This chapter discusses Interpersonal Communication and Mass Communication on theoretical grounds. Relevant theories and models of Interpersonal Communication and Mass Communication are presented in a comprehensive manner. A discussion of the same helps in understanding the very process of communication in a better way. At the same time, it brings to light views of different communication scholars and researchers regarding these two fields of communication. The scope for the convergence of these two fields of study provides an opportunity to the communication scholars and researchers to explore their interdependence.
CHAPTER – 2

Theoretical Perspective of Interpersonal Communication & Mass Communication

2.1 INTRODUCTION

The study of communication and mass media has led to the formulation of many theories. Structural and functional theories believe that social structures are real and function in ways that can be observed objectively. Cognitive and behavioral theories tend to focus on psychology of individuals. Integrationist theories view social life as a process of interaction. Interpretive theories uncover the ways people actually understand their own experience. Critical theories are concerned with the conflict of interests in society and the way communication perpetuates domination of one group over another. Most communication theorists agree on three common communication settings which are:

- **Interpersonal (face-to-face)** – direct one to one communication

- **Machine assisted** (computers, cell phones, etc) – use of email, instant messages, conversation over cell phones, etc, which makes use of machines as a channel for information exchange.

- **Mass communication**- information to be conveyed is targeted at a larger audience that is scattered. Television, radio, print media like magazines, newspapers, etc are used as medium of mass communication.
2.2 DYADIC OR INTERPERSONAL THEORIES

Theories of interpersonal communication focus on communication between two individuals and development of relationship between these two as a result of exchange of ideas and emotions. Majority of theorists in this area contend that the major function of communication is to help people who are in some way “connected”, establish clearly defined relationships. Some basic theories of interpersonal communication are as follow:

ATTRIBUTION THEORY

The theory was propounded by Fritz Heider in 1958. Heider in *The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations* (New York: Wiley, 1958) attempts to explain the causes of human behavior.

Fig - 2.1 Attribution Theory of Interpersonal Communication
The theory explores the causes of people's behavior and attribute or explain reasons as to why people behave the way they do. There is not a direct relationship between our behavior and its causes. There can be a variety of behaviors that are perceived resulting from a variety of causes. Since, Attribution Theory is Humanistic, it is based on the assumption that human nature is of free will and cannot be predetermined.

**MEHRABIAN CONCEPT**

The interpersonal communication can be classified by a three dimensional frameworks i.e. **immediacy** (linking), **dominance** (power), and **responsiveness** (stimulation). The actual verbal and non-verbal communication that took place in everyday life can be understood in terms of these three dimensions. The **immediacy** metaphors explain that people get involved when they like a person or a person appeals to them. Immediacy is reflected in verbal and non-verbal behaviour. For example, coming close shows attraction, interpersonal distance may show avoidance and touching behavior may show emotional appeal. **Power** metaphors explain that relationships relate to status. The **responsiveness** metaphor correlates with arousal of emotions and stimulation. It points out our vocal expressiveness.

**FUNDAMENTAL INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS ORIENTATION THEORY (FIRO):**

The theory was propounded by psychologist, **W.C. Schutz (1958)** in the article “**A Three Dimensional Theory of Interpersonal Behavior**” (New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston). This theory concentrates on three basic interpersonal needs that most people share:

- Need for inclusion (the need to belong)
- Need for control (the need to be in charge and have power)
- Need for affection (the need to be loved)

**Schutz** maintains that people initiate relationships in order to satisfy one or more of these three needs.
Fig - 2.2 FIRO Theory of Interpersonal Communication

With some basic assumptions, this is a humanistic theory because it has intuitive credibility, it makes sense and is relative to actual communication practice. It has a systematic approach and is timely. It also has heuristic value because it is easily applicable to situations.

