



Developments in Communication Theory

A review of the following books: *Communication Theory* by Ernest Bormann; *Human Communication Theory: The History of a Paradigm* by Nancy Harper; *Explorations in Interpersonal Communications* by Gerald Miller; *Persuasion: New Directions in Theory and Research* by Michael Roloff and Gerald Miller; *I Am An Impure Thinker* by Eugen Rosenstock-Huussy; *Speech and Reality* by Rosenstock-Huussy; and *Intercultural Communication* by Lawrence E. Sarbaugh. Publishing information on page 71.

EUGENE D. TATE *University of Saskatchewan*

Those of us who graduated from graduate programs in communication around 1970 did not realize at the time that our discipline was entering a transitional stage of development. During the early seventies we rapidly discovered that our training in communication theory was obsolete. The discipline changed rapidly in theory and methodology. New developments in theory, most of which we had been introduced to in graduate school, became the foci of the discipline. Multivariate analysis became *the* methodological necessity if one wanted to publish in reputable journals such as HUMAN COMMUNICATION RESEARCH. This we had not been prepared for in the graduate programs of the sixties.

During the sixties the social psychological paradigm for the study of communication still held the attention of scholars. We analyzed carefully the recent developments in attitude theory. We looked closely at the current research on attitude change. By 1974 communication scholars had almost stopped doing attitude change research.¹ Attitude theories popular in the sixties, e.g., dissonance theory, congruity theories, etc., were inadequate to carry forward the research. It was now understood that persuasion was not a one-shot phenomenon.² Gradually we came to understand that persuasion is supported by a complex relationship of variables which simplistic, linear attitude theories could never explain.

In the late sixties and early seventies, convention sessions for the Speech Communication Association and the International Communication Association, were filled with papers attempting to define communication, analyze the focus of the discipline, and pondering the reasons why communication scholars did not quote other communication scholars or publish in SCA and ICA journals. It is now apparent that these were the adolescent years for the discipline of communication in the United States. During the seventies communication journals have come of age. They are now widely respected in the social sciences and there are fewer quotations from

journal articles in Sociology, Psychology, Social Psychology and Political Science.³

Communication studies in Canada, however, are at a different stage of development. They are a more recent development. In 1970 the program at Simon Fraser was just developing along with the programs at McGill, Windsor, Saskatchewan, and Concordia. Only now is the discipline in this country beginning the adolescent identity crisis which communication studies in the U.S., Great Britain, and Germany have already undergone.⁴

At a recent University Council meeting in Saskatoon, for example, a professor arose to attack the Educational Communications Department (which was formed in the mid-sixties) stating that there was no such academic discipline as communication. Such a statement reflects the state of the art in Canada. It is beliefs such as this which make the creation of the Canadian Communication Association so important.

Similarly the recent article⁵ in the Canadian Journal of Communication was so reminiscent of the papers at SCA and ICA meetings around 1970 that I was moved to put it into proper perspective. I, and one assumes many others, found myself saying, "Hey, I've been over this road before. Is it necessary that we go over it again?" The answer appears to be that it is necessary for us to repeat the efforts of the past.

At the C.C.A. conference in Montreal one heard comments about the *new* discipline of communication which "has developed from social theory." Are Canadian scholars so uninformed that they are unaware of the more than twenty-five century tradition of communication theory? Do they not know that in the Medieval University communication, then called Rhetoric, was one of the seven Liberal Arts? In the Medieval University it was unthinkable to have a course of study which did not include studying the communication process!

The books reviewed here, with two exceptions, are recent additions to the communications theory literature. Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy, the exception, is a scholar who has based his entire social theory upon communication theory but has been overlooked by scholars in this discipline. Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy has been called on of the seminal thinkers of the Twentieth Century by W.H. Auden. He began his life work in dialogue with Franz Rosenzweig and Martin Buber in Germany. While Rosenzweig and Buber have become well known, the work of Rosenstock-Huessy has been generally overlooked.⁶

This is unfortunate because Rosenstock-Huessy has made communications the focal point of his social theory. He argues that communication is the central process for human life. In his essay, "Farewell to Descartes," Rosenstock-Huessy shows that Descartes' COGITO ERGO SUM—"I think therefore I am"—while supportive

of the physical sciences can only lead to a false social science. He shows clearly that the basic reality of life is RESPONDEO ET SIMILITER MUTABOR—"I respond although I will be changed." Response to other people, God, nature, is the central reality of life. We come to know ourselves, conceive of ourselves, and develop a self-concept only in response, in communication with other people. Therefore, the basic human reality is not 'thought' as Descartes taught, or 'faith' as Anselm of Canterbury postulated, but communication/response.

