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Introduction

Media effects research is at the core of the discipline of communication. Concern over the impact of mediated communication content on individuals, groups, and societies is as old as the media forms themselves. And, indeed, concern over the impact of non-mediated persuasive communications may date back even further, to ancient Greece. The classic model of communication inquiry asks (1) who (2) says what (3) in which channel (4) to whom (5) with what effect? (Lasswell, 1948). While these five aspects are clearly interconnected, scholars have tended to concentrate on each separately, with a focus on the fifth: effects. Empirical research on the impact of mediated messages originated and flourished in the twentieth century, principally in the United States (Berger & Chaffee, 1987), growing in volume, scope, and complexity over the years, corresponding to a matching expansion in media types and content options. Prior to the advent of the Internet, the study of “media” effects was essentially also the study of “mass” communication (Chaffee & Metzger, 2001). Mediated communication might be defined as messages sent through a mechanical or electronic system or device that is interposed between source and receiver. Mass communication generally has referred to processes where an organization sends messages to a relatively large, heterogeneous, and dispersed audience, with delayed feedback. Mass media that would fit both sets of characteristics include newspapers, magazines, movies, radio, television, and some applications of the Internet. Other forms of Internet use might be considered mediated but not mass—that is, messages may be tailored for and directed at individuals or at a small audience that is differentiated from an at-large audience. With changing technologies, the boundaries between mass, interpersonal, group, and organizational communication have become blurred. Historically, the “mass” aspect of mass media has generated the greatest concern because it vastly extends a source’s ability to reach receivers across both space and time and have a more powerful impact. The gatekeepers of traditional mass media wielded great power in that mass media outlets were limited in number and therefore potential audiences were very large. As boundaries between forms of communication have blurred because of technologies, theories and studies of media effects have started to take into account newer audience activities that include use of social media, streaming online content, and electronic gaming. This has necessarily broadened the scope of inquiry to include the involvement of intrapersonal
and interpersonal constructs. Indeed, some critical effects today are mediated by new technologies but are not produced by traditional media organizations, rather entailing interpersonal contact and outcomes (e.g., the person-to-person context of bullying on social media).

The history of US media effects scholarship has in contemporary times been subject to contestation. The “received view” has privileged a retrospective focus on political issues (propaganda, voting, and public opinion), according to Wartella and Reeves (2003), who counter with the point that debates over the power of communication via various media have all shown a prominent concern with impacts on youth—dating back to Plato’s Republic. Others have also challenged the primacy of early political communication studies as providing an overemphasis on the political realm while ignoring entertainment and other commercial media functions. These critics propose that early benchmark studies need to be viewed in the context of the time and place in which the studies were conducted, and that findings need to be reinterpreted in light of subsequent research traditions and paradigms. Of further note is the fact that the early, influential scholars in media effects (e.g., Bernard Berelson, Harold D. Lasswell, Paul F. Lazarsfeld, Kurt Lewin, and Wilbur Schramm) each approached their scholarship from a vantage point determined by their own discipline. The study of media effects over the past century has been decidedly interdisciplinary. While scholarship since the 1960s has included an increasing array of theoretical perspectives arising from within the communication discipline, the contributions of scholarship in allied disciplines (e.g., social psychology, sociology, political science) to the origins of the study of media effects is undeniable (Rogers, 1994).

**Concern with media effects**

Concern about media and their effects in the United States dates back at least to the beginning of the country, when President George Washington suffered scathing criticism, as did Thomas Jefferson, whose opinion of the press shifted from admiration to disgust in the face of extraordinary scrutiny. Fast forward to the early twentieth-century storefront “nickelodeon” movie houses, when criticism focused on the unsavory places where the new, popular moving images were being viewed. Early comics also came in for scrutiny for their potential impact on vulnerable youth, and the new electronic medium, radio, was seen as a threat because it could jump over national borders with propaganda.

