Roman Jakobson’s Model of the Constitutive Factors [Dimensions] of Communication:

**Dimensions**

1 context
2 message
3 sender --------------- 4 receiver
5 channel
6 code

Roman Jakobson’s Model of the Functions of Communication:

**Functions**

Referential
Poetic
Emotive -------------- Conative
Phatic
Metalingual
Speech Acts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech Acts</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Locutionary Acts – the act of utterance | • Promising  
| Illocutionary Acts – the function one has in mind that causes them to speak | • Reporting  
| | • Asking  
| Perlocutionary Acts – the intended/desired result of the speech act | • Intimidating  
| | • Threatening  
| | • Deceiving  

John Searle (b. 1932, Professor of Philosophy at UCB) divides speech acts into five performative functions as follows.

1. **Declarations** - change things by virtue of their being uttered.

2. **Representatives** - state what the speaker believes to be the case.

3. **Expressives** - state what the speaker feels (psychological states of pleasure, pain likes, dislikes, joy or sorrow).

4. **Directives** - get others to do something.

5. **Commissives** - speakers use to commit to some future action.
Grice’s Universal principles, or maxims of communication:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Maxim of Quality</th>
<th>Speakers’ contributions to a conversation should be true. They should not say what they believe to be false, nor should they say anything for which they lack adequate evidence.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Maxim of Quantity</td>
<td>The contribution should be as informative as is required for the purposes of the conversation. One should say neither too little nor too much.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Maxim of Relevance</td>
<td>The contributions should clearly relate to the purpose of the exchange.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Maxim of Manner</td>
<td>The contribution should be perspicuous (plain to the understanding). In particular, it should be orderly and brief, avoiding obscurity and ambiguity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Comparison of Moral and Ethical Discourse Frames

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Moral Frame</th>
<th>Ethical Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Texts/Questions</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgment</td>
<td>Right/Wrong</td>
<td>Fairness/Unfairness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Relationships</td>
<td>“thin” relations</td>
<td>“thick” relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Relationships</td>
<td>Giving</td>
<td>Reciprocity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimate Relationships</td>
<td>Love</td>
<td>Sexuality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Responsibility</td>
<td>“resilience” paradigm</td>
<td>“vulnerability” paradigm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body/Mind</td>
<td>Healing/Wellness</td>
<td>Medicine/Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>Restorative</td>
<td>Criminal/Civil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intra-Personal Relations</td>
<td>“I-lessness”&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Politeness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> “I-lessness” refers to Gadamer’s (2004, p. 124-128) concept of self-forgetfulness, or losing oneself when a state of true dialogue is achieved.
Active Listening
(based on the work of Carl Rogers)
Applied to the CMNS304W ‘Triangle’

Paraphrase the process
You/we/I/They - did…
- (e.g., we talked, we ate)

Paraphrase the content
You/we/I/They - wanted/saw/heard…
- (e.g., you got a txt msg; I saw a bluebird; she said “let’s eat”)

Paraphrase the effect
You/we/I/They - felt/were…
- (e.g., I was happy with the result; they were afraid of change)
Percentages, by grade level, of students who could repeat what the teacher had just said:

- First-grade – 90%
- Second-grade – 80%
- Junior High School – 44%
- Senior High School – 28%

Research has shown that the average adult has a **listening efficiency of only 25%** - **even if they are trying to listen**. As soon as we hear something, we start to forget it.

- After just 10 minutes, on average, we forget 50% of what we heard.
- Within two to twenty days, we forget another 50%.
If you shot a gun at sporadic intervals during lectures, and asked students to encode their thoughts and moods at that moment, you would discover that:

- About 20 percent of the students, men and women, are pursuing erotic thoughts.
- Another 20 percent are reminiscing about something.
- 20 percent are actually paying attention to the lecture (12 percent are actively listening).
- The other 40 percent are worrying, daydreaming, thinking about lunch, or about religion (8 percent).
Listening can be broken down into a number of individual activities:

1. Being Mindful
2. Hearing
3. Selecting & Organizing
4. Interpreting
5. Responding
6. Remembering
Some Important Features of Platonic Dialogue

• Everyone gets to speak for themselves and nothing is wasted, all points are either resolved or reframed to further the dialogue.

• Dialogue illustrates how to help people arrive at consensus. Even if that is not possible, everyone leaves with a better understanding.

• Relationships are respected and maintained.

• Establishes a cultural norm in Western culture that truth can be uncovered through the use of language.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIALOGUE</th>
<th>DEBATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue is collaborative; two or more sides work together toward a common understanding.</td>
<td>Debate is oppositional; two sides oppose each other and attempt to prove each other wrong.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding common ground is the goal.</td>
<td>Winning is the goal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enlarges, and possibly changes the participants’ points of view.</td>
<td>Affirms the participants’ own points of view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reveals assumptions for reevaluation.</td>
<td>Defends assumptions as truth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causes introspection about one’s own position.</td>
<td>Critiques the others’ positions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opens up the possibility of reaching a better solution than any of the original proposals.</td>
<td>Defends one’s own positions at best, and at worst, excludes other approaches and proposals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involves genuine concern for the other person and seeks not to alienate or offend.</td>
<td>Involves countering the other position without focusing on feelings or relationship, and often belittles or deprecates the other position.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jurgen Habermas, in *Knowledge and Human Interests*, says that all human knowledge is motivated by interests. One cannot know about something without being biased by one’s own motivations. Habermas identifies three main interests motivating our intellectual search for truth:

1) A technical interest (technical control = process)
2) A practical interest (mutual understanding = content)
3) An emancipatory interest (from seemingly “natural” constraints = effect)

These *knowledge-constitutive interests* comprise the full range of our intellectual approach to the world. Based on these interests, Habermas suggests that science as we know it fails to address the emancipatory interest, and overemphasizes the technical interest. According to Habermas, the self-referential aspect of science results in something called *scientism*. “Scientism,” says Habermas, “means science’s belief in itself; that is, the conviction that we can no longer understand science as one form of possible knowledge, but rather must identify knowledge with science.”