'Alema finds a Reporter who wants to interview him, and he answers her in quite an acid way.

Our analysis of the fragment was aimed at accounting for the impression of acidity given by D'Alema's communicative behavior to the Multimodal Speaker's intuitive judgment.

To analyze it, the annotation scheme of Table 1 (see last page) was built up. In the scheme, the timeline of the behaviors taken into exam is represented vertically: at each second the behavior or the character under analysis is analyzed through three rows, while, when present, the other Speaker's turn is written on a single line (see first line, at time 6.33). For each group of three rows, the first one contains a description of the signal analyzed, in terms of the parameters and values of Table 2. below. In the second row we write the literal meaning we attribute to that signal, and possibly, preceded by an arrow, its indirect meaning, since, according to the principles adopted in our analysis [8], each signal may have, beyond its literal meaning, a further meaning that is to be inferred by the Addressee. In the third row we write the mental ingredient that forms the core of the meaning conveyed: a mental ingredient that may or not be included within the "acid" ingredients above. The signals are distinguished according to their productive modality, that is, the body organs by which they are produced, represented in the columns. So, while column 1 specifies the time in the video and the Sender of the signal under analysis, the subsequent columns contain the modalities taken into account: Verbal (Col.2), Voice (3), Body (4 and 5), Head (6,7) Gaze (8,9,10), and Mouth (11,12). In the analysis presented here we do not take gestures into account, because D'Alema is walking or standing and does not make gestures. Moreover, since gesture is a very complex type of signal, gestures of acidity are worth a dedicated study.

Within each modality, Table 1. distinguishes some specific parameters: e.g., for the body we distinguish trunk position (col.4) and body movement (5), for head, movement and direction, and so on (see. Table 2.). This is because sometimes a body organ, or even some aspect of its behavior or traits (like position, direction, movement), may by itself convey a single piece of meaning that when combined with other behaviors or aspects or behavior makes up a complex message; and even, sometimes the meaning conveyed by one part or aspect of the signal relevantly combines with an aspect of another. For example (see Table 1.), a global meaning resulting in the ingredient of DEFIANCE is conveyed, at time 6.44, by a body movement (D'Alema, who has been walking so far, suddenly *stops*), head position (*head canting*), head movement (he *turns toward Interlocutor*), and gaze direction (he *stares at Interlocutor fixedly*).

For each parameter we consider a small number of possible values (actions or features), as shown in Table 2.

Modality	Parameter	Values
Voice	Voice	*High, medium, low*
Body	Trunk osition	*Erected, close, distancing, retracted, protended*
	Bodymovement	*Stands still, walks, stops*
Head	H.movement	*Default, nod, shake, toss, canting*
	H.direction	*To Interlocutor, forward, backward, leftward, rightward*
Gaze	G.direction	*Forward, fixed to Interlocutor, oblique to Interlocutor, gazing down to Int., gazing upward to Int., downward, upward, averts*
	Eyebrows	*Default, open, half-closed, closed*
	Eyelids	*Default, raising, frown, asymmetrical*
Mouth	Lips	*Default, half-open, tight closed, pressed, protruded*
	Lip corners	*Default, upward, downward, retracted*

Table 2. Parameters and Values for each modality

The fragment was analyzed separately by two independent judges; after analysis, critical passages were discussed until reached agreement.

3.3. A Politician's Acid Communication

Let us see some passages from our analysis (Table 1).

At 6.33, the Reporter approaches D'Alema coming out of his home by asking him: *Sta andando a votare, immagino* (You're going to vote, I guess). He, only a step out of his house, suddenly *stops*, as if he wanted to escape from the Reporter, and assumes an *upright rigid posture* – almost the *freezing* of a scared animal – meaning that he would really like to get back home. Both *freezing* and *stopping* signal that D'Alema would not like to interact with the reporter: an ingredient of DISTANCE. After the Reporter, at 6.35, makes her prediction on D'Alema's candidate ([You are going to vote] *Bersani, I guess*), at 6.36, not only his *rigid posture* (Col.5) but also the

