

18

Interpersonal Communication in the Time of Globalization

Anna Pawiak¹

Abstract

This work aims to bring closer the constantly developing globalization and its meaning for the interpersonal communication. This process has dynamic, spontaneous and at the same time irreversible character, which means it is not always a matter of choice. Constant development of both communication and information technologies are indicators of globalization. These developments and accompanying communications revolution have effects not only at a world's scale, but referring directly to social groups and individuals as well. These bring virtual and physical migration without any restrictions. Developments in technology play a huge role and are important for the created social changes and interpersonal relations. Apart from the feeling of community and closeness globalization influences the rise of new barriers in personal relation connected with feelings of loneliness and isolation. This antagonistic situation is a result of rare direct interpersonal human communication.

Introduction

Globalization is not, as John Paul II wrote, neither a bad nor a good process – only its management processes may be bad. It should be a process that integrates through taking into account interpersonal relations, family and social bonds, made mainly by interpersonal communication and supported by global communication. Globalization is meant to serve the human and not the other way round. Thus one should concentrate on considerations which will enable to answer, in the future, the following questions: Do the tools of global communication make the beginning or the end of traditional human communication?, maybe they are the beginning of a new form of global attachment and community? Are we, since the beginnings of the Internet, becoming a mute community with restricted interpersonal communication? Is it only a temporary stage in the changing reality? It is very difficult nowadays to find answers to these questions. However, by being participants of the irreversible process of globalization we should consider the words of the person, who for many years was the Father of our common 'global village' and who by looking at the directions of the development of this process precisely stated that 'Globalization will be what people will make it be'. Globalization is a term which in the last years causes lively reactions in all countries and among different social

groups. Ambiguity and lots of aspects of the term „globalization” results in the fact that in literature a lot of definitions can be found – there is no satisfying definition however. It is certain that globalization is a complex and multidimensional process.

Evolutions of Personal Communication in the Time of Globalization

The term globalization at the break of the 80's and 90's of the 20th century made a tremendous career abroad and in Polish academic literature. *'Globalization is on everybody's lips'* Zygmunt Bauman wrote, it is *'a fashionable word that changes fast into a slogan, a magic formula (...)* We are *'globalized'* (Bauman 2000, 5). This term is still interpreted in many ways and causes a lot of controversy. At the base of globalization according to Cz. Porębski there are such events as: decommunization (a fall of communistic countries), deregulation (focusing on political actions and law regulations that aim at reducing restrictions referring to the freedom of economic relations), and permanent communication revolution connected with media, computerisation, fast means of transport and other. (Bielska 2001, 31). A term *'global village'* is associated with this pace of sending information. This definition was introduced by a Canadian journalist, theoretician of communication Marshall McLuhan referring to the world, where electronic media and migration reduce the distance between people and their isolation, leading to a conclusion that we are living in a village where everyone knows everyone and information travels fast. Globalization apart from benefits brings a lot of drawbacks such as the growth of economic inequality. That leads to pushing a huge number of people living in the world to the margin that has no chance of taking part in the advantages of this process. According to R. Fortner instead of *'global village'* we should rather talk about a *'global metropolis'* which according to him defines the process much better, as it points to the fact that there are disproportions and inequalities (Ociepka 2003, 58). The access to advanced technologies, which are at the same time means of information, is not equal within the globe, and even in places where it is possible not everyone can use it equally. It is difficult to talk about a communication revolution if only 2% of the world's population has the access to the Internet, even though in the last years a growth in the use of the web is noticed in the less developed countries. The whole technological and information revolution takes place in the world of rich people (Mojsiewiczem 2003, 53).

