Intersubjective communication: from classic approaches to the incorporation of body and emotions for its theoretical and empirical approach

Comunicación intersubjetiva: de los enfoques clásicos a la incorporación de lo corporal y emocional para su abordaje teórico y empírico

Marta Rizo García. Professor and researcher at the Academy of Communication and Culture of the Autonomous University of Mexico City. National Researcher Level II of the National Council for Science and Technology (*CONACYT,* Mexico). Coordinator of the Intersubjective Communication Research Group of the Mexican Association of Communication Researchers, and Vice-Coordinator of the Communication Theories and Research Methods Working Group of the Latin American Association of Communication Researchers.
Autonomous University of Mexico City, Mexico
marta.rizo@uacm.edu.mx
ORCID: 0000-0003-3066-1419

Abstract:

The academic field of communication has primarily studied media communication processes. This article claims the need to investigate the interpersonal and intersubjective aspects of communication. Firstly, three classical theories are presented: Symbolic Interactionism, Phenomenological Sociology, and the Theory of Communicative Action. All are about understanding intersubjective communication and how it is distinguished from interpersonal communication. Secondly, the article argues for the emotional and affective dimension to be incorporated into communication studies. This starts with the articulation between the body, communication, and emotions. The presentation of these elements is based on proposals by Goffman, Bourdieu, Merleau-Ponty, and Collins. This article concludes with some methodological ideas about how to investigate intersubjective communication, and presents some challenges that should be considered in this sub-field of communication studies.

Keywords:

Intersubjective communication; interpersonal communication; interaction; emotions; corporality.

Resumen:

El campo académico de la comunicación ha estudiado de forma primordial los procesos de comunicación mediática. En este texto se reivindica la necesidad de investigar los aspectos interpersonal e intersubjetivo de la comunicación. Para ello, en un primer momento, se presentan tres propuestas teóricas clásicas para la comprensión de la comunicación intersubjetiva y su distinción de la comunicación interpersonal: el Interaccionismo Simbólico, la Sociología Fenomenológica y la Teoría de la Acción Comunicativa. En un segundo momento se propone la incorporación de la dimensión emocional y afectiva a los estudios sobre comunicación, a partir de la articulación entre cuerpo, comunicación y emociones, elementos que son presentados a partir de las propuestas de Goffman, Bourdieu, Merleau-Ponty y Collins. El ensayo concluye con algunas ideas metodológicas en torno a cómo se puede investigar la comunicación intersubjetiva, así como con la exposición de algunos retos a tomar en cuenta en este subcampo de estudios de la comunicación.

Palabras clave:

Comunicación intersubjetiva; comunicación interpersonal; interacción; emociones; corporalidad.

1. Thinking about communication: from daily experience to academic reflection

Communication is a social phenomenon that permeates all human existence. Its presence and centrality is so evident in everyday life that we rarely stop to analyse or think about it. This is because we see communication as natural, we take its neccesity and usefulness for granted; we communicate automatically and pre-reflectively. However, it is one thing to communicate daily, and another to think about it and reflect on it academically.

A review of the history of communication research, whose epistemological status and object of study are still the subjects of academic discussion, shows that its main influences come from fundamentally sociological currents, such as Functionalism and Critical Theory, among others. There are many currents, theories, paradigms, and theoretical proposals that have provided specific views on communicative phenomena such as psychology, cultural sociology, political economy, semiotics, etc. Although the aim of this work is not to discuss the epistemological status of the field of communication, it is worth noting that the media is usually studied in communication sciences. Furthermore, many times when we say "study or research communication," our interlocutors understand that we are researching something related to the media such as the press, television, and the current context, as well as the socio-digital networks.

For this reason, it is relevant to ask the following questions: what happens with other processes of constructing meaning? Specifically, what happens with unmediated communication; interpersonal communication? We highlight the expression "processes of the construction of meaning" from the Mexican researcher Raúl Fuentes Navarro, who stated some years ago that:

> In the centre of our object of study, communication, there are not "messages" or "contents" but relationships, established and investigated through their multiple mediations, between the production of meaning and the identity of the social subjects in the most diverse socio-cultural practices (Fuentes, 2008: 113).

The interest in communication as a field of knowledge lies in relationships and processes, more than the results of such processes. Communication has a similar meaning to its etymological origin[1] both in Fuente Navarro's quote and in this article; it means having something in common with others. How do we put our ideas, information, feelings, and emotions in common? What type of communication allows us to share things in common? We assert that communication not be reduced to the media. However, the centrality of the media as the main object of study in the communication sciences is apparent- to the detriment of other phenomena and themes. We believe that interpersonal and intersubjective communication should be of greater interest in the academic field.

We agree with Sierra that communication is a social fact that can and should interest any field of knowledge related to society and human behaviour, since "all orders of the human traverse it, and it also traverses them" (Sierra, 2005: 93).

This paper focuses on the interpersonal and intersubjective aspects of communication. In other words, it centres on communication as a phenomenon related to face-to-face dialogue, sharing, having things in common, the interaction between bodies that create meaning, the connection between subjects who interact on the stage of everyday life.

---

1   The word 'communication' comes from the Latin word *communicare*, which comes from *comoin*, meaning to have in common.

The word communication suggests many things; it is a daily action that we all live and experience, directly, face to face, or indirectly, via an electronic device such as a telephone or computer. According to Raúl Fuentes Navarro's (2001: 50) contributions, "communication can come to mean many different and sometimes contradictory things." For some people, communication can refer to the mass media such as television or radio; for others, it refers to how we relate to each other. While others compare it to the relatively recent forms of participating in digital social media, the consumption of entertainment programs on television, or following a series on Netflix. And so the list goes on. Communication is, therefore, many things simultaneously.

