

# Bibliotekarstudentens nettleksikon om litteratur og medier

Av Helge Ridderstrøm (førsteamanuensis ved OsloMet – storbyuniversitetet)

Sist oppdatert 15.04.19

Dette dokumentets nettside (URL) er:

<https://www.litteraturogmedieleksikon.no/cm4all/uproc.php/0/parasosial.pdf>

## Parasosial

Parasosial interaksjon er en type subjektiv medietilegnelse (Geimer 2010 s. 126). Personlig “over-involvering” i fiktive virkeligheter utviser litt av skillet mellom det fiktive og det reelle.

Vanskelighetene med å skille fiksjon og virkelighet, og et enormt emosjonelt engasjement i reelle og fiktive personer fra filmer, TV-programmer, dataspill m.m., fører til at mediepersonene utgjør ens “sosiale omgangskrets”. En synes en kjenner disse fiktive personene bedre, og vil heller “omgås” med dem, enn med sine egne naboer. Figurer i såpeserier blir mer fortrolige for oss enn fjerntboende slektninger (Vollbrecht 2001 s. 153). Og vi tenderer til å tro at roller er ekte eksistenser. For eksempel kan skuespillere som spiller leger i TV-serier, bli spurt om medisinske råd av folk på gata (Vollbrecht 2001 s. 201). Noen seere sender inn penger til operasjon for såpeserie-figurer som er kreftsyke, osv.

Gjennom mediebruken “fordobles deres sociale omverden så at sige. Man kan tale om den første sociale omverden, som er de sociale relationer til personerne i deres hverdag, og den anden sociale omverden, som er kontakten til mennesker man møder i det virtuelle univers, dvs. med computerens skærm som medie, men som man ikke møder ansigt-til-ansigt. Det er naturligvis kun en analytisk skelnen, som rummer overgangsformer, men den er egnet til at fastslå, at børn og unge har fået en ny omverden.” (Brandt-Pedersen 1999 s. 67)

En ung fransk kvinne uttalte til en forsker, om en amerikansk TV-serie: “Jeg synes noen ganger at jeg kjenner personene i *Friends* bedre enn min egen familie.” (forskeren Jean-Pierre Esquenazi; <http://communication.revues.org/4931>; lesedato 17.11.15) “Pippi og de andre barna til Astrid [Lindgren] var for meg like virkelige som mine lekekamerater da jeg vokste opp. Jeg levde, lekte, tenkte og kjente med dem og leste, leste, leste.” (journalisten Madeleine Cederström sitert fra *Morgenbladet* 10. – 15. mai 2015 s. 40) En 39 år gammel ingeniør fra Avignon i Frankrike sa om personene i filmer som han hadde sett på kino: “man deler deres eventyr, man knytter seg til dem, de blir våre venner.” (sitert fra Ethis 2013 s. 50)

“Netthatet mot karakteren Skyler White fra [TV-serien] *Breaking Bad* kan kanskje ses som en symbolsk fullendelse av tv-dramaets maskulinisering – det ble så ille at skuespilleren Anna Gunn ble truet på livet.” (Gry Rustad i *Klassekampen* 18. oktober 2014 s. 41)

“[Den] moralske bekymringa for medias potensielle negative påverknadskraft kjem til uttrykk i offentlegheita med jamne mellomrom. Debatten er viktig nok. Men den tek merksemda bort frå dei meir positive og kvardagslege funksjonane media har for dei fleste av oss. For mange menneske er media integrerte og naturlege element i dagleglivet, noko vi tar for gitt at vi bruker og har glede av. Media er også viktige kjelder både til informasjon, underholdning og engasjement. I tillegg er media viktige for opplevinga av fellesskap i eit samfunn, for å styrka den einskilde sin identitet. Dei kan også gi ei kjensle av å “ha selskap” (såkalla parasosial funksjon).” (*Adresseavisen* 25. februar 2003 s. 12)

“The primary characteristic of a parasocial interaction is that an illusion of a face to face relationship is created between the viewer and the person appearing on the screen. The viewer is made to believe that the person on the screen is communicating directly to them, as if they are close friends, conversing both personally and privately.” (<http://www.aber.ac.uk/media/Students/nrb0002.doc>; lesedato 24.01.14)

