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CHAPTER I- INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND OF STUDY

The importance of functionalism and uses and gratification as research designs can best be understood by taking a brief look at the history of mass communication research. Katz, Blumler, and Gurevitch (1974) point out that if one was studying opera in 19th century Italy the emphasis would probably be on "social and psychological functions and perhaps long-run effects" (p. 19), but that it was short-run effects, however, that mass communication research began to study first. Katz, Blumler, and Gurevitch explain when they state:

We have all been over the reasons why much of mass communication research took a different turn, preferring to look at specific programs as specific messages with, possibly, specific effects. We were social psychologists interested in persuasion and attitude change. We were political scientists interested in new forms of social control. We were commissioned to measure message effectiveness for marketing organizations, or public health agencies, or churches, or political organizations, or for the broadcasting organizations themselves. And we were asked whether the media were not causes of violent and criminal behavior. (p. 20)

The emphasis was on the sender and the message and the effect of the message on the receiver. Bauer (1964) states that "in
this period, effects for the most part were not studied: they were taken for granted" (p. 320). It soon became obvious, however, that effects could not be taken for granted.

Carl Hovland, a psychologist from Yale and a student of the experimental psychologist Clark Hull, was the head of a research group for the Research Branch of the Information and Education Division of the War Department during World War II. Hovland and his fellow researchers were charged with the task of testing the effectiveness of War Department films and film strips. The films and film strips were intended to accomplish one or both of two purposes. The first was to educate the soldier and to impart certain skills such as map reading. The second purpose was to change the soldier's attitudes and opinions relative to American participation in the war. Joseph T. Klapper (1954) sums up the findings of this research in the following way:

In brief, all media products and all devices investigated were found to be highly effective in communicating information and imparting skills. All were, however, found to be very much less effective, and at times wholly ineffective, in modifying opinions or in increasing motivation. (p. 294)

Lazarsfeld, Berelson, and Gaudet (1948) studied the process of how a voter makes his or her choice during an election. The 1940 presidential election was chosen and Erie County, Ohio, was selected as the site for the study. The research was conducted as a panel study, with the panel
consisting of 600 respondents chosen at random with three groups of 600 acting as a control. The researchers found that very few people changed their intentions on whom they were going to vote for, and those few who did so attributed it to personal influence. Of those who were undecided, personal influence also played a large part in their subsequent decision. Lazarsfeld, Berelson, and Gaudet state:

For example, people who made up their minds later in the campaign were more likely to mention personal influences in explaining how they formed their final vote decision. Similarly, we found that the less interested people relied more on conversations and less on the formal media as sources of information. (p. 151)

It was from these findings that Lazarsfeld, Berelson, and Gaudet proposed the Two-step Flow Theory of mass communication, which posits that mass communication messages do not have a direct effect but are filtered through a process of personal influences.

Though field studies were having trouble finding media effects, the same was not true of experimental studies done under more or less laboratory conditions. Bauer (1964) states:

The experimenters generally had no trouble conveying information or changing attitudes. Of course nobody stopped to record very explicitly the main finding of all the experiments: that communication, given a reasonably large audience, varies in its impact. It affects some one way, some in the opposite way, and some not at all. (p. 320)

It is obvious that this difference between field and labora-
tory studies had to be reconciled in some manner. Bauer states that "more recently, pursuing the same theme, I stated Hovland's major point as being that the audience exercises much more initiative outside the laboratory than it does in the experimental situation" (p. 320). Bauer goes on to point out that the audience is very active in the selective process of mass communication.

The realization that the audience was an important factor in the mass communication process led to a series of investigations into why an audience attends to a particular mass medium. Many of these early studies were included in Lazarsfeld and Stanton's two volumes of Radio Research and their one volume of Communication Research. These studies have had the label "functional" attached to them, but that is an issue that will be dealt with later in this paper. It is from this orientation that uses and gratification studies came into existence.

Research began to take another direction away from effects and into the study of mass communication as a sociological structure and process. Merton (1949) and Lasswell (1948) provided an early framework from different orientations of functionalism. Wright (1960) combined the two orientations into one typology. According to Charles Wright (1974) functionalism has become a major force in mass communication research. Wright states:
In a recent survey of the historical development of mass media studies, Brown (1970:55) observes that "there has recently been something of a vogue for the use of Merton's paradigm of functional analysis in the mass media field." Even more recently, F. Gerald Kline (1972), in a constructive review of theory in mass communication research, states: "It would appear that, in general, the major leitmotif of communication research has been functionalist from the beginning...(and) we are using functional analysis as described by Merton and cited by Wright (1960)." (p. 198)

Uses and gratification has also enjoyed some success as a research method. This success is, in part, explained by Carey and Kreiling (1974), who state:

The assumption that audiences formulate their intentions in an actively structuring perceptual process came chiefly from the various streams of functional and Gestalt psychology. Not surprisingly, the uses and gratifications approach received wide acclaim among communications researchers about the same time as cognitive dissonance theory and various other psychological equilibrium models surfaced in modern psychology. (p. 228)

PURPOSE AND IMPORTANCE OF STUDY

The purpose of this study is to compare and contrast functionalism and uses and gratifications. This study is made imperative by the tendency among some researchers to fail to draw a clear line between the two orientations. Lometti, Reeves, and Bybee (1977) list the functions of Wright (1960) along with those found by McQuail, Blumler, and Brown (1972). Katz, Blumler, and Gurevitch (1974) list the functions found by Lasswell (1948) and Wright along with
those found by such uses and gratifications researchers as McQuail, Blumler, and Brown and Katz, Curevitch, and Haas (1973). The assumption seems to be that functionalism and uses and gratifications are dealing with the same thing or, at least, that the term function means the same thing in both orientations. The often confusing relationship between functionalism and uses and gratifications will be examined later in this chapter in a survey of the literature.

For the purpose of this study, both theory and empirical research will be examined. This study, however, does not attempt to deal with all of the literature that has been written on these two orientations. In addition to the fact that much of this literature is difficult to find, the sheer undertaking would be of such a magnitude as to make such a study unfeasible in a paper of this scope. What has been done, however, is to restrict this paper, for the most part, to the major theorists and researchers of the two orientations. Basically, the yardstick that has been used for the inclusion of a theorist or researcher is, first of all, whether this person's work is deemed important by other researchers; and whether their work has had any impact on latter theorists and empirical researchers. The only exceptions to this is in the empirical research where studies are included because they use methods that are indicative of other functional and uses and gratifications studies.
For the most part, I was able to take the researcher’s own word as to whether they were functionalists or uses and gratification researchers. In the few instances where it was not stated, such as in the early empirical research, operational definitions were used for determination.

Functionalism is derived from the social sciences use of functional or structural analysis, where it was used in sociology by such people as Robert K. Merton and in anthropology by Claude Levi-Strauss and others. Functionalism, as it pertains to mass communication, is primarily concerned with structure and the purposes and consequences of this structure for society. In this way the functionalist is concerned with the relationship between sender, message, and receiver; but the emphasis is placed more with the sender and message than it is with the receiver.

Uses and gratifications, however, is primarily concerned with patterns of mass media consumption and the satisfaction of individual needs. There is a concern with the relationship between the message and the receiver but the emphasis is placed on the receiver. The purposes of mass communication are from the orientation of the individual and not society.

The importance of this study is, in many ways, tied in with the importance of these orientations to mass commu-
nication research in general. There has been a good deal of theory and research written about both functionalism and uses and gratifications; but, as of yet, there have been few attempts to synthesize and codify this information. Because of this, misunderstandings and mis-statements have been compounded. This can best be shown by taking a survey of the literature that discusses both uses and gratification and functionalism.

SURVEY OF THE LITERATURE

There have been researchers and theorists who have pointed to the differences between functionalism and uses and gratifications. Charles Wright (1960) states:

There is no reason, however, why future audience research might not bear directly upon the functional issue at hand, especially as such research illuminates the multiple uses to which the mass media are put and the varied gratifications and annoyances that people experience while getting the news. (p. 620)

It appears that Wright feels that uses and gratifications has some benefit for functionalism but at the same time is a separate area of research, noting that "it seems singularly appropriate that this volume at long last brings together the challenge of the two orientations toward communication explicitly formulated by Katz and Blumler on the one hand, and myself on the other" (1974, p. 210).

Katz and Foulkes (1962) also make a distinction between the two orientations, when they state:
The study of uses and gratifications represents a bridge to two major sources of ideas that have remained largely untapped in empirical mass media research. One of these, obviously, is functional theory. Klapper and Wright have illustrated the applicability of Merton's functional paradigm to mass media behavior, and there is little doubt that it will easily overtake the behavioristically oriented stimulus-response type of theory that has been prevalent heretofore. (p. 379)

Once again a distinction is made between functionalism and uses and gratifications. At the same time a relationship between the two orientations is pointed out. In both Wright and Katz and Foulkes, both a difference and a relationship are referred to but not explained in any depth.

