CHAPTER-1
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

Family communication is usually interface interpersonal communication. The family is the smallest segment of the society and the family members discuss various topics of interest sharing freely their thoughts - happiness, frustration, fear, pain and joy etc. This is possible because the pillar of trust develops right from the childhood when child interacts with father, mother and elders and as he/she grows the trust and topic they share change with time and family members. Similarly, the grown-up family members bonded by strong relationship communicate freely and discuss their topic of interest. The type of family communication varies within relations they maintain with one other. Various mass media communication sources like-newspaper, magazines, radio and new media sources like- television, computer, internet and social media have eventually occupied both time and space in Indian households and has become the interface interpersonal communication in Indian family system today. New communication technologies have changed the communication media use in Indian family system. It is important to examine the impact of mass media technology in the Indian households and how it affects the communication within the families and its penetration along with time and space occupancy in the interface interpersonal communication in Indian family system today.

1.2 Family and Family system

Every society or social structure is characterized by the basic unit i.e. family. These are the building blocks of social structure. They have a common motto, culture, rules and values. The key function of family is to preserve, protect and promote its generation year after year. Elder members of the family are responsible for rearing their offsprings. They make sure the fulfillment of basic needs of family viz. food, shelter and clothes. According to Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary- “the basic unit in society traditionally consisting of parent(s) rearing their children” where children refer to the young dependent member(s) and parent(s) refer to the adults taking care of the children.
Even the traditional families whenever mentioned give us the impression of a bread winning father and a home making mother with two or more children.

1.3 Meaning and Definition of family

In order to adequately examine the implications of mass media communication sources on interface interpersonal communication in family system, we must first clarify the definitions of each significant term. Though the majority of these terms are familiar but they were scientifically defined which explains its meaning, application and limitations in broad perspectives. Family is a multidimensional unit performing various functions in a society. It has been a great interest for sociologists to define it on the basis of its various aspects like size of the family, functions of the family, relationship between the family members etc. According to the classification by Wamboldt & Reiss, (1989); Noller & Fitzpatrick, (1993) “Definitions of the word family generally fall into three categories: family structure, task orientation, and transactional process definitions”.

Family structure definitions are based on number of family members, their blood relations and the hierarchy followed. According to Wamboldt & Reiss, (1989) –“Family structure definitions surround the family of procreation (partners and children), relatives by blood, or individuals that have established biological or legal legitimacy”. Census, 2000) describes family as an example of households who are related to the householder by birth, marriage, or adoption. These definitions help to divide the families on the basis of size like small, nuclear, large, combined etc. Though these definitions provide scholars with clear criteria for membership, but may not be as useful as the social definition of family continues to evolve. This categorization is beneficial for framing various policies concerned with population.

Task orientation definitions focus on whether certain tasks for family life are performed (Wamboldt & Reiss, 1989). Families are described as a group working towards mutual need fulfillment. Lerner & Spanier, (1978) describe a family as working towards the socialization and nurturance of children. Thus the task oriented definition gives the impression of role and motto of family and its members. On this basis a family can be categorized under backgrounds like professional, educational, religious, economy based etc.
Transactional process definitions view the family as a group of intimates who generate a group identity (Wamboldt & Reiss, 1989). Families therefore have strong ties of loyalty and experience a history and a future together. It concentrates towards various relations and their communication with each other. This type of definition is especially useful for communication scholars because of the strong emphasis on communication as the major vehicle in establishing intimacy (Caughlin, et al., 2011). The interpersonal relationship between the family members, their communication with each other and the social challenges they face as an integrated unit is the basis of this definition.

1.4 Role of Family

Zabriskie and McCormick (2001) stated that families are goal-directed, self-correcting, dynamic, interconnected systems that both affect and are affected by their environment and by qualities within the family itself. The structure, function or relations within the family are often common within a society or a region. They decide the social structure and shape the culture of the society. It is noteworthy that both family and society affect each other. The words goal-directed, self-correcting, dynamic, interconnected etc give family a sense of life. It is only a good family that makes house ‘a home’. In families goals for better living are set, the drawbacks or wrong traditions or superstitions are corrected. Love, compassion, trust and cooperation play positive role and fear, hatred and selfishness play a negative role thus giving family a dynamic look. The family is the basic and important unit of society because of the role it plays in generation of human capital resources and the power that is vested in it to influence individual, households, and community behavior (Sriram, 1993). It is, therefore, a basic unit of study in most social sciences disciplines, such as sociology, psychology, economics, anthropology, social psychiatry, social work or human development.