While Martin Buber maintains that the human posture is two-fold—I Thou and I-It—depending upon the word-pair spoken to the other, Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy, utilizing a grammatical analysis, described a four-fold stance. "Speech," says Rosenstock-Huessy, "sustains the time and space axes of society. Grammar is the method by which we become aware of this social process."⁷ Rosenstock-Huessy utilizes 'grammar' as the methodology with which the social sciences must be developed. Social science can only be construed upon an analysis of how people speak and listen since it is in the manner that they construct reality.

The four-fold stance of human life arises from the manner in which one is addressed and addresses other people. One may conceive of this as a multidimensional space which the analysis of speech patterns describes. In the first place one hears her/himself addressed as THOU.⁸ Our response to this address causes us to discover the I, the inward, subjective, singular self. As we return the gift of having been addressed we form a dual, a WE, as in marriage, the family and other attachments of life. Finally, as one participates in the outside world, in the many groups which one becomes a member of, such as professional or business groups, one becomes known in the third person, a SHE/HE. This represents the recognition and maturity one obtains in the work world.

These four orientations of reality: inward, forward, future, and past, become the paradigm upon which Rosenstock-Huessy developed his sociological, psychological and theological writings. SPEECH AND REALITY outlines the basic premises of his thought while the essays in I AM AN IMPURE THINKER expand this into education, sociological analysis, and psychological reflection upon his own life and work. Communication is central to Rosenstock-Huessy's understanding of human life. As Clinton Gardner writes in his introduction to the first book, "it is speech which creates inward and outward space (I and HE) as well as backward and forward time (WE and THOU)."⁹

Nancy Harper in HUMAN COMMUNICATION THEORY traces the development of communication theory from ancient Greece through the Nineteenth Century. Oral communication was important to the citizens of Greece in 500 B.C. It was in this social milieu that Corax of Syracuse 'invented' communication theory. His student

Tisias introduced communication theory to the citizens of Athens in approximately 428 B.C. Plato wrote two dialogues, *Gorgias* and *Phaedrus*, in which Socrates first attacked communication theory and then developed his own theory. Aristotle focused upon it in his book *RHETORIC*. The theory has flourished, developed in the minds of countless scholars such as Cicero, Augustine, Boethius, The Venerable Bede, Leonard Cox, Frances Bacon, Descartes, Pascal, Fenelon, Thomas Sheridan, David Hume, Joseph Priestley, Gilbert Austin, Thomas DeQuincy, and Richard Whately, to only name a few of the scholars Harper discusses. Even John Quincy Adams, who taught communication theory at Harvard before his election to the U.S. presidency, is discussed in this encyclopediac book.

Harper divides the vast history which she surveys into three periods. The first period, Classical, extends from 500 B.C. to 400 A.D. The second, the Medieval and Renaissance Period, extends from 400 A.D. to 1000 A.D. The final period covered in detail by Harper is The Modern Period, approximately 1000 A.D. to 1900. In her final chapter in which she draws together the various aspects of communication theory, Prof. Harper links the various themes discussed by past scholars with communication theorists and researchers at work today. Thus she is able to show how themes discussed by Aristotle, or Thomas DeQuincy, have been explored in present communication theory.

In each chapter Nancy Harper first briefly outlines the major theorists and their work for the period being discussed. She then relates their work to the five-fold paradigm of communication theory first developed by Roman scholars (Invention, Style, Arrangement, Memory and Delivery). Harper has used this paradigm as the central analytical tool in her book although she has renamed the five 'arts'. She chooses to call them Categorization, Conceptualization, Symbolization, Organization, and Operationalization. The paradigm describes the communication process. The individual (1) selects data which is classified and stored for future use (categorization), (2) gives some meaning to this data (conceptualization), (3) encodes the meaning into symbols (symbolization), and (5) delivers the message in some suitable physical form (operationalization). This paradigm becomes the framework by which Harper analyzes each period of theory development in communication. The use of the paradigm gives a structure to the book which is helpful to the reader.