It is noteworthy that each new medium, at its introduction, seems to have attracted the attention of concerned observers, be they located in government (e.g., the 1986 US Attorney General’s Commission on Pornography and its “Meese Report”), business, foundations (e.g., the Rockefeller Foundation’s funding of research on radio’s impact during the 1930s), or the general public, and academics tended to follow with research projects. “With the development of each modern means of storytelling—books, newspapers, movies, radio, comics, and television—social debates regarding their effects have recurrent” (Wartella & Reeves, 2003, p. 54). Notably in the United States, a nation that offers “considerable avenues of democratic expression” (Delia, 1987, p. 22), the mass
media as agencies of social change generated considerable public controversy throughout the twentieth century. In the 1920s, as cinema became the main pastime of the masses, the US government threatened to enter the fray, resulting in the movie industry’s self-censorship via the Hays Office’s Production Code, which set industry content standards to protect public morals. The Payne Fund Studies, a four-year, multimethod project funded privately and executed using social psychological methods by researchers at seven universities, was perhaps the first large-scale media effects research initiative. The researchers were charged with investigating the influence of motion pictures on children’s knowledge, attitudes and ideals, emotions, health, and sex behaviors, as well as movies’ effect on “standards of American life” (Charters, 1933, p. 3). The Payne Fund Studies combined laboratory studies, field experiments, content analyses, and survey techniques aimed at identifying effects, arguing that “the directions in which … changes occurred would be determined by what [spectators] saw in the movies” (Charters, 1933, p. 3). The Payne Fund research set initial, baseline standards for scientific inquiry into media content and effects, although its role would be largely ignored for many decades as scholars focused on effects in the political arena.

A 1938 radio broadcast by actor–director Orson Welles, an adaptation of the H. G. Wells book War of the Worlds, created fear and panic behavior across the United States. This particularly well-executed faux news program about Martians invading New Jersey was taken seriously by thousands. Many listeners fled their homes, some seeking safety in numbers in churches and schools. The high-profile radio event would spark interest in research on the potentially strong effects of the mass media. The public and scholarly reactions and efforts to explain the phenomenon are seen as the beginning of what has been called the magic bullet theory or the hypodermic needle model. This perspective advanced a simple stimulus–response (media reports → audience responds, or S-R) model wherein the media had direct effects on audiences.

The 1940s saw the beginning of systematic research on political effects—particularly public opinion—and news diffusion, soon followed in the 1950s with a focus on persuasion and personal influence. Empirical research really started in earnest with the massive 1940 Erie County, Ohio, door-to-door survey of voters by Paul Lazarsfeld and colleagues at Columbia University (Lazarsfeld, Berelson, & Gaudet, 1944). This and surveys to follow (the Columbia Studies) produced the notion of the two-step flow of influence from the media to interested and communication-savvy individuals (opinion leaders), and then to the less interested segment of society via interpersonal contacts. A string of studies continued to refine this notion of combined media effects and personal influence in Elmira, New York, and Decatur, Illinois. Since elections are so important in a democracy, it is understandable that political communication would become the strongest initial line of inquiry for media effects. The discovery of the mediating role of interpersonal relationships in the process of mass communication added a new complexity to the modeled processes of media effects. Subsequent researchers extended the notion of the two-step flow to a multistep flow, still acknowledging the importance of interpersonal channels and personal influence. And, further elaborations of opinion leadership recognized the complexity of the status, including the idea that a given individual may serve as an opinion leader for just one or for many topics.
The magic bullet theory assumed that media audience members live in relative isolation from one another and behave largely instinctively, responding in similar fashion to media stimuli—thus supporting the simple S-R model of media effects. In short, the perspective viewed media messages like bullets or needles that bring about cognitive and behavioral impacts that are direct, immediate, powerful, and uniform. Earlier direct effects scholarship that was analytical—not empirical—in its approach included Lasswell's seminal Propaganda Technique in the World War (1927). Lasswell critiqued World War I political communication and made a root assumption about the power of mass-mediated messages to shape collective attitudes. However, studies of the effectiveness of the World War II US Army indoctrination film series Why We Fight, conducted by a team of psychologists for the Army, showed increased factual knowledge about the war among military recruits but did not demonstrate the hoped-for enhanced beliefs in the rightness of the cause for which the United States was fighting, increased motivation to serve, or greater confidence in self and the Allies (Hovland, Lumsdaine, & Sheffield, 1949). The Why We Fight studies challenged the notion of homogeneous effects by identifying significant moderating variables (e.g., level of education, initial opinion position).

