THE PRINCIPLES OF ENGLISH LITERATURE AND COMMUNICATIVE EDUCATION

H.L.Narayana Rao
Research Scholar, Bhagwant University, Ajmer.

Dr.Pooja Begde
Govt. Excellence H.S.S. Vidisha.

ABSTRACT: *Interpersonal communication can be conducted using both direct and indirect mediums of communication such as face to face interaction, as well as computer-mediated-communication. Successful interpersonal communication assumes that both the message senders and the message receivers will interpret and understand the messages being sent on a level of understood meanings and implications*

KEYWORDS: English literature, commutative, Interpersonal communication

INTRODUCTION

Interpersonal communication: Usually defined by communication teachers in numerous ways describing participants who are dependent upon one another and have a shared information. It can involve one on one conversation or individuals interacting with many people within a society. It helps us understand how and why people behave and communicate in different ways to construct and negotiate a social reality. While interpersonal communication can be defined as its own area of study, it also occurs within other contexts like groups and organizations. Overall, interpersonal communication can be conducted using both direct and indirect mediums of communication such as face to face interaction, as well as computer-mediated-communication. Successful interpersonal communication assumes that both the message senders and the message receivers will interpret and understand the messages being sent on a level of understood meanings and implications. Communication channels, the conceptualization of media that carry messages from sender to receiver, take two distinct forms: The direct and indirect.

The Direct channels

Direct channels are obvious and easily recognized by the receiver. Both verbal and non-verbal information is completely controlled by the sender. Verbal channels rely on words, as in written or spoken communication. Non-verbal channels encompass facial expressions, controlled body movements (police present hand gestures to control traffic), colour (red signals 'stop', green signals 'go'), and sound (warning sirens) etc.

The Indirect channels

Indirect channels are usually recognized subconsciously by the receiver, and are not always under direct control of the sender. Body language, comprising most of the indirect channel, may inadvertently reveal one's true emotions, and thereby either unintentionally taint or bolster the believability of any intended verbal message. Subconscious reception and

interpretation of these signals is often described with arbitrary terms like gut-feeling, hunch, or premonition.

The Social exchange theory

Social exchange theory falls under the symbolic interaction perspective. The theory predicts, explains and describes when and why people reveal certain information about themselves to others. Social exchange theory argues the major force in interpersonal relationships is the satisfaction of both people's self interest. Theorists say self interest is not necessarily a bad thing and that it can actually enhance relationships. According to the theory human interaction is like an economic transaction, in that you may seek to maximize rewards and minimize costs. You will reveal information about yourself when the cost-rewards ratio is acceptable to you. As long as rewards continue to outweigh costs a couple will become increasingly intimate by sharing more and more personal information. The constructs of this theory include discloser, relational expectations, and perceived rewards or costs in the relationship.

The Symbolic interaction

Symbolic interaction comes from the socio-cultural perspective in that it relies on the creation of shared meaning through interactions with others. This theory focuses on the ways in which people form meaning and structure in society through interactions. People are motivated to act based on the meanings they assign to people, things, and events. Symbolic interaction argues the world is made up of social objects that are named and have socially determined meanings. When people interact over time they come to shared meaning for certain terms and actions and thus come to understand events in particular ways. There are three main concepts in this theory: society, self and mind.

1) Society: Social acts (which create meaning) involve an initial gesture from one individual, a response to that gesture from another and a result.

2) Self: Self- image comes from interaction with others based on others perceptions. A person makes sense of the world and defines their "self" through social interactions. One 's self is a significant object and like all social objects it is defined through social interactions with others.

3) Mind: Your ability to use significant symbols to respond to yourself makes thinking possible. You define objects in terms of how you might react to them. Objects become what they are through our symbolic minding process.

Constructs for this theory include creation of meaning, social norms, human interactions, and signs and symbols. An underlying assumption for this theory is that meaning and social reality are shaped from interactions with others and that some kind of shared meaning is reached. The boundary conditions for this theory are there must be numerous people communicating and interacting and thus assigning meaning to situations or objects.