By ending her analysis at 1900 Harper does not consider the rejection of Cartesian thought by Rosenstock-Huessy and the Non-Aristotelian Revolution introduced by Korzybski, Kurt Lewin, and others into communication theory. Harper's book is an exposition of the Aristotelian and Cartesian mode of scientific analysis. Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy challenges the communication scholar to develop a non-Cartesian paradigm on which to base the study of communication behavior.

A similar challenge was given by David K. Berlo in his short review of communication theory published in the first COMMUNICATION YEARBOOK.¹⁰ Berlo argued that the S-R paradigm under which communication research was conducted during the 1960's and its expanded S-O-R paradigm are inadequate for an understanding of human behavior. Recent research and psychological theory has shown that people not only respond to messages from other people but they organize and construct their own reality prior to the response. For Berlo a proper understanding of process leads one to accept a view of human beings which emphasizes their ability to organize the world as well as react to it.

As long as we focus on questions of induced compliance, and the corresponding emphasis on communication as productive change (*instruction* and *persuasion*), cause as control seems feasible. As we have turned to less "do it to others" processes (reporting, negotiating, counseling, planning, imagining, playing) S-R theories or even S-O-R theories simply cannot account for the data... We are turning more to cognitive information processing, creating and maintaining social relationships of an enduring and satisfying nature, and procedures for monitoring and depicting complex information-communication systems. Given those interests we can't afford to ignore the wealth of data in the introspective reports of both subject and researcher.¹¹

In 1970 communication scholars defined interpersonal communication as persuasion. Given the centuries of the Rhetorical tradition which focuses upon persuasion as the sole rationale for communication, it is natural that it took scholars some time to break away from this emphasis. The authors whose articles are collected in Gerald R. Miller's book, *NEW DIRECTIONS IN INTERPERSONAL COMMUNICATION*, have broken with the traditional emphasis upon persuasion in the study of interpersonal communication. They understand that interpersonal communication is relational communication. The focus of attention is now upon individual people in relationship with one another. People who are involved in a transaction.

Previous research defined the individual communicator as 'source' or 'receiver' but in relative isolation from other communicators. The famous S-M-C-R model developed by David Berlo¹² stressed the interdependence of the communicators but did not necessitate taking interdependence seriously when studying source traits, message characteristics, channel distortion, or code systems which would produce the desired effect in the receiver. The research inspired by the Rhetorical tradition emphasized the *CONTENT* of the message while

the new research focuses upon the RELATIONAL aspects of the message. Thus a more complete understanding of interpersonal communication is developed.

The articles collected in this book are basic to an understanding of the new directions being taken in interpersonal communication theory development. Cushman and Craig develop the framework for the change in paradigm which became necessary in expanding the scope of interpersonal communication. Morton, Alexander and Altman demonstrate that the proper unit of analysis is the social relationship. Millar and Rogers discuss the theoretical foundation of a coding system to analyze relational development. The system was developed by Robert Mark with modifications by Ericson, Millar, Rogers, et. al. It is based upon the theoretical framework of Watzlawich, Beavin and Jackson.¹³ Other articles trace the development of relationships through the various stages beginning with getting acquainted to ending the relationship.

The article by Gilbert analyzes the role of self-disclosure in the development of a relationship. Gilbert argues that there is a curvilinear relationship between self-disclosure and satisfaction with an interpersonal relationship. This is counter to the predictions of Jourard who argued for a linear relationship, i.e., the more the self-disclosure the greater one's satisfaction. Gilbert's research has shown the curvilinear relationship to be more common. "Consequently, the far end of the disclosure continuum may be characterized more by a reciprocity of disclosure which goes beyond satisfaction with the relationship, as it is typically operationalized, to include an *affective response of acceptance and commitment, in its deepest form, of not only the disclosures but of the person making them*" (emphasis in original).¹⁴ Thus it may be that future researchers will have to examine other dimensions of relationships than simple satisfaction ratings.

One of the problems with this book is the manner in which various authors use the term "information". Duck, a British psychologist, especially talks about information transferral during the communication transaction. Duck is not alone among these authors many of whom talk about information being transferred between people. Information cannot be transferred between people. It is a potential in any message for reducing uncertainty.