**From direct to limited effects**

The simple S-R model would soon be abandoned as more intervening variables emerged in research, and Joseph Klapper's popular book (1960) pronounced the end of the era of strong, direct media effects. However, this was not the last word, as mass communication scholars in the coming decades constructed more complex theories and research to understand effects and communication processes. Even follow-up analyses of the War of the Worlds phenomenon (by Princeton scholar Hadley Cantril and associates) would conclude that key individual, situational, and contextual factors—such as listeners' religious beliefs and level of fatalism, the perceived credibility of radio news in the 1930s United States, whether listeners heard the full broadcast uninterrupted, and the war-is-brewing world situation (which engendered a growing fear)—moderated the supposedly powerful impact of the broadcast (Lowery & DeFleur, 1995).

Klapper's work (extending from research by Lazarsfeld, Berelson, and others, which concluded that media “exposure crystallizes and reinforces more than it converts”; Berelson, Lazarsfeld, & McPhee, 1954, p. 23) led to what has been called the **minimal effects model**, where mass communication is not seen as a “necessary and sufficient cause of audience effects” (Klapper, 1960, p. 5); rather, audience factors are seen as mediating mass media’s influence, greatly reducing any possible effects of mass media content on audiences. In a review of more than 1,000 studies, essays, and reports prior to 1960, Klapper summarized findings in three areas of concern: the effects of violence, political persuasion, and the notion that escapist content may “blind people to reality” (1960, p. 2). He noted a “pessimism” among lay public and scholars alike, as they tried to make sense of empirical findings that were contradictory and inconclusive. He concluded that direct media effects were rare, calling for further consideration of the main audience-situated mediating factors: predispositions and the concomitant
processes of selective exposure, selective perception, and selective retention; group membership and the norms of those groups; interpersonal dissemination of communication content; the role of opinion leadership; and the status quo nature of commercial mass media.

The minimal or limited effects approach introduced a significant contribution from social psychology: the development of the O-S-O-R model, which describes a cognitive approach to understanding the individual’s relationship to his or her environment. The model recognizes and articulates the involvement of an active organism (the “O”s in the model) in the process of human response to stimuli, including media content. The model followed the earlier, more simplistic S-R model, as well as a preliminary cognitive approach model that had added a middle O, representing internal states of the organism (individual) that mediate the impact of the stimulus: S-O-R. Finally, an initial O was added, representing the organism’s preorientations to the stimulus. As Markus and Zajonc noted, “It is now recognized that the internal states not only mediate between the stimuli of the environment and the responses but that what stimuli are attended to and what stimuli are ignored is under the selective control of the organism as well” (1985, p. 138).

While many influential scholars viewed the limited effects model’s emphasis on reinforcement as a noneffect, others, including Marxist and critical commentators, noted the strategic aspect of this reinforcement in buttressing the positions of the dominant political and social forces in a society. And, over time, scholars began to reexamine the early effects studies with an eye to discovering under what conditions media effects might accrue, rather than dismissing such effects simply because they were not uniformly and reliably found.

To some extent, the difference between the S-R and O-S-O-R models of media effects focuses on whether the audience is active or passive. Beginning in the 1970s, there was a resurgence of interest in this issue as scholars started examining audience activity. The basic tenets of the selective psychological processes (selective exposure, selective perception, and selective retention, stemming from the theory of cognitive dissonance) were reexamined and have formed a base from which a number of these theoretical and research traditions have developed. In short, the first “O” in the O-S-O-R model is an important element in these research lines. But these traditions also include a consideration of true media effects beyond selective processes and activities. The key line of inquiry that developed has come to be referred to as uses and gratifications.

Uses and gratifications research began as efforts to explain audience media use patterns (Katz, Gurevitch, & Haas, 1973) but soon migrated into effects research as the source of important mediators. The uses and gratifications perspective makes several key assumptions: that an active audience is goal directed in its choice of media experiences; that there is considerable initiative involved on the part of an audience member; that the media compete with a wide range of other sources for needs gratification; and that individuals are sufficiently self-aware to be able to accurately self-report their media uses and gratifications. The uses and gratifications perspective has continued to generate
much interest and research, with later foci on particular proactive uses of the mass media by audience members, such as mood management.

