This issue is a heavy one, both in its number of pages and in the gravity of some of the contributions. For example, Buttle reviews in depth 101 'popular texts on marketing communications theory' (MCT), pointing out that most rely directly or indirectly on five 'ancestral theorists' who did their research thirty to fifty years ago. He concludes that conventional MCT fails to give weight to more recent research which challenges these traditional models. This is a serious reproach to those who teach and write about the subject.

Buttle has deliberately excluded books which focus on only one component of marketing communications such as advertising. Possibly as a consequence, none of the 101 books nor the forty-eight other cited references are by practitioners. What theories do they use – the traditional or the recent?

It is part of the philosophy of this journal that closer understanding between academics and practitioners will be to the benefit of both parties. A recent seminar held at the University of Cambridge on the effects of advertising was attended by senior representatives of both groups, who showed significant gaps in their knowledge of each others' work. In a subsequent issue, I hope to report on the output of this seminar and persuade some eminent practitioners to put forward the models they respect and to cite supporting texts.

The other articles in this issue are varied: interpersonal relationships in 'lonely-heart' advertising in Canada; business-to-business vs. consumer advertising in USA (a large subject with a small literature); gender in advertising in Japan, and further tracking of the development of advertising in China.

Many more contributions continue to be offered to this journal than it can possibly publish. All those on remit of appropriate quality are reviewed for possible publication.

The final selection from those commended by the reviewers is intended to offer to the readership breadth and depth: from articles originating from all over the globe by writers with long and respected experience and by those nearer the beginning of their careers. These articles review and research a rich variety of topics, some central, others peripheral, to the development of the subject. Not everything can possibly be of immediate interest to everyone, but I hope most readers will wish to take note of at least some articles in each issue.

ALAN WOLFE

The Advertising Association is not responsible for the opinions and data in the editorial and articles in this journal.
A survey of 101 popular texts in the fields of marketing, marketing communication, marketing management, promotion management and marketing strategy was undertaken. Analysis revealed five key ancestral communication theorists whose work underpins contemporary textbook presentations on marketing communication. The term 'ancestors' means those forebears whose theoretical work pioneered new ways of thinking about communication, and whose work became the organizing influence around which the research activities of others rotated.

Of the 101 texts, thirty referred to ancestral theory, as indicated in Table 1. Cited most often were Wilbur Schramm, Claude E. Shannon and Warren Weaver, Joseph T. Kipper, David K. Berlo and Harold D. Lasswell. The most frequently cited works are listed in Table 2.

Seventy-one of the texts failed to cite any ancestral communication theorists. However, many of these did attempt to construct their own theoretical explanations of marketing communication. These generally made claims similar to those of the leading theoreticians cited in the other thirty texts. Some text authors referred not to ancestral theorists but to the work of the likes of Elihu Katz, Bernard Berelson, Paul Lazarsfeld and Carl Hovland whose research in the 1940s, 1950s and 1960s was grounded in the ancestral work of others – Schramm, and Shannon and Weaver in particular. This is not to claim that theory is absent from such texts, for theory is implicit in the managerial strategies those texts recommend. What is absent is any explicit recognition of the theoretical grounds upon which such recommendations are based. Theory without practice may be barren and vacuous, but practice without theory risks being gratuitous and promiscuous.

There have been very few attempts by members of the marketing community to produce comprehensive, integrative theory about marketing communication. Maile and Kizilbash (1977) have developed a marketing communications model but this was cited in just one of the 101 texts. A second attempt presented what the author (Bitt, 1978) called a 'psychological model of communicating'. Britt's work is not cited once in the other 100 contemporary marketing communication texts. Robertson (1971) and DeLozier (1976) have also made notable efforts to generate theory.

Table 1  Cited marketing communication theorists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theorician</th>
<th>Date(s) of publication</th>
<th>Number of citations in the 101 texts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Claude E. Shannon and Warren Weaver</td>
<td>1948, 1949, 1962</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph T. Kipper</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David K. Berlo</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold D. Lasswell</td>
<td>1948a, 1948b, 1952, 1960</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANCESTRAL THEORY

The following paragraphs outline the claims of the five principal ancestors of contemporary marketing communication theory.

Lasswell (1948a, 1960)

Harold Lasswell, who was Professor of Law at Yale University, is the earliest ancestor of contemporary marketing communication theory cited in the texts. In this article which Schramm (1971) later claimed to be 'one of the classic papers… which did so much to structure the thinking of a whole generation of communication scholars and students', Lasswell (1948a) described communication in these words:

A convenient way to describe an act of communication is to ask the following questions:

Who
Says What
In Which Channel
To Whom
With What Effect?