Jean Cazeneuve (1974) discusses functionalism but does not really distinguish between functionalism and uses and gratifications. He describes functionalism in the following manner:

To say that television has a function or functions could simply mean that in order to understand the relationship effected between the transmission source, the programs, and the ultimate destination, the viewers, we must first ask ourselves what audience members seek in these programs and why they are motivated to watch them. That is, we have to find out what needs these programs fill and what satisfactions they bring to their public. (p. 213)

According to the operational definitions already outlined, what Cazeneuve is describing is not functionalism but uses and gratifications. This is because the emphasis is placed on the individual's use of the media and not on the purposes and consequences of the structure on society.
Carey and Kreiling (1974) attempt to bring popular culture studies and those of uses and gratifications closer together. In doing so they point to a close relationship between functionalism and uses and gratifications. They state:

Implicitly or explicitly, research on uses and gratifications relies on functionalism for whatever intellectual underpinnings it possesses. This reliance on functionalism is not merely a product of the narrow history of mass communications research but reflects, more importantly, the general history of the social sciences, particularly when the social sciences attempt to deal with artifacts and expressions that are explicitly symbolic. (p. 233)

Carey and Kreiling spend a great deal of the time discussing uses and gratifications and functionalism without clearly defining their terms. The authors condemn uses and gratifications for its functional base, but at the same time they never clearly delineate the relationship between the two orientations. At times Carey and Kreiling appear as if they are not distinguishing between the two orientations. They state that in "most studies such value judgments are introduced through the very nature of functionalism, through the very language used to explore audience orientations 'on their own terms' and to name audience needs" (p. 230). Carey and Kreiling conclude their article by saying that if uses and gratifications is going to treat popular culture, it will have to divorce itself from its functional base and to cast off "its naive and underdeveloped aesthetic theory, and its simplistic utilitarianism" (p. 242). Once again a
relationship is pointed to but not clearly defined.

Phillip Elliot (1974) is primarily concerned with presenting a critique of the uses and gratification approach to audience research. He does, however, point out a relationship between functionalism and uses and gratifications. Elliot states:

Finally, the approach raises all the problems commonly associated with functionalism, and more besides since it is based on a peculiarly individualistic variant of functionalism. Because of the inferences involved, the argument that use leads to gratification of needs is at best circular and at worst imprisons research within a stable system of functional interdependencies from which there is no escape. (p. 253)

Once again a relationship is referred to without a clear explanation as to exactly what that relationship is.

It appears that there is a consensus that uses and gratifications and functionalism share some type of relationship. If we accept Wright's and Katz and Foulkes' contention that they are separate and distinct orientations and not two names for the same theory, then we are left with the question of what exactly that relationship is. It is of little help to turn to those researchers who have dealt with this relationship; for, as we have seen, they tend to present contradictory information. It would appear that the best way to clear up this issue would be to go back to the original literature of both areas and to trace, from the beginning, the basic tenets of each area. Only then
can we compare and contrast the two orientations in order to find out exactly what the relationship is between uses and gratifications and functionalism. The following chapter deals with the theory and empirical research of functionalism. That is followed by a chapter on the empirical research and basic assumptions of uses and gratifications. The paper will then conclude with a chapter comparing and contrasting the two orientations and offering some areas for further research.
CHAPTER II- FUNCTIONALISM

THEORY

Contributing to the uncertain relationship between functionalism and uses and gratifications, is the confusion that exists within functionalism itself. Many researchers refer to functionalism as if it were a codified orientation. This proves not to be the case when we examine more closely the orientation of functionalism. The functionalism of Robert K. Merton (1949) is not the same thing as that outlined by Harold D. Lasswell (1948). These two researchers appear to be coming from different orientations within functionalism. Charles Wright (1960,1974) attempts to reconcile the two orientations but with varying degrees of success, as we shall see later in this chapter.

It is important to understand that functionalism, as it pertains to mass communications research, arose from other disciplines in the social sciences, particularly sociology and anthropology. Merton's theory on functions can be applied to "a standardized (i.e., patterned and repetitive) item" (p. 50). This, of course, does not restrict its use to mass communication. It should also be noted that
Lasswell was addressing himself to the functions of communication and not specifically mass communication. The purpose of this chapter is to examine the writings of Merton, Lasswell, and Wright and to show how their theories have been combined to form a functional theory of mass communication.

Robert K. Merton

In his seminal essay *Manifest and Latent Functions*, Merton outlines the major points of his paradigm for functional research and analyzes the state of functionalism at that time. He was especially critical of the functionalism that grew out of anthropology.

Merton points out a weakness in functional analysis that has persisted to this day, when he states:

Functional analysis is at once the most promising and possibly the least codified of contemporary approaches to problems of sociological interpretation. Having developed on many intellectual fronts at the same time, it has grown in shreds and patches rather in depth. (p. 21)

Merton goes on to identify method as the weakest link in the triple alliance of theory, method, and data. This is an issue that will be covered in greater depth later in this paper.

Merton also addresses the problem of the confusion of terms as it relates to the functional approach in soci-
ology. Merton states that "too often a single term has been used to symbolize different concepts, just as the same concept has been symbolized by different terms. Clarity of analysis and adequacy of communication are both victims of this frivolous use of words" (p. 22). Merton offers evidence to support his contention by pointing out that there are, at least, five definitions of function used in sociology and in common usage. It can mean a social event, occupation, "duties assigned to the incumbent of a social status" (p. 23), or "a variable considered in relation to one or more variables in terms of which its own value depends" (p. 23). The fifth and last definition of function is the one that is most appropriate to this study. It stems from the mathematical definition, but is more explicitly adapted from the biological sciences, where the term function "is understood to refer to the vital organic processes considered in the respects in which they contribute to the maintenance of the organism" (p. 23). Merton clarifies this point in discussing Radcliffe-Brown's conception of social function. Merton states:

After the fashion of Durkheim, he (Radcliffe-Brown) asserts that "the function of a recurrent physiological process is thus a correspondence between it and the needs... of the organism." And in the social sphere where individual human beings, "the essential units", are connected by networks of social relations into an integrated whole, "the function of any recurrent activity...is the part it plays in the social life as a whole and therefore the contribution it makes to the maintenance of the structural continuity. (pp. 23-24)
It will be shown that even this last definition is open to several interpretations depending on which perspective we take: that of society or the individual organism.

In addition to a single term having diverse concepts, functionalism also suffers from having a single concept that has diverse terms. Merton states:

The large assembly of terms used indifferently and almost synonymously with "function" presently includes use, utility, purpose, motive, intention, aim, consequences. Were these and similar terms put to use to refer to the same strictly defined concept, there would, of course, be little point in noticing their numerous variety. But the fact is that the undisciplined use of terms, with their ostensibly similar conceptual reference, leads to successively greater departures from tight-knit and rigorous functional analysis. (pp. 24-25)

By way of explanation, Merton points out that the motive for marriage (love, personal reasons) cannot be confused with the function of the family (socialization of the child). Merton states that "whenever it mistakenly identifies (subjective) motives with (objective) functions, it abandons a lucid functional approach" (p. 26).

Merton delineates three basic assumptions that functionalists have postulated. For the most part they come from the anthropological school and, according to Merton, have served to restrict empirical studies of a functional nature.

The first postulate is that cultural items are functional for the entire social or cultural system. Radcliffe-
Brown (1935) states:

The function of a particular social usage is the contribution it makes to the total social life as the functioning of the total social system. Such a view implies that a social system (the total social structure of a society together with the totality of social usages) in which that structure appears and on which it depends for its continued existence, has a certain kind of unity, which we may speak of as a functional unity. We may define it as a condition in which all parts of the social system work together with a sufficient degree of harmony or internal consistency, i.e., without producing persistent conflicts which can neither be resolved nor regulated. (p. 397)

Merton points out that an item that is functional for one group might, in some cases, be dysfunctional for other groups within the same society. Merton asserts that anthropologists "often cite 'increased solidarity of the community' and 'increased family pride' as instances of functionally adaptive sentiments" (p. 29). Yet, as Merton points out, an increase in pride among individual families often serves to disrupt the solidarity of a small community. Merton explains this assumption of functional unity among anthropologists as coming from the fact that, for the most part, the cultures studied were pre-literate and not "large, complex and highly differentiated literate societies" (p. 29).

Merton uses religion as an example and states:

Deriving from the Durkheim orientation which was based largely upon the study of non-literate societies, these authors tend to single out only the apparently integrative consequences of religion and to neglect its possibly disintegrative consequences. (p. 30)
The second postulate is that all standardized social or cultural forms have positive functions. Some theorists, such as Kluckhohn, attach functions to items that appear to be non-functional. Kluckhohn (1944) states:

The at present mechanically useless buttons on the sleeve of a European man's suit subserve the "function" of preserving the familiar, of maintaining a tradition. People are, in general, more comfortable if they feel themselves as following out the orthodox and socially approved forms of behavior. (p. 47)

Merton points out that this type of hypothesis "falls back upon a type of function which would be found, by definition rather than by inquiry" (p. 32). Merton further clarifies his position when he states:

This universal functionalism may or may not be a heuristic postulate; that remains to be seen. But one should be prepared to find that it diverts critical attention from a range of non-functional but theoretically and practically important consequences of existing cultural forms. (p. 32)

The third postulate of functionalism is functional indispensability. Merton counters this by stating that "just as the same item may have multiple functions, so may the same function be diversely fulfilled by alternative items" (p. 35). This is particularly relevant to the study of mass communications, where there are new items competing with older and more traditional forms to fulfill some of the same functions.

One of the major criticisms of functionalism is that
it is conservative and basically teleological in orientation. Carey and Kreiling state that "these issues raise that long standing charge about which functionalists are most touchy—that their methodology is conservative and defensive of the status quo" (p. 231). The basic reason for this charge is the tendency of some researchers in functionalism to center on the positive, integrative functions. Merton answers this charge by implying that, as a method, functionalism is inherently neither conservative nor radical and "may involve no intrinsic ideological commitment; although, like other forms of sociological analysis, it can be infused with any one of a wide range of ideological values" (p. 40). Merton diffuses the argument of functionalism as conservative teleology by insisting that systems can be functional for one group and dysfunctional for others. He also points out that functions produce both intended and unintended consequences. In this way, the concentration is not on the positive, manifest function and, because of this, is not an automatic defense of the status quo.