The Relational dialectics theory

In order to understand relational dialectics theory, we must first understand specifically what encompasses the term *discourse*. Therefore, discourses are "systems of meaning that are uttered whenever we make intelligible utterances aloud with others or in our heads when we

hold internal conversations". Now, taking the term *discourse* and coupling it with Relational Dialectics Theory, it is assumed that this theory "emerges from the interplay of competing discourses".

The three relational dialectics

In order to understand relational dialectics theory, one must also be aware of the assumption that there are three different types of relational dialectics. These consist of (1) connectedness and separateness, (2) certainty and uncertainty, and (3) openness and closeness.

Connectedness and separateness

Most individuals naturally desire to have a close bond in the interpersonal relationships we are a part of. However, it is also assumed that no relationship can be enduring without the individuals involved within it also having their time alone to themselves. Individuals who are only defined by a specific relationship they are a part of can result in the loss of individual identity.

Certainty and uncertainty

Individuals desire a sense of assurance and predictability in the interpersonal relationships they are a part of. However, they also desire having a variety in their interactions that come from having spontaneity and mystery within their relationships as well. Much research has shown that relationships which become bland and monotonous are not desirable.

Openness and closeness

In close interpersonal relationships, individuals may often feel a pressure to reveal personal information. This assumption can be supported if one looks at the postulations within social penetration theory, which is another theory used often within the study of communication. This tension may also spawn a natural desire to keep an amount of personal privacy from other individuals. The struggle in this sense, illustrates the essence of relational dialectics.

1. The Exploratory affective stage: Next, in the exploratory affective stage, individuals become somewhat more friendly and relaxed with their communication styles.

2. The Affective exchange: In the third stage, the affective exchange, there is a high amount of open communication between individuals and typically these relationships consist of close friends or even romantic partners.

3. The Stable stage: The stable stage, simply consists of continued expressions of open and personal types of interaction. Also important to note, is the fact that due to current communicative exchanges involving a high amount of computer mediated contexts in which communication occurs, this area of communication should be addressed in regard to Social Penetration Theory as well. Online communication seems to follow a different set of rules. Because much of online communication between people occurs on an anonymous level, individuals are allowed the freedom of foregoing the interpersonal 'rules' of self disclosure. Rather than slowly disclosing personal thoughts, emotions, and feelings to others, anonymous individuals online are able to disclose personal information immediately and without the consequence of having their identity revealed.

The Relational patterns of interaction theory

Relational Patterns of Interaction Theory of the cybernetic tradition, studies how relationships are defined by peoples' interaction during communication. Gregory Bateson, Paul Watzlawick, et al. laid the groundwork for this theory and went on to become known as the Palo Alto Group. Their theory became the foundation from which scholars in the field of communication approached the study of relationships among the group.

CONCLUSION

I would share, an example of Social Penetration theory, which can be seen when one thinks of a hypothetical situation such as meeting someone for the first time. When two individuals meet for the first time, it is the cultural expectation that only impersonal information will be exchanged. This could include information such as names, occupations, of the conversation participants, as well as various other impersonal information. However, if both members participating in the dialogic exchange decide that they would like to continue or further the relationship; with the continuation of message exchanges, the more personal the information exchanged will become more familiar for each other.

REFERENCES

Littlejohn, S. (1996). Theories of human communication (Ed 5). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.

Watzlawick, P., Beavin, J., & Jackson, D. (1967). Pragmatics of Human Communication: A Study of Interactional Patterns, Pathologies, and Paradoxes (pp. 120 – 121). New York: Norton.

Beavin, J. (1990). Behaving and communicating: a reply to Motley. Western Journal of Speech Communication, 54, 593 – 602.

Imahori, T. & Cupach, W. (1993). Identity management theory: communication competence in intercultural episodes and relationships. In Wiseman, R. L. & Koester, J., (Eds.), Intercultural Communication Competence (pp. 112 – 31). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Berger, C. R., Calabrese, R. J. (1975). Some Exploration in Initial Interaction and Beyond: Toward a Developmental Theory of Communication. Human Communication Research, 1, 99–112.

Foss, K. & Littlejohn, S. (2008). Theories of Human Communication, Ninth Edition. Belmont, CA.