**English Composition and Comprehension**

**FALL 2022**

**Assignment 1**

**BS (CY) – A**

The following document contains a reading comprehension text, along with its set of questions. Attempt the questions in the given space, using **Microsoft Word** (handwritten assignments will not be accepted), and submit it on the **GCR** by **September 15, 2022; 12:00 PM**. **Printed copies** must be handed over to the instructor on the same day (**September 15, 2022**) before **02:30 PM**. Any assignment received an hour after the deadline (digital and printed) will not be accepted.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Student Credentials** | |
| **Name:** | **Reg #** |
| **Review Sheet (For instructor’s use only)** | |
| Q1 | \_\_\_\_\_/08 |
| Q2 | \_\_\_\_\_/04 |
| Q3 | \_\_\_\_\_/04 |
| Q4 | \_\_\_\_\_/04 |
| **Total Marks** | **\_\_\_\_\_/20** |

Before reading the following material, read the question given below and understand your purpose for reading and taking notes accordingly.

***How does emotional exchange take place during interpersonal communication?***

|  |
| --- |
| **What Happens When Two People Talk? By Malcolm Gladwell**  What happens when two people talk? That is really the basic question here, because that's the basic context in which all persuasion takes place. We know that people talk back and forth. They listen. They interrupt. They move their hands. In the case of my meeting with Tom Gau, we were sitting in a modest-size-office. I was in a chair pulled up in front of his desk. I had my legs crossed and a pad and pen on my lap. I was wearing a blue shirt and black pants and a black jacket. He was sitting behind the desk in a high-backed chair. He was wearing a pair of blue suit pants and a crisply pressed white shirt and a red tie. Some of the time he leaned forward and planted his elbows in front of him. Other times he sat back in his chair and waved his hands in the air. Between us, on the blank surface of the desk, I placed my tape recorder. That's what you would have seen, if I showed you a videotape of our meeting. But if you had taken that videotape and slowed it down, until you were looking at our interaction in slices of a fraction of a second, you would have seen something quite different. You would have seen the two of us engaging in what can only be described as an elaborate and precise dance.  The pioneer of this kind of analysis—of what is called the study of cultural microrhythms—is a man named William Condon. In one of his most famous research projects in the 1960s he attempted to decode a four-and-a-half-second segment of film, in which a woman says to a man and a child over dinner, “You all should come around every night. We never have had a dinnertime like this in months.” Condon broke the film into individual frames, each representing about 1/45th of a second. Then he watched—and watched. As he describes it: To carefully study the organization and sequence of this, the approach must be naturalistic or ethological. You just sit and look and look and look for thousands of hours until the order in the material begins to emerge. It's like sculpturing…. Continued study reveals further order. When I was looking at this film over and over again, I had an erroneous view of the universe that communication takes place between people. Somehow this was the model. You send the message, somebody sends the message back. The messages go here and there and everywhere. But something was funny about this. Condon spent a year and a half on that short segment of film, until, finally, in his peripheral vision, he saw what he had always sensed was there: “the wife turning her head exactly as the husband's hands came up.” From there he picked up other micromovements, other patterns that occurred over and over again, until he realized that in addition to talking and listening, the three people around the table were also engaging in what he termed “interactional synchrony.” Their conversation had a rhythmic physical dimension. Each person would, within the space of one or two or three 1/45-th-of-a-second frames, move a shoulder or cheek or an eyebrow or a hand, sustain that movement, stop it, change directions, and start again. And what's more, those movements were perfectly in time to each person's own words—emphasizing and underlining and elaborating on the process of articulations— so that the speaker was, in effect, dancing to his or her own speech. At the same time the other people around the table were dancing along as well, moving their faces and shoulders and hands and bodies to the same rhythm. It's not that everyone was moving the same way, any more than people dancing to a song all dance the same way. It's that the timing of stops and starts of each person's micromovements—the jump and shifts of body and face—were perfectly in harmony.  Subsequent research has revealed that it isn't just gesture that is harmonized, but also conversational rhythm. When two people talk, their volume and pitch fall into balance. What linguists call speech rate—the number of speech sounds per second—equalizes. So does what is known as latency, the period of time that lapses between the moment one speaker stops talking and the moment the other speaker begins. Two people may arrive at a conversation with very different conversational patterns. But almost instantly they reach a common ground. We all do it, all the time. Babies as young as one or two days old synchronize their head, elbow, shoulder, hip, and foot movements with the speech patterns of adults. Synchrony has even been found in the interactions of humans and apes. It's part of the way we are hardwired.  When Tom Gau and I sat across from each other in his office, then, we almost immediately fell into physical and conversational harmony. We were dancing. Even before he attempted to persuade me with his words, he had forged a bond with me with his movements and his speech. So what made my encounter with him different, so much more compelling than the conversational encounters I have every day? It isn't that Gau was deliberately trying to harmonize himself with me. Some books on salesmanship recommend that persuaders try to mirror the posture or talking styles of their clients in order to establish rapport. But that's been shown not to work. It makes people more uncomfortable, not less. It's too obviously phony.  