Merton distinguishes between two types of functions: manifest and latent. According to Merton, manifest functions refer to the consequences for a specific unit. These functions contribute to the adaption of the group and, therefore, are intended. In contrast, latent functions are "unintended and unrecognized consequences of the same order" (p. 63).
Merton (1948), along with Paul Lazarsfeld, applied functional analysis to mass communication in an article entitled *Mass Communication, Popular Taste and Organized Social Action*. Though Merton and Lazarsfeld state that mass media serve many functions, they chose to restrict themselves to three latent functions: status conferral, the enforcement of social norms, and narcotization.

Status conferral occurs when an individual's or group's status is increased simply because of mass media coverage. As Lazarsfeld and Merton point out: "recognition by the press or radio or magazines or newsreels testifies that one has arrived, that one's behavior and opinions are significant enough to require public notice" (p. 101). They further explain the process when they state:

The operation of this status conferral function may be witnessed most vividly in the advertising pattern of testimonials to a product by "prominent people"...Such testimonials not only enhance the prestige of the product but also reflects prestige on the person who provides the testimonials. They give public notice that the large and powerful world of commerce regards him as possessing sufficiently high status for his opinion to count with many people. In a word, his testimonial is a testimonial to his own status. (p. 101)

This is a latent function because it is an unintended consequence, a by-product of mass media exposure. It is interesting to note that status conferral is intrinsically neither good nor bad, but it is dependent on the individual instance of status conferral. This differs greatly from the
intrinsically good manifest functions.

The second latent function was the enforcement of social norms. This function closes the gap between public morality and private attitudes. Merton and Lazarsfeld point out that "many social norms prove inconvenient for individuals in the society. They militate against the gratification of wants and impulses" (p. 103). As a result there exists a private toleration of the violation of such norms. But this can exist only as long as one does not have to take a public stand. Public denunciation, however, forces everyone to take a stand for or against the group norms. There is pressure exerted for a single rather than a dual morality and there is a call for the reaffirmation of the group norms. Lazarsfeld and Merton state:

In a mass society, this function of public exposure is institutionalized in the mass media of communication. Press, radio, and journals expose fairly well known deviations to public view, and as a rule, this exposure forces some degree of public action against what was privately tolerated. The mass media may, for example, introduce severe strains upon "polite ethnic discrimination" by calling public attention to these practices which are at odds with the norms of non-discrimination. At times the media may organize exposure activities into a crusade. (p. 103)

Once again Merton and Lazarsfeld are identifying a latent function, one that has unintended consequences.

The third function outlined by Merton and Lazarsfeld is, in actuality, a dysfunction. The authors state that "it
is termed dysfunctional rather than functional on the as-
sumption that it is not in the interest of modern complex
society to have large masses of the population politically
apathetic and inert" (p. 105). The name of this dysfunction
is narcotization and it operates in the following manner.
In order to inform the public in an increasingly complex
society, there is a great deal of information being spread
through the various mass media. Merton and Lazarsfeld state:

Exposure to the flood of information may serve to narcotize rather than energize the
average reader or listener. As an increasing need of time is devoted to reading and listen-
ing, a decreasing share is available for organized action. The individual reads accounts
of issues and problems and may even discuss alternative lines of action. But this rather
intellectualized, rather remote connection with organized social action is not activated.
The interested and informed citizen can con-
gratulate himself on his lofty state of in-
terest and information and neglect to see
that he has abstained from decision and action.
(pp. 105-106)

In this way people make the mistake of confusing knowledge
with action. One can feel informed and concerned with social
issues without actually becoming involved. Merton and Lazars-
feld contend that, in this way, the individual can maintain
a clear conscience. They state:

He is concerned. He is informed. And he has
all sorts of ideas as to what should be done.
But, after he has gotten through his dinner
and after he has listened to his favored
radio programs and after he has read his
second newspaper of the day, it is really
time for bed. (p. 106)

It must be pointed out that all three of these func-
tions are presented in theory and are not empirically tested. In fact, though Merton identifies method as the weakest link in functionalism, he does little to strengthen it. He says little about how functions are to be tested empirically. Despite this weakness, Merton's work on functionalism is extremely important because of the framework it provides for later functionalists, such as Charles Wright. In addition, Merton's work is important because it moved functionalism away from dealing with only the positive and intended functions of an item and into an area more adapted to the study of the consequences of an item on the social structure. The positive, integrative type of functionalism found in cultural anthropology was, however, adapted to communications by Harold D. Lasswell.

Harold D. Lasswell

The functionalism of Lasswell appears to correspond quite closely with the definition of function that has been adapted from the biological sciences and forms many of the basic tenets of such cultural anthropologists as Radcliffe-Brown. Lasswell (1948), in fact, draws an analogy between modern society and a biological organism when he states:

The single-celled organism or the many-membered group tends to maintain an internal equilibrium and to respond to changes in the environment in a way that maintains this equilibrium. The responding process calls for specialized ways of bringing the parts of the whole into harmonious action. Multi-celled animals specialize cells to
Lasswell views society as an organism striving to keep in balance. This balance is maintained through the functions that are fulfilled by communication. These functions are: 1) the surveillance of the environment, 2) the correlation of the parts of society in responding to the environment, and 3) the transmission of the social heritage from one generation to the next.

The surveillance function informs the organism of the environment. Within highly differentiated organisms the function is accomplished through specialization as exemplified by organs such as the eye and ear, and the nervous system. In animal societies this specialization is carried through and certain members might be called upon to survey the environment and act as sentinels for the good and protection of the society. This same function is fulfilled in human society by certain specialists since the environment has become increasingly complex. It is no longer enough to rely on the individual's sensory apparatus to survey the environment. This is especially true in today's society where national and international events effect the individual's life to such a great degree.

The function of internal correlation is carried on in reaction to the surveillance of the environment. Lasswell states that "when the stimuli receiving and disseminating
patterns operate smoothly, the several parts of the animal act in concert in reference to the environment ('feeding', 'fleeing', 'attacking')" (p. 39). This relationship is further explained by Lasswell with an analogy of an animal society. He states:

Individuals act as "sentinels", standing apart from the herd or flock and creating a disturbance whenever an alarming change occurs in the surroundings. The trumpeting, cackling, or shrilling of the sentinel is enough to set the herd in motion. Among the activities engaged in by specialized "leaders" is the internal stimulation of "followers" to adapt in an orderly manner to the circumstances heralded by the sentinels. (p. 39)

The last function outlined by Lasswell is the transmission of social heritage from one generation to the next. It is also the function that Lasswell spends the least amount of time explaining. The first two functions are obvious in their relationship to each other and their applicability to both the single organism and society as a whole. The last function is a little less obvious. In lower forms of the animal kingdom the function would appear to be fulfilled more by DNA and instinct than by any real teaching process. In higher forms, however, the teaching process is necessary to insure that the youth's surveying of the environment will be consistent with their correlation of the environment. This is particularly important in complex societies where the number of possible reactions are multiplied greatly.

These three functions should not be thought of as
separate and distinct since they are all parts of a process that, like a machine, needs all of its parts to run smoothly. It is Lasswell's contention that, though communication is the mode for all of the functions, we have developed specialists to perform each of the functions. He states:

When we examine the process of communication of any state in the world community, we note three categories of specialists. One group surveys the political environment of the state as a whole, another correlates the response of the whole state to the environment, and the third transmits certain patterns from the old to the young. Diplomats, attaches, and foreign correspondents are representative of those who specialize on the environment. Editors, journalists, and speakers are correlators of the internal response. Educators in family and school transmit the social inheritance. (p. 40)

Though he does not identify them as such, Lasswell seems to come close to identifying latent functions when he is discussing the inefficiency of communication. One inefficiency is when "in the interest of a scoop, the reporter gives a sensational twist to a mild international conference, and contributes to the popular image of international politics as chronic, intense conflict and little else" (p. 47). Lasswell also points out that often the communicator chooses words that fail to communicate precise meanings. Another variable that effects efficiency of communication is personality structure. Lasswell states that people of like personality structure tend to seek each other out. Pessimists tend to seek out pessimists, optimists seek out optimists, and so forth. In this way each might gain an uncorrected and exag-
erated viewpoint. Power, wealth, and respect are also variables that influence the efficiency of communication.

Perhaps the most striking examples of power distortion occur when the content of communications is deliberately adjusted to fit an ideology or counter ideology. Distortions related to wealth not only arise from attempts to influence the market, for instance, but from rigid conceptions of economic interest. A typical instance of the inefficiencies connected with respect (social class) occurs when an upper class person mixes only with persons of his own stratum and forgets to correct his perspective by being exposed to members of other classes. (pp. 47-48)

Lasswell is, however, primarily concerned with positive, manifest functions: surveillance, correlation, and transmission of cultural heritage. His own analogy of the biological organism seems to conjure up the spectre of conservatism. If the functions of communication contribute to the well-being of the organism, there seems to be little reason to proceed much further in the examination. Robert K. Merton counters the biological orientation when he states:

That all human societies must have some degree of integration is a matter of definition and begs the question. But not all societies have that high degree of integration in which every culturally standardized activity or belief is functional. (1949, p. 28)

As examples of biological organisms that are loosely integrated, Merton cites the example of the starfish and the sea anemone. The starfish, when placed on its back, suffers from a breakdown between the surveillance and correlation functions. A portion of the starfish's arms move in one direction,
tion while the rest are moving in the other direction, working against the efforts of the starfish to restore equilibrium. In the case of the sea anemone, it is not uncommon for it to pull away while it is still anchored to a rock, causing severe rupture. In this way there is a breakdown in the functional framework that is not in the best interests of the organism. In a complex society there would appear to be even more opportunity for breakdowns of this type.