**Back to strong effects and more complex models**

From the 1960s through the 1980s, media effects scholarship saw the emergence of a cluster of what might be called strong effects research traditions, in all cases taking into consideration individual differences and contextual factors that might mediate or moderate the impact of mass media exposure. These strong effects traditions all made assumptions that media content can, and often does, have powerful effects on individuals, groups, and societies but that this potential for effects is neither direct nor deterministic. The second “O” in the O-S-O-R model is pointedly acknowledged by these traditions as the locus of potential mediators and moderators acting upon stimuli (media messages) as they produce their response (effects). Early in the 1960s, cultural philosopher Marshall McLuhan (1964) articulated the view that a predominant medium or technology may tell us how to think, while his mentor Harold Innis (1950) had earlier pointed to their influence on social organization. The more contemporary medium theory focuses on how each medium is physically, socially, and psychologically distinct from the others.

In the 1970s, the strong effects perspectives emerged as prominent, including such theoretical perspectives as agenda-setting, cultivation theory, and the spiral of silence. These theories assumed that media have strong, often long-term effects on receivers; these theories also assumed the relative homogeneity of media content consumed en masse by audiences. At the same time, mass communication scholars began focusing on levels of analysis other than the individual, in particular the community.

The following sections examine these enduring lines of research that continue to develop and describe the impact of media.

**Agenda-setting theory**

First articulated by communication scholars Max McCombs and Donald Shaw, agenda-setting theory outlines the news media’s presumed ability to set priorities for public opinion—that is, to determine the relative salience of current news topics for members of the public. In their 1968 “Chapel Hill study,” McCombs and Shaw (1972) demonstrated a strong relationship between what topics were covered heavily in the news media and what members of the public considered the most salient issues in an election. Hundreds of studies to follow confirmed and extended the notions of agenda-setting theory. A key differentiation was made between first-order agenda-setting (media tell us “what to think about”) and second-order agenda-setting (media tell us “how to think about it” by emphasizing certain attributes of issues). In addition, studies have examined “agenda-building” influences and intermedia agenda-setting processes.
**Social learning theory/social cognitive theory**

Originally, the work of Stanford psychologist Albert Bandura was aimed simply at confirming that individuals may learn through observing the behaviors of others, rather than only via reward or punishment for their own behaviors. His famous “Bobo doll studies” confirmed observational or social learning, both for live models and mediated models (filmed and animated). Bandura’s social learning theory, later reworked to include a stronger cognitive focus as social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1986), has served as the direct basis or rationale for thousands of studies. His framework established that receivers may acquire orientations and learned normative behaviors from remote and fictional models, which had clear and far-reaching implications for media effects. Further theoretical clarifications, such as the enhancing impact of demonstrated rewards (and the opposite effect of punishment) and the similarity of the receiver to the model exhibiting the behaviors, have also found application to media effects studies. While Bandura applied his theory to planned changes such as the extinguishing of phobias through observation, many others have used it as the base for research on violence and the media and numerous other outcomes, including prosocial behaviors such as eating healthy foods or exhibiting altruism.

Probably the most studied area using the O-S-O-R model (and relying heavily on Bandura’s work) has been violence on television and its impact on children. Following much public and governmental debate over the growing influence of television in the 1950s and 1960s United States, the US Surgeon General’s Scientific Advisory Committee on Television and Social Behavior was funded in 1969, charged with determining the impact of TV violence on youth. The 12-member committee’s five-volume report was released in 1972, consisting of 40 scientific reports in 2,300 pages. It reached conclusions on media effects, but also became mired in political controversy. It stands as a powerful statement of the commitment by the US government to attempting to identify media effects, although ultimately it did not lead to regulation or long-term reform of violent content.

**Cultivation theory**

Developed by George Gerbner and colleagues in communication at the University of Pennsylvania, USA, cultivation theory is a cognitive-focused adjunct to social cognitive theory, specifying that exposure to mediated images of the world that are repeated and consistent will cultivate the view that these images reflect the real world. The original focus of the theory and related research was television, which at the time presented a monolithic source of information and entertainment for US audiences. The consistency of TV images and portrayals allowed for tracking such impacts as the mean world hypothesis, which indicated that heavy TV viewers held a view of the real world as more crime-ridden, dangerous, and frightening than it really was. There was also support for mainstreaming, the notion that heavier TV viewers would be more similar in their perceptions of the real world than would light viewers (Signorielli & Morgan, 1990). Cultivation has been applied to the process of gender and racial stereotyping, as well as body image. Cultivation studies continue to map the theory as changes in
the media landscape have led to the proliferation of channels and the fragmentation of audiences.