In this paper, communication is understood as a fundamental process for constructing social life, as a mechanism for producing meaning that allows for dialogue and different ways of coexisting between social subjects. From this perspective, communication involves the world of human relationships, of the established and yet to be established bonds, of the dialogues turned conflict and the monologues that will someday become a dialogue.

These ways of understanding communication allow us to understand the social world as a network of interactions between subjects. Communication allows us to overcome individual isolation, as it is the set of associations between processes of experience- individual and collective- which enables the construction of shared worlds. According to Eduardo Vizer (2007: 194), "communication can be considered as the concrete and objective manifestation of the permanent processes of reconstruction of different contexts of reality that we construct and cultivate in daily life."

Every communication situation takes place in a specific context, which is composed of three aspects. These aspects are cultural, which refers to the attitudinal frame of reference that the person develops throughout his/her life; situational, which includes all the psychological, sociological and physical variables; and urgency, which denotes the need to communicate, which requires a specific kind of communication. Communication is, therefore, "the only way we have to make contact with others and even if we do not realise how much we depend on it, makes up the centre of our existence" (Borden and Stonoe, 1982: 82). For this reason, the study of the interpersonal aspect of communication is essential.

In short, communication is conceived as the basis of social relationships in this article, since it is understood that communication processes involve interactions between different people in multiple scenarios in everyday life. Are these connections always similar? Do subjects who communicate always look for the same thing? These questions are addressed in the following section, where some general ideas are raised, and some classical theoretical approaches are put forward to distinguish interpersonal communication from intersubjective communication.

2. Interpersonal and intersubjective communication: conceptual explanations

Intersubjective communication is often viewed as synonymous with interpersonal communication. Indeed, both concepts share similar empirical phenomena or situations, which is the communication situation between people. However, the theoretical scaffolding that supports them is different. The term interpersonal communication has been fundamentally defined by social psychology. In contrast, intersubjective communication, as we understand it here, requires a more philosophical view in order to be conceptualised more rigorously and more complexly.

Some classic ideas are gathered in this text to distinguish interpersonal communication from intersubjective communication. However, the inclusion of "new" elements- especially the body and emotions, which are initially viewed as more closely connected to interpersonal rather than intersubjective communication. This distinction is not, at least in this text, so essential for arguing that intersubjective communication should be considered theoretically and empirically investigated. As it is a fertile sub-field of study that can generate reflections and data that help us to understand ourselves better.

Symbolic interactionism –a term coined by Herbert Blumer in 1938, Alfred Schütz's proposal– The Phenomenological Sociology-and Communicative Action Theory- proposed by Jürgen Habermas-are three classic currents that share an interest in communication beyond face-to-face interactions, which every social subject is immersed in daily. Although these three views are not the only or most important ones, they are fundamental for defining intersubjective communication and distinguishing it from interpersonal communication.

Intersubjective communication highlights the social construction inherent in the communicative phenomenon. This can be seen in the approaches made to interpersonal communication to a lesser extent, which is usually understood as the concrete and empirically observable situation in which at least two people establish communicative contact, whatever its purpose. There is an important distinction: interpersonal communication is an event that occurs, a non-instrumental social phenomenon, which does not require any theorisation since when we want to think about it, it has already happened. Whereas speaking about intersubjective communication already implies a particular theoretical approach to the given communicative event or situation.

It is worth noting that some approaches to interpersonal communication emphasise its corporeality, as it is a situation of interaction between two or more bodies that share a space and a time as opposed to intersubjective communication. The following statement from Sodhi highlights this:

> Every interpersonal relationship involves some form of communication, whether intentional or not. People, as soon as they are interacting with other people, are regularly communicating. Because of his/her corporeal inclination, he/she cannot stop communicating, since man is all body and the interpersonal encounter takes place in corporeality (Sodhi, 2008: 31).

As seen in the quote above, the body is essential in the reflections on the interpersonal dimension of communication. Therefore, without leaving the explanations that allow us to distinguish interpersonal communication from intersubjective communication aside, it is relevant to propose that incorporating the body and emotions in the reflections on communication can cancel out the difference. This allows us to approach it through what we understand as interpersonal communication and intersubjective communication.

In this way, a few years ago, it was argued that interpersonal communication, unlike intersubjective communication, had a more sensual-corporeal nature and was associated almost exclusively with experience and, to a much lesser extent, with the exchange of ideas and concepts or with the exchanged information itself. This paper is aimed at overcoming this distinction and at proposing that intersubjective communication can also be understood from sensory and bodily elements and not only rational ones.

2.1. Theoretical focuses and concepts for the study

Before highlighting the contributions of each of the three theoretical currents in this text, we must recall the central assumptions or ideas of each one briefly. Firstly, the term Symbolic Interactionism was coined by Herbert Blumer in 1938. The author proposed three basic premises for this approach: 1) People act on the objects of their world and interact with people based on the meanings that objects and people have for them; that is, based on symbols; 2)These meanings are the product of social interaction, fundamental for constituting individuals and the social production of meaning; and 3) People select, organise, reproduce and transform the meanings in interpretative processes according to their expectations-on themselves and others-and the purposes of interaction (Blumer, 1969).

On the other hand, Alfred Schütz's Phenomenological Sociology, which is shown here, is inspired by the phenomenology tradition, whose fundamental problem is the question of sociability as a superior form of intersubjectivity. Schütz posed a crucial question, where and how are the meanings of social action formed? In his proposal, the emphasis is neither on the social system nor on the functional relationships that occur in life in society, but on the interpretation of the meanings of the world (*Lebenswelt*) and the actions and interactions of social subjects. The known world and intersubjective experiences shared by the subjects and the signs and indications for interpreting the diversity of symbols are obtained. Schütz's approach starts from the need to analyse the intersubjective relationships from the social interaction networks (Schütz, 1962). As Schütz states,

> As we live in the world, we live with others and for others, and we orient our lives to them. By living them as others, as contemporaries and congeners as predecessors and successors, by uniting ourselves with them in everyday activity and work, by influencing them and receiving their influence in turn, by doing all these things, we understand others' behaviour and assume that they understand ours (Schütz, 1962: 39).