CO-ORDINATED MANAGEMENT OF MEANING (CMM) THEORY

Pearce and Cronen (1980) gave an important contribution in book titled Communication, action, and meaning: The creation of social realities (New York: Praeger). In this book, they state that Persons-in-conversation co-construct their own social realities by achieving coherence, coordinating actions, and experiencing mystery. Coherence is a unified context for stories told, coordination comes through stories lived, and mystery is a sense of wonder for stories unexpressed.

Pearce and Cronen assert that depending on specific situations and contexts, the meaning created and understood can be varying. In discussing contexts, varying levels of importance of episodes, relationships, self-concept and culture play key roles.
People choose which context is most important in the given situation and act accordingly. Finally, since this theory is dependent on people’s experiences and beliefs, the values play a significant role in each situation.

DECEPTION THEORY

Buller and Burgoon (1996) introduce it in *Interpersonal deception theory: Communication Theory*. The theory states that communication senders attempt to manipulate messages so as to be untruthful, which may cause them apprehension concerning their false communication being detected. Simultaneously, communication receivers try to unveil or detect the validity of that information, causing suspicion about whether or not the sender is being deceitful.

Fig - 2.4 Deception Theory of Interpersonal Communication
Individual Interpretations of the theory: -

There are three aspects of deceptive messages:

- The central deceptive message, which is usually verbal.
- Ancillary message, which includes both verbal and nonverbal aspects of communication that often reveals the truthfulness of a particular message.
- Inadvertent behaviors which are mostly nonverbal and help to point out the deceit of the sender through a term called leakage.

EXPECTANCY VIOLENCE THEORY

Judee Burgoon (1978) contributed by defining communication as “The exchange of information which is high in relational content and can be used to violate the expectations of another which will be perceived as either positively or negatively depending on the liking between the two people.” In a research paper titled “Communication Model of Personal Space Violation: Explication and an Initial Test”, he states “When our expectations are violated, we will respond in specific ways. If an act is unexpected and is assigned favorable interpretation, and it is evaluated positively, it will produce more favorable outcomes than an expected act with the same interpretation and evaluation”.

This theory assumes that humans have a certain amount of free will. It assumes that humans can survey and interpret the relationship and liking between themselves and their conversational partner and then make a decision whether or not to violate the expectations of the other person depending on what outcome they would like to achieve.

The Expectancy Violation theory assumes that there is one truth. This truth is that there are norms for all communication activities and if these norms are violated, there will be specific, predictable outcomes.

This theory seems to be value-neutral because in it the study was done empirically and it seeks to objectively describe how humans react when their expectations are violated.
SOCIAL EXCHANGE THEORY

This theory was developed by psychologists, Thibault and Kelley in 1952. The theory focuses on how people maintain their interpersonal relationships. According to this theory, relationships are assumed to revolve around the exchange of resources (e.g. money, time, sex, communication and self-disclosure). To give up a resource is a cost and to receive a resource is a reward. As long as the relational partners perceive a balanced exchange of resources, their relationship remains stable. But when one member perceives an imbalanced exchange of resources, relational dissatisfaction may occur.

![Fig - 2.5 Social Exchange Theory of Interpersonal Communication](image)

Thibault and Kelley in their book titled *The Social Psychology of Groups* (New York: John Wiley & Sons) state that “the communication theory of social exchange is a theory based on the exchange of rewards and costs to quantify the values of outcomes from different situations for an individual. People strive to minimize costs and maximize rewards and then base the likeliness of developing a relationship with someone on the perceived possible outcomes. When these outcomes are perceived to be greater, we disclose more and develop a closer relationship with that person”.

SOCIAL PENETRATION THEORY

This theory was propounded by psychologists, Altman and Taylor in 1973. In their write up *Social Penetration: The Development of Interpersonal Relationships* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston) they state that, “as relationships develop, communication moves from relatively shallow, no intimate levels to deeper, more personal ones”.
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They further assert that, “the more time we spend with others, the more likely we are to self-disclose more intimate thought and details of our life”.

This theory makes the statement that if self-disclosure is high, then the relationship will develop. This "if-then" statement makes this a scientific theory. It does allow for free-will because people can choose whether or not to self-disclose (time and manner). This theory says that this behavior will take place regardless of values.