The basic problem presented by Lasswell's typology is that we are presented with manifest functions that seem to negate investigation of any meaningful design. Organisms survey the environment, correlate this information to the various parts of the organism, and then transfers the social and cultural heritage to the offspring. What seems simple on one scale, when we are talking about a one-celled organism, where the functions are automatic and, in some cases, chemical; becomes exceedingly complex when we expand it to include a large organism, such as a social institution or society itself. The concern with manifest functions might, in fact, lead to a dead-end for the social scientist. Robert K. Merton echoes this problem when he states:

The distinction between manifest and latent functions serves further to direct the attention of the sociologist to precisely those realms of behavior, attitude and belief, where he can most fruitfully apply his special skills. For what is his task if he confines himself to the study of manifest functions? He is then concerned very largely with determining whether a practice insti-
The importance of Lasswell's typology is that on a manifestly functional level he implies that mass communication provides positive functions for society. As we have seen earlier, this runs counter to the prevailing studies of mass communication at that time, which viewed it either as an agent for attitude change or as an item of popular culture. The implication of Lasswell is that mass communication might, indeed, be accomplishing very important things for society. Though he is stating himself in functionalist terms, the emphasis is still on the consequence of the message on society, Lasswell provides an impetus for uses and gratification researchers. It is interesting to note that two of his functions of communication, surveillance and correlation, can also be thought of as motives of the individual to use the media. The third function, transmission of culture, would have to be restated in order to place the emphasis on the receiver.

So far, we have been able to identify two types of functionalism: Merton's functions of consequence and Lasswell's functions of purpose. Charles Wright (1960, 1974) attempted to accommodate both types of functionalism within one model.
Charles R. Wright

Functionalism, as it applies to mass communication, appears to be coming from two different functional orientations. Robert K. Merton's latent functionalism was coming from the sociological school that was concerned with consequences, both intended and unintended, and also dealt with the dysfunction along with the function. Lasswell's functionalism comes from the cultural anthropological school and studies items in terms of their purpose for the culture or society. Charles Wright draws upon both orientations to formulate his model for functional analysis.

Wright (1960) outlined three areas that he felt must be dealt with by functionalists. First of all, he wanted to deal with what items were suitable for functional analysis. Secondly, he wished to provide a systematic functional framework for the organization of hypotheses. One such organizing procedure, a functional inventory, is proposed in the second section of the article. The third area addressed in the article is the rephrasing of some hypotheses in functional terms.

In the first section of the article, Wright outlines several areas that are suitable for the functional analysis of mass communication. The first is mass communication, itself, as a social process. According to Wright, the basic
questions to ask are:

What are the consequences- for the individual, subgroups, social and cultural systems- of a form of communication that addresses itself to large, heterogeneous, anonymous audiences publicly and rapidly, utilizing a complex and expensive formal organization for this purpose. (pp. 606-607)

Wright, however, states that the scope of such an inquiry is of such magnitude that empirical testing becomes difficult and unwieldy. Wright concludes his discussion of this type of functional analysis by stating that "functional analysis at this level...holds little immediate promise for the development of an empirically verifiable theory of mass communication" (p. 607). Fourteen years later, however, Wright (1974) revises his position when he states:

I think now that this view was unduly pessimistic because it couched the question unrealistically (for the purposes of contemporary research) in terms of all or nothing, that is, presence or absence of mass media in a society. (p. 199)

Wright then proceeds to describe two societies. One possesses no mass media; all communication takes place through interpersonal channels. The second society possesses no communication other than mass communication. Interpersonal contact is non-existent. Wright points out that the first type of society is becoming increasingly extinct except on a small scale of remote villages. The second society, as of now, is totally imaginary. Wright states:

In today's world, most societies have a total communications system that includes both
capabilities—interpersonal and mass communications. Three questions of significance emerge: 1) What is the communication mix that characterizes a society? 2) What difference does this make? and 3) What are the conditions (both external and within the media systems) which affect the kinds of social consequences that the media have? (pp. 199-200)

Wright concludes by stating that there has been little attempt to document the social consequences of a heavier or lighter mix of mass communications/personal communications.

The second type of functional analysis is one that considers each particular method of mass communication as an item for analysis. By way of example, Wright (1960) cites an early study. Wright states:

An early example is an essay by Malcolm Willey, in which he asks, "What then, are the functions performed by the newspaper? What are the social and individual needs that it has met and still meets?" As an answer, he isolates six distinguishable functions: news, editorial, backgrounding, entertainment, advertising, and encyclopedic. (p. 608)

It should be pointed out that these are manifest functions and shed little light on the true impact of the medium. There is, however, a research strategy that was more applicable to finding the impact of a particular medium. Wright (1974) states:

The basic research question posed was what functions (and dysfunctions) can be attributed to each medium and how can these be isolated through research. One research strategy was to conduct studies in which a particular medium is disturbed, for example, by a strike, providing one can account for
the influence of other factors in the situation....This research strategy still seems promising to me, although in practice it appears to have been more beneficial in illuminating the functions of particular media for individuals than for social systems. (p. 202)

The third way the functional approach can be used, according to Wright (1960), is in the "institutional analysis of any mass medium or organization in mass communication, examining the function of some repeated and patterned operation within that organization" (p. 608).

The fourth and last type of analysis is the one that Wright has the most hope for as a research strategy. This type of functional analysis concerns itself with the consequences of the major communication activities being handled by mass communication. Wright uses Lasswell's typology of surveillance, correlation, and cultural transmission and adds a fourth activity of entertainment. Wright points out that each of these activities were carried out and are still being carried out by methods that pre-date mass media. He also states that, where mass media does exist, each of these activities is fulfilled, to some degree, by mass media. Wright (1960) states:

In its simplest form, then, the question here is: what are the consequences of performing such activities through mass communication, rather than through some other form of communication? For example, what are the effects of surveillance through mass communication rather than through face-to-face reporting? What are the results of
treatment of information about events in the
environment as items of news to be distrib-
uted indiscriminately, simultaneously, and
publicly to a large, heterogeneous and
anonymous audience? (p. 609)

One of the areas of confusion that arises with Wright is
his use of Lasswell's typology as activities rather than as
functions, which was how Lasswell identified them. Wright
(1974) addresses this issue when he states:

An important distinction, sometimes blurred
in subsequent reviews, is between functions
and communication activities. Our working
quartet of communication—surveillance, cor-
relation, cultural transmission, and enter-
tainment—was intended to refer to common
kinds of activities which might or might
not be carried out as mass communications
or private, personal communication. These
activities were not synonyms for functions,
which, as noted, refer to the consequences
of routinely carrying out such communication
activities through the institutionalized
process of mass communications. (p. 205)

It is Wright's objective to bring together the func-
tional orientations of Merton and Lasswell. Wright acknowled-
ges the presence of both manifest and latent functions as
well as the existence of dysfunctions. Wright (1960) arrived
at a formula for functional research that can be stylized in
the following manner:

What are the 1) manifest and 2) latent 3) 
functions and 4) dysfunctions of mass-
communicated 5) surveillance, 6) corre-
lation, 7) cultural transmission, and 
8) entertainment for the 9) society, 
10) subgroups, 11) the individual, and 
12) cultural systems. (p. 610)

Using this model Wright hypothesizes functions and dysfunc-
Taking just the example of surveillance, Wright identifies functions and dysfunctions on several levels. For the society Wright finds three functions that he labels: 1) Warning: natural dangers, 2) Instrumental: news essential to the economy and other institutions, and 3) Ethicizing. Wright identifies two dysfunctions on this same level: 1) Threatens stability: news of better societies, and 2) Fosters panic. On the individual level, Wright identifies four functions: 1) Warning, 2) Instrumental, 3) Adds prestige: opinion leadership, and 4) Status conferral. On the same level Wright identifies four dysfunctions: 1) Anxiety, 2) Privatization, 3) Apathy and 4) Narcotization. Wright proceeds to outline functions and dysfunctions of surveillance for subgroups and culture and then goes on to outline functions and dysfunctions at the various levels for correlation, transmission of culture, and entertainment. (see chart in Wright, 1960, for complete data).

Wright is not maintaining that this is a complete list but simply a listing of some of the hypotheses of mass communication functions. It is important to keep in mind that these are hypotheses and have not been empirically tested. Wright lists three ways in which a hypothesis can be tested. In describing the first method Wright (1960) states:
What are the circumstances under which such a hypothesis could be tested? One method consists of experimentally manipulating the forms of mass-communicated news available to the individual, perhaps disturbing the normal pattern by removing or interfering with it for an experimental group of individuals but not for a matched control group. Then the analyst could examine the behavior of the individuals involved. The hypothesis of self-regulation would lead to the prediction that the deprived individuals would now turn to alternative its in order to continue to meet the necessary conditions for normal operation. (pp. 618-619)

The second method is to take advantage of natural disturbances in mass communication, such as newspaper strikes, etc.; and to note what occurred and what, if any, things took the functional place of the medium that was temporarily lost.