He noted that these questions are the central issues in a number of communication research fields – control analysis (who), content analysis (says what), media analysis (in which channel), audience analysis (to whom), and effect analysis (with what effect?). Furthermore, he claimed that the communication process in society performs three functions: (a) surveillance of the environment, disclosing the threats and opportunities affecting the value position of the component parts within it; (b) correlation of the components of society in making a response to the environment; (c) transmission of the social inheritance.
Although Lasswell’s ‘Who Says What . . .’ aphorism has taken root in marketing texts, little else of his has found fertile ground.

Shannon and Weaver (1948, 1949)

In a paper published in the Bell System Technical Journal, Claude E. Shannon (Shannon, 1948) made innovative use of the expression ‘communication theory’ to mean the study and statement of the principles and method by which information is conveyed.

A year later, Shannon collaborated with Warren Weaver to publish the book *The Mathematical Theory of Communication*. The book combined Shannon’s earlier paper with Weaver’s update entitled ‘Recent contributions to the mathematical theory of communication’. Their definition of communication, ‘all the procedures by which one mind may affect another’, was operationalized in a mathematical model which provided a precise, quantified measure of information.

Cited in one marketing text as ‘a sophisticated treatment of communication systems’ (Kernan et al., 1970), in another (quite wrongly as it happens) as ‘the most widely cited model of the communication process’ (Bennett, 1988), and in a third as ‘a complete discussion’ (Lipson and Darling, 1971), Shannon and Weaver were primarily concerned with problems of engineering a communication system which could handle any message produced by a source.

Their concern was to specify the conditions under which high fidelity would be achieved. They identified three critical communication problems: the accuracy problem, the precision problem and the effectiveness problem. The accuracy problem is a technical problem. The key question is: is the channel technically capable of accurately transmitting the symbols produced by a source? The precision problem is a semantic problem. The key question is: do the symbols precisely convey the meaning desired? The effectiveness problem can be expressed thus: does the received meaning affect conduct in the desired way?

Shannon and Weaver describe communication as a process which starts when an information source selects a desired message out of a set of possible messages. The transmitter sends this message into the signal which is then sent over the communication channel from the transmitter to the receiver. In speech communication, the source is the brain and the transmitter is the voice mechanism. The receiver changes the transmitted signal back into a message, and passes this message on to the destination. Infidelity may be introduced into the process at various stages. Both the encoded and decoded messages may contain semantic error; channel characteristics may distort the signal; environmental factors may inhibit reception. The authors summarized their position in a diagram (see Figure 1).

Schramm (1954, 1971)

Schramm’s (1954) book of readings, entitled *The Process and Effects of Mass Communications*, opens with a 24-page explanation of his general theory of communication. Schramm claims that ‘when we communicate we are trying to establish a ‘commonness’ with someone’ (1954, p.3). All communication involves at least three elements: source, message, receiver. The source encodes the message, transmits it and the receiver decodes it. Both the encoding and decoding are grounded in the particular ‘fields of experience’ (p.6) of sender and receiver. If decoding matches encoding, there has been established a commonness with someone. Since distortion may occur at any link in the process preventing the achievement of commonness, the source tries to encode the message in signs which will ‘make it easy for the destination to tune in the message’ (p.6).

Schramm claims that it is ‘misleading to think of the communication process as starting somewhere and ending somewhere’ (p.8) because we are constantly receiving and decoding signs from the environment, interpreting these signs and encoding something as a result. Consequently, Schramm adds one final element to his model: feedback. Feedback tells us how our messages are being interpreted. Schramm sums up his model in Figure 2.

In his 1971 update of the book of readings, Schramm comments on his earlier essay that ‘human communication seemed a simpler thing in 1952 than it does in 1970’ (p.6). A particular development he noted was that communication had now come to be thought of as ‘a relationship, an act of sharing, rather than something which someone does to someone else’ (p.8). This reflects the demise of what Schramm had earlier called ‘The Bullet Theory of Communication’. Communication had been seen as a magic bullet that ‘transferred ideas or feelings or knowledge or motivations from one mind to another’ (p.8). By 1971 Schramm was acknowledging that audiences are not passive and defenceless, and proposing that ‘it is now necessary to think of the communication process as two separate acts, one performed by a communicator, one by a receiver’ (p.11). Schramm redefined communication as ‘the sharing of an orientation towards a set of informational signs’ (p.13). Information in turn was broadly defined as ‘any content that reduces uncertainty or the alternative number of possibilities in a situation’ (p.13).