**UNCERTAINTY REDUCTION THEORY**

This theory was formulated by Charles Berger and Richard Calabrese in 1975. The theory assumes that when people meet for the first time, their primary concern is the reduction of uncertainty or the increase of predictability about the behavior of both themselves and the others in interaction. The theory states that as interaction increases, uncertainty decreases. Berger and Calabrese state that “Initial interactions between
strangers are characterized by information seeking in order to reduce uncertainty. Uncertainty is reduced as levels of self-disclosure, nonverbal warmth, and similarity increase”.

The truth set forth by this theory is that people attempt to “make sense” of interpersonal situations by reducing uncertainty through seeking information. While particular aspects of the encounter dictate how people react, the reactions are based on 8 axioms resulting in a list of 28 possible theorems. Since reactions are limited, according to Berger, this theory favors a deterministic perspective. This theory is value-neutral because the reactions are set factors and thus predetermined regardless of values.

**COGNITIVE DISSONANCE THEORY**

**Leon Festinger** in 1950 explains how humans are consistency seekers and attempt to reduce their dissonance, or discomfort, in new situations. When individuals encounter new information or new experiences, they categorize the information based on their pre-existing attitudes, thoughts, and beliefs. If the new encounter does not coincide with their preexisting assumptions, then dissonance is likely to occur. When dissonance does occur, individuals are motivated to reduce the dissonance they experience by avoiding situations that would either cause the dissonance or increase the dissonance. For this reason, cognitive dissonance is considered a drive state that encourages motivation to achieve consonance and reduce dissonance.

**The Selection Process for Reducing Resonance**

- **Selective exposure** is a method used for reducing dissonance *i.e.* only seeking information that is consonant with one’s current beliefs, thoughts, or actions.
- **Selective attention** is a method for reducing dissonance *i.e.* by only paying attention to particular information or parts of information that is consonant with current beliefs, thoughts, or actions.
- **Selective interpretation** is a method for reducing dissonance by interpreting ambiguous information so that it seems consistent with one’s beliefs, thoughts, or actions.
- **Selective retention** when an individual only remembers information that is consistent with his / her current beliefs.
RELATIONAL DIALECTICS THEORY

Leslie A. Baxter and Barbara M. Montgomery propounded this theory in 1988. This concept could be interpreted as "a knot of contradictions in personal relationships or an unceasing interplay between contrary or opposing tendencies." These contradictions experienced within common folk proverbs are similar to those we experience within our relationships as individuals. When making decisions, we give voice to multiple viewpoints and desires that often contradict each other.

Baxter includes a list of Dialectical Tensions that reminds us that relationships are constantly changing and successful and satisfying relationships require constant attention. Although Baxter’s description of Relational Dialectics is thorough, it by no means is exact or all inclusive since us all experience different tensions in different ways.

Different Types of Dialectical Tensions: -

- **Autonomy and Connectedness**: The desire to have ties and connections with others versus the need to separate yourself as a unique individual.
- **Favoritism and Impartiality**: The desire to be treated fairly and impartially versus the desire to be seen and known as “special”.
- **Openness and Closeness**: The desire to be open and divulge information versus the desire to be exclusive and private.
- **Novelty and Predictability**: The desire for the relationship to be predictable versus the desire for it to be original and new.
- **Instrumentality and Affection**: The desire for affection to be genuine versus the desire for affection to be motivated by benefits and perceived advantages of the relationship.