1.5 Nature and Characteristics of Family

1.5.1 Types of Family

On the basis of family structure families can be classified as nuclear or small family and joint or extended family. (Reiss, 1988) stated that “Nuclear family system is a term used to define a family group consisting of a father, mother and their children. Joint
or extended family system comprises of father, mother, and children, one or more grandparents, an Aunt, an Uncle and even some cousins, live together within the same households”. The size of the nuclear family depends on the number of children in the family where as number of uncles, aunt, cousins and grandparents decide the size of joint or extended family. In developing countries, the joint or extended family system has been the prevalent family system (Mason, 1992). However, in recent times, urbanization has led to alterations in existing family structures in the country, especially the larger cities. It has been suggested that urbanization leads to households becoming less extended and more nuclear and that this trend would be observed in developing countries (Bongaarts, 2001). The situation mentioned by Bongaarts indicates a major social change within the family which is restructuring the society inclining more towards goal specific nature rather than emotional or intimate touch in the relationships.

1.5.2 Types of Families in India

Family may be broadly defined as a unit of two or more persons united by marriage, blood, adoption, or consensual union, in general consulting a single household, interacting and communicating with each other (Desai, 1994).

Figure-1.1 shows the conceptual framework of family structure in India. (Desai, M., 1994)
India is a country of rich cultural heritage crowned with most ancient history. It is all due to the joint family system that preserved and nurtured the culture and customs. Today, the Indian family is subjected to the effects of changes from joint family to nuclear family system mainly due to changes in the economic, political, social and cultural spheres of the society. Census of India (1981) described Indian families comprising largely of nuclear family structure with joint families forming about a fifth of the total households. Kolenda (1987) classified the families into several types of family structures: Single member households (a man or woman in one households), nuclear pair (only married couple), nuclear family (a married couple with or without children) and forms of nuclear family (broken nuclear — a fragment of a former nuclear family, e.g., a widow with unmarried children living together; supplemented nuclear — a nuclear family plus one or more unmarried/separated/widowed relatives of the parents, other than married children), collaterally extended (two or more married couples among whom there is a sibling bond, normally brothers plus their unmarried children), supplemented collateral joint (a collateral joint family with unmarried, divorced, widowed relatives, typically such supplemented relatives are the widowed mother or widower father or an unmarried sibling), lineal extended (two couples between whom there is a lineal link, usually between parents and married son or married daughter), supplemented lineal joint (a lineal joint family plus unmarried, divorced or widowed relatives who do not belong to either of the lineally linked nuclear unmarried brother), lineal collateral joint (three or more couples linked lineally or collaterally, typically, parents and their married sons plus the unmarried children of the couple), supplemented lineal collateral joint (a lineal collateral joint family plus unmarried, widowed, separated relatives who belong to none of the nuclear families lineally and collaterally linked) and an unclassified category.

1.5.3 Family Relationships

Family is a group of people sharing a common roof in general and fulfills commitments to one another. This relationship is made legal by the society. In an effort to recognize the diversity of families Pearson, (1993) defined family as, “an organized, relational transactional group, usually occupying a common living space over an extended time period, and possessing a confluence of interpersonal images that evolve through the exchange of meaning over time”.
The word organized specifies various roles assigned to the family members who as an individual are related to each other with common understanding of rights and duties. The relations are quiet strong and stable over a long period of time. The values, culture and habits are so shared that it represents a common image in each individual.

1.6 “Family” Communications

As discussed earlier members of the family share culture, experiences, feelings, threats with each other through verbal or non verbal conversations. These conversations are the building blocks of communication system. The word communication has its roots in a Latin word “communis” which means common. In terms of social sciences communication means mutual sharing of ideas and feelings. The link between communication and families is created through social interaction of family members. On the other hand to understand family communication it is essential to understand family members and family relationships. Bruner, (1990) stated that “family communication is the mechanism for most early socialization experiences as through interaction with family members most people learn to communicate and, they learn to think about communication”. This is supported by Barrett, (1995) who says that infants engage in social interactions with their primary caregivers. These early interactions are the basis for what later become automated communication behaviors (Cappella, 1991). They also serve as a model for future interactions (Bowlby, 1973). By communicating with close family members, infants and children quickly learn what they should (and should not) anticipate from others. They learn relationships function and they learn to behave in the context of those relationships. Indeed, communication is the means by which rules about social interaction and social relationships are established and maintained (Shimanoff, 1985). Parents use communication to teach children when they should speak, to whom they should speak, and what they should say. These rules shape the way children, and later adults, coordinate meaning with others (Pearce, 1976). Thus family communication is the way in which verbal and non-verbal information is exchanged between family members (Epstein et al., 1993). Communication within the family is extremely important because it enables members to express their needs, wants, and concerns to each other. It
is through communication that family members are able to resolve the unavoidable problems that arise in all families (Peterson & Green, 2009).