**Spiral of silence theory**

Also arising from an observed homogeneity of societal conditions, political scientist Elisabeth Noelle-Neumann’s spiral of silence theory (1974) attempted to explain why individuals in her native West Germany would tend to remain silent when they perceived that they held a minority opinion. She posited that fear of isolation (a lack of conformity) and fear of reprisals were likely explanations. A focus on the mass media (particularly news media) as prime conveyors of climate of opinion—what opinions are in the majority and which in the minority—brought this theory to the attention of communication researchers. The spiral of silence perspective has since been applied to many international situations and has been adapted and tweaked to account for heterogeneity in societies by acknowledging multiple spirals (Jeffres, Neuendorf, & Atkin, 1999) and has most recently been applied to social media environments.

**Diffusion of innovations**

Beginning in the 1960s, the articulation of the diffusion of innovations perspective provided a model explaining how communication enables the diffusion of new ideas and inventions through a social system. Based on early work in rural sociology at the University of Iowa, USA (Ryan & Gross, 1943), and clarified and extended by communication scholar Everett Rogers in his 1962 book (see Rogers, 2003), the diffusion of innovations perspective spawned thousands of studies around the world and helped policymakers struggling with the stimulation of economic development. Acknowledging the two-step flow of mediated messages through opinion leaders and change agents, the perspective also added typologies of adopter types (from innovators to laggards), characteristics of innovations that stimulate or impede adoption, and consequences of innovation adoption. Diffusion of innovations continues to be a robust research tradition to the present, with great international and interdisciplinary crossover but with particular attention to technologies within the communication field.

Not limited to diffusion theory, research on how communication impacts development has been a strong line of inquiry. Daniel Lerner (1958) noted the influence of media in national development, and Wilbur Schramm (1964) pointed to the positive relationship between economic growth and communication services. Studies in the 1960s and 1970s focused on how innovations diffused in rural communities, and the concept of *development communication* emerged. These top-down studies were joined by examinations of bottom-up grassroots projects that incorporated influences from interpersonal channels as well as popular entertainment. More recently, those concerned with development issues have focused on how communication technologies fit into the picture.
Structural pluralism and the knowledge gap

The 1970s saw the emergence of media effects research at the community level. The Minnesota team of Tichenor, Donohue, and Olien (1970) introduced scholars to structural pluralism, which says that media reflect the power structure of a society. These scholars’ work using communities as units of analysis found that media in heterogeneous communities distributed critical messages more than those in homogeneous communities, where consensus was more valued and media avoided upsetting the apple cart. Tichenor and his colleagues also introduced the idea of the knowledge gap, which says that a gap between high and low socioeconomic groups’ knowledge of public affairs grows as more information is fed into the system. This gap has been a continued focus of concern into the Internet age, with debate over whether the introduction of Web 2.0 is closing the knowledge gap.

Media imperialism and media dependency

Societal-level impacts have included investigations of cultural imperialism as conveyed via the media, sometimes referred to as media imperialism. With ties to the UNESCO New World Information and Communication Order debate of the late 1970s, this perspective held that the domination of the international media by a limited number of concerns from large, powerful nations results in the diminishment of national identities in smaller nations. Fitting the politics of the times, media imperialism became a popular theme of research examining influence from the West, and the United States in particular, concentrating on news flow but also considering the influence of film (particularly from Hollywood). This line of research peaked in the 1980s and declined as leftist politics waned (Tunstall, 2008).

However, media dependency theory provided a more broadly based perspective from which to view the power of information distributed via the mass media. The perspective views people, at both the individual and society levels, to be dependent on media for “continuous and ongoing ambiguity resolution” (Ball-Rokeach & DeFleur, 1976, p. 9). Under this perspective, media sources are viewed as powerful constructors of social reality, in that “by controlling what information is and is not delivered and how that information is presented, the media can play a large role in limiting the range of interpretations that audiences are able to make” (p. 10).