forward direction of head and gaze (Cols. 7 and 8) tell that D'Alema wants to take DISTANCE from the Reporter. But at 6.39, by *rotating eyes upward*, with *open eyelids* almost as if praying God in the sky to get him rid of the Reporter, he displays he is annoyed by her: an ingredient of ANNOYANCE. Yet, when the Reporter, probably with the intent of provoking him, goes on *"Escluderei che vota Renzi"* (I would esclude you may vote for Renzi), he apparently finally decides to reply. As is clear from context, that is, from his concomitant behavior, here his *stopping* is not due to indecision whether to go back home, as it was at time 6.34, but to decision of finally confronting the Reporter. His *stop* here means: "I now want to talk to you"; at the same time, his *turning his head to the Reporter* (col.7) and *staring fixedly* to her (col.8) clearly mean he is now addressing her, and allow us to interpret his *head canting* too (col 6.) not as a sign of appeasement as it usually is, but rather as an ironic imploration actually conveying DEFIANCE. This is again confirmed by *tight closed lips* (col.11) that convey determination, and *default lip corners* (col.12) – i.e., total *absence of smile* – quite close to threat. Thus, while since 6.34 through 6.36 D'Alema's tendency not to have a welcoming attitude toward the Reporter is simply passive avoidance of contact – DISTANCE – in this case he switches to somewhat actively aggressive attitude – DEFIANCE: the two faces of acidity. After this (6.45) he responds to the Reporter's provocation using the weapon of irony: he *looks at her from down up* (col.8), a combination of gaze and head direction often used when teasing someone; at the same time he *opens his eyelids* and *raises his eyebrows* (cols. 9 and 10): an expression of surprise and praise that is, though, utterly ironic: it means something like: "How smart you are! It was very difficult to understand this!" but in fact implies: "your prediction is obvious and trivial". This ironic praise thus finally results in criticism or even OFFENCE.

3.4 Acid vs. Non-Acid Behavior

The qualitative analysis of the fragment presented allows us to account in detail for the impression of acidity given by D'Alema's behavior. At first sight, this only ends up with a non-repeatable picture of a single episode of acidity in a single person. Yet, the third line of analysis for each signal, by singling out the specific mental ingredient resulting from that particular signal or combination of signals, provides us with a tool for quantitative analysis of large scale real data. Depending on the number of "acid" ingredients found out in a fragment, we can compute the quantity or intensity of acid signals in a given unit of time or speech.

    While postponing a such quantitative study to a subsequent work, let us now provide a flash on how such work might reveal the differences between acid and non-acid behavior. What is particularly striking in D'Alema's fragment is the high frequency of acid ingredients in his communicative and non-communicative behavior. This pops up from a comparison of D'Alema's behavior with one of another person interviewed in the same program: Susanna Camusso, the chief of the leftist trade union CGIL, whose too traditional management has also been attacked by Matteo Renzi.

(2)   As interviewed by the Journalist Lucia Annunziata, Susanna Camusso says: *"Io ho votato Bersani"* (I voted Bersani), while *looking straight* at Annunziata and *smiling*, as if

showing proud of her vote. Then she shakes her head, implicitly denying any doubt on her choice, and *presses lips protruding lower lip*, a grimace of satisfaction, followed by a *wider smile*.
Annunziata: *Ah, finalmente, ha votato Bersani!* (Ooh! In the end, you voted Bersani!)
Then Annunziata asks: *Nel caso il day after segnasse una vittoria di Renzi, non questa volta ma semmai in seconda battuta, se si va al…. sarebbe una tragedia per la CiGiElle?* (Should the day after show a victory for Renzi, not this time but possibly on the second vote…., would it be a tragedy for CGIL?)
Camusso *looks forward-downward*, as if reflecting, with her *lips tight* and *no smile* for a second, almost showing sadness, then she *slightly shakes her head* – answering no, while *raising eyebrows* – a signal of perplexity. Finally she answers: "*Ma guarda, so tra… io penso che le tragedie non ci sono mai* (she *shakes her head* and *raises her eyebrows*), *soprattutto quando si è di fronte a un voto democratico*" (she *looks upward leftward*).
(Well, I know between… I think that there are no tragedies ever (she *shakes her head and raises her eyebrows*) especially when you face a democratic vote (she *looks upward leftward*). Then, while *looking forward down*, she says: *Sarebbe sicuramente un problema* (It would certainly be a problem), *stressing* the vowel *è* of "*problèma*".