1.6.1 Communication system and Family

Communication system plays an integral role in family. Relationship satisfaction in family is the outcome of communication system followed within the family members. In interpersonal and family communication Bowen, (1978) and Gilbert, (1992) have been influential in the emergence of system as a key concept. This particular system theory tends to view change in interpersonal relationships in terms of the systems of interaction between family members. Additionally, in interpersonal communication, the systems perspective takes an interactional view of relationship maintenance by focusing on repeated and interdependent behaviors (Dainton & Zelley, 2005). Finally, the systems perspective has also been adopted by mass communication theorists and media researchers interested in the investigation of media systems (Baran & Davis, 2009).

Systems theory helps clarify how family communication is an important part of effective family functioning (Beavers & Voeller, 1983; Bloom, 1985; Stinnett & DeFrain, 1985; Olson & DeFrain, 1994). Open communication develops stronger relationships within family through an environment of positive change, understanding, and growth.

1.7 Interpersonal communication

Interpersonal communication is communication between individual people. We often engage in interpersonal communication in dyads, which means between two people. It may also occur in small groups such as an individual and its family members trying to figure out a system for household chores.

Communication scholars view interpersonal communication qualitatively; meaning that it occurs when people communicate with each other as unique individuals. It occurs when we communicate to “build knowledge of one another and create shared meanings” (Wood, 1999). Thus, interpersonal communication is a process of exchange where there is desire and motivation on the part of those involved to get to know each other as individuals.
1.7.1 Factors Affecting Interpersonal Communication

Interpersonal communication explore the three primary types of relationships in our lives—friendships, romantic relationships, and family relationships. The most important aspects of interpersonal communication are self-disclosure.

*Self-Disclosure*- Interpersonal communication helps the individuals to know others as unique. The process of revealing information of self to others that is not readily known by them comes under self-disclosure. It plays an important role in establishing mutual understanding.

There are degrees of self-disclosure, ranging from relatively safe (revealing hobbies or musical preferences), to more personal topics (illuminating fears or fantasies). Typically, as relationships deepen and trust is established, self-disclosure increases in both breadth and depth. We tend to disclose facts about ourselves first, and then move towards opinions, and finally disclose feelings.

1.8 Need and Importance of Family Communication

Family scholars have defined the family in a variety of ways. Family structure traditionally refers to a group of members who are related by blood ties and —mutual bonds of love and obligation (Berger, 2002). Galvin and Brommel (1999) broadly defined family as —networks of people who share their lives over long periods of time bound by ties of marriage, blood, or commitment, legal or otherwise, who consider themselves as family and who share a significant history and anticipated future of functioning in a family relationship. This definition is inclusive and consistent with Noller and Fitzpatrick’s view of family (1993).

Noller and Fitzpatrick (1993) focus on transactional processes in the family. The transactional definition of the family —places a very strong emphasis on communication as the major vehicle through which ties of identity and loyalty are forged (Noller & Fitzpatrick, 1993). Family members consist of a group of intimates who have emotional ties and personally and structurally commit to one another. Importantly, family members interdependently interact and share feelings, thoughts, or behaviors (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 2004; Noller & Fitzpatrick, 1993). As a result of such mutual interactions, the family can represent a system in which all parts need to be interrelated and
interdependent to maintain balance (Galvin & Brommel, 1999; Stafford & Dainton, 1995; Yingling, 1995). If one part of the family changes, the rest is affected and has to adjust to reassert a sense of balance. (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 2004)

With the changing lifestyle and economic burden in the past few decades, in the urban households parents may not spend substantial quality time with their children because of their burdens outside the households. Family members may not communicate as much as they should. The relationships among them may not remain strong. Accordingly, children might receive negative influences outside the family and develop undesirable personality traits and behaviors (Booth-Butterfield & Sidelinger, 1998; Dong, 2005; Fitzpatrick et al., 1999). Again, these negative traits and behaviors may affect leadership styles because children carry these personality characteristics and communication styles into adulthood. These personal factors could affect their leadership styles (Hackman, et al., 1999; Rosenfeld & Plax, 1975). The above studies focus towards the importance of family communications failing to which families face interpersonal conflicts, negative traits/behaviours or poor leadership in their family members.