Cognitive approaches

Moving beyond the work in social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1986), scholarship interested in the actual mechanisms of the cognitive processing of mediated messages has grown steadily in the period of the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries. Models and theories explaining how advertising affects audiences and consumers have looked at message strategies, message content and formats, consumer and audience characteristics, and audience information processing. Cognitive processing has been a key focus, but researchers also have looked at “attitudes toward the ad,” the hierarchy of effects (Ray, 1973), and the theory of reasoned action (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975).
Primming theory acknowledges the existence of cognitive schema, the mental networks unique to each individual that are forged by learning and experience. Exposure to particular cues can activate an individual's schema such that proximate thoughts and behaviors will be called to the fore, and responses to mediated stimuli will reflect this priming (Roskos-Ewoldsen, Roskos-Ewoldsen, & Carpentier, 2009).

Framing theory, while most commonly thought of as the modes of presentation used by news professionals to try to tap into existing audience schemas for a given topic, has also been applied to the process by which receivers interpret and form impressions from mediated information, perhaps bringing it under the same umbrella as agenda-setting (Scheufele & Tewksbury, 2007).

Additional foci of contemporary research that looks at how audiences process messages include studies of memory performance, cognitive capacity and cognitive resource allocation, excitation transfer, narrative transportation, telepresence, social presence, flow, social comparison, social identity, and how the cognitive development of children relates to media exposure outcomes. Some research focuses specifically on the nature of cognitive processing, and one segment of this research uses psychophysiological measures to assess reactions to media exposure.

**Third-person effect**

Introduced in a 1983 article by sociologist W. Phillips Davison, the third-person effect is the tendency of individuals to perceive or report that mass-mediated messages have a greater impact on others than on themselves. Subsequent research has confirmed the conditional nature of the effect—for example, the social desirability of the particular effect and the precise nature of the third persons (“others”). This theory is unique in its metaeffects status—it is a theory about how people think the media affect members of the audience—and has the potential to integrate media effects theories.

**Topical focuses and current issues**

The discussion thus far has been organized roughly chronologically by eras of theoretical perspectives, as each set of theories developed and was explored via empirical investigations. It is worth acknowledging that, additionally, much of the media effects scholarship—both theoretical and empirical—has been driven by concern over the effects of particular types of media content. Across media and across time, a number of topics have stood as robust areas of concern for scholars, critics, politicians, and the general population: violence; sexual behaviors; frightening media content; gender, racial, and ethnic stereotyping; pornography; and advertising. Other key areas have included political communication and socialization, public communication campaigns, educational media, and marketing communication. Many of these topics have been examined for various media across the decades; for example, violence has been a concern in movies (1930s), television (1970s), rock music (1980s), and video games (2000s).
In the present age of media interactivity, with a dramatic increase in the menu of available content and unprecedented receiver gatekeeping power by each receiver over his or her own exposure, some older research traditions deserve a second look. Joseph Klapper’s notion of limited effects might indeed provide explanations for certain aspects of contemporary audience behavior. Selective exposure processes have never been so prominent in the information environment, and the growth of channels and online options reflecting partisan views and special interests rather than balanced presentations makes reinforcement of one’s preexisting attitudes and perceptions increasingly likely.

At the same time, the affordance provided by nearly unlimited content choices also presents the possibility that a particular piece of content for a particular receiver may prove to have powerful effects beyond reinforcement, perhaps *drenching* in its impact (Greenberg, 1988). Specifically, social media may have strong, but very particular, effects on individuals, particularly those with limited exposure to news and other content offered by legacy media and traditional channels.

Neuman and Guggenheim (2011) have called for clustering media effects theories not by era of introduction or prominence but by sets of assumptions. For example, their cluster of *social context theories* transcends historical divisions by including the two-step flow, diffusion theory, knowledge gap theory, the spiral of silence, and third-person theory. In attending to this call, we might fruitfully view the full history of media effects scholarship not as discrete eras but as cumulative, with each era providing incremental additions to the sophistication and complexity of theorizing and researching mass media effects. Effects studies have focused on the individual, and secondarily communities. With global communication, the context for media effects needs to expand and consider impacts on relationships among peoples, cultures, and countries. Use of the Internet for propaganda by extremist groups and the growth of media organizations that cross and disregard national boundaries and cultures are part of this developing picture.
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