The third method of analysis is explained by Wright, when he states:

The third method consists of analyzing the behavior of people who are differentially located in society with respect to their access to specific forms of mass-communicated news. What alternative form of surveillance has been employed by people for whom a certain type of mass-communicated news is not ordinarily available? Several possible groups might be compared instructively here, such as literate versus illiterate members of the society; immigrants knowing only their native language versus citizens; people wealthy enough to have television and radio receivers versus those who are not. (p. 619)

Wright (1960) concludes his article by pointing out that each communication activity does not exist alone in a
vacuum but interacts with each other. He goes on to state:

Our concluding proposition is that many of the functions of one mass-communicated activity can be interpreted as social mechanisms for minimizing or counteracting the dysfunction produced by another activity, in order to keep the system from breaking down. (pp. 619-620)

In this way the organism maintains equilibrium, a concept that is very similar to that of Lasswell's functionalism. Wright explains the concept by using the example of surveillance. The individual must learn of his environment but at the same time large amounts of raw news might overwhelm him and lead to anxiety, apathy, or other equally adverse reactions. This is countered by correlation, which edits, interprets, and selects what the public will attend to. Even edited news, especially during a war, can bring about anxiety. In this way, entertainment can function in a positive way. Wright states:

One function of mass-communicated entertainment, then, is to provide respite for the individual which, perhaps, permits him to continue to be exposed to the mass-communicated news, interpretation, and prescriptions so necessary for his survival in the modern world. (p. 620)

One of the possible criticisms of Wright stems from this contention of equilibrium. A system in balance would seem to negate any meaningful research rather than foster it. An additional criticism is Wright's use of Lasswell's functions as activities of communication. The difference between function and activity is not clearly defined, and the
assigning of the terminology appears to be arbitrary. Wright, however, has provided a framework for research that shows some promise. He has attempted to combine the orientations of Merton and Lasswell and has succeeded on several levels by stressing the need for empirical research and by stressing the use of latent functions and dysfunctions.

Functionalism, as a theory of social research, has, as we have seen, enjoyed a good deal of popularity. There has been a large amount of literature written about functionalism. This chapter has been able to only dent the surface of the literature written about functional theory. While there is no shortage of theory, the same cannot be said for empirical research. While theorists, such as Merton and Wright, have called for empirical research of functionalism, it appears that few researchers have taken up the challenge. The state of functional empirical research will be dealt with in the next section.

**EMPIRICAL RESEARCH**

Many of the empirical studies that are labeled as functional turn out to be, on closer examination, uses and gratifications studies. One of the few truly functional pieces of research is one that was conducted by Maxwell E. McCombs and Donald L. Shaw. The authors' purpose was to find
empirical evidence for the hypothesized agenda-setting function of mass media. McCombs and Shaw (1972) explain the hypothesis in the following way:

Perhaps this hypothesized agenda-setting function of the mass media is most succinctly stated by Cohen, who noted that the press "may not be successful much of the time in telling people what to think, but it is stunningly successful in telling its readers what to think about." While the mass media may have little influence on the direction or intensity of attitudes, it is hypothesized that the mass media set the agenda for each political campaign, influencing the salience of attitudes toward the political issues. (p. 177)

What McCombs and Shaw did was to try to "match what Chapel Hill voters said were the key issues of the campaign with the actual content of the mass media used by them during the campaign" (p. 177). The study was comprised of interviews with 100 respondents, who were selected randomly from five precincts in Chapel Hill, NC, that were representative of the economic, social, and racial makeup of the community. A filter question was used to identify those who had yet to make up their minds, since it was assumed that these people would be more open to campaign information. The respondents were asked to outline the key issues as they saw them. In addition to these interviews, the mass media serving these voters were collected and the content analyzed.

The researchers found that people had a tendency to reflect a composite of media coverage in their determination
of the key issues. McCombs and Shaw sum up their research by stating:

The existence of an agenda-setting function of the mass media is not proved by the correlations reported here, of course, but the evidence is in line with the conditions that must exist if agenda-setting by the mass media does occur. (p. 184)

This research is functional because it is seeking to establish a link between the message and the audience and is concentrating on the consequences of the message for the audience and society as a whole. It is a latent function, because it is an unintended consequence and is intrinsically neither good nor bad. McCombs and Shaw appear to be using functionalism from Merton's perspective since they don't deal with the manifest functions (or activities) of surveillance, correlation, transmission of culture, and entertainment.

**SUMMARY**

Functionalism is far from a codified, organized research strategy. There appear to be several different orientations: the search for latent functions and dysfunctions, and the attempt to look at communication as a necessary, biological process of equilibrium.

The mixing of terminology, one term meaning different things and one item being attached different terms, is one of the problems that exists within functionalism and it
is a problem that has also led to the uncertain relationship between functionalism and uses and gratifications.

The practice of hypothesizing without empirical testing has weakened functionalism as a research orientation. Establishing functions by definition rather than by evidence, appears to be counter-productive for a research strategy. The opposite problem, as we shall see in the next chapter, exists in uses and gratifications. In their case the evidence and empirical research far outweighs any actual theory that might be identified.
CHAPTER III- USES AND GRATIFICATIONS

One of the problems that uses and gratifications has had is that there have been few attempts to present a codified theory. In fact, many researchers have pointed out that uses and gratifications is basically atheoretical (Swanson, 1977). In any case, empirical research seems to have come before any statement of theory. This is, indeed, the opposite problem of functionalism, which developed theory but very little empirical research. Because of the importance of empirical research to uses and gratifications, the research will be dealt with first.

EMPIRICAL RESEARCH

The earliest empirical studies of uses and gratifications occurred in the 1940's and were generally labeled as "functional" studies. As we shall see in a detailed exploration of such studies, this was not the case.

One example of an early uses and gratifications study is The Children Talk about Comics, a study conducted by Katherine M. Wolf and Marjorie Fiske (1949). The purpose of their study was to "get from these reports some impression of the motives for and effects of comic book reading"
among different groups in relation to their general behavior, interests and attitudes" (p. 3). The sample was restricted to 104 children, stratified according to age, sex, and economic status. Slightly more than half were either eleven or twelve years old. This was because Wolf and Fiske felt that this was the most intensive period of comic book reading. The rest were fairly evenly distributed, using ages down to seven and up to seventeen. It was also taken into account how many brothers and sisters there were in the family because of the possible influence of siblings on comic book reading behavior. Approximately three-fourths of the interviews were done "in greater New York (in public and private schools, settlement houses and private homes); the remaining fourth were done for checking purposes in rural areas of Connecticut" (p. 4). Wolf and Fiske describe their method in the following way:

Each child was interviewed for more than an hour, during which time he was asked various questions concerning his comic reading habits, background, and social adjustment. In addition, his behavior was observed while he read a Superman story and was subjected to certain deliberate distractions. Interviewers were provided with an "interview guide" but were instructed to allow the children to talk on more or less at will, as long as the discussion remained relevant to reading comics. (p. 4)

Wolf and Fiske found that not all comics were alike but could be broken down into three major groupings: A) comics of the Walt Disney "funny animal" type, B) adventure,
crime, and mystery comics of the "Superman" type, and C) educational comics of the "True" and "Classic" type.

Group A is peopled, almost exclusively, by animals such as Bugs Bunny and Mickey Mouse. These characters, except for their appearance, have all of the characteristics of humans. They walk upright, talk, have a family life, go to school, take baths, and so on. In other words, the plots involve things that the children can identify within their own life. In group B, the situation is reversed since the characters are human; but the plots are fantastic and unrealistic. The superhero and villain are presented in the terms of absolute good versus absolute evil. Group C are usually adaptations of books or other factual or educational material. Wolf and Fiske state:

Here the physical settings are just as realistic as those in Group A, and the characters...are naturally made to look as physically realistic as possible. Their actions, in contrast to those of the characters in group B, are perfectly plausible: they do not fly, nor have x-ray vision, nor are they physically invulnerable. Nevertheless, psychologically they adhere to the pattern of extremes, being wholly good or wholly bad persons. Almost invariably in these comics, too, justice prevails and virtue is rewarded. (p. 7)

Wolf and Fiske discovered that not only do children tend to group comics into three categories, they also progress through the categories as they grow older. The 10 years and younger group broke down in the following way:
25% preferred group A, 68% preferred group B, none preferred group C and 7% had no preference. The 11-12 year old group broke down in the following manner: none preferred group A, 63% preferred group B, 30% preferred group C and 7% had no preference. The 13 years and older group broke down as follows: none preferred group A, 35% preferred group B, and 65% preferred group C.

Wolf and Fiske identify three major functions that comics fulfill for the child's satisfaction. They follow roughly the three different types of comics. The first one is the "Alice in Wonderland" function. Wolf and Fiske write:

Psychologists have long been aware of the child's need for projection, and have in fact written of the egocentric or animistic stage, in which the child, by the process of projection, experiences an almost limitless number of selves. He can be a rabbit, a duck, a pig, any number of things at will. ...Our material suggests, however, that it is not so much that the child cannot see the difference between themselves and Superman- but rather that he has a basic need to constantly enrich his fantasy life with new characters. (p. 11)

This particular function is fulfilled, in the early stages, by the "funny animal" type of comic, in which animals are the predominant characters. In the later stages, this function might be fulfilled by the superhero type of comic.

The second function was what Wolf and Fiske identified as the "invincible hero" function. This is primarily a stage of ego fortification. Wolf and Fiske state:
Judging from the children's own reports and the objective description of their reading behavior, the satisfaction derived from reading comics in this stage seems to be one primarily of escape from the real world where the child becomes powerful. It is as though, realizing that he really cannot take all the shapes and forms he assumed in the earlier period, the child's ego becomes deflated. He finds that he is only one small person after all, and that the world is a very large and confusing place over which he has no control. By reading about invincible heroes he becomes an invincible hero for a time. He gains reassurance by identifying with an inflated ego, and the physical realism of the settings in which Superman and his counterparts operate facilitates the process. (p. 13)

The third function that comic books fulfill is what Wolf and Fiske call the "Readers Digest" function. This is primarily an information gathering function that allows children to gather facts in order to structure their social reality.