It would be much better to conceive of interpersonal communication within the attribution process. Messages from another person help one to attribute certain characteristics—beliefs, attitudes, values—to them thus reducing uncertainty about them. Information cannot be transferred from person to person but exists as a potential for any message to reduce uncertainty. David Berlo has pointed out in several articles¹⁵ that only patterned matter-energy is transferable during the communication transaction. To speak of

information transfer is to confuse the process of communication with a mechanical transfer between two person of some type of substance.

Ernest G. Bormann begins his book, *COMMUNICATION THEORY*, by surveying the development of rhetorical and communication theory since 1900. Bormann draws upon the work of Thomas Kuhn to analyze the paradigms and quasi-paradigms which scholars have utilized to develop communication theory. Instead of three levels of theory development as Kuhn described the growth of theory in the natural sciences, Bormann describes four levels of development.

According to Bormann the first level is the discussion of natural phenomena and social realities. The second level is the discovery of style-specific theories which are used to guide practice and criticism. At this level Bormann places rhetorical theories on how to create specific effects in an audience, descriptions of 'exemplar communication' in debate or particular communities, model development, e.g., Berlo's SMCR model, and social psychological theories of communication such as Balance theory. The third level of theory development provides a scientific analysis of human behaviour based on laws or regularities in communication behavior. The fourth level is the philosophical and historical study of communication theory. It is at this level that Bormann is attempting to work in this book.

Bormann rejects social scientific attempts to study communication in favor of an humanistic approach based upon rhetorical theory. Much of his book is given over to an analysis of Dramatism and Fantasy Analysis as the paradigm for the third level of communication theory development. Fantasy Analysis has been developed by Ernest Bormann to focus upon the communication process by which "human beings coverge their individual fantasies, dreams, and meanings into shared systems."¹⁶

The convergence viewpoint provides an assumptive system for the analysis of messages in order to discover the manifest content of fantasy themes and evidence that groups of people have shared the symbolic interpretations implied by them. The shared fantasies may begin to cluster around common scripts or types, and when members of the community allude to such shared scripts they provide further evidence that the symbol systems are shared. Once a community has shared a number of fantasies, they often integrate them by means of some organizing principle such as a master analogy into a coherent rhetorical vision.¹⁷

This type of analysis is only one of three types of dramaturgical analysis discussed by Bormann. The dramatism of Kenneth Burke and Hugh Duncan is presented along with the work of Erving Goffman as

alternative forms of analysis utilizing a humanistic perspective. He also examines several types of historical analysis arising from the seminal work of Herbert A. Wichlens who wrote his essay on historical criticism of oratical movements in 1925.

Bormann saves his heaviest and most scornful criticism for the social psychological paradigm (quasi-paradigm) of cognitive consistency. Actually he is attacking the variable analytic studies of the late fifties and sixties in persuasion but he also has no time for an "idealized image of the individual human being (which posits) and essentially logical person who strives for cognitive consistency."¹⁸ Yet he provides no rationale for any necessity for human beings to share common fantasies or even engage in fantasy creation. One is left to wonder why human beings 'fantasize', that is have a need to understand past and future events, and share these 'fantasies, dreams, meanings' with other people so that they develop a shared symbol system. Cognitive social psychologists, among whom this reviewer would place himself, are now discussing Attribution Theory which argues that human beings do precisely what Fantasy Analysis says they do and provides a theoretical rationale for this behavior.

Bormann goes to some length to prove that he is not biased against the social scientific study of communication. While he is willing to give the benefit of the doubt to Kenneth Burke and other rhetorical scholars for their inadequacies while developing mature theories, he does not seem to apply the same benefits to social scientific research. No one would argue that the operationalization of variables in studies done during the fifties or sixties was adequate. In the same manner that Burke's early formulations of dramatism were lacking in completeness, the early empiricists did not completely understand how to examine the communication process. Bormann's assertion that the empiricists attempted to apply a mechanistic model of behavior upon process is more to the point. David Berlo had poignantly made this same point in his review essay which Bormann quotes in his book. Bormann assures us in the text and again in a footnote that he is not biased against the social sciences. He sees a role for empirical research which investigates under controlled conditions premises developed by the rhetorical (humanistic) scholar.