Schramm now felt able to claim that all communication, whether interpersonal or mediated, involved three elements and two kinds of action. The elements are the communicator, the message and the receiver. He observed that ‘the message exists as a sign or collection of signs with no meaning of their own except that which cultural learning enables a receiver to read into them’ (p.15). The first act of the communication process is the construction by the communicator of the ‘signs which he hopes will call forth the desired responses’ (p.15). The second act is performed by the receiver. ‘A receiver selects among the stimuli available to him, selects from the context of the message he chooses, interprets it and disposes of it as he is moved to do’ (p.16). These acts are separately motivated but brought
Fig. 2 Schramm’s earlier model of communication
Source: Schramm (1954), p.8

together by a single collection of signs. He concludes that communication is something people do; it has no life of its own, and there is no meaning in a message other than that which people put into it. The study of communication, therefore, is the study of people in relationship.

Given these changes, Schramm now rediaugrammed his model of communication (Fig. 3). Person A encodes a message and transmits the message to person B. B comes to the message in an active way. B encodes a response, transmits this message to A who also interacts with the message. Both A and B operate within certain frames of reference, by which Schramm means their ‘fund of usable experience’ (p.31). Where they can communicate efficiently, the two frames overlap. The final element in the revised model is termed ‘social situation and relationships’. Schramm claims that all communication necessarily functions within a broader framework of social relations which he identifies as comprising four elements: the physical/spatial relationship between sender and receiver; the situational context; role expectations, and social norms.

Berlo (1960)

David K. Berlo’s book The Process of Communication (1960) provides a behavioural approach to human communication [which is] interdisciplinary. It relies on relevant research in experimental and social psychology, sociology, linguistics, anthropology and philosophy, together with significant studies in mass communication and other applied communication fields. The central concepts of the book, particularly the core concepts of meaning, are developed multidimensionally, using whatever disciplines and subject-matter specialties are relevant. (p.v)

Berlo goes to some lengths to emphasize that communication is a process; as such it poses problems for theoreticians. In particular, it is necessary to ‘arrest the dynamic of the process’ (p.25) to make it accessible. Berlo borrows Hayakawa’s aphorism – ‘the word is not the thing’ – to draw attention to the dynamism which this analysis of process obscures. Given this caveat, Berlo proceeds to list six ‘ingredients’ of the communication process: the communication source; the encoder; the message; the channel; the decoder; and the communication receiver. Berlo’s particular contribution is his observation that encoding and decoding functions are separable from source and receiver functions. Communication

Fig. 3 Schramm’s revised model of communication
Source: Schramm (1971), p.33

sources have a ‘purpose’ (p.32) or ‘intended’ to affect behaviour’ (p.73), and a ‘central nervous system’ which enables communication. The source instructs encoders to encode. Examples of encoders mentioned by Berlo are the speech mechanism, the writing mechanism, typewriters, typists and printers. Messages include words and the manner in which they are arranged. Examples of channels are sound waves and light waves. He cites the hearing mechanism and the eye as examples of decoders. The receiver is whoever responds to the decoded message.

Berlo warns that the concepts of source, encoder, decoder and receiver should ‘not be viewed as separate things or entities or people. They are the names of behaviours which have to be performed for communication to occur’ (p.37). Berlo then develops this model of the communication process by addressing some issues affecting fidelity in encoding/decoding, message construction and communication channels.

Klapper (1960)

Klapper is the only author among these five ancestral theorists whose focus is entirely upon mediated communication. Those marketing communication textbook writers who have cited Klapper as providing theoretical insights into marketing communication are generally culpable of ignoring the major area of interpersonal marketing communication.