2.3 THEORIES OF MASS COMMUNICATION

The early theories on mass communication were those propounded by western theorists Siebert, Paterson and Schramm in their book, *Four Theories of the Press* (1956). These were termed “Normative Theories” by McQuail in the sense that “they mainly express ideas of how the media ought to or can be expected to operate in a prevailing set of conditions and values”. Later theories on mass communication depict media’s impact on culture and society. They focus mainly on long-term cumulative media effects. They
present mass media as a powerful tool to influence mass audience and a weapon to control or alter people’s behavior. Some basic theories of mass communication are as follows:

**BULLET THEORY**

Before the First World War, there was no separate field of study on Communication, but knowledge about mass communication was accumulating. The first generation of mass communication scholars assumed that the mass media had a profound and direct effect on people. Their idea drew heavily on social commentator, Walter Lippmann’s influential 1922 book of *Public Opinion*. Lippmann argued that we see the world not as it really is but as “pictures in our heads”. The ‘pictures’ of things we have not experienced personally, he said are shaped by the mass media. He propounded the view that the mass media had a powerful influence on the mass audience and could deliberately alter or control peoples' behavior.

**POWERFUL EFFECTS THEORY**

Yale psychologist, Harold Lasswell, who studied World - War II propaganda, embodied the powerful effects theory in his famous model of mass communication: *Who says What, in which Channel, to Whom, with what Effect?*

Powerful effects theory assumed that the media could inject information, ideas and even propaganda into the public consciousness. According to this theory, mass media were so powerful that ideas and even ballet-box instructions could be inserted as if by hypodermic needle into the body politic. It is called the powerful effects theory or hypodermic needle theory.

**ONE STEP FLOW THEORY**

This theory simply stated that mass communication media channels communicate directly to the mass audience without the message being filtered by opinion leaders.

**TWO STEP FLOW THEORY**

Scholarly enthusiasm for the hypodermic needle theory dwindled after the massive study of voters’ behavior conducted in Erie County, Ohio in 1940 by Lazarsfeld, Berelson and
Goudet. The study led by these scholars was the first rigorous test of media effects on elections. Their study revealed that informal social relationships played an important part in modifying the manner in which individuals selected content from the media campaign. The mass media hardly had any direct effect.

The study also indicated that among the people who were studied, some individuals serve as ‘Opinion Leaders’. Opinion leaders refer to the individuals who through day-to-day personal contacts influence others in the matters of decision and opinion formation. The suggestion that ideas flow from mass media (radio and print) to the opinion leaders and from them to the mass audience (the less active sections of the population) is expressed as the two-step flow hypothesis of communication.

MULTI STEP FLOW THEORY

Later, as mass communication research became more sophisticated, the two-step theory was expanded into multi-step theory to capture the complex web of social relationship that affects individuals. This theory was based on the idea that there are a number of relays in the communication flow from a source to a large audience.

KLAPPER’S SELECTIVE EXPOSURE THEORY

Klapper (1960) formulated several generalizations on the effects of mass media. His research findings are as follows: "Mass-media ordinarily does not serve as a necessary and sufficient cause of audience effect, but rather functions through a nexus of mediating factors and influences. These mediating factors render mass-communication as a contributory agent in a process of reinforcing the existing conditions".

The main mediating factors which he considers responsible for the functions and effects of mass communications are:

- **Selective exposure** i.e., people's tendency to expose themselves to or attend to only those mass communication messages which are in agreement with their preexisting attitudes and interests.

- **Selective perception** i.e., people's tendency to interpret mass media messages in a manner consistent with their preexisting attitudes and beliefs.
• **Selective retention** i.e., people's tendency to remember best and longest those mass media messages that are consistent with their preexisting attitudes and beliefs.

**USES AND GRATIFICATION THEORY**

This theory propounded by Katz in 1970, is concerned with how people use media for gratification of their needs. An outcome of Abraham Maslow's *Hierarchy of Needs*, it claimed that media do not do things *to* people; rather, people do things *with* media. In other words, the influence of media is limited to what people allow it to be. The theory propounds the fact that people choose what they want to see or read and the different media compete with each other to satisfy each individual’s needs.

In the hierarchy of needs, there are five levels in the form of a pyramid with the basic needs such as food and clothing at the base and the higher order needs climbing up the pyramid. The fulfillment of each lower level need leads to the individual looking to satisfy the next level of need and so on till he reaches the superior-most need of self-actualization.

![Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs Theory](image)

**Fig - 2.7** Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs Theory
The Uses and Gratification approach reminds that people use media for many purposes. As media users become increasingly confronted with choices, this approach direct our attention to the audience. Lull's television research found that families used television for communication facilitation, relationship building, intimacy, and for structuring the day.

Riley and Riley (1951) found that children in peer groups used adventure stories from the media for group games while individual children used media stories for fantasizing and daydreaming. The study, thus, found that different people use the same messages from the media for different purposes.

Katz replaced the question "what do media do to people?" with the question "what do people do with the media?"

McCOb's AND SHAW’s AGENDA SETTING THEORY

This theory puts forth the ability of the media to influence the significance of events in the public's mind. The media set the agenda for the audience's discussion and mentally order and organize their world. The theory is consistent with "uses and gratification" approach. Maxwell McCombs and Don Shaw describing the agenda-setting phenomenon in 1972, said that the media do not tell people what to think but tell them what to think about. They asserted that the agenda-setting function of the media causes the correlation between the media and public ordering of priorities. The people most affected by the media agenda are those who have a high need for orientation.

MEDIA DEPENDENCY THEORY

Developed by Ball-Rokeach and Melvin De Fleur, the key idea behind this theory is that audiences depend on media information to meet needs and reach goals. Social institutions and media systems interact with audiences to create needs, interests, and motives in the person. The degree of dependence on media is influenced by the number and centrality of information functions and social stability. Some questions that this theory raised were:

- Do media create needs?
- Do people turn to media to achieve gratification and satisfy needs?
• Are media needs personal, social, cultural, political, or all of these?

SOCIAL COGNITIVE THEORY

Social Cognitive theory is based upon the idea that people learn through observation and they apply it to mass media especially television. The theory argues that people model (Copy) the behaviors they see and that modeling happens in two ways. The first is imitation, the direct replication of an observed behavior. The second form of modeling is identification a special form of imitation in which observers do not copy exactly what they have seen but make a more generalized but related response. This idea of identification was of particular value to mass communication theorists who studied television’s impact on behavior.

STEPHENSON’s PLAY THEORY

Stephenson’s Play theory (1967) focused on the media users’ relationship with the medium. It emphasizes that play is an activity pursued for pleasure. The effect of mass communication is neither escapism nor seducing the masses. Rather it is seen as anti-anxiety producing, and is regarded as communication-pleasure.

CULTIVATION THEORY

George Gerbner (1976) tried to determine the influence of television on viewers’ ideas of the environment they lived in. He found that dominance of TV created a common view of the world and that it homogenized different cultures. TV portraying the society as a bad place to live in leads people to become distrustful of the world. Over time, particular symbols, images, messages, meanings become dominant and are absorbed as the truth. Cultural stereotypes, ways of assessing value and hierarchies are established.

DIFFUSION OF INNOVATIONS THEORY

Pioneered in 1943 by Bryce Ryan and Neil C. Gross of Iowa State University, this theory traces the process by which a new idea or practice is communicated through certain channels over time among members of a social system. The model describes the factors that influence people's thoughts and actions and the process of adopting a new technology or idea.
SOCIAL LEARNING THEORY

Formulated by Albert Bandura at Stanford University, this theory specifies that mass-media messages give audience members an opportunity to identify with attractive characters that demonstrate behavior, engage emotions, and allow mental rehearsal and modeling of new behavior. The behavior of models in the mass media also offers vicarious reinforcement to motivate audience members' adoption of the behavior.

Baran and Davis (2000) classify mass communication theories into three broad categories:

1. Microscopic theories that focus on the everyday life of people who process information - for example, uses and gratifications, active audience theory, and reception studies;
2. Middle range theories that support the limited effects perspective of the media - for example, information flow theory, diffusion theory, and
3. Macroscopic theories that are concerned with media's impact on culture and society - for example, cultural studies theory.