Given this minor weakness in his presentation, Ernest Bormann's book is an excellent source of examining the trends in theory development within the communication sciences. In recent years attention has turned away from the governing paradigm to seek rules and generalizable statements about communication behavior. Bormann surveys each of the schools of thought now examining communication. Having learned during the past thirty years that predictions made by futurists are most often wrong, Bormann does not attempt to predict where the field of communication will go in the next thirty years. Rather he is content to suggest several avenues which

seem promising for the development of communication theory including systems theory, the examination of communicator style and persuasive message strategies, as well as the Illinois studies on the development of communication competence in children which has been characterized as 'constructivism.'

In **PERSUASION: NEW DIRECTIONS IN THEORY AND RESEARCH**, Michael Roloff and Gerald R. Miller have collected a series of essays which examine the persuasion literature and suggest new approaches to it. Miller introduces the topic by defining persuasion or being persuaded as applying to "situations where behavior has been modified by symbolic transactions (messages) which are sometimes, but not always, linked with coercive forces (indirectly coercive) and which appeal to the reason and emotions of the person(s) being persuaded."¹⁹ He then turns his attention to specifying the three types of behavioral modification which persuasion may induce in the audience. Three behavioral outcomes are distinguished: a) being persuaded as a response-shaping process, b) as a response reinforcing process, and c) as a response-changing process. The first is an educational process in which the individual being persuaded does not know how to react to a situation. The agenda setting effect of the mass media would appear to fit this type of behavioral response. The second is the most common and is utilized in sermons, political speeches, addresses at Learned Society meetings, etc. The final one is the one which most people associate with persuasion yet is the most difficult and short lived without reinforcement. The current campaign for modification of energy usage is an example of a persuasive attempt to modify behaviour of the population at large.

Other chapters of this books examine the role of self-awareness in persuasion, situational variables which may affect persuasiveness, cognitive responses to persuasion, and communicator acceptability. Burgoon and Bettinghaus contribute a chapter which summarizes the most recent research findings concerning persuasion and message strategies. One of the most interesting chapters is Robert Bostrom's analysis of altered psychological states and persuasion. He examines the effects of caffeine, tranquilizers, depression, tobacco, alcohol, amphetamines and cannabis upon the central nervous system and the effects each has upon persuasability. For example, the simple act of having a drink increases the susceptibility of one to persuasion but drinking alcohol reduces it. Consequently a salesman who takes a client for a drink loses the benefit if the drink is alcoholic. Caffeine, on the other hand, enhances persuasion as the individual attributes the effects of caffeine to the persuasive appeal and not the coffee or cola.

The final five chapters of the book examine persuasion in various situations. Charles Berger examines the concept of power within the family. James Tedeschi and Paul Rosenfeld discusses communication

in bargaining and negotiation while Norman Fontes and Robert Burdens summarize the persuasion process during a court trial Robert Chestnut looks at consumer information processing research which is the new paradigm that advertisers and marketing experts are beginning to utilize to examine persuasion in marketing. Finally Charles Atkins examines the research on persuasion in political campaigns. Each of these chapters presents the advances which have been made in understanding the process of persuasion and suggests new avenues for research. *Certainly one of the failings of persuasion research in the 50's and 60's was the linear, one-shot appeal paradigm which was utilized. Persuasion is never a one-shot deal with a simple appeal making people rush out to purchase a new product or deliver a desired verdict in the courtroom. It is extremely important that communication scholars begin to take seriously the complexity of the persuasion process.*²⁰

Lawrence E. Sarbaugh's book, *INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION*, should be of special interest to Canadians who take multiculturalism seriously. Sarbaugh begins by discussing the various components of the model of intercultural communication which he wishes to develop. He draws upon his extensive experience as a counselor for foreign students at Michigan State University, leader of A.I.D. workshops, and teaching experience in various countries to illustrate his concepts.

Topics which Dr. Sarbaugh discusses in the opening chapters are (a) the openings of communications—how does one get the attention of the other person, etc. (b) code systems, (c) belief systems with appropriate beliefs about the world, people, relationships between people, and intention. He defines each of these and illustrates how they may differ from culture to culture. These are important factors which must be considered when one moves from one culture to another. I remember vividly a student advisee of mine who was threatened with dismissal because when people asked him how he was each morning, he took time to tell them. He simply did not understand the Canadian gesture of "Hi, how are you?" and mistook it for genuine concern and interest.