Klapper’s work is original in the sense that he formulates certain empirical generalizations based on others’ published research. Klapper dubs his general approach ‘phenomenistic’ and claims that mass communication can no longer be thought of as a ‘necessary and sufficient cause of media effects’, but rather as one influence functioning ‘amid other influences in a total situation’ (p.5). The conclusions Klapper draws from his reading of over 270 published and several unpublished reports are as follows:

1. Mass communication ordinarily does not serve as a necessary and sufficient cause of audience effects, but rather functions among and through a nexus of mediating factors and influences.
2. Those mediating factors are such that they typically render mass communication a contributory agent, but not the sole cause, in a process of reinforcing existing conditions.
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3. On such occasions as mass communication does function in the service of change, one of two conditions is likely to exist. Either:  
a. the mediating factors will be found to be inoperative and the effect of the media will be found to be direct; or  
b. the mediating factors which normally favour reinforcement, will be found to be themselves impelling toward change.
4. There are certain residual situations in which mass communication seems to produce direct effects, or directly and of itself to serve certain psycho-physical functions.
5. The efficacy of mass communication, either as a contributory agent or as an agent of direct effect, is affected by various aspects of the media and communications themselves or of the communication situation. (p.8)

Basically, Klapper seeks to disempower mass media and place its operation in a broader psycho-social context. Like Schramm (1971), he called into question the notion of the bullet theory of communication, or as Klapper himself called it, the 'hypodermic effect'.

THEMES IN ANCESTRAL MARKETING COMMUNICATION THEORY

A number of themes are shared by all or most of these ancestral theories.
1. The appropriate unit of analysis for audience effects is the individual.
2. The effect of particular messages is the principal concern.
3. The intention of the source determines the meaning of a message.
4. Communication can be said to be effective when the receiver’s decoding of message content produces the same meaning as intended by the encoder.

It is these themes and assumptions that contemporary communication theorists have called into question and which form the basis of the following discussion.

CRITIQUING MARKETING COMMUNICATION THEORY

This discussion proceeds by critically examining the four common themes identified above, which I now refer to as normal marketing communication theory (MCT).

Focus on the individual
Critics of the practice of regarding the individual as the appropriate unit of analysis observe that marketing communication has effects at the household, family, institutional and cultural levels. Marketing communication theory would be more comprehensive in its explanation if it imported some relevant insights from the broader communication literature concerning these other levels of effect.

Household effects
Between 1978 and 1990, Communication Abstracts recorded the publication of over 650 empirical or theoretical studies of the effects of mediated commercial communication; that is, advertising. Of these, approximately fifty have examined the relationship between advertising and social practices within households and families. Research has focused on five thematic questions. First, what do people do during television commercial breaks? Second, what is the social context of advertisement reception? Third, how does advertising find expression in interpersonal communication? Fourth, how do intra-family relationships and processes mediate the effects of advertisements on children? Fifth, how are advertisements used by family members in their social interactions? The evidence points to an active audience which manages its relationship with advertising and integrates it into everyday family social practices in productive ways (Bottle, 1990a). There is clear evidence that households and families develop complex rule-governed relationships with advertising media and advertising content. The simple stimulus-response model of normal MCT ignores this complexity. Institutional effects
Effects may also occur at an institutional level. The source of the bulk of marketing communication in western economies is an institutional form which can be characterized as privately-owned-enterprise-in-public-competition. The message production system is institutionalized in advertising, sales promotion and public relations agencies. The delivery system is institutionalized in privately owned media. The message receivers are the least institutionalized of all components of the marketing communication system. All major communications effects occur within this interlocking network of institutions. No effects would occur in the absence of any of these institutions. Fear of manipulation by ostensibly powerful marketer-controlled message production and delivery systems has created a number of institutional effects. Advertisers have introduced voluntary codes of practice, governments have legislated against certain forms of marketing communications practice such as pyramid selling and inertia selling, consumers have organized themselves into lobbying groups, conservatism have rallied to protest wasteful resource use and so on. Such institutional effects are not accounted for in normal theory.

Cultural effects
Finally, normal MCT does not account for the cultural effects of marketing communication.

Cultural effects may be studied from two perspectives: cognitive and critical. Cognitive questions such as the following are not addressed by the ancestral theorists adopted by marketers: How does advertising influence the construction of social realities? What is the relationship between beliefs, values, moral orders, knowledge claims and marketing communication? How does marketing communication influence the processes of enculturation and socialization?

Also absent from normal MCT is any accounting for the critical approach to the examination of cultural effects. Marxism and feminism provide two critical perspectives on marketing communication. The Marxist view, much simplified, is that the institutional structure is so organized as to support the ideology and protect the interests of the ruling classes. The feminist critique of marketing
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communication has noted that society is organized into a patriarchy and that the voices of women are missing or subordinated in marketer-controlled communication. Common to both feminist and Marxist critics is a concern with hegemony. Hegemony appears in the 'proper social and moral order' that serves to maintain the ongoing hierarchically organized social structure. Critical theorists call into question the commonly unquestioned social order and attempt to radicalize those who are subjugated by it.