Den britiske sosiologen John B. Thompson “notes that a specific form of social relationship which he calls ‘non-reciprocal intimacy’ has developed in late modernity. [...] fans can feel close to famous individuals, yet that closeness is not tied to any physical locale. The familiarity exists despite the fact that the fan has never met the star; indeed, the star may never have set foot in the fan’s home country. Still, the fan feels he or she knows the celebrity and experiences an emotional intimacy made up of shared knowledge, understandings, taste, and style. The relationship ‘grows’ despite the fact that only a one-way flow of communication over vast geographic distance has taken place. As Thompson notes: “Since mediated quasi-interaction is stretched across space and time, it makes possible a form of intimacy with others who do not share one’s own spatial-temporal locale; in other words, it makes possible what has been aptly described as ‘intimacy at a distance’. Second, since mediated quasi-interaction is non-dialogical, the form of intimacy established through it is non-reciprocal in character.” (1995: 219)” (Lull 2001 s. 202)

TVen kann fungere som et parasosialt kontaktledd med kjendiser eller med fiktive figurer. Filmregissøren Ole Giæver har sagt om TV-serien *Six Feet Under* (2001) at “Familien Fisher blir etter hvert som dine egne familiemedlemmer og du lever med dem i livets opp- og nedturen.” (i *Morgenbladet* 8. – 14. februar 2008 s. 40)

Musikalske guttegrupper som Nsync og Westlife har fans som prøver å minske avstanden mellom selg selv og sine idoler, og “medleve og medlide” idolenes

eksistens (Vollbrecht 2002 s. 74-75). Det å møte i virkeligheten en “stjerne” som en beundrer, kan sette i fare det byggverket av sympati som en har skapt på avstand fra personen, og som har vært en stabil referanse i ens eget liv (Ethis 2013 s. 114). Helten svarer ikke alltid til forventningene “in real life”.

De to forskerne Donald Horton og Richard Wohl undersøkte på 1950-tallet “the kind of vicarious or simulated relationship which members of the media audience establish with individual stars or personalities in the media, whether with a pop singer, a newsreader or a character in a soap opera. What characterizes such relationships is “intimacy at a distance”. This actually gives rise to some difficult analytical problems [...] but we should resist the still prevalent tendency to see para-social relationships as automatically deficient. For many people the kind of regular interaction they provide makes the media companions of their everyday lives into a ‘screen community’ that operates as ‘an extended kin grouping, whereby the viewer comes into contact with the wider society beyond his [sic] immediate family’ ” (Deacon m.fl. 1999 s. 285; det siste sitatet er fra G. Noble, 1975).

“The concept of parasocial interaction has become well established in the media and communication literature since the term first appeared in an article by Horton and Wohl (1956). Parasocial interaction was originally defined as the apparent face-to-face interaction that can occur between media characters and their audience. While audience members consist of users of mass media, media characters can include several types of media figures (or personae) such as presenters, actors, or celebrities. [...] Conceptually, parasocial relationships can be thought of as being similar to an interpersonal social interaction or relationship, although they typically consist of a much weaker bond. [...] For example, parasocial interaction is one of many important outcomes that audience members may seek when they select television shows to view. Moreover, parasocial interaction has also been established as an important determinant of media use, and an important concept to be investigated from a uses and gratifications perspective [...] Although parasocial relationships are based on simulated interaction, they can continue beyond the viewing period when viewers experience characters as close friends they would like to meet (e.g., Skumanich and Kintsfather 1998).” ([http://www.acrwebsite.org/volumes/v32/acr\\_vol32\\_83.pdf](http://www.acrwebsite.org/volumes/v32/acr_vol32_83.pdf); lesedato 07.08.13)