The term *'globalization'* was first used by an English sociologist Ronaldo Robertson in 1985 with reference to cultural and religious events in the contemporary world. According to him *'globalization'* is a set of processes which co-organize the

world', as a concept it refers both to 'making the world smaller' and increasing the level of understanding the world as a whole. Both factors strengthen global co-dependence and understanding the world as a whole in the XXth century' (Cynarski, 2003, 17). Taking the above into account there emerged some visions of globalization that influence its processes. R. Robertson introduced two versions of globalization. One known as a Global Gemeinschaft I, is a vision of independent of each other communities, unique and hierarchically dependent what is seen in the form of anty globalization or fundamentalist movements. Global Gemeinschaft II is to show the world as a global village which can be seen in the form of ecumenical, pacifistic or ecological movements. The first of the mentioned visions: Global Gesellschaft I is a vision of sovereign, hierarchically dependent or equal, possessing equal rights countries, open to each other, the last Global Gesellschaft II is a vision of unification of countries and rise of a world's government.

The meaning of the process of globalization gained a lot of importance thanks to the latest technological inventions which allow a broad exchange of products, fast movement of people and almost immediate exchange of information at huge distances. This process develops through time and is directed at a number of characteristic changes which take place in the contemporary world. "These changes (...) are based on coming closer, reducing the distance, fast growth of numerous relations, contacts, exchanges, growth in the dependence of communities in almost all aspects of their life, on what is going on in different, even distant parts of the world. A very important quality (...) of the process of globalization is a remarkable, faster and faster development of technological means of communication and transport' (Mojsiewicz 2003, 54). Globalization makes bigger and bigger circles, because it 'not only shapes the character and the scope of production and exchange, but it leaves a stamp on social relationships and style of life' (Dembiński 2001, 19). Within a broad understanding of globalization there is P. Sztompka's definition as well. According to it globalization should be understood as 'a process of condensing and intensification of economic, financial, political, military, cultural, ideological relations between societies which lead to the world's unification within all these scopes and what is mirrored in the social relations, solidarity of identity at local and national scales' (Dzwonczyk 2004, 319).

The above cited definitions are not – of course – all definitions from the long list referring to globalization that can be found within Polish and foreign literature of the subject. They show the essence of the phenomenon and highlight the fact that the process involves a lot of aspects starting with economic finishing with the social ones. Globalization is considered an unavoidable faith of the world (Bauman 2005, 5). This refers to the development of the means of transport at a global scale which allows the creation of a new social reality.

The Essence of Traditional Interpersonal Communication

Communication is a necessary condition for the creation and existence of a community. Genuineness and validity of this definition of society according to John Dewey was based on the fact that 'society exists not only thanks to the transfer of information and communication, but its existence is based on the processes of transfer of information and communication (Dobek-Ostrowska 1999, 13). Apart from the process of communication, equally important for the relations within society and shaping new social experiences, connected with the process of globalization are economical, political and technological changes that influence the ways of interpersonal communication.

Fast development of electronic media and dynamic expansion of information-communication technologies revolutionized almost all spheres of human life. The development of new technologies within the area of communication, getting and access to information started a process that is referred to as information revolution or electronic revolution. Until now it could be thought that the process of communication which is the subject of scientific research has no mystery inside as many things have been verified and taken for granted. However, fast changing reality influenced by globalization carries many changes within human communication which are results of the development of new technologies and tools of communication.

The basic means of human communication, the only available to the primitive societies, was the direct contact with the use of verbal and non-verbal communication. The notion 'communication', as many other existing in the casual language, derives from Latin verb *communico*, *communicare* translated as: making common, connect, give somebody information, discuss; and a noun *communio* meaning: community, feeling of connection².

The term communication, in its first Latin meaning and then used by other modern languages, appeared in the XIVth century and 'meant entering community, being in touch with somebody'. Until XVIth century the notion functioned in the meaning of 'communion, participation, sharing'. It was only in the XVI century due to the development of post and road that it received its second meaning 'transmission'. Nowadays terms 'announcement, communication' are the terms that appear in at least several branches of science with reference to different areas of reality.