The social world we share can be analysed at several systemic levels. This practice of 'bracketing' experience, excluding some parts while including others in an effort to make the complex more accessible and intelligible, is probably responsible for marketing communication theory's failure to account for effects experienced beyond the individual level - at the family/household, institutional and cultural levels.

FOCUS ON INDIVIDUAL MESSAGES

Normal MCT focuses on the effects of individual messages or campaigns on identified individuals. However, marketing communication in general is a pervasive, inescapable presence. Advertising agents Ogilvy & Mather have estimated, for example, that we are typically exposed to some 3000 marketer-controlled messages each day. Normal MCT does not address the question of the cumulative impact of living in a society which is saturated with marketing communication. Social and economic historians have made contributions which could illuminate MCT. The movement of western culture from a pre-industrial level to its present-day post-industrial or consumer society has been traced by a number of commentators (Fox and Lears, 1983; Leiss et al., 1986). A particular observation has been how this movement is inextricably linked to institutional change. The breakdown of traditional, ethnic modes of living has been accompanied by changing beliefs and value systems; a mass communications industry has emerged; production, once located at the point of consumption, has become centralized and organized in fewer hands; distribution of goods is similarly concentrated; finally, marketing and advertising became institutionalized as a significant, perhaps the most significant, influence on meaning production for consumers. Shared products, shared communications technologies, shared messages and shared interpretive strategies are features of the consumer society in which marketing communication is so central. Normal theory fails to recognize this phenomenon.

A related criticism is that normal MCT assumes that the only marketing practices that are thought meaningful by consumers are those promotional messages which are so carefully constructed to produce specific outcomes. However, individuals may interact symbolically, or find meaning in, the product, price decisions or any other publicly accessible corporate information. Consumers are capable of interacting symbolically with the most silent of companies. Other decision variables used by marketers to influence demand - price and place - are also message-laden. There is already some evidence to suggest that these marketing variables are also (largely unwitting) communicators (Buttle, 1990b).

FOCUS ON SOURCE'S INTENT

The focus of normal MCT on the intent of the message producer is founded on two related propositions. First, that the audience is passive, in that it fails to actively interpret messages. Second, that the receiver is relatively powerless in relationship with the message content.

Passive audience

Traditionally, there have been two opposing models of the audience in the individual effects literature - the passive audience and the active audience. The former is the assumption of the bullet or hypodermic theory of communication. The latter has had a tenuous presence in marketing communication theory since Bauer (1964) introduced his notion of the 'obstinate audience' and Klapper (1960) remarked that mass media function 'through a nexus of mediating factors and influences'.

A third and more recent innovation in audience research has been the concept of interpretive communities. Community membership, whether formal or informal, brings with it a particular interpretive world view. What appears to an audience member to be his or her own particular imposition of meaning is, according to Fish (1980), actually the result of a system of beliefs and resultant interpretive strategies he or she shares with a larger community. The notion of interpretive community is absent from normal MCT.

Relationship to message content

There are three research traditions in the individual effects literature which are concerned with the relationship between content and audience. The exposure tradition grants most of the power in the relationship to the content; the uses and gratifications tradition grants most to the audience; the interactive tradition grants power to both.

The exposure tradition, which dominates normal MCT, assumes that meaning resides in the content, and that it should be possible to detect a causal relationship between message content and audience effects. The uses and gratifications tradition reverses the power relations. Rather than assuming that content does things to people, it assumes that people do things with content - the individual selects content for some purpose, to gratify some need, or to gain some satisfaction (O'Donohoe, 1994). The uses and gratifications approach neatly reverses the Lasswellian formula cited earlier. Uses and gratifications researchers ask: who uses what content, in which media, under what circumstances, for what purpose and with what effects?

The interactive model holds that the meaning of a message is in the interaction of the content and its user. Messages are not entirely semantically open; some
meanings are enabled, some are constrained. In this regard, Eco (1979) has written about the degree of openness or closure of a text, and Hall (1980) about preferred readings. This interactive model is seen as 'a slightly more sophisticated form of the exposure model in which cognitive states are accountable within the mediating conditions of attendance' to particular media or content (Anderson and Meyer, 1988, p.175).

What we now know about the active audience, the interpretive community, meaning attribution and uses and gratifications calls into question the argument that the meaning of a message is in the intent of the source. There is certainly good reason to rethink the role of intent in marketing communication theory.