Thus, being in the world means communicating with others and interacting with others in phenomenological sociology. Every subject communicates to constitute himself/herself as such, and every act of communication involves putting manifest acts in the external world into action, which others must interpret and understand.

Finally, the Theory of Communicative Action proposed by Jürgen Habermas formulates "a theory of argumentation, social theory and of the public space which, from the approach of the linguistic turn, has made the formulation of intersubjective recognition possible through pretensions of universal validity" (Fernández, Millán, and Rizo, 2017: 140). The communicative rationality proposed by Habermas is based on the notion that intersubjectivity is founded on consensus by recognising the implementation of the pretensions of validity, where the participants, in a situation of symmetry, freely choose and exercise different acts of speech. The author states that "by acting communicatively, subjects are always understood within the horizon of a world of life. Their world of life is made up of fundamental convictions, more or less diffused, but always problematic" (Habermas, 1987: 84).

The specific contributions of these three theoretical currents to the definition of communication will be summarised below—[Table 1. Conceptions of Communication in Symbolic Interactionism, Phenomenological Sociology, and the Theory of Communicative Action].

Table 1: Conceptions of Communication in Symbolic Interactionism, Phenomenological Sociology and Communicative Action Theory

Current	Symbolic interactionism	Phenomenology and Socio-Phenomenology	Theory of Communicative Action
Dominant perspective	Socio-psychological	Philosophical	Philosophical and social-critical
The conception of the subject	Actor in constant interaction with others, with an enormous interpretative capacity, which constitutes their identity based on his/her ability to conceive himself/herself as an object and a mirror of the other.	A human being who looks at the world from a natural, pre-theoretical attitude, determined by his/her biography and immediate experience and who recognises other subjects as analogous to him/her. To be oriented to others.	A rational and free subject, capable of communicating within the framework of an ideal speaking community based on arguments orientated towards the search for truth, generating the necessary consensus that guarantees collective action; oriented toward emancipation,
The conception of the world	Symbolic world, built from the collective meanings emanating from daily interactions between subjects.	The world of life as a sphere of reality in which people participate in specific and standardised ways with a natural attitude.	Objective, social, and subjective simultaneously, in constant tension with the social system. Its rationalisation requires an increase in the rationality of communicative action.
Definition of communication	The basis for the social actors' construction of meanings on the environment and themselves.	The raw material for constituting the social. The basis for shaping meanings about the environment by the subjects.	Communicative action aimed at understanding and comprehension, providing the necessary consensus for the establishment of a social system.

Source: created by the author

As can be seen, the three perspectives grant the subject a fundamental role as a constructor of meanings about the world. However, in the case of Jürgen Habermas's Theory of Communicative Action, the subject is a social actor responsible for their own emancipation. The author introduces the theme of understanding from an ethical-critical point of view, which can be understood as the ultimate goal of communication, the key to building the necessary consensus that can allow a group to act for the common good. This role of the subject, as an active being in the social and political fabric, is not so clearly observed in Symbolic Interactionism and Phenomonelogocical Sociology. Since these perspectives start from a more conservative or static understanding of the subject as the subject is a social actor in interaction with others with whom he/she constructs daily meanings about the world of life that they experience collectively.

Similarly, the concept of intersubjective communication, although central to all three currents, only acquires an ethical and political dimension in the case of the Theory of Communicative Action. The psychosocial and socio-phenomenological approaches both conceive intersubjective communication as the basis for the creation of meanings, but do not explicitly state the direction the communication should be orientated, that is, what its ultimate purpose is. These currents propose definitions that are less 'committed' to social evolution, which is more naive, given that they practically omit power structures.

As an exercise of theoretical integration, the following definition is proposed, which considers ideas from the three approaches:

> Intersubjective communication is the basis for constructing social meanings, oriented to understanding and comprehension and ideally, enables the necessary consensuses that would ultimately allow a democratic social fabric based on rational arguments characteristic of free men acting for the collective good (quote from the author).

This definition emphasises the argumentative as a critical element for intersubjective communication. The importance lies in the rational. But it is worth raising questions such as the following: Can we speak about a process of relationship between human beings where the emotional, sensory-body, and affective are absent? Is it possible?

3. The body and emotions: a proposal to broaden the conceptual space of intersubjective communication

As previously indicated, we propose the incorporation of elements such as the body and emotions in reflections on interpersonal and intersubjective aspects of communication in this paper. The relationship between the body and communication is fundamental to addressing these aspects since the body is undoubtedly the first medium that human beings use for communication with the environment.

> Human communication is communication from the body, for the body, and between bodies. We are aware of the existence of others with whom we communicate because we are perceptively aware of our bodies. From our body schema, we constitute the images we have of others and can interact with them. The body, therefore, not only receives but, above all, creates, means. Language is only possible if it emanates from living and feeling bodies, and as such, it is this instance that unifies being (quote from the author).

Therefore, subjects relate to the world from the body. For this reason, the body can be understood as a universal space. Through our bodies, we access the world. Our body allows us to occupy a place in the world, and from that place, from what we call the body schema, we communicate with fellow human beings. As the philosopher, Ramón Xirau affirms, "when I perceive "another" I perceive him/her as an incarnate being, as a being that lives in his/her body, that is to say, as a being similar to mine, that acts in the same way to the way I act and that thinks similarly to the way I think" (Xirau, 2002: 436-437).