So, the term 'communication' is in Polish associated with transport, in cyber sciences it is used to describe the process of the transfer of information between a system of an unidentified type and the surrounding world or between two or more systems. However, in this sense this term is not connected with communication that takes place as a result of human interaction, then it referred to as interpersonal

communication (Łęcki, A. Szóstala 1999, 15).

Communication can be understood both in a broad and narrow scope. In the broad sense it describes the whole natural world – the world of plants, animals and people, where it acts as a process of transmission of all biological information. We are interested more in the narrow sense which can be called human approach or social approach due to the restriction to the phenomena of human communication. This view is presented by Withur Schramm who calls communication ‘a tool which enables societies to exist and due to its character it distinguishes human beings from other living creatures’(Schramm 1973, 2).

Similarly Melvin Defleur, by restricting only to human phenomenon, refers to communication as to ‘act which is a means of expressing group norms, having social control, appointing roles, and getting coordination of efforts.’(Goban-Klas 1978, 72) Due to the fact that acts of communication appear always within a society, in its different structures and at different levels, it can be said that they are of a social character. That is why we may talk about ‘social communication’ as the broadest system of communication, which involves all the processes connected with communication between human beings (Dobek-Ostrowska 1999, 12).

Representatives of empirical school³ of science of communication, in terms of systemic-pragmatic point of view, from the so called Palo Alto School, in their assumption took for granted that there is a social system created by communication which involves every human being. A human does not start and finish the system, but only starts and finishes his part in the process of social communication. Representatives of this school, including P. Watzlawick, G. Bateson, R. Birdwhistell, E. T. Hall considered acts of communication a behaviour that can be observed, contributing to the process of personal interaction and shaping such social relationships that without communication would not exist. Moreover, they assumed that the system of communication is a sequence of events that take place one after the other at a certain point in time – the process of communication can not be broken during contact with another person, as each act of observable behaviour can be a source of information for the spectators of such behaviour. Silence is thus a means of communication as well. Each act in their opinion has two aspects. The first aspect of substantive content are information about reality or imaginary reality (report), the second aspect is the one that describes relationship between interlocutors (command), so the interpretation of the act of communication with reference to the personal relation between the sender and receiver (Nęcki 2000, 29). Representatives of this school were identified with a name ‘invisible college’ as the essence of communication was brought by them to the social process taking place at different levels, integrated with different manners of behaviour in the interpersonal space, such as a word, gesture, look, gesticulation, way of moving and similar.

Psychologists, theoreticians and researchers of so called theory of information

are all interested in human communication which is a basic social skill. They consider the possibilities of influencing behaviour, beliefs and human attitudes and describe and explain the need for human communication. Thus, in the science about communication there is a huge number of definitions referring to communication.

R. Merton in the fifties counted as many as about one hundred sixty definitions and up to now there are many times as many. Authors point to different aspects and characteristics of this phenomenon and assign them different meanings. Charles Cooley, forerunner of the research within the field of communication, described it as a certain type of mechanism, thanks to which human relationships exist and develop, and symbols created by humans are passed through space and preserved through time. He was the first who introduced the term 'communication' to scientific literature in his work from 1894 entitled *The Theory of Transportation*, highlighting that it refers to face, gesture, tone of voice, words, writing, printing, etc (Ibid. 12).

The analysis and look into different definitions of communication allows seeing the multidimensional aspects of the direct process of communication. Communication is a reaction of a human body to a stimulus. Based on this assumption W. Garstka calls the process of communication - sending and receiving information and reactions to them which are behaviours seen only from the outside, and human inner reaction¹.

Communication is a transfer of information, ideas, emotions, that is confirmed by M. Dymek who describes communication as exchange of different types of messages including information, evaluation, and suggestions of actions. This process takes place due to all symbols and notions that are known by humans, including non-verbal behaviour (Garstka 1999, 483). Communication is getting answers by the use of verbal symbols. Finally, communication is creating shared notions, opinions, beliefs which was confirmed by T. Goban-Klas who thinks that communication is understanding and reaching by humans the same thoughts and feelings (Goban-Klas 1978, 71).