Thus, effective communication remains as a critical variable for family members to succeed in facing extraordinary change. When parents-child communication and relationship is weak, negative environments at home can forge children’s undesirable traits. Some researchers suggest that parents should aim to develop a strong and healthy family communication pattern because it plays a significant role in helping families achieve more flexibility and carry through changes in the modern American life (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 2002; Fitzpatrick, 2004).

1.8.1 Family Communication Patterns (FCP)

Family communication patterns (FCP) first proposed by McLeod and Chaffee (1972) represent the assumption that children’s perceptions of reality and socialization reflect how parents communicate with their children. According to Ritchie and Fitzpatrick (1990), FCP are a set of norms governing the tradeoff between informational and relational objectives of communication. Accordingly there are two patterns- socio orientations or conformity orientation; and concept orientation or conversation orientation.
The *socio orientation* is a parental authoritative pattern in which children are expected to follow the family’s values and avoid arguing with parents.

In *concept orientation*, family members focus on the topics of conversations. Children are allowed to debate a course of action with their parents (McLeod & Chaffee, 1972; Stone & Chaffee, 1970).

Ritchie and Fitzpatrick (1990) argued that socio-oriented questions reflected the use of parental authority to enforce children’s conformity and obedience rather than family harmony, whereas concept-oriented questions reflected —parental supportiveness of children's autonomy and the mutual enjoyment of free and open communication in the family rather than intellectual or conceptual discourse (Huang, 1999). Classifying family communication into two groups has helped scholars understand the environment within each family that leads to individuals, social development (Dong, 2005; McLeod & Chaffee, 1972).

Crossing both patterns, the researchers proposed four family types: pluralistic, consensual, protective, and laissez-faire (Chaffee et al., 1971; Chaffee et al., 1973).

**1.8.2 Family Types**

*Pluralistic Families:* The pluralistic family is high on conversation orientation but low on conformity orientation. Parents are —committed to female equality and believe that personal preference rather than role proscriptions should determine an individual’s behavior (Fitzpatrick, et al., 1996). Parents from these families allow their children to express opinions freely; younger members can make their own decisions without worry as to whether or not it could affect relations with their parents or other older members. Therefore, pluralistic parents and children engage in positive and successful conflict (Fitzpatrick et al., 1996). Children’s decisions appear equal to parents’ or other adults’ (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 2002 a, b; McLeod & Chaffee, 1972).

*Protective Families:* The protective family is low on conversation orientation but high on conformity orientation. Parents from these families believe in male domination in society. Fathers usually engage in masculine traits (assertion, competence, and rationality). According to Fitzpatrick et al. (1996), —these parents expect boys to be less self-restrained and expect girls to be both self-restrained and socially adept. Children should
obey their parents and remain submissive. Because of the high authority of the parents, children from this type of family tend to get influenced and persuaded by others outside the family easily (Fitzpatrick, 2004).

**Consensual Families:** The consensual family is high on both conversation orientation and conformity orientation. Parents believe in traditional gender role ideologies (Fitzpatrick, 1988, cited in Fitzpatrick et al., 1996). To illustrate, men emerge in leadership roles in society, while women — define themselves in relation to the feminine traits of expression, warmth, and nurturance. (Fitzpatrick et al., 1996) Most boys tend to exhibit low level of self-restrain. Therefore, these boys may develop uncooperative behaviors (Fitzpatrick et al., 1996). Overall, parents expect obedience from their children; however they also listen to their children’s opinions. Also, parents try to explain why children should follow the family’s rules and believe in the parents’ decisions (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 2002 a).

**Laissez-Faire Families:** The laissez-faire family is low on both conversation orientation and conformity orientation. Members in these families have low communication because both parents have little in common. (Fitzpatrick et al., 1996) The parents neither expect to hear their childrens’ opinions nor to guide their actions because the parents believe that all family members can make their own decisions. Due to the lack of interactions in the family, the children tend to get influenced by social groups outside the family (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 2002 a; McLeod & Chaffee, 1972).