The others with whom we relate are, first and foremost, bodies loaded with meaning. Thus it makes sense to think that "society is, first and foremost, a corporal activity" (Collins, 2009: 56). In any face-to-face communication situation,

we assign senses to the body, to our own, and others. At the same time, the body emits senses on the environment, on the social. The subject-body, as the French phenomenologist Maurice Merleau-Ponty would say, is a situated body, historically, socially, and culturally constructed.

Bodies exert significant power over the subjects. From bodies, human beings endow their environments, other human beings, space, and time with meaning. Therefore, it is impossible to understand ourselves as bodies if this is not done so from the significant and communicative unravelling that we transmit towards others from our corporal schema. Likewise, we cannot understand our societies if it is not through what the bodies of those who inhabit them communicate about them since the body is a donor of meaning that receives and simultaneously conveys meaning. That is why we say that the body is our primary vehicle of communication with the world.

3.1. Sociological and philosophical views on the body and corporeality

The approach to the body and corporeality requires interdisciplinary approaches. This section presents some sociological and philosophical views. In the framework of sociology, there is a consensus on the need to articulate micro-social and macro-social views in the approach to the body. The following is a brief description of Goffman's micro-social-interactionist and Bourdieu's macrosocial-structuralist contributions to the body and corporeality.

For Erving Goffman, people in their corporeality are actors performing on a stage, which is everyday life. In these performances, bodies carry meaning and sense. We present ourselves to others through the body, and these external appearances take on full importance because of the social meaning attributed to them. Giving to others takes place through signs, especially non-verbal ones, which Goffman calls "body gloss." This corporal gloss refers to the "process through which a person uses corporal gestures clearly so that other aspects, not otherwise noticeable of his/her situation, can be deduced" (Goffman, 1979: 30). The glosses are facilitators of the interpretations that each subject wants to project to the other (Sabido, 2013).

According to Goffman, "people in interaction, define the situation since they provide certain information with their bodies and gestures which mean what others give to them, as well as affecting that which they already possess" (Goffman, 1997: 13). Therefore, the body is the receptacle of the relations between culture and personality, between the environment and the subject, since the corporal gestures are a manifestation of culture and can be analysed sociologically, as are institutions and social facts. Corporal behaviours are standardised and generate compulsion and assimilation in the cultural context in which they have been constructed and where they are used.

This idea is connected to the contributions of the French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu's contributions, for whom the processes of socialisation shape the body, preparing it to act in one way or another. Thus, the performance of the body is always determined by the society that shelters it. The body is not, then, something individual, nor does it solely belong to the order of the subjective. Still, in Bourdieu's view, it appears to be linked in interdependently with more complex and structural social logic. The ways of perceiving, feeling, doing, and thinking- what Bourdieu calls habitus- are unembodied, made in-body, and by the body for and in the subjects, depending on his/her social and individual conditions.

Bourdieu's view of the body involves, "(to) consider(ing) the body as something more than an object separated from a consciousness that thinks, but as a producer of a particular type of Sense, a practical Sense" (Sabido, 2013: 39). If the Goffmanian proposal brings us closer to bodies in interaction, which project and receive meanings, Bourdieu's perspective allows us to conceive bodies as primary producers of sense in themselves. Bodily habits are not individual but are always related to the societies in which we live, societies, which, as we said, shape- and to a certain extent, determine- the uses of bodies. What we do with our body is guided by what Bourdieu calls practical reason. In this sense, the body has a practical sense that enables what we do with it to account for the society in which we live, its hierarchies, differences, and categorisations.

For Olga Sabido, the reading of the body proposed by Pierre Bourdieu can be called an "order of dispositions." The author summarises it as follows: "it makes the body visible not by the meaning attached to its surface, […] but by the social logics inscribed in its constitution and specific feeling" (Sabido, 2013: 38). The body allows us to observe the social and both social and individual conditions, determining how we learn to carry, feel, and use our bodies.

In this regard, Bordieu states the following: "We learn through the body. The social order is inscribed in bodies through this permanent confrontation, more or less dramatic, but which always gives a more prominent place to affectivity and, more precisely, to the affective transactions with the social environment" (Bourdieu, 1999: 186). In other words, the habitus operates in agents' practices, and such practices are closely linked to their bodies. Hence, the body not only has a biological nature but is also social and symbolic, and according to Bourdieu, involves the incorporation of habitus, corporal hexes, and symbolic capitals that reproduce the subject's social logic.

We will gather the proposals of two phenomenologically minded philosophers: Maurice Merleau-Ponty and Alfred Schütz due to their contributions to intersubjectivity and its explicit relationship with the body. Although it is only in the case of the former that the body constitutes a central axis of his thought, Schütz also subscribes to the studies of the body and, ultimately, allows a fruitful dialogue between communication, intersubjectivity and the body.

For Merleau-Ponty, it is necessary to consider the problem of the body as a genuinely human problem, without which it is impossible to think about the person. The above explains this based on one of his central ideas, which affirms that all conscience is a corporal experience: "to be a consciousness or, rather, *to be an experience* is to communicate internally with the world, the body and others, to be with them instead of beside them" (Merleau-Ponty, 1993: 114). The author considers that conscience and perception cannot be understood without the body, and vice versa, and develops the concept of subject-body as an alternative to Cartesian thought. He attempts to demonstrate that the corporal schemes are a set of elements that govern the perception of space, movement, language and the presence of the subject in the world.

For Merleau-Ponty, we can only know the world through the body schema, that is, we capture everything that happens in the external space, relationships between the objects that surround us, and our relationship with those objects, through the place that our body occupies in the world. The body and the world are indissolubly linked by perception; perception unites them. The body, therefore, allows the communication between the subject with other bodies, and other subjects.