“[P]arasocial relationships complement social relationships, and are better understood as part of a viewer’s social life. It is perhaps not surprising that evidence has been gathering in support of the similarity between parasocial and social relationships. For example, viewers will judge media characters using many of the same criteria as those they use to judge other people they meet (Perse and Rubin 1989), and there are similar patterns in the development of social and parasocial relationships (Rubin and McHugh 1987). Overall, parasocial relationships resemble social relationships, and although they may often be less salient and intense than close social relationships, for many television viewers,

relationships with television characters and other celebrities are a constant, large, and in many instances important part of their social world (Skumanich and Kintsfather 1998).” ([http://www.acrwebsite.org/volumes/v32/acr\\_vol32\\_83.pdf](http://www.acrwebsite.org/volumes/v32/acr_vol32_83.pdf); lesedato 07.08.13)

“Television personalities encourage parasocial involvement with viewers by using conversational style and gestures within informal face-to-face settings that mirror interpersonal communication and invite interactive responses. The relationship is magnified by production techniques, such as close-up shots and camera zooms, which promote a sense of intimacy. The parasocial relationship, then, is fostered by a combination of factors: degree of reality approximation of the persona and the media, frequency and consistency of appearance by the persona, stylized behavior and conversational manner of the persona, and effective use of the formal features of television [...]. These factors work together to make the persona a predictable, nonthreatening, and, hence, perfect role partner for the viewer.” ([http://www.researchgate.net/Rubin\\_Perse\\_Powell\\_1985.pdf](http://www.researchgate.net/Rubin_Perse_Powell_1985.pdf); lesedato 07.08.13)

“Richard Schickel (1985) argues that fans today are led astray; mass media provide so much information about the real lives of stars that people believe they know them. He calls this a phenomenon of the “intimate stranger.” ” (Staiger 2005 s. 118).

Mediene bryter opp grensene mellom det fjerne og det nære, det offentlige og det private, det sosiale og det intime (Bougnoux 2001 s. 95). Brukeren glemmer sin egen anonymitet overfor f.eks. mediestjerner og “kommuniserer” med dem. Både de profesjonelle medieaktørene og brukerne (lesere, seere, spillere) oppfører seg som om de stod i et direkte sosialt forhold til hverandre. Brukernes forventninger og behov påvirker de profesjonelle medieprodusentene, mens brukerne inngår i en “kvasi-dialog“ med produsentene (Fromme m.fl. 1999 s. 132).

“One of the striking characteristics of the new mass media – radio, television, and the movies – is that they give the illusion of face-to-face relationship with the performer. The conditions of response to the performer are analogous to those in a primary group. The most remote and illustrious men are met as if they were in the circle of one’s peers; the same is true of a character in a story who comes to life in these media in an especially vivid and arresting way. We propose to call this seeming face-to-face relationship between spectator and performer a para-social relationship. In television, especially, the image which is presented makes available nuances of appearance and gesture to which ordinary social perception is attentive and to which interaction is cued. Sometimes the ‘actor’ – whether he is playing himself or performing in a fictional role – is seen engaged with others; but often he faces the spectator, uses the mode of direct address, talks as if he were conversing personally and privately. The audience, for its part, responds with something more than mere running observation; it is, as it were, subtly insinuated into the program’s action and internal social relationships and, by dint of this kind of staging, is

ambiguously transformed into a group which observes and participates in the show by turns. The more the performer seems to adjust his performance to the supposed response of the audience, the more the audience tends to make the response anticipated. This simulacrum of conversational give and take may be called para-social interaction.” (Horton og Wohl i [http://www.participations.org/volume%203/issue%201/3\\_01\\_hortonwohl.htm](http://www.participations.org/volume%203/issue%201/3_01_hortonwohl.htm); lesedato 22.01.14)

“Para-social relations may be governed by little or no sense of obligation, effort, or responsibility on the part of the spectator. He is free to withdraw at any moment. If he remains involved, these para-social relations provide a framework within which much may be added by fantasy. But these are differences of degree, not of kind, from what may be termed the ortho-social. The crucial difference in experience obviously lies in the lack of effective reciprocity, and this the audience cannot normally conceal from itself. To be sure, the audience is free to choose among the relationships offered, but it cannot create new ones. The interaction, characteristically, is one-sided, nondialectical, controlled by the performer, and not susceptible of mutual development. There are, of course, ways in which the spectators can make their feelings known to the performers and the technicians who design the programs, but these lie outside the para-social interaction itself.” (Horton og Wohl i [http://www.participations.org/volume%203/issue%201/3\\_01\\_hortonwohl.htm](http://www.participations.org/volume%203/issue%201/3_01_hortonwohl.htm); lesedato 22.01.14)