Family communication has a great role in an individual’s trait development and communication styles which can indicate leadership styles (Hackman et al., 1999; Rosenfeld & Plax, 1975). Therefore, before understanding how FCP can relate to leadership styles, one must explore to what extent FCP influence individuals’ personality characteristics and traits.

### 1.9 Mass communication-Definition

Littlejohn and Foss (2005) define mass communication as “the process whereby media organizations produce and transmit messages to large publics and the process by which those messages are sought, used, and consumed by audiences”. McQuail (1994) states that mass communication is, “only one of the processes of communication
operating at the society-wide level, readily identified by its institutional characteristics”. Simply put, mass communication is the public transfer of messages through media or technology driven channels to a large number of recipients from an entity, usually involving some type of cost or fee (advertising) for the user.

Mass Communication represents the creation and sending of a homogeneous message to a large heterogeneous audience through media. Mass communication studies the uses and effects of the media by many as opposed to the study of human interaction as in other communication contexts.

Group communication has now been extended by the tools of mass communication: the press, radio, television, video and cinema. A lot of discussion has been generated on the power of the mass media (termed by Daniel Learner as mobility multipliers and by Schramm as magic multipliers).

“The sender often is a person in some large media organization, the messages are public, and the audience tends to be large and varied” (Berger, 2002) However, with the advent of outlets like YouTube, MySpace, Facebook, and text messaging, notice that these definitions do not account for the increased opportunities individuals now have to send messages to large audiences through mediated channels.

Mass communication continues to become more integrated into our lives at an increasingly rapid pace. This “metamorphosis” is representative by the convergence occurring (Fidler, 1997) between ourselves and technology, where we are not as distanced from mass communication as in the past. Increasingly we have more opportunities to use mediated communication to fulfill interpersonal and social needs. O’Sullivan (2003) refers to this new use of mass communication to foster our personal lives as “masspersonal communication” where (a) traditional mass communication channels are used for interpersonal communication, (b) traditionally interpersonal communication channels are used for mass communication, and (c) traditional mass communication and traditional interpersonal communication occur simultaneously. Over time, more and more overlap occurs.

“Innovations in communication technologies have begun to make the barriers between mass and interpersonal communication theory more permeable than ever” (O’Sullivan, 2003). Sites such as Facebook, Watsapp, and YouTube, are classic examples
of mass personal communication where we use mass communication to develop and maintain interpersonal relationships.

1.9.1 The traditional focus of mass communications research

To establish the first part of our framework we find it useful to categorize research according to two dimensions: level of analysis, and that which is being studied. The levels of analysis in communications research can be thought of as forming a continuum ranging from micro to macro—from the smallest units of a system to the largest. A micro-level study examines communication as an activity engaged in and affecting individual people; a macro-level study examines social structures beyond the control of any one individual — social network, organizations, and cultures. These levels function hierarchically: What happens at the lower levels is affected by, even to a large extent determined by, what happens at higher levels.

One of the earliest and most often quoted ways of describing the communication process was suggested by Harold Lasswell (1948), who proposed this framework:

Mass communication studies have examined all these elements—the communicator (who); media content (says what); the medium (through which channel); the audience (to whom); and the effects (with what effect)—but most studies have concentrated on the final two elements, audience and effects.

The classic voting study that was conducted by Paul Lazarsfeld and his colleagues in Erie County, Ohio, in 1940 (Lazarsfeld, et al., 1948). Three thousand residents were interviewed about their voting intentions, personal characteristics, and the attention they
paid to newspaper and radio messages about a particular political campaign. The researchers concluded that media messages reinforced (but did not determine) people's political predispositions. Personal characteristics of the audience members were found to determine campaign interest, and audience members were found to have used media selectively to filter out political messages contrary to their preexisting political stances. In this study, as in many others, a number of components were involved ("says what"—campaign messages; "through which channel"—radio and newspapers; "to whom"—voters; "with what effect"—reinforcement); however, the primary focus was on the audience.

1.9.2 Functions of Mass Media

The following are the basic functions performed by the mass media:

1. **Information:** Surveillance of the environment relates to news about the happenings in society. The mass media carry out this function by keeping us informed about the latest events in and around the world.