In short, for this philosophical proposal, our social experience is based on our bodily experience. For Merleau-Ponty, the body is the subject's primary vehicle of communication with the world; it expresses our corporal scheme and constitutes, in itself, a symbolic system since we communicate from it and with it.

In the case of the Austrian phenomenologist Alfred Schütz, although the body is not a central category of his theoretical proposal, we can infer some ideas that allow us to link the body to intersubjectivity. Schütz intends to develop a more everyday phenomenology based on Edmund Husserl's phenomenology, which can provide knowledge about daily life, where the natural attitude predominates, where we can already see the presence of the body. "The body allows human beings to know, explore, investigate and appropriate the world that he/she inhabits, the contexts that surround him/her; it allows us to have interaction" (Schütz, 1962: 80-81). Therefore, from this perspective, we can understand the body as a mediating agent.

Human beings know and understand their environment through experimentation, and experimentation always occurs through the body. Experimentation is a physical act. For Schütz, the body is an accumulation of life situations, biographical, specific, within determined contexts (Schütz, 1962). In his proposal, the author starts from the subject's need to explain others' behaviour with whom he/she lives. For this purpose, he/she distinguishes between the interpretation of the observer's own experiences and the authentic understanding of the other person. The essential requirement for such knowledge is the observation of the other's body movements. These bodily movements are indications of the experiences that person has. Juan Dukuen, in his interpretation of Schütz states that "the body of the other is a field of expression of indications that refer to their experiences" (2010: 44). In summary, although we do not have full knowledge or access to the consciousness of the other, his/her body gives us information about that other.

For Alfred Schütz, the body also articulates the relationships between one's own subjectivity and the subjectivity of others: "in the face-to-face relationship –body to body– it is possible to interpret the experiences of the other" (Schütz, 1972: 161). Thus, the corporal self and its diverse representations develop in infinite acts of reflexivity, for which the presence of the other is necessary.

3.2. Emotions and communication: Randall Collins and interaction rituals

Since the second primary objective of this paper is to propose the importance of incorporating the categories of body and emotions for complex reflections on intersubjective communication. Since the issues of body and corporeality have already been set out, this section provides a concise approach to the idea of emotions and their relationship with the body and communication.

The sociology of emotions has existed in the sociological field for three or four decades. This does not mean that there were no previous sociological approaches to emotions and feelings and, in general, to the affective, social dimension. However, the presence of this dimension was lagging behind. The main achievement of sociology of the emotions is that "it opens up an important horizon of social study, also necessary for developing sociological meta-theories that correct the rationalist bias that affects almost all of them", among others (Bericat, 2000: 149). For this author, this

sociology considers "the wide variety of affections, emotions, feelings or passions present in the social reality" (Bericat, 2000: 150).

Most of the proposals that have arisen in the framework of sociology of the emotions consider that most human emotions are nourished and make sense in the scenario of our social relationships. The fundamental focus of the sociology of emotions is the study of relationships between human beings' social dimension and emotional dimension.

As aforementioned, the research on emotions in the field of social sciences is not new. In the United States, there have been exemplary works since the 1970s, and the sociology of emotions was established as an autonomous field in the late1980s. However, in the Latinamerican space, it would take a few more years to see a proliferation of works on emotions and affectivity; they were incorporated at the end of the 1990s and the beginning of the 21st century (Sabido, 2011). This has aroused the most interest in the body and is central to it since the sociology of emotions includes the body and affectivity as elements that affect and are affected.

This current is part of the so-called "affective turn" (Lara and Enciso Domínguez, 2013), which according to these authors, is above all a turn toward the body and against the privilege of the study of meaning and discourse (Lara and Enciso Domínguez, 2013). This proposal of the "affective turn" in our opinion must also be addressed from the academic field of communication, which cannot leave the emotional and bodily sensory areas aside, since these are critical dimensions in communication situations, as processes of creating meaning.

Despite the growing interest in the body-affectivity relationship, there is a significant separation, on the one hand, between the studies of the body. On the other hand, the study of emotions, this concerns several prominent authors in this sub-field of studies (Scribano, 2013, Sabido, 2011). We agree with Denzin (1985) when he states that "emotion and emotionality are not found in the subject or his/her body, but in the relationship of the subject with his/her body lived in a given social context" (Denzin in Ariza, 2016: 17).

"The senses are everywhere" (Bull *et al.*, 2006: 5). They mediate in the relationship between idea and object, body and mind, self and society, culture, and environment (Howes, 2014: 21). Emotions are always located emotions; that is, although they are expressed individually, they are still shaped by the surrounding culture, and are objectified or rooted in specific communication situations.

Although the contributions of many authors cannot be denied, it is relevant in this paper to mention the works of one author in particular: Randall Collins, the author of the proposed interaction rituals. In this proposal, the idea that emotions are central in the processes of daily ritual interaction is key. For Collins, emotional energy is what makes a ritual successful or unsuccessful, since according to how shared the feelings exchanged in a given interaction ritual is, the ritual will either succeed or, on the contrary, will fail or be frustrated. The author states that "what coheres a society-the "cement" of solidarity- and what moves conflict-the energy of mobilised groups- are emotions" (Collins, 2009: 142).

Collin's theory of interaction rituals allows us to see how the process of interaction transforms emotions and how these are present both at the beginning and during the process of connecting people. Collin's proposal can be summarised as follows: most aspects of our lives are driven by a common force, which is what the author calls interaction rituals. For rituals to be considered effective, they must create and recreate symbols of group belonging and instill emotional

energy in their participants. According to the author, we all flow from one situation to another, attracted by the interactions that offer us the most significant emotional payoff, and we try to get away from those interactions that cause us discomfort.