Theories of mass communication have always focused on the "cause and effects" notion, i.e. the effects of the media and the process leading to those effects on the audience's mind. Harold Lasswell and Berelson have succinctly expressed this idea. Lasswell's essential question is timeless (1949): "Who says what, in what channel, to whom, with what effects?" Berelson said: "Some kinds of communication, on some kinds of issues, brought to the attention of some kinds of people, under some kinds of conditions, have some kinds of effects." (1949).

2.4 MODELS OF INTERPERSONAL AND MASS COMMUNICATION

Theorists have proposed various models of communication from time to time. Linear models dominated communication research earlier but gradually convergence models of network communications evolved. In linear models individuals are treated as the unit of analysis and the information flow is unidirectional whereas in convergence models information exchange relationships are the unit of analysis. Some of the important models of interpersonal communication and mass communication are as follows:
ARISTOTLE’s MODEL

This model was formulated about 2500 years ago by a Greek philosopher, Aristotle in his book *The Rhetoric*. It is one of the earliest known models. This model is suitable for public speaking. It is a one-way or linear model of communication. The components of this model are: the sender or source, the speech or message, the receiver or the audience and the effect. This model is contemporary in the sense that Aristotle proposed as taking in a place in a context on a given occasion. This model can be diagrammatically presented as follows:

```
Source or Sender ↔ Speech or message ↔ Receiver or audience ↔ Effect

Context or Occasion
```

Fig - 2.8 Aristotle’s Model of Communication

LASSWELL’s MODEL

Harold Lasswell, a political scientist, proposed a linear model of communication in 1948. He posed the model in question form:

- **Who**
- **Says** What
- In which **Channel**
- **To** Whom
- With what **Effect**?

Fig - 2.9 Lasswell’s Model of Communication

The model seems to be fairly obvious and quite simple.

- ‘**Who**’ alerts one to the communicator or communicators?
- ‘**What**’ indicates the text, the comment, the content, the discourse or the message?
- ‘**Channel**’ refers to means or medium of communication.
• ‘Whom’ refers to the perceived receiver?

• ‘Effect’ refers to the impact of any communication effort. It can be judged from the reactions, expressions, actions and comments of receiver.

Lasswell’s model focuses primarily on verbal communication just as Aristotle’s. The model is a simple description of one-way communication process, which comprises of a speaker who communicates a message to a receiver by making use of any of the media like print, radio, television, etc to finally convey the information.

The process of interpersonal communication can best be understood with the help of some models which are as follows:

OSGOOD MODEL

Osgood Model opposes the traditional Sender & Receiver model. It interprets communication in a practical way. It describes communication as something that is circular. It is also called Circular Model of Communication. It has three main components:

Encoder – Who does encoding or sends the message (message originates)

Decoder – Who receives the message?

Interpreter – Person trying to understand (analyses, perceive) or interpret

Following diagram can illustrate the model in best way:

Fig - 2.10 Osgood Model of Communication
From the message starting to ending, there is an interpretation that goes on. Based on this interpretation, the message is received. It can happen within our-self or two people. Each person acts as both encoder and decoder and hence as interpreter. Encoding, interpretation and decoding take place simultaneously. To begin with, the source initiates the process by having a thought or an idea that he or she wishes to transmit to some other entity. This is called encoding. The decoding process is the opposite of the encoding process. It consists of activities that translate or interpret physical messages into a form that has eventually some meaning for a receiver. After decoding and interpreting the message, a number of responses arise in the mind of the receiver. The receiver may or may not decide to respond. If he decides to respond, he encodes that response in the format that he thinks is suitable. Now he performs the role of a source. The encoded message is further passed on and the process goes on.

**Advantages of Osgood Model of Communication**

- Dynamic model- shows how a situation can change.
- It shows why redundancy is an essential part.
- There is no separate sender and receiver- sender and receiver is the same person.
- Assume communication to be circular in nature.
- Feedback – central feature.

**Disadvantages of Osgood Model of Communication**

- This model does not talk about semantic noise.
- It assumes the moment of encoding and decoding and ignores the cultural and demographic factors.