2. **Entertainment:** Mass media help us relax with family and friends and pass time. They also fulfill our psychological and social needs.

3. **Symbolic Function:** Mass media provide a shared symbolic environment. George Gerbner sees television as the central symbol of American culture.

4. **Development:** The mass media in developing countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America perform the function of facilitators of development communication focusing on the socio-economic needs of the backward sections of society.

5. **Advertising:** This is a commercial function that helps keep the economic status of a country healthy. At the same time it would be suicidal to let this function dominate over the other functions of the mass media.

1.9.3 Effects of Mass Media

The word effects connote different meanings for different people. For e.g. a sociologist talks about social effects, a psychologist has psychological effects in mind while employing the term; an anthropologist - cultural effects, the advertiser - the market effects and so on.
Bernard Berelson arrived at the conclusion that some kinds of communication on some kinds of issues, brought to the attention of some kinds of people under some kind of conditions have some kinds of effects.

**1.10 Significance of the Study**

With the developing character at its core, India stands on the strong foundation of precious Vedic and rich cultural values. Joint families are the strong evidence favouring it. Long marital bonds, strong, open but decent interpersonal communication blended the family members into a single identity of love. With the intervention of mass media, technology and easy access to education, the family values and culture have inculcated Western thoughts too. Various forms of mass communication media have directed the interpersonal communication within the family.

Taking Wilbur Schramm’s model of mass communication as the basis, the study explores – what happens to the messages received from mass media? Whether or not these messages form in the interpersonal communication of the recipients? If yes, with whom these messages are shared? Do issues of media become interpersonal issues of the families? Do family issues get reflected in media? The study seeks to find answers to the above questions with the help of pragmatic data.

The Uses and Gratifications approach (Katz, 1970) reminds us that people use media for many purposes as media users become increasingly confronted with choices. Lull’s television research found that families used television for communication facilitation, relationship building, intimacy, and for structuring the day.

In general researchers have found four kinds of gratifications:

1. **Information** – One wants to about society and the world to satisfy curiosity.
2. **Personal Identity** – One watches the television in order to look for models to follow.
3. **Integration and Social Interaction** – One uses media in order to explore the circumstances of other people and to empathize and sympathize with the lives of others
4. **Entertainment** – One simply uses the media for enjoyment, relaxation or just to fill time.
Researchers have proved that interpersonal communication within the family has been shifted from interpersonal disclosure to various events or serials being broadcasted through radio or telecasted through T.V. Further, this can be practically observed in the research by Seymour Feshbach, who concluded that the group that watched an aggressive film of a brutal boxing match, it was found that those students who had seen the aggressive film felt less hostile to their experimenters than those who had seen the control film. This is strengthened by “The Magic Bullet or Hypodermic Needle Theory” that says that the mass media had a powerful influence on the mass audience and could deliberately alter or control peoples' behaviour. After a thorough literature review it is concluded that most of the studies have been done in foreign countries and media intervention in interpersonal communication in Indian context still needs to be explored.

It is evident that studies have been done relating mass communication to interpersonal communication but family has not been studied in detail.

The theory advocated that the sole purpose of mass media was to educate the great masses of workers and not to give out information. The public was encouraged to give feedback as it was the only way the media would be able to cater to its interests.

1. Cognitive needs (acquiring information, knowledge and understanding);  
2. Affective needs (emotional, pleasurable experience);  
3. Personal integrative needs (strengthening self image);  
4. Social integrative needs (strengthening self image);  
   a) library storage of movies and shows  
   b) watching music videos  
   c) Using exercise tapes  
   d) renting movies  
   e) letting children view  
   f) time-shifting  
   g) Socializing by viewing with others  
   h) Critical viewing including TV watching and studying tapes
1.11 Statement of the Problem

Interface between interpersonal communication and mass communication in family system: a survey.

1.12 Major objectives of the Study

To evaluate-

1. acquaintance of mass media sources and its uses in the family system.
2. time spent by individual family members with mass media sources.
3. the choice of content in mass media sources among family members in two age groups.
4. the interface in interpersonal communication in families.
5. the interface in interpersonal communication in family system on contents and information received through mass media communication.
6. the interface between interpersonal communication and mass communication on day-to-day discussion of issues on content and information received through various media sources.
7. the degree of credibility and acceptability of mass media communication sources in family interpersonal communication.