Small scale interaction is the territory of human beings' emotional and unconscious aspects in constant relationship with others. They are, therefore, the daily interactions in the scenario where we can unravel the emotional and affective components that construct social subjects.

Interaction rituals are co-presence situations that delimit participants from the others, and that vary according to two significant dimensions: on the one hand, the degree to which participants coincide in their shared focus of attention, and on the other hand, by the intensity of the emotional connection that arises between them. The core of any interaction ritual involves a process whereby the participants develop a common focus of attention, and in which their body rhythms and emotions enter into "reciprocal consonance" (Collins, 2009:71)

After briefly showing these considerations surrounding the emotional and its relationship with the bodily, it is essential to ask the following question: to what extent intersubjective communication can do without emotion? Although a complete answer to this question is not sought, the next section presents a proposal of articulation between intersubjectivity, body, and feelings that can enrich the approach of intersubjective communication.

3.3. Intersubjectivity, body, and emotions: conceptual articulation for enriching the approach to intersubjective communication

As previously shown, interpersonal communication and intersubjective communication are usually given a more emotional and rational character, respectively. In this respect, the following passage from Fatima Fernandez is very illustrative:

> If we had to say in one word what the central component, not the only one, the central one of interpersonal communication is we would say that it is emotion. Obviously, in intersubjective communication, the dominant ingredient is reason. Neither of the two usually appears in a pure state, since in our communication, both emotion and reason tend to amalgamate (Fernandez, 2013: 34).

In her work, Fátima Fernández (2013) considers the contributions of the sociologist Norbert Elías, who suggests two different meanings for the concept of emotion. One, which is more limited, refers to feelings, and the other, in a broader sense, is "a reaction pattern that involves the whole organism" (Elias in Fernandez 2013: 35). This is the one that interests us in order to understand better how interpersonal communication is occurring. The same author refers to the Chilean biologist and epistemologist's proposal Humberto Maturana, who affirms that:

> Everything we do from an emotion [...] as all human activity is done from an emotion, nothing human happens outside the intertwining of language with emotion and, therefore, the human is always lived from emotion, even the most exalted and pure reasoning (Maturana, 2004: 106).

Following Maturana, the emotion-reason relation is also evident in the following idea: "the validity of our rational arguments does not depend on our emotions, but the rational domain in which we find ourselves in each instant when we talk, does" (Maturana, 2004: 108). Therefore, the difference between interpersonal and intersubjective communication regarding the role of emotions is not so clear. For Fernández, it is necessary to "keep in mind that intersubjective communication can be hindered if we do not consider the emotional components of our expression" (Fernández, 2013: 42). That is why it is necessary to expand the conceptual space of intersubjective communication and incorporate the affective and emotional aspects, present in every interaction situation.

Although the fleeting and spontaneous nature of interpersonal communication makes it seem like it is more charged with an emotional component, intersubjective communication does not lack this component. The fact that the interactors seek to build rationality to understand each other does not imply that emotion has no place in this discursive negotiation.

As shown in the previous section, emotion plays a central role in Randall Collin's theory of interaction rituals. Although the author does not distinguish between the notions of interpersonal communication and intersubjective communication, he realises that all interaction dynamics are charged with this type of energy through the concept of emotional energy.

Every communication situation starts from an encounter between bodies charged with emotions and consciousness due to the effect of the encounters experienced throughout their life history. Collin's conception of interaction rituals has an essential component in the consensus: the shared focus of attention generates a higher degree of consensus that gives the participants a feeling of belonging to the group, which in turn produce feelings in the individuals, which is emotional energy such as self-confidence and enthusiasm.

In short, we are communicating bodies. From our body, we communicate with others; the reason-emotion dichotomy, like emotion-body, does not seem to be very useful in the approach between the intersubjective and the interpersonal that we are proposing.

4. From the theoretical reflections to the empirical analyses. How do we investigate intersubjective communication empirically?

In addition to thinking about interpersonal and intersubjective communication in theoretical terms, it is also essential to reflect on how we can investigate it empirically, and ultimately, how we can intervene or modify it. Over a decade ago, in a collective academic exercise, the research group "Intersubjective Communication" from the Mexican Association of Communication Researchers (AMIC in Spanish) expressed the need to propose specific research projects that would contribute to generating theoretical, methodological and empirical knowledge on intersubjective communication and in general on processes of construction of meaning (communication processes), steering away from the media. Specifically, the group proposed that the theoretical, methodological, and empirical aspects should be closely linked,

although some guiding questions were proposed for each of these research dimensions. [Table 2: Dimensions, Questions and Preliminary Concepts of AMIC's "Intersubjective Communication" Research Group (2008)].

Table 2. Preliminary Dimensions, Questions, and Concepts of AMIC's "Intersubjective Communication" Research Group (2008)

Dimension	Questions – guide	Preliminary Concepts and/or ideas
Theory	From what concepts do we see the phenomena of intersubjective communication? What theoretical approaches can be most relevant to address the relationship between intersubjectivity and communication What other social sciences and/or human science currents have provided ideas for the conceptualisation of intersubjective communication?	Some of the concepts to be explored initially are the following: subject, subjectivity, intersubjectivity, intrapersonal communication, interpersonal communication, individual-society link, interaction. Regarding the sources, we initially consider that philosophy, sociology, and social psychology can be basic disciplines for the conceptualisation of intersubjective communication.
Methodology	How can we research intersubjective communication? What research techniques could be the most appropriate to the object of study? How can we improve intersubjective communication today?	The methodological strategies that help to investigate and/or improve the phenomenon of intersubjective communication were identified. Specific research and/or intervention technique protocols will be discussed and designed-
Empirical	What empirical objects can be investigated regarding the phenomenon of intersubjective communication? In what areas of daily life is intersubjective communication "at-risk"?	In addition to identifying and reviewing existing empirical research on the subject, specific projects on empirical objects that can be addressed from the perspective of intersubjective communication will be proposed.