The heart of this book is in chapter three where Dr. Sarbaugh draws these various components together into a communication taxonomy. This model for understanding intercultural communication allows for the various complexities of understanding, values, and expectations which the participants possess. The taxonomy moves from homogeneity of culture to heterogeneity allowing each variable to vary in degree. Thus the model helps one to understand that while values, world views, and perceived intention may be the same, participants may differ on norms and expectations.

The taxonomy is fully developed through a series of generalizations

about intercultural communication. Each proposition develops from one portion of the taxonomy. Thus Sarbaugh provides the beginnings of a theory of intercultural communication. The final third of the book contains a series of case studies which are analyzed utilizing the taxonomy and propositions. The case studies vary from a husband and wife discussing a common problem (comparatively homogeneity of culture) to traveling in a country where one does not speak the language or a professor discussing a problem with members of a minority community (heterogeneity of culture). The final chapter is written to help a person live and work in a culture other than the one which they grew up in as a child. The advice given in this chapter is very practical but based upon the previous discussion. Lawrence Sarbaugh has provided the student of communication with a very useful theory which is applied to the intercultural arena.

These books have focused upon interpersonal communication and the development of communication theory. They do not refer directly to mass communication. However one must understand interpersonal communication before they approach the area of mass communication. An understanding of the problems within the interpersonal communication process will keep one from making exaggerated claims about the power and influence of mass communication. Uses and gratifications theory²¹ is one mass communication theory which take seriously the communication problems of meanings, listening, perception, structure of belief systems, and the social environment.

Harper and Bormann's surveys of communication theory development indicate that we are entering a period of major theoretical development. There are several books, not at present available to this author, which could have been included in the review because they present a communication theory from the rules perspective. Communication journals are now publishing articles examining the communication theory of Habermas,²² Marxist perspectives,²³ and theoretical developments in Europe.²⁴ The WESTERN JOURNAL OF COMMUNICATION has devoted two or three issues simply to various approaches to communication theory.

Kurt Lewin²⁵ described three stages of theory development in the social sciences. The first stage he called the Aristotelian stage because it focused upon developing a Grand Theory based upon Aristotelian principles. A major theory or paradigm was sought which would explain human behavior utilizing laws which apply to all cases. The exception is understood to prove the rule so that general behavior is important and the individual is ignored.

The second stage of development is one in which scholars ignore theories and undertake a mass of unrelated empirical research projects. Here the emphasis is upon the collection of data and little

attempt is made to synthesize the data into any type of theory. During this stage theory development is scorned and ridiculed.

The third stage is one of synthesis and the development of rules to explain behavior. Lewin called this stage the Galilean stage. The Grand Theories of the first stage are dismissed as impractical and impossible. Rather one seeks to develop general rules of behavior. Variable analytic studies which were carried out in the first and second stages (epoch, is Lewin's term) are set aside. Instead scholars seek to develop general rules of behavior which take into account the inter-relationship of all aspects of life.

Communication, as an academic discipline, is now entering this third stage of development. Instead of one major paradigm (Marxian, Freudian, Economic) which will explain all communication behavior, we are beginning to understand that communication is a multi-paradigm science.²⁶ Aristotelian principles cannot help us develop the social science of communication. Rosenstock-Huessy is quite right that a social science must be developed on non-Cartesian principles. Communication must take into account all behavioral and environmental circumstances which affect interaction between people. In 1938 Kenneth Burke reacted to the Marxist rejection of his developing theory of Dramatism in words which are still valid.