“For the great majority of the audience, the para-social is complementary to normal social life. It provides a social milieu in which the everyday assumptions and understandings of primary group interaction and sociability are demonstrated and reaffirmed. The “personality” program, however, is peculiarly favorable to the formation of compensatory attachments by the socially isolated, the socially inept, the aged and invalid, the timid and rejected. The persona himself is readily available as an object of love – especially when he succeeds in cultivating the recommended quality of “heart.” Nothing could be more reasonable or natural than that people who are isolated and lonely should seek sociability and love wherever they think they can find it. It is only when the para-social relationship becomes a substitute for autonomous social participation, when it proceeds in absolute defiance of objective reality, that it can be regarded as pathological. The existence of a marginal segment of the lonely in American society has been recognized by the mass media themselves, and from time to time specially designed offerings have been addressed to this minority. In these programs, the maximum illusion of a personal, intimate relationship has been attempted. They represent the extreme development of the para-social, appealing to the most isolated, and illustrate, in an exaggerated way, the principles we believe to apply through the whole range of “personality” programs. The programs which fall in this extreme category promise not only escape from an unsatisfactory and drab reality, but try to prop up the sagging self-esteem of their unhappy audience by the most blatant reassurances.” (Horton og Wohl i [http://www.participations.org/volume%203/issue%201/3\\_01\\_hortonwohl.htm](http://www.participations.org/volume%203/issue%201/3_01_hortonwohl.htm); lesedato 22.01.14)

“Horton and Wohl refer to television personalities as *personae*, who achieve intimacy with the viewers from their regular appearances on camera. [...] They suggest that a Bond of Intimacy is created by the persona and the production company in order to create the illusion of interaction. The persona uses small talk, casualness and will often speak to members of his ‘cast’ using their first names or even nicknames. Graham Norton often does this, acting as if he has known the guest for a long time. Researchers look for stories of the guest’s past so that Graham can bring them up casually and fondly to imply a sense of closeness and intimacy. The production team and Graham Norton work out all the cues so that Graham knows when to turn his head [...] to what camera to make his ‘private jokes’ with the home audience. Horton and Wohl note how the persona will step into the audience and converse with them and send people into the street converting the outside world into the extension of his stage, eradicating the line that separates persona and spectator (Horton & Wohl 1956, 218). Graham Norton does this on almost every show; it allows the television viewer to see that there are other people who like them are spectators but who have active involvement and vulnerability; this identification of spectator to spectator compels the home audience to feel more involved. The involvement of a spectator, someone who is real and unprepared, allows for a greater identification, and the persona’s direct conversation with a member of the audience creates a very personal feel, which can be felt by the television viewer. It is not uncommon for people to feel embarrassed for someone else and these shared feelings can be felt for a complete stranger on the television. Norman Fairclough, whose research is more modern, refers to the personal relationship between a spoken or written text and an audience as *synthetic personalisation*.” ([http:// www.aber.ac.uk/media/Students/nrb0002.doc](http://www.aber.ac.uk/media/Students/nrb0002.doc); lesedato 24.01.14)

På tysk finnes disse bøkene om fenomenet: T. Fabian: *Fjernsyn og ensomhet i alderdommen: En empirisk undersøkelse om parasosial interaksjon* (1993); U. Gleich: *Parasosial interaksjon: Forholdet mellom TV-seere og mediepersoner* (1995); P. Vorderer (red.): *Fjernsyn som relasjonskasse: Parasosiale relasjoner og interaksjoner med TV-personer* (1996).

Alle artiklene og litteraturlista til hele leksikonet er tilgjengelig på <https://www.litteraturogmedieleksikon.no>