Source: created by the author

Reflecting in methodological terms on research in intersubjective communication is subject of discussion in another text, and could give rise to highly suggestive methodological and technical proposals. In this section, we will only present some methodological lines that can serve as a basis for empirical research on intersubjective communication. In this sense, it is interesting to refer to the questions about the methodological dimension that appears in the table above.

In general terms, obviously, thinking that empirically researching phenomena related to face-to-face communication requires, a qualitative methodological strategy, since it is not a question of measuring a phenomenon that, in itself, is unquantifiable. It is a matter of approaching it, aiming to go beyond superficial descriptions, to obtain explanations and, ultimately, understand the communication situations that we all experience in our daily lives. Since it is a subjective phenomenon, marked by the interactions that at least two people sustain from their particular subjectivities, it is impossible to think that an instrument can measure these situations or can characterise them in terms of quantities. Therefore, what is relevant are qualitative approaches.

We can also take for granted that the most appropriate techniques for researching intersubjective communication are, on the one hand, observational techniques –which allow us to see and record communicative situations to be later analysed– and, on the other hand, dialogical techniques- which will make it possible to establish communicative contact with the subjects studied and which, in some way, will involve a metacommunicative situation-. The former may include participant and non-participant observation, while the in-depth interview, oral history, and discussion group- in the case that it is of interest to approach communication in groups-may be relevant dialogical technical tools for the empirical approach to intersubjective communication.

We will not detail the characteristics and potentialities of each research technique in-depth in this paper. An overview is provided concerning how to address a communication situation empirically. And the methodological reflection features some opinions about how to investigate intersubjective communication, which involves researching a specific interpersonal communication situation that must consider the emotional and physical dimension of the relationship established between researchers and the subjects.

Below we point out the steps for empirical research of an intersubjective communication situation, according to the research techniques used for such purpose [Table 3. Research techniques for the empirical approach of intersubjective communication situations]

Table 3. Research techniques for an empirical approach to intersubjective communication situations.

Observational techniques	Dialogical techniques
1) Selection and justification of the communicative situation to be analysed: why can this situation be considered as an example of intersubjective communication? 2) Description of the interactors in terms of gender, age, social class, among other elements of identity affiliation. 3) Description of the communication context: where does the communication take place, which elements of the context condition it? 4) Analysis of the messages exchanged by the participants-previously recorded-with emphasis on the deployment of argumentative strategies, but without omitting the discursive elements of emotional-affective nature. 5) Analysis of the sensory-body elements previously videotaped-and, in general of the staging participants' non-verbal communication in the situation.	1) To raise the need to hold a conversation with the participants about the importance of communication in everyday life. Therefore, interviews or oral stories will have a metacommunication character. 2) Establish a guide of questions or topics on the theme, which give an account of elements such as facilitators and hinderers of communication; the use of arguments; corporal communication; communication of emotions; those who interact with those who communicate with greater ease and with greater difficulty; communication in groups, family, friends, work, among others. 3) Carry out the interview, with prior agreement with each of the participants, separately. 4) Transcribe the information 5) Analyse the speech obtained.
Triangulation	
Once the observation and the interviews or oral history are applied, we could triangulate the information obtained to compare the differences and similarities between what has been observed in the given communication situation, and what has been discussed with each of the participants.	

Source: created by the author

As can be seen in this proposal, the emotional and rational, on the one hand, and the body and discourse, on the other hand, appear articulated as elements that unfold simultaneously in any given communication situation. Although there are moments when we are communicating, in which we emphasise our arguments- because the communication situation merits it-, the emotional is present even if it is less visible. Conversely, in communication situations where the emotional and affective aspects predominate, we may also be using more rational arguments to alleviate the effect of the emotional on our interlocutors.

5. Closing. Challenges in intersubjective communication research

In the field of communication, media studies still predominate to the detriment of interpersonal and, of course, intersubjective communication phenomena.

In this scenario, we must consolidate the idea of the production of meaning as an object of study in the communication sciences. This will undoubtedly make it possible to open up the conceptual spaces of communication and to articulate the emotional dimensions, as we have attempted to do in this text. The body is at the centre- and rational dimensions are ingredients deployed in communication situations, understood as the processes of production/construction of meaning.

In the discussions on interpersonal and intersubjective communication, progress has been made in conceptual terms, from the contributions of fields of knowledge such as philosophy, psychology, and sociology to clarify what intersubjective communication means. Although part of this progress has been included in this text, based on the presentation of some classical theoretical currents that allow for a particular conceptualisation of intersubjective communication, the inclusion of some axes that seem to be forgotten in previous reflections on the subject has been proposed: emotions and the body. The triad Body-Communication-Emotions provides much to think about regarding how we communicate and try to solve everyday communication problems.

This inclusion of the body and emotions in discussions on the interpersonal and intersubjective dimension of communication makes it important-even urgent-for the field of communication to participate in the so-called "Affective Turn" and "Sensory Turn" that has appeared in the field of social sciences. This is because it is not possible to conceive- or not, at least, from the point of view assumed in this text-communication situations between people in which the senses are absent, besides the more rational-argumentative discourses.

We are body, and from our body, we communicate. Our body produces meanings and simultaneously receives the meanings from our fellow human beings, with whom we interact daily. There is no communication without a body. There is no communication without emotions and sensations.

How can reflection on intersubjective communication incorporate these sensory-body elements that, in principle, we thought belonged to interpersonal communication and not intersubjective communication? Although a complete answer to this complex question is not given in this article, it has contributed to some conceptual and methodological elements that can feed this urgent debate.