Both Freud and Marx were "impresarios." Marx's concept of the "classless" stage following a maximum intensification of class conflict is *precisely* in line with the Aristotelian recipe for the process of dramatic "catharsis." The shock value of Freudian analysis exemplified the same process in tiny "closet dramas" of private life (the facing and burning-out of conflict).²⁷

Kenneth Burke, like Harold Innis, has taken seriously economic and psychological perspectives to advance them to a new level of Dramatism. As one recent scholar has commented, "Dramatism dialectically advances Marxism and Freudianism, linking insights from economics and psychology to transcend both through a new understanding of roles and strategies, of process-categories."²⁸

We began this essay by commenting upon the stage of development in Canadian communication studies. As we enter our adolescent stage of development—endlessly defining, redefining, and analyzing communication theory and research in this country, let us draw upon all of the possible paradigms available to us. As I read Bormann's discussion of Fantasy Analysis, for example, it struck me that here is a useful theory to analyze the 'myths,' themes, fantasies which underlie Western and Quebec separatism. I do not wish to suggest that they have similar themes underlying them but do support Bormann's contention that such a movement depends upon common fantasies

shared by most in the community to exist. Last Fall the Saskatoon STAR-PHOENIX published a political cartoon from 1925 showing Eastern Canada gorging itself at the trough of Western Canada. A theme which has existed since the early 1900's and is even more common today in the energy debate within this country. The themes of Eastern domination, control, and greed for Western resources are commonly shared in the West but little understood in the East. Fantasy Analysis allows for the description and discussion of the historical development of such regional movements and can advance our understanding of Canadian society. The 1925 cartoon illustrates the role of the media in communicating a 'fantasy' which is developing within the community it is serving.

In COMMUNICATION YEARBOOK II, Brent Rubin discusses a personal experience of his which gives insight into the problem faced by many Canadian communication scholars. He reports the remarks of a British sociologist who had attended the I.C.A. conference in Berlin. Coming from the discipline of Sociology this scholar found himself lost at the conference because of the communication perspective shared by the majority of scholars in attendance. He simply did not know what they were talking about in their papers and discussion groups.

The comments heard at the Montreal meeting of C.C.A. were similar to those made by others. Most of us have come from disciplines other than communication, e.g., Sociology, Psychology, Political Science, Anthropology, Film Studies, etc., and still prefer to borrow from the paradigms utilized by these disciplines. Yet as both Harper and Bormann demonstrate, there is a very rich theoretical tradition in communication which is over twenty-five centuries old. Our diversity can, and undoubtedly will, create a discipline of communication which is diverse and rich in its insights into Canadian life. It is hoped we can escape some of the infighting which has raged between the empiricists and the humanists in the United States. In the United States these two warring factions have begun to negotiate peace and seek ways to work together.

At the same time communication scholars in the United States are, and have been, very ethnocentric and narrow in their perspective and knowledge of communication research being done outside of their country. We must continue to seek ways to expand their horizons. We must not allow their ethnocentrism to become an excuse for our own ethnocentrism. Our Canadian discipline is at a different level of development from theirs and perhaps we can learn how to avoid many of the pitfalls and battles which they have struggled through in Communication.

Finally allow me to make one related observation about Fantasy Analysis. Communication scholars are not the only persons who are conducting such research. Certainly those scholars who have been

inspired by the French scholar Levi-Strauss to examine the mythic structure of a culture conducting related research. The Swedish theologian and philosopher Anders-Nygren and the British scholar, Philip S. Watson, also conducted similar research in theology. Anders Nygren's concept of motif research is directly related to Bormann's concept of Fantasy Analysis.²⁹ Having studied with Philip Watson this has always struck me as the most rational theological undertaking. Communication scholars have much in common with scholars in other sciences, such as Theology, and can learn from their common pursuits.

Footnotes:

1. Gerald R. Miller and Michael Burgoon, "Persuasion research: Review and commentary," *Communication Yearbook II*. (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Books, 1978.) pp. 29-47.
2. Herbert W. Simons, *Persuasion: Understanding, Practice, and Analysis*. (Don Mills, Ont.: Addison-Wesley Publ. Co., 1976).
3. My own survey of communication journals indicated this and Bormann found the same thing in his survey. See Bormann, pp. 3-21, 240.
4. See *Communication Yearbook II* and *Communication Yearbook II* for summaries of research and theory development in European countries.
5. Joan. S. Homer, "The spectrum of communication," *Canadian Journal of Communication*, 1979, 6 (3), 34-51.
6. Although I remember when I began my honours thesis in philosophy on Martin Buber in 1957 only *I And Thou* was generally known to scholars on this continent until the publication of Herberg's collection of Buber's writings and Friedman's book outlining his work. Today practically every communication textbook contains some reference to Martin Buber. See especially, John Stewart and Gary D'Angelo, *Together: Communicating Interpersonally*.
7. Eugen Rosenstock-Huussy, *Speech and Reality*, p. 16.
8. The English language is deficient in descriptive relational terminology since even Buber's most recent translator has felt bound to use 'you' for the German DU while keeping the old English Thou in the title.
9. Clinton Gardner in *Speech and Reality*, p. 7.
10. David K. Berlo, "Communication as process: Review and commentary," *Communication Yearbook I*, pp. 11-27.
11. *ibid.*
12. David K. Berlo, *The Process of Communication*. (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1960.) p. 72.
13. Paul Watzlawich, Janet Beavin and Don Jackson, *The Pragmatics of Human Communication*. (New York: Norton, 1967).
14. Shirley J. Gilbert, "Empirical and theoretical extensions of self-disclosure," in Miller (Ed.) *Explorations in Interpersonal Communication*, p. 212.
15. David K. Berlo, "Essays on Communication," mimeographed Michigan State University, 1969-1970. See also David K. Berlo, *Information and Communication*. (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1975).
16. Ernest G. Bormann, *Communication Theory*, p. 189.

17. *ibid.*
18. *ibid.*
19. Gerald R. Miller, "On being persuaded," in Miller and Roloff (Eds.) *Persuasion*, p. 15.
20. Simons, *op. cit.* See also Erwin Bettinghaus, *Persuasive Communication*. (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1980.)
21. Jay G. Blumler and Elihu Katz, editors. *The Uses of Mass Communications: Current Perspectives on Gratifications Research*. (Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1974. See also Eugene D. Tate, "Viewers perceptions of selected television programs." *Report of the Royal Commission on Violence in the Communications Industry*, Volume VI: 283-401. 1976.
22. Brant B. Burleson and Susan L. Kline, "Habermas' theory of communication: A critical explication," *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 1979, 65 (4), 412-428.
23. Dallas W. Smythe, *Dependency Road: Communications, Capitalism, Consciousness and Canada*. (Norwood, N.J.: Ablex Publ. Corp, in press.)
24. *op. cit.*, *Communication Yearbooks III and IV*.
25. Kurt G. Lewin, *Principles of Topological Psychology*. (New York: McGraw Hill Publ. Co., 1936.)
26. See especially Gerald R. Miller, "The person as actor—cognitive psychology on the attack," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 1976, 62(Feb.), 86-87.
27. Kenneth Burke, "Twelve propositions by Kenneth Burke on the relation between economics and psychology," *Science and Society*, 1938, 2 (Spring), 246.
28. Michael Feehan, "Kenneth Burke's discovery of Dramatism," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 1979, 65 (4), 405-411.
29. See especially Anders Nygren, *Meaning and Method: Prolegomena to a Scientific Philosophy of Religion*. (1970) Philip S. Watson, "Theologians of our time: VIII. The Scientific Theology of Anders Nygren," *The Expository Times*, 1963 (July) 74 (10), 300-304. Philip S. Watson, "Systematic theology and motif research," in Kegley (Ed.) *The Philosophy and Theology of Anders Nygren*. (Carbondale, Ill: Southern Illinois University Press, 1970) pp. 223-236.

Publishing information on books reviewed in this essay.

- Bormann, Ernest G. *Communication Theory*. New York: Holt Rinehart & Winston, 1980.
- Harper, Nancy, *Communication Theory: The History of a Paradigm*. Rochelle Park, N.J.: Hayden Book Co., 1979.
- Miller, Gerald R., *Explorations in Interpersonal Communication*. Beverley Hills Ca.: Sage Publications, 1976.
- Roloff, Michael E., and Miller Gerald R., *Persuasion: New Directions in Theory and Research*. Bev. Hills, Ca.: Sage Publications, 1980
- Rosenstock-Huessy, Eugen. *I Am An Impure Thinker*. Norwich Vt.: Argo Books, 1970.
- Rosenstock-Huessy, Eugen. *Speech and Reality*. Norwich Vt.: Argo Books, 1970.
- Sarbaugh, Lawrence E. *Intercultural Communication*. Rochelle Park, N.J.: Hayden Book Co., 1979.