The presented above ways of understanding the process of communication are not in opposition to each other. They highlight that communication is a process, interaction, exchange of information, and its numerous definitions result from different approaches to this phenomenon and highlighting other elements. So communication can be ascribed with several fundamental characteristics. Firstly, it is a specific social process, as it refers to at least two entities and takes place in social environment. Secondly, communication takes place in a certain social context determined by the number and character of its participants. It can be an interpersonal, group, institutional, public, mass, or intercultural context. Apart from that it is a creative process which relies on building new terms and acquiring knowledge about the surrounding world. It is thus an indispensable element of the

process of education. It should be remembered that communication is dynamic in nature and it relies on getting, understanding and interpreting information both by students and teachers. Communication is a continuous process as it lasts from birth until death. It is a symbolic process as it uses symbols and signs. In order for the interlocutors to communicate it is essential to have semiotic community that is using the same symbols and signs. It is essential that it is an interactive process, which means that its participants have certain relationships which can be of a partnership character (symmetric communication) or can be based on dominancy and subordination (asymmetrical or complementary communication). Communication is conscious as it is an activity of each participant of the process who is driven by certain motives.

Irrefutable is the fact that communication is inevitable because each person can not live without communication. It means that people always and everywhere will communicate through words or gestures, facial expressions, etc., no matter if the process will have conscious or unconscious intentions of its participants.

Apart from that, communication is a complex process, consisting of many elements and many phases. It can be of a bilateral or unilateral character, verbal or non-verbal, direct, mediating or indirect. In contrast to some physical or chemical processes, communication is irreversible, can not be retracted, repeated or its course can not be changed (Ibid. 1978, 15).

A similar characteristic of basic traits of the process of communication was done by T. Goban-Klas (Goban-Klas 1978, 71). Grounding on accomplishments of science of communication one universal definition can be made: it is a process of communication of individuals, groups or institutions. Its aim is sharing thoughts, knowledge and ideas. The process takes place at different levels with the use of different means and has different effects (Dobek-Ostrowska, 1999, 14).

From the beginning of thirties of the XXth century until now the process of communication remains an attractive field for theoreticians. The effect of research is the rise of several dozens of models of social communication, which can be divided into groups using the criterion of the attitude to the reality (pattern and reproduction), usefulness (description, operational, functional pattern), construction of the model (linear pattern). All these patterns are based on basic models that influence and still influence the way of thinking of scholars. One of such basic, and at the same time model, models of communication is the one presented by C. Shannon and W. Weaver in 1948. Within this pattern they distinguished five elements⁵:

- source of information, that is the sender,
- message (announcement),
- channel (way of transferring information coded in a certain way),
- receiver (i.e. one of the senses),
- recipient (addressee).

Scheme no 1. Basic model of Communications according to C. Shannon and W. Weaver (1948)

SOURCE OF INFORMATION	TRANSMITER	RECEIVER	ADDRESSEE
TRANSMISSION	SENT SIGNAL	RECEIVED SIGNAL	TRANSMISSION
SOURCE OF INTERRUPTIONS			

This model assumed that each source of information needs to have a transmitter for coding messages in a way adequate to the type of the channel of transmission. The main subject of the process is the sender who wants to communicate something. The content of information chosen by him is changed by the transmitter into a signal which passes, i.e. sound waves, radio waves, or telecommunication wires) and reaches the addressee. A message changed this way is encoded back by the transmitter and is readable for the addressee. In the process of communication there are some phenomena that disturb, make the transfer of communication difficult, the researchers call them interferences. In C. Shannon and W. Weaver's model technical aspect is highlighted, the success of communication depends on reading of the information by the communicate addressee. In their model they focused their attention on interferences (sources of interferences), throughput of the channel and codes (sent and received signal).