Of course, the setting of the two interviews is very different. D'Alema was waited in ambush near home for a surprise interview, and this might account for his annoyance and the desire to take distance and skip questions; Camusso on the contrary was invited by Annunziata for a dedicated long interview, in the TV studio, where she at ease, willingly answering questions. Yet Camusso, just like D'Alema, is not at all happy with Renzi as a candidate. But the way she says this – both verbally and through body modalities – is not acid at all. First, her verbal answer "I think that there are no tragedies ever, especially when you face a democratic vote" seems to minimize the problem, that has been exaggerated and dramatized, with a provocative aim, by the Journalist's question. Then she does acknowledge "it would certainly be a problem". But this sentence too, though clearly euphemistic, reveals an intention of smoothing the dramatic judgment (a "tragedy") hypothesized by the interviewer. Further, her whole body behavior is far from acid.

Even before in the fragment, when she claims she voted Bersani, she looks straight to the interviewer while smiling, as if showing proud of her vote: a definitely positive attitude, where the ingredient of pride rules out the hostility typical of acidity. But after the Interviewer's provocative question too, she denies Renzi's possible victory being a tragedy, not only by words, but also by her head shake. Moreover, just before answering, she displays somewhat sadness: another ingredient (namely, an emotion) that is utterly opposite to the grudge or annoyance embedded in acidity. Finally, while saying "it would certainly be a problem", Camusso's face, without smile and with slightly raised eyebrows is not threatening nor alarmed, but simply serious, and yet calm. Her whole behavior then conveys a mild but rational concern about the possible negative consequences of Renzi's victory. D'Alema's behavior, instead, is clearly loaded with the negative emotions caused by Renzi's attacks, that give rise to the frequent ingredients of annoyance, distance, question avoidance, and defiance toward the obtrusive and provocative Reporter.

In this analysis, we are not interested in the specific causes of a specific fragment of acid communication.

Therefore, we conducted a preliminary analysis of several interviews to politicians focusing the attention at a time when the interviewer posed "uncomfortable question"

to the interviewee. In this phase we have chosen as the basis of comparison the answer with a simple argumentation about the topic.

It has been chosen Camusso's interview assuming that not only the verbal also the acidity multimodal communication; we observed density of acid ingredients in D'Alema's communication as opposed to their absence in Camusso's multimodal behavior. This demonstrates the expressive power of our annotation scheme and its underlying principles, and points at the possibility to use it in further quantitative research.

4 Conclusion

Research on emotion and its communication has only recently passed from studying signals of single emotions to investigating complex combinations of mental states and their multimodal communication. Acid communication is the expression of intertwined feelings of anger and impotence, revenge and defiance, that together shape a peculiar type of aggressive interaction. In this work we have proposed an annotation scheme that provides a picture of both the internal semantic side and of the physical signal side of acid multimodal communication, by singling out on the one hand the mental ingredients of acid interaction – among which the emotions of annoyance and the communicative intentions of taking distance, criticism, offence, irony, defiance – and on the other hand the signals that express them.

A large scale quantitative analysis of acid signals in real or simulated situations will be carried out in future work.

Detailed knowledge on this kind of communication might be of help in the construction of automatic systems for the detection and management of conflict and of subtle negative emotions in real life situations and for their simulation in serious games.

Acknowledgments

References

1. Tomkins S.S., *Affect, imagery, consciousness*. NewYork, Springer (1963).
2. Ekman P., *Emotion in the Human Face*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press (1982).
3. Frijda N. H., *The emotions*, Cambridge, New York, Cambridge University Press (1986).
4. J. Averill, *Anger and aggression: an Essay on Emotion*, Heidelberg, Springer, 1982.
5. I. Poggi and F. D'Errico, "Acid communication". II Congresso Internacional "Interfaces da Psicologia", *Qualidade de Vida… Vida de Qualidade*, Evora, November 14-15, 2011.

6. D'Errico F. and Poggi I., "Blame the opponent! Effects of multimodal discrediting moves in public debates", in Cognitive Computation, vol 4(4), 2012, pp.460-476.