FOCUS ON CO-ORIENTATION

If the intent of the communicator is not a (wholly) explanatory factor in marketing communication theory, then the claim that communication occurs when there is an isomorphism of encoding/decoding, commonness or co-orientation cannot be sustained either. If the decisions, artefacts and other incidental outputs of marketing organizations are polysemic, the issue of fidelity similarly becomes redundant.

Normal MCT assumes the text (the content of marketing communication) to be semantically closed, but accessible to a competent receiver. Open texts, by comparison, are capable of multiple readings. Normal MCT opts for the closed text stance. Different understandings of texts are thought of as misinterpretations, distortions, errors, evidence of receiver incompetence or biases. The goal of marketing communicators may be to produce unambiguous messages capable of only one reading by target audiences, but this ignores the fact that people may contextualize a message in many ways and render it multiply meaningful. People are social beings 'enmeshed in multiple systems', each with its own logic of meaning and action (Pearce and Cronen, 1980). These logics supply interpretive frames which contextualize message reception. Normal MCT ignores the issue of the many interpretive frames which could conceivably contextualize message interpretation for the individual, and yet fail to produce co-orientation.

CONCLUSION

The adherence of marketing communication authors to the ancestral writings of Lasswell, Shannon and Weaver, Schramm, Berlo and Klapper has produced a contemporary literature which has failed to take account of recent advances made in communication theory more generally. What we have is outdated, ill-informed and in need of revision.

Four related common themes cut across the work of the five ancestral theorists: their focus on audience effects at the individual level; their concern with the effects of single messages or campaigns; their endorsement of intentionality, and their support of the encoding/decoding model of communication.
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MARKETING COMMUNICATION THEORY

Each of these themes has been called into question by more recent theory. Communication effects are felt at family/household, institutional and cultural levels in addition to the individual level. Furthermore, normal marketing communication theory does not acknowledge that individual effects can be explained from a number of competing viewpoints – those which focus on the role of content, audience and the relationship between the content and audience. For the most part, normal MCT assumes that content is semantically closed and that audiences are relatively passive. Broader theoretical advances made in our understanding of the active audience's uses for and gratifications obtained from media and content, or of the interpretive communities which may produce dominant, oppositional and negotiated readings of texts have yet to find their way into marketing communication theory. It is clear that the normal privileging of the individual perspective is both ill-informed and myopic.

Normal MCT's focus on the effects of an individual message or campaign is also problematic. There is no acknowledgement of the cumulative impact of marketing communication upon individuals, families, institutions or cultures. Neither does normal MCT acknowledge that marketing practices in areas other than promotion can be meaningful to audiences; for example, product design and price decisions. Finally, given the notions of the active audience and the potential for multiple meanings in any given message, it is necessary to moderate the centrality given to intentionality and co-orientation by the ancestral theorists.

In all, normal MCT is ill-informed and narrowly focused as a result of its continued reverence for Lasswell, Shannon and Weaver, Schramm, Berlo and Klapper. Perhaps this should not surprise. After all, normal MCT is largely written for students who wish to become practitioners. For them, the big issue is how to bring about short-term cognitive, affective and behavioural change. However, for those who seek to understand the process and effects of marketing communication, such an approach is clearly inadequate. If theories are abstract constructions which attempt to describe, explain and interpret some phenomenological parts of human experience so that we may better understand, predict or control both the phenomena themselves and our relationship to those phenomena, then normal MCT is a lamentable failure. Theory is always historically situated. As scholars and researchers learn more, theory changes. This has not been the case for marketing communication theory which has remained steadfastly immobile.

NOTES

1 Books that focused on any particular one of the four components of marketing communication – advertising, selling, sales promotion and publicity – were omitted. Theorists cited in these books would not have had to contend with the diversity that characterizes marketing communication in general.

2 Other theorists receiving mention were Cherry (1966); DeFleur (1966); Eco (1976); Gerbner (1956); Miller (1951); Mortensen (1972); Thayer (1966); Whorf (1956), and Wiener (1949, 1954). Fuller details about these theoreticians and the books in which they are cited are in a working paper available from the author.

3 According to Anderson and Meyer's (1988) review of the effects literature, theories of communication effects vary in four ways, with respect to: (1) the agent of effects (which can be content, intent, interpretation); (2) the class of effect (behaviour, beliefs, affect, interactive, structural);  
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