This linear model (i.e. always coming in the same direction), was qualified according to categories as an operational model (it allows to forecast the process) and it influenced the way contemporary human communication scientists think. It does not include, however, social situation of the sender and receiver, it concentrates on elements in which the sender affects the receiver, that is why it is considered a so called transmission where elements of monologue done by the sender are dominating. There is no possibility that the participants can have a double role of a sender-receiver as it takes place in the interpersonal communication.

Interpersonal communication is a process of exchange consisting of signs and symbols, it creates meanings, it is performed as interaction in the presence of a small group of people and as it is of a report type it creates human bonds. M. W. Lustig and J. Koester define interpersonal communication as a form of communication including a small number of people, who may interact with each other and who are capable of adjusting their messages to each other, and getting immediate interpretation of the message (Głodowski 2001, 20).

Direct interpersonal communication has however, some restrictions which in some circumstances make the communication difficult. The reason is the necessity of the participants to be within the voice's reach and synchronisation that is taking part in the process of exchange of information at the same time. The above mentioned conditions make communication useless in some situations. That is why reality is different from the reality initialized and created during research over human communication. The difference results from the development of technologies and tools of communication where in a short time the process evolved from a direct face-to-face conversation to communication at any distance, thanks to the so called new media.

Internet Communication in the Time of Global Communication

The base for communication revolution which took place at the break of the XXth and XXIst centuries was given by so called 'new media' or telemetric media which include among other things: mobile phones, tele-text, cable television, satellite television, the Internet and other.

All communicates and tools of information technology used by humans are nowadays considered 'new media'. In the process of receiving information Derrick De Kerckhove distinguishes the following characteristics of new media;

- **multimedia**, i.e. integration of all available forms of transmission,
- **communicativity**, i.e. process of exchange of information between participants,
- **hypertextuality**, i.e. connection of all contents – text, sound, film due to a Web of logical relations (hyperlinks) enabling an unbroken flow of information, until curiosity is satisfied,
- **interactivity**, i.e. ability to receive information with an immediate reaction to it (Jędryczkowski 2006, 14).

Apart from its dynamics and constant development of technologies telematic media are constantly in their early stage of development. Essential characteristics of new media technologies used in global communication are their direct relationship with the use of a computer. Global communication directs announcements to a clearly specified receiver or a narrow, very often organized group of receivers. Modern technologies and tools enable the receivers a reaction through audio-tele systems, Internet chat meetings, pay per view services, that is payment form the chosen TV channel, electronic mail or more and more popular SMS voting. The level of this type of communication is referred to as global due to its cross

continental reach (Sugier-Szerega 2006, 85). It is the development and the possibility to use new media in different combinations that allow the rise of a broad in its sense level of communication called global.

Global communication awakens hope, but at the same time it gives rise to objections. It has many supporters who in such type of communication see new quality of human relationships, however it has many opponents as well, who see above all threats in the area of social life.

The numerous meanings of the term 'global communication' force the creation of its definition. By global communication one can understand 'system of information and communication technologies, thanks to which messages in a form of text, picture or sound are sent at any distance. In this system audiovisual means of transmission, not necessarily connected with control and official channels of communication, allow its participants such type of contact where both the sender and receiver have a chance for active participation' (Ibid. 85). It is difficult to forecast the direction of the development of the telematic media however, nowadays among these technologies Internet seems to be in the first place as it became one of the most important means of interpersonal communication. For almost 40 years computer has been one of the basic tools used in the process of communication which gave rise to the appearance of the term internet communication. Unlike interpersonal communication which uses natural media sending and explaining symbols by the use of body and the senders mind, in internet communication computer is used as electronic media. The literature of the subject refers only to a process which takes place in one of Internet environments, however many specialists of the new field of research called Computer Mediated Communication used the term CMC that is internet communication through the use of computer which takes place in the net created by joining several computer devices and at the same time referring to internet communication. Thus both definitions are used interchangeably.