According to Wolf and Fiske, there are three types of comic book readers: comic book fans (37%), moderate readers (48%), and those who were indifferent or hostile (15%). They found that these readers differed in more ways than just the quantity of comic books read. Fans tend to be compulsive and excessive in their comic book reading. According to Wolf and Fiske: "they prefer comic reading to all other activities and if left to their own devices would apparently do nothing else" (p. 22). Moderate readers, however, enjoy comic book reading as a pastime. They view comic reading as
one activity among many others. In addition, 82% of the fans were reading comics to fulfill the "invincible hero" function compared to 58% of the moderate readers. Wolf and Fiske state:

"The normal child is a "moderate reader" who uses comics as a means of ego-strengthening. In the early or "funny animal" stage, he expands his ego-experience through projection. Later, in the "adventure" stage, he inflates his ego by identification with an invincible hero. Finally, he stands on his own feet, and employs "true" comics as a tool for the real adventure which is life itself. (p. 34)"

For the fan, however, there is a tendency to stay at the "invincible hero" level and not to progress any further. Wolf and Fiske state:

"For the maladjusted child, the comics satisfy, just as efficiently, an equally intense emotional need, but here the need itself is not so readily outgrown. The religion of comics is not easily given up, for the child is frightened, and no new religion beckons. (p. 35)"

As an empirical study there appears to be a few weak points. First of all, the questions asked are open-ended and not all of the children were asked the same questions. In addition, the three age groupings appear to have been arbitrarily assigned and were not empirically tested.

The major difference between functionalism and uses and gratifications can be seen in this empirical study. The concern is with the individual's consumption of the media
and the motivations for this pattern of consumption. The emphasis is not on the consequences of the media on society.

Another early uses and gratifications study was conducted by Bernard Berelson (1949). In 1945 the eight major New York City newspapers went on strike, depriving most people of their favorite newspaper for two weeks. The Bureau of Applied Social Research of Columbia University sponsored a study of people's reaction to the loss of their newspapers at the end of the first week of the strike. Bernard Berelson described the method of the study in the following way:

The Bureau conducted a small number (60) of intensive interviews. The sample, stratified by rental areas in Manhattan, provided a good distribution by economic status although it was high in education. ...The Bureau's interviews were designed to supply so-called qualitative data on the role of the newspaper for its readers, as that became evident at such a time. The results are not offered as scientific proof, but rather as a set of useful hypotheses. (p. 113)

Berelson outlines five functions that newspapers fulfill in the lives of their reading public. The first function is the use of newspapers for information and interpretation of public affairs. This is somewhat similar to the "Readers Digest" function of comic books as outlined by Wolf and Fiske. Both functions fulfill the need for information in order to structure reality.
The second function of newspapers is as a tool for daily living. To some the newspaper was an indispensable aspect in their lives. Berelson states that "fully half of them indicated that they had been handicapped in some way. Many people found it difficult, if not impossible, to follow radio programs without the radio logs published in the paper" (p. 118). In addition, others felt the loss of stock reports, movie schedules, and the weather report.

The third function of newspapers is escape. Newspapers can accomplish this with the comics page but it also goes beyond this. Berelson explains:

Beyond this, however, the newspaper is able to refresh readers in other ways, by supplying them with appropriate psychological relaxation. The newspaper is particularly effective in fulfilling this need for relief from the boredom and dullness of everyday life not only because of the variety and richness of its "human interest" content or because of its inexpensive accessibility. (p. 119)

The fourth function is the use of newspapers for social prestige. This is so that the reader will appear informed at social gatherings. Berelson states that "readers not only can learn what has happened and then report it to their associates but can also find opinions and interpretations for use in discussions on public affairs" (p. 119).

The fifth and last function of newspapers is for social contact. Berelson states:
The newspaper's human interest stories, personal advice columns, gossip columns, and the like provide some readers with more than relief from their own cares and routine. They also supply guides to the prevailing morality, insight into private lives as well as opportunity for vicarious participation in them, and indirect "personal" contact with distinguished people.

(p. 120)

Berelson breaks down the functions into what he calls rational and non-rational groups. In the rational group he places such functions as information and interpretation of public affairs. In the non-rational group he places such functions as provision of social contacts and social prestige. In conclusion, Berelson states that "the newspaper is missed because it serves as a (non-rational) source of security in a disturbing world and, finally, because the reading of the newspaper has become a ceremonial ... act for many people" (p. 129).

Once again this study can be labeled uses and gratifications, since it deals with why people attend to a particular medium. The main issue is one of motive and, as we have already seen in the work of Merton, there is a difference between motive (subjective) and function (objective).

These early studies all had several aspects in common. First of all, the information was gathered in a relatively open-ended manner. Secondly, according to Katz, Blumler, and Gurevitch (1974), these researchers all shared
a qualitative approach in grouping statements into labeled categories, not dealing with the frequency of statements within the population. Thirdly, these researchers "did not attempt to expose the links between the gratifications thus detected and the psychological or sociological origins of the needs that were satisfied" (p. 20). These researchers also failed to search for interrelationships between media functions "either quantitatively or conceptually, in a manner that might have led to the detection of the latent structure of media gratifications" (p. 20). These early studies are important, however, because they mark the beginning of the study of the receiver and its use of the message, rather than the study of the message and its effect on the receiver.

An example of a later uses and gratifications study is one that was conducted by McQuail, Blumler, and Brown (1972) in the United Kingdom. The study examined the uses and gratifications of six programs or program types. These were: "The Dales", a radio serial, television quiz shows, a television serial, television news, and two action-adventure series, "Callan" and "The Saint". Each show was subjected to the same type of test. People who frequently watched the particular program in question were chosen for the sample. Each group varied from seventy to one hundred and eighty respondents. Quota controls were instituted to
make sure the respondents were representative of the society.

The basic format of the research project was a list of statements relating to the gratifications received from that particular program that was being tested. This list was given to the respondent, who was instructed to indicate whether the statement applied to his or her viewing and to what degree. The method for analyzing the results is described by McQuail, Blumler, and Brown:

These results were then subjected to an item-by-item intercorrelation, and the whole matrix of correlations was further examined...to reveal the underlying structure of response. For each programme or type, a set of clusters emerged, grouping together those kinds of audience gratification that were empirically associated. It is these data which constitute the basis of the typology set out below. (p. 146)

The clusters fell into one of four main categories: 1) Distraction, which includes escape from the constraints of routine, escape from the burdens of problems, and emotional release; 2) Personal Relationships, which includes companionship and social utility; 3) Personal Identity, which includes personal reference, reality exploration and value reinforcement; and 4) Surveillance.

McQuail, Blumler, and Brown point to several weak points in their own research, when they state:

As it stands, the typology has a number of evident weaknesses. It is probably incomplete, since it is based on the study of only a limited number of programme types,
using rather small samples of respondents. Further evidence would presumably require an extension of its range and the addition of further sub-classifications. It also requires a good deal more validation, in respect both of the meaning attributed to discrete categories and of the distinctions drawn between category boundaries. (p. 162)

There are several differences between this study and the earlier uses and gratifications studies. First of all, the method is more complex than the earlier methods. The cluster analysis (McQuitty's elementary linkage analysis) is much more capable of determining gradations of gratification than were the percentages of the earlier studies. The second difference is that the respondents' answers are channeled and are not given in an open-ended manner. This makes it much easier to measure the findings statistically. This makes analysis much easier and more profitable for the researcher.

Another example of a recent uses and gratifications empirical research is a study carried out by Katz, Gurevitch and Haas (1973). They were primarily concerned with needs and the different mass media used to gratify these needs. The population studied is a representative sample of 1,500 Israeli adults. The method of the study is explained by Katz, Gurevitch, and Haas:

We began by assembling as comprehensive a list as possible of social and psychological needs said to be satisfied by exposure to
the mass media. This list, taken from the literature, was supplemented by additional items, based on our own insights into the specific functions of the media in Israel. The list was then pilot-tested and subsequently reduced to thirty-five "need statements" of the form: "How important is it for you to understand the true quality of our leaders?" (p. 165)

They then asked their respondents these "need statements." If the respondent answered "very important" or "somewhat important", they were then asked how important media were in helping them fulfill this need. Each medium is tested separately: radio listening, TV viewing, newspaper reading, book reading, and movie going. If a respondent answers that a given medium does not help, the interviewer was instructed to discover whether the medium is hindering satisfaction of the need or if the medium is simply not used by the respondent. The respondent is also asked if there is anything besides the media that helps them satisfy the needs that they have.