6. Bibliographical references

Ariza, M. (coord.). (2016). *Emociones, Afectos y Sociología. Diálogos desde la Investigación Social y la Interdisciplina.* Ciudad de México: Instituto de Investigaciones Sociales de la UNAM.

Bericat, E. (2000). La Sociología de la Emoción y la Emoción en la Sociología. *Papers. Revista de Sociología* (62), 145-176. http://dx.doi.org/10.5565/rev/papers/v62n0.1070.

Blumer, H. (1969). *Simbolic interaccionism. Perspective and method.* Nueva Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Borden, G. y Stone, J. (1982). *La Comunicación Humana.* Buenos Aires: El Ateneo.

Bourdieu, P. (1999). *Meditaciones Pascalianas.* Barcelona: Editorial Anagrama.

Bull, M. *et. al.* (2006). Introducing Sensory Studies. *The Sense and Society*, 1(1), pp. 5-7. https://doi.org/10.2752/174589206778055655

Butler, J. (2002). *Cuerpos que Importan. Sobre los Límites Materiales y Discursivos del 'Sexo'.* Buenos Aires: Editorial Paidós.

Collins, R. (2009). *Cadenas de Rituales de Interacción.* Barcelona: Anthropos.

Denzin, N. (1985). Emotion as lived experiences. *Symbolic Interaction* 8 (2), 223-240. https://doi.org/10.1525/si.1985.8.2.223

Dukuen, J. (2010). Entre Bourdieu y Schütz. Encuentros y Desencuentros en Fenomenología Social. *Revista Latinoamericana de Estudios sobre Cuerpos, Emociones y Sociedad,* 2(3), 39-50. https://bit.ly/2xGwdr3

Elias, N. (1987). On Human Beings and their Emotions: A Process-Sociological Essay. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 4(2), 339-361. https://doi.org/10.1177/026327687004002008

Fernández, F. y Rizo, M. (2009). Comunicación, Intersubjetividad y Sentido. Apuntes Iniciales para el Impulso de la Línea de Investigación sobre Comunicación Intersubjetiva. Vega Montiel, Aimée (coord.) (2009). *La Comunicación en México. Una Agenda de Investigación* (315-329). Ciudad de México: UNAM.

Fernández, F. (2013). El Trasfondo Emocional de la Comunicación Interpersonal (y el Difícil Tránsito hacia la Comunicación Intersubjetiva. Fernández, F., Millán, M. y Rizo, M. (2013). *La Comunicación Humana en Tiempos de lo Digital* (29-68). Ciudad de México: UAM-Cuajimalpa.

Fernández, F., Millán, M. y Rizo, M. (2017). Epistemología de la Comunicación Intersubjetiva: Aproximaciones Sociológicas, Filosóficas e Interdisciplinarias. *MatriZes*, 11(1), 126-147. http://dx.doi.org/10.11606/issn.1982-8160.v11i1p127-147

Fuentes, R. (2008). *La Comunicación desde una Perspectiva Sociocultural. Acercamientos y Provocaciones 1997-2007.* Guadalajara: ITESO.

Fuentes, R. (2001). *Comunicación, Utopía y Aprendizaje. Propuestas de Interpretación y Acción 1980-1996.* Guadalajara: ITESO.

Goffman, E. (1979). *Relaciones en Público. Microestudios del Orden Público.* Madrid: Alianza.

Goffman, E. (1997). *La Presentación de la Persona en la Vida Cotidiana.* Buenos Aires: Amorrortu.

Habermas, J. (1987). *La teoría de la acción comunicativa, Vols. I y II.* Madrid: Taurus.

Lara, A. y Enciso, G. (2014). Ciencia, Teoría Social y Cuerpo en el Giro Afectivo: Esferas de Articulación. *Quaderns de Psicologia*, 16(2), 7-25. http://dx.doi.org/10.5565/rev/qpsicologia.1172

Maturana, H. (2004). *Desde la Biología a la Psicología.* Buenos Aires: Lumen.

Merleau-Ponty, M. (1993). *Fenomenología de la Percepción.* Barcelona: Península.

Sabido, O. (2013). Los Retos del Cuerpo en la Investigación Sociológica. Una Reflexión Teórico-Metodológica. Aguilar, M., Soto, P. (coords.) (2013). *Cuerpos, Espacios y Emociones. Aproximaciones desde las Ciencias Sociales* (19-54). Ciudad de México: UAM-Iztapalapa.

Sabido, O. (2011). El Cuerpo y la Afectividad como Objetos de Estudio en América Latina: Intereses Temáticos y Proceso de Institucionalización Reciente. *Sociológica*, 26(74), 33-78. https://bit.ly/3bnv46r

Schütz, A. (1962). *El Problema de la Realidad Social.* Buenos Aires: Amorrortu.

Schütz, A. (1972). *Fenomenología del Mundo Social. Psicología Social y Sociología.* Buenos Aires: Paidós.

Scribano, A. (2013). *Encuentros Creativos Expresivos: Una Metodología para Estudiar Sensibilidades.* Buenos Aires: Estudios Sociológicos.

Sierra, L. (2005). Una Aproximación Trans e Interdisciplinaria del Campo de la Comunicación. *Conexão – Comunicação e Cultura*, 4(8), 81-100. https://bit.ly/2VI7mem

Sodhi, J. (2008). *Incomunicabilidad de la Persona y Comunicación Interpersonal* [Tesis de pregrado]. Universitat Abat Oliva CEU, España.

Vizer, E. (2007). "Interfases y líneas de investigación entre procesos sociales y procesos de comunicación". Ferreira, Jairo (org.) (2007) *Cenários, teorias e epistemologias da comunicação* (189-208). Rio de Janeiro: E-papers.

Xirau, R. (2002). *Introducción a la Historia de la Filosofía.* Ciudad de México: UNAM.