**SHANNON & WEAVER’S MODEL**

American researchers, **Claude Shannon** and **Warren Weaver (1949)** proposed what they termed the ‘mathematical’ model of communication. Shannon and Weaver’s published work for Bell Telephone Company forms the basis of their model. They presented a linear model identifying the actors in the situation and indicating the process.
The model consists of an information source, which selects a desired message out of a set of possible messages, and the selected message may consist of written or spoken words, or of pictures, music, etc. It has a transmitter that converts the message into a signal, which is sent over the communication channel from the transmitter to the receiver.

During signal transmission through the channel, receiver may come across noises, which are any mental or physical distraction that interferes with the transmission of a signal from the source to the destination. "Correction channels” are introduced which overcome the problems created by noise and the information in form of the signal finally reaches the receiver.

**NEWCOMB’s MODEL**

Theodore Newcomb opted for the triangular formation in proposing his famous ABX model in 1953. Easy to draw, triangles immediately illustrate two factors: connections and dynamics. Here A, B and X are interconnected in a dynamic situation.
The focus is interpersonal communication between A and B, but the militating factor in the communicative exchange, or interaction, between person A and person B is X. This can be another person – a friend, a relative, a colleague – or a range of external factors such as attitudes, points of view, issues or events.

What is significant is the orientation of A and B to each other with regard to X. Let us take an example of like-dislike. A and B like each another. They agree on X, whatever X is, say a third person. They are, in Newcomb’s judgment, in consonance; that is they feel at one.

Things get complicated, however, when A and B like one another, but discover their opinions markedly differ. The outcome now is likely to be dissonance; that is A and B find themselves at odds on a deeply felt matter. They experience unease, emotional discomfort. The stronger the disparity of views on X, the more powerful, goes the theory, the feelings of dissonance.

**SCHRAMM'S MODEL**

Wilbur Schramm (1954) asserts that communication is most effective where there is a substantial degree of sharing. He acknowledges this when he gives salience to what in his model of 1956 he calls 'fields of experience'.

When, the fields of experience of encoder and decoder overlap, there is potential for meaningful communicative interaction. There is a sharing of culture, language, values and experience and hence, there is the probability of mutual understanding. Further, shared experience allows participants to ‘step into the shoes’ of other; that is, to empathize, and thus increase the likelihood of interaction between equals, characterized by a sense of give and take.
In *A First Look at Communication*, Em Griffin (2003) lends support to the importance of fields of experience, writing that ‘Communication between us begins when there is some shared overlap between two images, and it is effective to the extent that overlap increases’.

**GERBNER’s MODEL**

George Gerbner’s model of 1956 explores the relationship between media messaging and individual reception.

![Gerbner’s Model of Communication](image)

Gerbner highlights the complexity of process, as one can never have a foolproof perception of reality because one cannot know everything about that reality. It can be said that once E1 comes into play, all is perception. How true or accurate that perception is, how mistaken or biased, fair or prejudiced, will depend upon a complex number of variables. Our gender, social class, age, ethnicity, education, state of health or wealth may exercise a mediating role in our view of the world and of other people, and how we see ourselves in relation to them.

**ANDERSCH’s MODEL**

Elizabeth Andersch, Lorin Staats and Robert Bostrom propounded this model in 1969. They place *environment* in the very centre of their model. They see it as the powerhouse that generates the process of interpersonal communication. The environment provides the stimuli that initiate and influence the nature and direction of communication.
as it proceeds through sending to receiving to sending once more. These stimuli come from within ourselves as well as from life outside ourselves.

In the act of initiating an exchange, the source is himself a ‘‘message’’. Even before he begins to speak, the receiver perceives the message-source; he sees and interprets bodily activity and facial expression; he associates prior impressions he has had of the speaker, conditioning his own responses to the communicator.

In turn, the receiver’s behavior will be affected by the environment, his past experiences with the subject to be explored, his biases and interests, his attitudes towards the speaker, and his willingness to participate in this particular communication situation.