The major findings of this study can be broken down into ten distinct groupings. First of all, the researchers found that quite often non-media sources were deemed more gratifying than the mass media. Friends, holidays, lectures, and work were often said to be more important sources of gratification. Secondly, the researchers found "the greater the 'distance' from a referent—social, physical, or psychological— the more important the role of the media"
The third finding was that certain "comparative processes-such as striving for a higher standard of living-seem well served by the media" (p. 180). It seems, however, that needs connected with self-gratification are better satisfied by interpersonal contact with friends. The fourth finding was that for individuals who say that matters of state and society are important to them, the order of media usefulness is consistent, regardless of educational level. Newspapers are the most important, followed by radio, television, books, and then film. The fifth finding was that needs that pertain to the self are associated with a particular medium, depending on which need is being gratified. "Knowing oneself" is best satisfied by books, "enjoying oneself" is best satisfied by films, television, and books; while newspapers contribute to self-regulation and self-confidence. The sixth finding is that in satisfying needs associated with the self, the better educated turn to books while the lesser educated have the tendency to turn to television for gratification. The seventh finding was that Israeli television was useful for killing time but not as a medium of "escape". Katz, Gurevitch, and Haas state that "its presence at the hearth apparently prevents it from becoming an insulating agent against the demands of the ego and of others" (p. 180). The eighth finding was that film and television, respectively, help maintain friendship and family solidarity. The ninth finding was that television
was the least specialized of the media. People who say that it is helpful in satisfying one set of needs, have a tendency to list it as helpful for other needs as well. The cinema and newspapers appear to be the most specialized of the media. The tenth and last finding dealt with the relationship between the media. Katz, Gurevitch, and Haas state:

An examination of the media for their interchangeability- that is, for the extent to which they serve similar functions- reveals a circular relationship whereby each medium (as a point on the circle) is most similar to its two nearest neighbors. The circle goes from television to radio, newspapers, books, and cinema, back to television. These overlapping functions may be explained in terms of shared technical attributes, overlapping content, and the social contexts in which the media are consumed. (p. 180)

It should be noted here that there are many cultural factors that make Israeli society unique. It is important to realize that this study deals with Israeli use of the media and it is very difficult to generalize these results to any other nation. Literally living on a battleground has made the Israelis a news-intensive people. In addition, Israeli television differs from American television in that it broadcasts only during the evening hours and is predominantly news, rather than entertainment, oriented.

This study is important on several levels. First of all, it shows that the audience is very active in deciding which medium satisfies which need. It is interesting to note
that the media are co-existing with traditional, non-media modes of need satisfaction. In some instances the older forms are more popular than the mass media. One must be careful, however, in drawing conclusions for other cultures and nations since, in this case, the results might be culture bound.

One of the possible drawbacks of this study is the question of the validity of the self-evaluation of media use. Is there any tendency to answer the question the way one feels one should answer rather than the actual answer? The way people say they use the media might have little relationship to reality.

One of the areas that uses and gratifications has been applied in recent years, is political broadcasting and its use by the voting public. Blumler and McQuail (1969) conducted a study on the 1964 British General Election. The researchers used a panel of 748 respondents who were interviewed three times. The sample was drawn from Pudsey and West Leeds in Yorkshire. These two areas were chosen primarily because they are representative of the national average of economic and social status. The basic purpose of the study was to discover why people attended to or avoided political broadcasts. For this reason the study is primarily a uses and gratifications study. Blumler and McQuail state:

Perhaps the central aim of this investi-
The findings of this study are too lengthy to go into in any depth. For that reason, the discussion will be restricted to the reasons that Blumler and McQuail identified for the avoiding and using of political broadcasts. Chief among the reasons for avoidance was that the person had already made up his or her mind. Second is the fact that the person mistrusts politicians. Thirdly, there was a general disinterest in politics. The fourth reason was the fact that the broadcasts never have anything new to say. The fifth and last reason was the individual's preference to relax while watching television. McLeod and Becker (1974), in a similar type of investigation conducted in Madison, Wisconsin during the 1972 Presidential Election, identified three avoidances: partisanship, relaxation, and alienation.

Blumler and McQuail basically identified four reasons for the use of political broadcasts. They are: reinforcement, vote-guidance, surveillance, and excitement. McLeod and Becker identified a fifth motive that they label anticipated communication. McLeod and Becker (1974) explain:

Respondents who used political television
as a source of ammunition for arguments with others tend to take a greater interest in the campaign than other people, to be more politically active than other respondents, and to use advertising and special programs as sources of information. (pp. 156-157)

It is interesting to note that Blumler and McQuail found that particular motive to be used in so few cases in their own sample, that they did not include it (p. 78).

The importance of these studies is that it shows a trend of treating political broadcasting as part of a complex process that the individual is as much a part of as is the sender and the message. As we have already seen, this represents quite a departure from the early studies of media influence.

The preceding research is but a small amount of the empirical research done in uses and gratifications. It serves, however, to point out the basic orientation of uses and gratifications research. Though the methods and area of examination might vary from study to study, there are certain assumptions that run through the large body of empirical research.

ASSUMPTIONS OF USES AND GRATIFICATIONS

In many cases in uses and gratifications research, the research preceded any formal statement of the assumptions that bound together the various different studies.
The first assumption that is made is that the audience is an active seeker of mass communications and the gratifications that can be derived from the use of the mass media. This counters the image of the audience as inactive, passive receivers of messages. Raymond A. Bauer sums up the position of uses and gratifications researchers towards the nature of the audience, when he states (1973):

One of the most significant trends in the development of our view of communication has been the shift in the role accorded the audience. This shift ranged from the view of the audience as a grouping of passive objects to be influenced and counted— with the influence being taken for granted— to that of a complex system containing its own dynamics which is activated in an unpredictable direction....Far from being passive, people actively seek out information for such diverse purposes as reinforcing or consolidating their existing opinions, preserving or strengthening their self-image, ingratiating themselves with other persons, or even for the solving of cognitive problems. (p. 150)

Another important assumption that is made by uses and gratifications researchers is that much of the initiative in linking need gratification with the particular media is up to the individual. After all, the individual knows best which medium satisfies which need. This is shown to be particularly true in the study conducted by Katz, Gurevitch, and Haas (1973), as we have already shown. It is quite possible for one medium to lose its gratificational use and to be supplanted by another more satisfying medium. An example of this can be found in the Wolf and Fiske study.
on the use of comic books. They found that quite often when a child reached the "Readers Digest" stage, she or he would give up comics and start to read books to better fulfill the need for information. However, quite often some would return at a later stage in order to fulfill the need to relax and to go back into the safe and identifiable world of the superhero. The audience selects and changes the media that it uses in an active manner, aware of what best fulfills its own needs.

The third assumption that is made in uses and gratifications research is that the media compete with other sources of need satisfaction. It must be remembered that most needs existed before the formation of mass media and were being fulfilled in some manner. One example might be the use of the newspaper for social contact, as outlined by Bernard Berelson. This need has been traditionally filled by interpersonal communication; but in a changing world some people, at least, have been turning to mass media for this contact. Why this occurs is an important question that the researcher must consider when dealing with need satisfaction.

The fourth assumption that is made is that people are sufficiently aware of their motives in the use of mass media, that data can be arrived at by the use of questionnaires or interviews. Researchers in uses and gratifications,
for the most part, have tended to stay away from the laboratory-type experiment. It is assumed that the only natural way to gather data is to go out into the field. After all, it is the individual who knows best why he watches certain shows and what needs are being fulfilled. It is assumed that the individual can, at least, recognize the needs when confronted with them in clear and concise language.

The fifth assumption made is that "value judgements about the cultural significance of mass communication should be suspended while audience orientations are explored on their own terms" (Katz, Blumler, and Gurevitch, 1974, p.22). This does not, however, result in the rubber-stamping of approval for the existing programming. Katz, Blumler, and Gurevitch state:

> From the point of view of media policy, then, we reject the view that an application of the uses and gratifications approach to policy questions must inevitably support or exonerate the producers of junk or the status quo of media content. That belief seems to require the acceptance of one or both of two other assumptions: existing patterns of audience needs support the prevailing patterns of media provision and no other; and the audience concerns are in fact trivial and escapist. For reasons that should now be plain, we find both these propositions dubious. (p. 30)

Another assumption of uses and gratifications is that people use the media for other reasons than just escape. This is counter to the view of many popular culture writers.
Dwight McDonald (1957) states that "the merging of the child and grown-up audience means... infantile regression of the latter, who, unable to cope with the strains and complexities of modern life, escape via kitsch" (p. 66). The uses and gratifications view towards this total escapism is presented by McQuail, Blumler, and Brown, when they state:

If the typology is accepted as approximating to the true state of affairs, then the escapist formula, as it has often been applied to the television viewing experience is clearly inadequate. For one thing the motives and satisfactions to which the term "escape" has customarily been applied are far from exhaustive of audience orientations. (p. 162)

In fact, uses and gratifications research tends to view escape in a different light. Katz and Foulkes (1962) state:

We object basically, to the assumption, usually implicit and often unwarranted, that "escapist" drives or "escapist" content or "escapist" patterns of involvement with the media are invariably dysfunctional for the individual and society. (p. 387)

They point out that attending to mass media is a socially acceptable way of withdrawing from the pressure of social roles. One can insulate oneself "from one's wife (from) behind the newspaper at the breakfast table, or cut oneself off in this way from fellow subway and bus passengers" (Katz and Foulkes, p. 384). Katz and Foulkes point out some other uses of escape, when they state:

But to emphasize that media content is "escapist" when it is used for vicarious-
ness and make-believe is to avoid serious consideration of the function of fantasy and to ignore the other probable uses of this very same content. Surely, respite may be obtained, at least in the short run, and this is by no means irrelevant to the performance of one's roles. (p. 383)

Uses and gratifications is, for the most part, a series of empirical studies that have a set of assumptions in common. One of the areas of weakness that has been identified is the lack of theory and a consistent conceptual framework. David L. Swanson (1977) states:

Many of the conceptual difficulties of uses and gratifications approach stem from the tendency of some researchers working within the framework to treat data as primary and theoretic questions as secondary. (p. 214)

The following section reviews the basic findings of this paper. This will be followed by chapter 4, which will state the conclusions of this paper.