7. Anolli L., Ciceri R., Riva G. (2002) Say Not to Say: New Perspectives on Miscommunication. IOS Press, S.Attardo, J. Eisterhold, , J. Hay, & I. Poggi, , (2003) Multimodal markers of irony and sarcasm. International Journal of Humor Research, 16 (2), pp.243-260.

8. D'Errico F. and Poggi I., "Acidity. Emotional causes, effects, and multimodal communication". Forthcoming.

9. Berscheid E. and Reiss H., "Attraction and close relationships," in Handbook of social psychology, D. Gilbert, S. Fiske, and G. Lindzey, Eds. New York: McGraw Hill, 1997, pp. 193–281.

10. Dunbar NE, Burgoon JK (2005) Perceptions of power and interactional dominance in interpersonal relationships. J Soc Pers 22(2):207–233

11. Poggi I., D'Errico F. (2010) Dominance in political debates. In: Salah AA et al (eds) HBU 2010, LNCS 6219. Springer, Heidelberg, pp 163–174

12. Poggi I. Mind, hands, face and body. A goal and belief view of multimodal communication. Berlin: Weidler (2007).

13. Poggi I. and Pelachaud C., "Persuasion and the expressivity of gestures in humans and machines". In I.Wachsmuth, M.Lenzen, G.Knoblich (eds.): Embodied Communication in Humans and Machines. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008, pp.391-424.

14. Poggi I, D'Errico F. (2012) "Social signals. A framework in terms of goals and beliefs". In Poggi I. D'Errico F., Vinciarelli A., Foundation of Social Signals. From theory to Application. Special Issue of Cognitive Processing, Vol 13 (2), pp. 427-445.

15. Calbris G., *Elements of meaning in Gesture*. Amsterdam:Benjamins (2011).

16. Castelfranchi C., "Affective appraisal versus cognitive evaluation in social emotions and interactions". In A.Paiva (ed.), *Affective Interactions*. Springer: Berlin, 2000, pp. 76-106.

17. Poggi I. and D'Errico F., "Pride and its expression in political debates". In Paglieri F, Tummolini L, Falcone R & Miceli M (eds.) *The goals of cognition*. Festschrift for Cristiano Castelfranchi, London: London College Publications, 2012, pp. 221-253.

	1. Time, Sender	2. Verbal	VOICE 3. Intensity	BODY 4. Trunk Position	5. Body Movement	HEAD 6. Head Movement	7. Head Direction	8. Gaze Direction	GAZE 9. Eyelids	10. Eyebrows	MOUTH 11. Lips	12. Lip corners
	6.33 Reporter	*Sta andando a votare, immagino* — You're going to vote, I guess										
Signal	6.34 D'A			*Upright, rigid*	*Stops*			*Forward, not to Interlocutor*				
Meaning				I don't want to interact	I would like to escape			I don't want to talk to you				
Ingred.				DISTANCE	DISTANCE			DISTANCE				
	6.35 R	*Bersani, immagino* — Bersani, I guess										
Signal	6.36 D'A				*Rigid*	*Still*	*Forward*	*Forward, not to Interlocutor*				
Meaning					I don't want to react		I don't want to react	I don't want to talk to you				
Ingred.					DISTANCE		DISTANCE	DISTANCE				
Signal	6.39 D'A							*Rotates eyes upward*	*open*			
Meaning								I pray God to relieve me → I'm annoyed				
Ingred.								ANNOYANCE				
	6.43 R	*Escluderei che vota Renzi.* — I would esclude you may vote for Renzi										
Signal	6.44 D'A				*Stops*	*Head canting*	*Turns to Interl.*	*Stares Int. fixedly*			*Tight closed*	*default*
Meaning					Now I want to talk to you	I defy you	I address you	I address you			I am determined	I'm serious → now I'll get angry
Ingred.						DEFIANCE					DEFIANCE	THREAT
Signal	6.45-46 D'A							*To Int. from down up*	*open*	*Raised*	*Pressed*	*downward*
Meaning								I want to tease you	I praise your intelligence → it is trivial → I am ironic	I praise your intelligence → it is trivial → I am ironic	I praise your intelligence → it is trivial → I am ironic	
Ingred.								IRONY → OFFENCE		IRONY → OFFENCE	IRONY → OFFENCE	

Table 1 D'Alema acidity