This model contributes other salient features of the process of interpersonal communication. For example, two stages are identified prior to the act of communication – **structuring** and **evaluating**. We assess how best and most effectively, the message can be conveyed to the receiver. The receiver will ‘hear’ and by hearing (that is, paying attention rather than ignoring the receiver’s message) will ‘reconstruct’ the message. Yet whatever the nature of that reconstruction, a process of evaluation takes place prior to response.
All the while, self-evaluation is going on, the source remains interacting with his own values, opinions and ideas. In other words, he evaluates his continuing message. As Andersch, et al. assert, ‘it is almost impossible for sources to ignore their own values in any circumstances’.

**WESTLEY-MACLEAN MODEL**

**Bruce Westley and Malcolm MacLean**, proposed a model, which tells that in an environment various events occur on which advocates may choose to comment. The advocate’s comment are taken up by different types of media like print, radio, television, etc which passes on the information to the audience. The audience responds to these comments and gives its feedback to the media and to the advocates. Even the media can give its feedback to the advocates. The model elaborates the feedback concept and emphasizes on mass communication and interpersonal communication, as well as the relationship between the two.

![Fig - 2.16 Westley-MacLean Model of Communication](image)

**KINCAID’s CONVERGENCE MODEL**

In the convergence model, "communication" is defined as “a process in which participants create and share information with one another in order to reach a mutual understanding”.
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Lawrence Kincaid proposed the Convergence Model in 1979. This model lends a relational perspective to human communication. When information is shared with individuals or groups taking part in the communication process, it may lead collective action towards mutual agreement and mutual understanding. Before this, the information is understood, interpreted and perceived by individuals.

Communication in this model is viewed as a process rather than a single event. The model emphasizes information exchange and networks that exist between individuals.

![Kincaid Convergence Model](image)

**INTERNET MASS COMMUNICATION MODEL**

Internet Model of mass communication is an attempt to represent a new arrangement that makes possible several different levels of communication. One source communicating with one receiver (e-mail), one source communicating with many receivers (cnn.com), a few sources communicating with a few receivers (Chat Rooms, Blogs) and many sources communicating with many receivers (ebay.com).

Both individuals and organizations are linked through a computer-mediated environment. This makes interaction and feedback much easier. In this model, content is provided not only by organizations but also by individuals. In this circumstance there are
no organizational gate keepers. A single individual perform the decoding, interpreting and encoding functions.

**Fig - 2.18 Internet Model of Mass Communication**

It is not a one-way model. Communication doesn’t proceed from left to right but flows inward. The traditional mass communicator no longer necessarily initiates the process. Instead, it is possible for the receiver to choose the time and manner of interaction.

Another area of contrast between the traditional and internet model is that the messages that flow to each receiver are not identical. In addition, each receiver can customize the information that he or she receives.

Some writers have characterized the traditional mass communication model as a “Push” model (the sender pushes the information to the receiver), whereas the internet model is a “Pull” model (the receiver pulls only the information that he/she wants). All in all, this
new model suggests a new way of conceptualizing communication in the age of the internet.

2.5 SUMMARY

Traditionally, interpersonal communication has been viewed as a two-way message exchange between two persons. Classic example of interpersonal communication is face-to-face interaction between one individual and the another. Classical theories and models of mass communication depict it as a one-way message delivery to a large, heterogeneous audience. Traditional examples of mass communication include television, radio and print media like newspapers, magazines, books and theater like movies and recorded music. However, with the advancement of communication and digital technologies, making use of such criteria as two-way versus one-way and two participants versus large, undifferentiated audiences to distinguish between interpersonal communication and mass communication, is proving futile. Later theories and models of interpersonal and mass communication advocate the convergence of both interpersonal and mass communication channels which is best represented by Kincaid’s Convergence Model and the Internet Model. The internet has the potential to shake up these two fields of communication because it offers content that cannot be neatly categorised as either mass or interpersonal. Hence, the convergence of these two fields of communication is providing an opportunity to the communication scholars and researchers to explore the interdependence between these two fields of study.
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