What we are talking about is a kind of super-reflex, a fundamental physiological ability of which we are barely aware. And like all specialized human traits, some people have much more mastery over this reflex than others. Part of what it means to have a powerful or persuasive personality, then, is that you can draw others into your own rhythms and dictate the terms of the interactions. In some studies, students who have a high degree of synchrony with their teachers are happier, more enthused, interested, and easygoing. What I felt with Gau was that I was being seduced, not in the sexual sense, of course, but in a global way, that our conversation was being conducted on his terms, not mine. I felt I was becoming synchronized with him. “Skilled musicians know this, and good speakers,” says Joseph Cappella, who teaches at the Annenberg School of Communication at the University of Pennsylvania. “They know when the crowds are with them, literally in synchrony with them, in movements and nods and stillness in moments of attention.” It is a strange thing to admit, because I didn't want to be drawn in. I was on guard against it. But the essence of Salesmen, that is, on some level, they cannot be resisted. “Tom can build a level of trust and rapport in five to ten minutes that most people will take half an hour to do,” Moine says of Gau.  When two people talk, they don't just fall into physical and aural harmony. They also engage in what is called motor mimicry If you show people pictures of a smiling face or a frowning face, they'll smile or frown back, although perhaps only in muscular changes so fleeting that they can only be captured with electronic sensors. If I hit my thumb with a hammer, most people watching will grimace: they'll mimic my emotional state. This is what is meant, in the technical sense, by empathy. We imitate each other's emotions as a way of expressing support and caring and, even more basically, as a way of communicating with each other.  In their brilliant 1994 book Emotional Contagion, the psychologists Elaine Hatfield and John Cacioppo and the historian Richard Rapson go one step further. Mimicry, they argue, is also one of the means by which we infect each other with our emotions. In other words, if I smile and you see me and smile in response—even a microsmile that takes no more than several milliseconds—it's not just you imitating or empathizing with me. It may also be a way that I can passs on my happiness to you. Emotion is contagious. In a way, this is perfectly intuitive. All of us have had our spirits picked up by being around somebody in a good mood. If you think about this closely, though, it's quite a radical notion. We normally think of the expressions on our face as the reflection of an inner state. I feel happy, so I smile. I feel sad, so I frown. Emotion goes inside-out. Emotional contagion, though, suggests that the opposite is also true. If I can make you smile, I can make you happy. If I can make you frown, I can make you sad. Emotion, in this sense, goes outside-in.  If we think about emotion this way—as outside-in, not inside-out—it is possible to understand how some people can have an enormous amount of influence over others. Some of us, after all, are very good at expressing emotions and feelings, which means that we are far more emotionally contagious than the rest of us. Psychologists call these people “senders.” Senders have special personalities. They are also physiologically different. Scientists who have studied faces, for example, report that there are huge differences among people in the location of facial muscles, in their form, and also—surprisingly—even in their prevalence. “It is a situation not unlike the medicine,” says Cacioppo. “There are carriers, people who are very expressive, and there are people who are especially susceptible. It's not that emotional contagion is a disease. But the mechanism is the same.”  Howard Friedman, a psychologist at the University of California at Riverside, has developed what he calls the Affective-Communication Test to measure this ability to send emotion, to be contagious. The test is a self-administered survey, with thirteen questions relating to things like whether you can keep still when you hear good dance music, how loud your laugh is, whether you touch friends when you talk to them, how good you are at sending seductive glances, whether you like to be the center of attention. The highest possible score on the test is 117 points, with the average score, according to Friedman, somewhere around 71.  What does it mean to be a high-scorer? To answer that, Friedman conducted a fascinating experiment. He picked a few dozen people who scored very high on his test—above 90—and a few dozen who scored very low—below 6—and asked them all to fill out a questionnaire measuring how they felt “at this instant.” He then put all of the high-scorers in separate rooms, and paired each of them with two low-scorers. They were told to sit in the room together for two minutes. They could look at each other, but not talk. Then, once the session was over, they were asked again to fill out a detailed questionnaire on how they were feeling. Friedman found that in just two minutes, without a word being spoken, the low-scorers ended up picking up the moods of the high-scorers. If the charismatic person started out depressed, and the inexpressive person started out happy, by the end of the two minutes the inexpressive person was depressed as well. But it didn't work the other way. Only the charismatic person could infect the other people in the room with his or her emotions.  Is this what Tom Gau did to me? The thing that strikes me most about my encounter with him was his voice. He had the range of an opera singer. At times, he would sound stern. (His favorite expression in that state: “Excuse me?”) At times, he would drawl, lazily and easily. At other times, he would chuckle as he spoke, making his words sing with laughter. In each of those modes his face would light up accordingly, moving, easily and deftly, from one state to another. There was no ambiguity in his presentation. Everything was written on his face. I could not see my own face, of course, but my guess is that it was a close mirror of his. It is interesting, in this context, to think back on the experiment with the nodding and the headphones. There was an example of someone persuaded from the outside-in, of an external gesture affecting an internal decision. Was I nodding when Tom Gau nodded? And shaking my head when Gau shook his head? Later, I called Gau up and asked him to take Howard Friedman's charisma test. As we went through the list, question by question, he started chuckling. By question 11—“I am terrible at pantomime, as in games like charades”—he was laughing out loud. “I'm great at that! I always win at charades!” Out of a possible 117 points, he scored 116. |