GENERAL SUMMARY

A comparison and contrast of functionalism and uses and gratifications shows that, though there are certain aspects in common, there are fundamental differences in the approach and orientation of the research design. These differences, by themselves, probably would not be all that important. The importance comes from the fact that the distinction between the two designs has become blurred and, in some cases, totally obscured.
This blurring of the differences between functionalism and uses and gratifications is compounded by the increasing importance of both orientations in mass communications research. As we have already seen, mass communications research was initially concerned with short-term effects. The major focus was with the impact of mass media on attitude change. The shift from this emphasis occurred primarily because some researchers believed that the anticipated effect of mass media was quite often not supported by the results of the empirical research.

To many researchers it had become obvious that the audience was a much more important factor in mass communication than had initially anticipated. The concept of a passive audience soaking up messages like a sponge was replaced with the concept of an active, selective audience. With this new emphasis on the audience came new ways of evaluating the impact of mass media on the audience and the impact of the audience on mass media.

Functionalism, as it applies to mass communications research, was an outgrowth of the functional movement in the social sciences. Much of the foundation of mass media functionalism was derived from the works of Robert K. Merton, Harold Lasswell, and Charles Wright. Their orientations are, as we have already seen, far from codified and unified.

Merton's orientation is basically from the function-
alism of sociology. He varies from the anthropological approach in several distinct areas, and it is these differences that mold his particular brand of functionalism. The first major difference between Merton and the anthropological functionalists is in the insistence on cultural items being functional for the entire social or cultural system. It was Merton's contention that an item that is functional for one group might, indeed, be dysfunctional for other groups in the same society. Another area where Merton departs from anthropological functionalism is in his tendency to ignore manifest functions and to concentrate on latent functions. According to Merton, manifest functions are intended consequences, where latent functions are unintended consequences. Merton and Lazarsfeld (1948) outlined three latent functions of mass communications: status conferral, the enforcement of social norms, and narcotization. These aspects are by-products of mass media exposure and were not intended by mass media and society in general.

The functionalism of Merton, which stresses latent functions and the possibility of dysfunctions, contrasts with the functionalism of Harold Lasswell. Lasswell concentrates primarily on the integrative functions of communication. To Lasswell, society was much like an organism striving to keep in balance. This balance is maintained through the functions that are fulfilled by communication. These functions are: 1) the surveillance of the environment, 2) the
correlation of the parts of society in responding to the environment, and 3) the transmission of the social heritage from one generation to the next. These are obviously manifest functions and are not dysfunctional. The major importance of Lasswell is that he states on a manifest functional level communications provides positive functions for society. This, as we have already seen, runs counter to most of the prevailing theories on mass communications effects.

Charles Wright (1960) attempts to combine the functionalism of Merton with that of Lasswell. He adopts Merton's idea of latent functions and dysfunctions. He sets this within a framework of communication activities that he has borrowed from Lasswell. This, as we have seen, has led to some confusion.

In attempting to combine the different orientations of Merton and Lasswell, Wright has taken on a tremendous task that is often problematic. One problem is that Wright chooses to stick with the equilibrium theory which runs counter to the aspects that he has borrowed from Merton and would seem to negate empirical research. Another problem stems from the re-naming of Lasswell's functions as activities. The difference between function and activity does not appear to be clearly defined and the change of terminology results in confusion. Wright's attempt to combine the functionalism of Lasswell and Merton does, however, succeed on
several levels by stressing latent functions and dysfunctions, by pointing out that mass communication can provide positive functions, and by stressing the need for empirical research.

Though many of the functional theorists have highlighted the need for empirical research, there have been few attempts to carry out such research. One of the few truly functional, empirical projects was conducted by Maxwell E. McCombs and Donald L. Shaw. The purpose of the study was to find empirical evidence for the hypothesized agenda-setting function of mass communication. Briefly stated, the media are believed to fulfill a function that does not tell the people what to think, but what to think about. During a political campaign it is the media, according to McCombs and Shaw, that determine the issues that are viewed as important by the public. The research, which is covered in greater detail in Chapter 2, found that people had a tendency to reflect a composite of media coverage in their determination of the key issues. This research is functional because it seeks to establish a connection between the message and the receiver and concentrates on the consequences of the message for the audience.

Whereas functionalism is heavily theoretical but non-empirical, uses and gratifications is, in part, the exact opposite. Most uses and gratifications research is hy-
The earliest empirical studies in uses and gratifications were carried out in the 1940's and were labeled as "functional" studies since they generally included a list of functions that the media fulfilled for the individual. The orientation, however, was on the use of the media by the individual and not, as in functionalism, on the consequences of the media on society. Wolf and Fiske (1949) and Berelson (1949) are two examples of such uses and gratifications studies. The former was a study of the use of comic books by children and the latter was a study of the use of the daily newspaper. Though these studies varied in their methods, subject, and results, they all tended to emphasize that the media was used by the audience for positive reasons. The results of these studies showed that there was a much more complicated interrelationship between the media and its audience than was first anticipated. Instead of an audience using the media almost exclusively for entertainment (or escape), there appears to be a number of motivations for attending to mass media.

McQuail, Blumler, and Brown (1972) identified four main categories: 1) Diversion, which includes escape from the constraints of routine, escape from the burdens of problems, and emotional release; 2) Personal Relationships, which includes companionship and social utility; 3) Personal
Identity, which includes personal reference, reality exploration and value reinforcement; and 4) Surveillance. In addition to the concern with why people used mass media, researchers also dealt with the question of which medium gratified the particular need the best. Katz, Gurevitch, and Haas (1973), examining the Israeli mass media, explored the relationship between the various mass media and the needs that are satisfied.

Though there is little formal statement of theory, there are a set of assumptions that form the basis of uses and gratifications research. These assumptions are: 1) the audience is an active seeker of mass media and the gratifications that can be derived from the use of mass media; 2) the individual takes on much of the initiative in linking need gratification with a particular medium; 3) mass media compete with other sources of need satisfaction; 4) people are sufficiently aware of their motives in the use of mass media that data can be arrived at by the use of questionnaires or interviews; 5) value judgements about the cultural significance of mass communication should be suspended; 6) people use mass media for other reasons than just escape; and 7) escape is not necessarily dysfunctional or useless and, in fact, might be very important to the mental health of the viewer. Uses and gratifications is concerned with the patterns of media attention in order to gain satisfaction.
CHAPTER IV- CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to compare and contrast functionalism and uses and gratifications. In recent years these areas have become less defined and the distinctions between the two orientations have become blurred. The major question that this study attempted to answer was whether or not functionalism and uses and gratifications are two separate and distinct orientations. This was done by studying the original literature and empirical research to discover the basic tenets underlying both orientations.

Both functionalism and the uses and gratifications approach have been shown to share a common assumption that connects them together and sets them apart from effects researchers and popular culture writers. This assumption is that mass communication can and does fulfill positive aspects for society and for the individual.

Another similarity that functionalism and uses and gratifications share is a common terminology. This, as has already been shown, is a source of confusion. The word function is used in both areas but from a slightly different orientation. In functionalism, the function is rooted in the sender and message and provides consequences for the indivi-
idual and society. Cultural transmission or the narcotizing dysfunction comes from the sender, either intentionally or unintentionally, and are contained in the message. In uses and gratifications, however, the function is rooted in the receiver and his or her use of the message. Surveillance is from the orientation of the individual and explains the motive for the use of the media. This might be contrary to the intentions of the sender for it is the individual who is determining the use of the media.

If we use a linear model of communications, such as sender-message-receiver, functionalism is primarily a left to right process. The motivation is with the sender, the importance is contained in the message, and the consequences effect the receiver. For the most part, the receiver is not thought of as an individual but as part of the collective. The impetus is with the medium and not the individual. In uses and gratifications, however, the direction has been switched to a right to left orientation. When a uses and gratifications researcher identifies a function, he is speaking in terms of a function for the individual. The questions being asked are: why does the individual tune into media?; what do they receive as a result of tuning in?; and why do they choose a particular medium? In this way the function is contained in the receiver and the receiver's use of the message. Functionalism differs from uses and gratifications in that the basic question being asked is: what
are the consequences, either intended or unintended, of the message on society?

Uses and gratifications and functionalism differ in their strengths and weaknesses as research orientations. Functionalism is strong on theory but weak in empirical research. Uses and gratifications, on the other hand, is strong in empirical research and weak in theory. The aforementioned areas must be improved if the two research orientations are going to grow and expand.

There are several additional areas that are in need of further research. One of these is in the area of social reality. George Gerbner and others have shown that television has an effect on the viewer's perception of reality. A possible uses and gratifications study might be in how selective the motives are for need satisfaction. Can the need for surveillance be satisfied by an action-adventure show rather than the news?

Another area of further research is the need of both orientations to re-explore their own basic tenets and research. Much of both orientations is out of date since it was formulated before television became an important factor in mass communication. In addition, research that has been carried out in other countries should be repeated in America in order to evaluate any cultural differences in the use of the media.
The confusion of the terminology used by functionalists and uses and gratifications researchers also needs attention. There should be some way of distinguishing between a function as a consequence and a function as a motivation for the use of media. In addition, it would be of benefit to researchers if some agreement could be reached on the meaning of such words as use, motive, gratification, and others.

If both orientations are to flourish, there must be an attempt by researchers to clearly delineate the boundaries of the two orientations. This is not to say that uses and gratifications and functionalism are mutually exclusive, for this need not be the case. It would be difficult, however, to successfully blend the two orientations until the confusion that surrounds them has been clarified. Only then will these orientations be able to stand alone as truly viable research orientations.
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