**Questions**

1. The author presents three major supporting details regarding how two (or more) people talk. Complete the graphic to show the three key points. In the bubble for Key Point 1, 2 and 3, mention the keywords for the main idea and add the detailed point for each in the bubble below each one.



1. Based on your understanding, explain what the author means by physical and aural harmony.

|  |
| --- |
| Physical harmony refers to synchronization in gestures and actions and physical conditions of participants of a conversation.when two poeople talks ,their hand swings,facial expressions and body language get aligned with mode of conversation .Author calls this synchronization as physical harmony. |
| Aural harmony refers to hearingsynchronization of listenersof a conversation.During the conversation ,the viewpoints andhearing sensation of listenersgets synchronized with the speaker according to the topic.Most of time this happens while listening music when mood changes according to music taste.  Author calls this synchronozation as Aural harmony. |

1. The author never clearly explains what type of person scores high or low on Howard Friedman's Affective Communication Test. Based on what he says about the people who took it, what do you infer a high score means?

|  |
| --- |
| In my opinion, the person who is more emotional and have the ability to pass on his emotions to others is the high scorer,which means a person whose expression are easily readable to others is a high scorer.and the person whose emotions/ *feelings/*gestures are contagious/transferable is the high scorer,and I have drawn this conclusion from Friedman’s experiment. |

1. Based on your understanding of the Affective Communication Test, what do you believe your score would be if you were to take the test? Explain why it would be high or low.

|  |
| --- |
| My score would be very high because I am a moody person an highly emotional person.my mood/ gestures changes with the tone of music I am listening.Secondly my laughter is also reasonable and depends on joyfulness of a joke.And I also talk with my friends with my ful hand and body gestures.also I love to be center of attention of others. |