There are different theoretical interpretations of internet communication. The clearest criteria for defining this type of communication seem to be structural and functional ones. Defining internet communication on the basis of functional criterion, J. December comes to identifying computer as a basic tool allowing internet communication. He considers all activities connected with computer and telecommunication devices an internet communication, including transfer of information beyond the Net (e.g. transfer of information on disco Or Rother digital devices such as Cds (Miotk-Mrozowska 2009, 24).

The second criterion for defining the process is determining forms of internet communication, which fulfil the two remaining functions of basic characteristics of this communication. As P. Ferris states even though computer is used by CMC as a medium, it can not be used to fulfil a certain task (leading to changes in reality by participation of other people who we communicate with) or using it to get

in touch with other people without aiming at achieving specific utilitarian aims. In this sense the process is not examined into, but the focus is on its effectiveness.

Environments existing within the Internet, which are used differently in the process of communication between its participants are enumerated by P. Wallace. He includes: global network of www pages, electronic mail, asynchronous discussion forum, synchronous talks on IRC channel, MUD environments, metaworlds and interactive picture and sound transmission. This specification does not however, allow the precise reference to internet communication. In the subject matter, internet Communication, is divided into one-sided and interactive. The first one is communicative activity which is based on searching through data bases, passive reception of information included in the WWW or reading electronic papers and magazines. The sender does not expect feedback from the recipient, He only sends cyberspace communicates that reach any number of recipients (Ibid. 24 - 25). Unlike one-sided internet communication, interactive internet communication in some researchers' opinion fulfils a condition for the existence of interpersonal communication.

The Influence of Internet Communication on the Interpersonal Relations – for and against

In the interpersonal communication the media of talking face-to-face are such means as: uttered words, gestures, posture and other elements of verbal and non-verbal communication. In the internet communication we deal with technological media which act as tools of translation or strengthening or influencing in any other way the information coming from natural media. So what influences decisions of people who use internet communication more and more eagerly? The most popular emphasis, which comes from internet communication and not interpersonal communication, is first of all the pressure of time and emotionality of messages. Internet communication is very often favourable for fast establishment of contacts between people; unfortunately there are often emotional disturbances which decide about sending online offensive words directed at the recipient. People seeing the reaction of the recipient to the uttered information become more open. Internet communication increases the possibility of ambiguity as it a poor medium. Non-verbal messages are a great source of information concerning age, gender, status, origin, physical characteristics, but most of all emotional state of the interlocutor. These used in interpersonal communication gave a wider choice of the message interpretation. In the internet communication there is a restriction to text messages only, which is a major obstruction for transfer of non-verbal messages.

There is anonymity of interlocutors and difficulties in conveying emotions on the Net. This involves unrestricted possibilities of manipulation with our own identity. Due to the anonymity reset on the net there is practically no possibility to verify the information concerning a newly met partner which is not that common in a traditional interpersonal conversation. Anonymity however, allowing the creation of close interpersonal relations within the Net. There is no doubt that of a great importance was the use of written messages to compensate for non-verbal messages and the emotions of the interlocutors, possible to be read through observation of body and the interlocutors look, as it takes place in interpersonal communication. A system of conventional signs expressing emotions by text formatting was introduced, the use of emoticons i.e. a combination of signs that looked at a certain angle allow to see a picture of e.g. laughter, scream. Another way to express emotions in internet communication are so called avatars that is graphical pictures of the person that exist within MU environment or some types of chats and so called acronyms which are abbreviations of language phrases derived from first letters of words. The research shows that internet human relationships are very similar to those created in direct contacts of interpersonal communication⁶.

The process of communication through Internet is done in two dimensions: first is the physical space which includes the surrounding of the interlocutor and cyberspace which is the virtual and real worlds. Virtual reality as an area of interaction between person and a computer enables interaction allowing for „immersion” which is ‘immersing’ in the world created by the computer. Interactivity which occurs in the internet communication is not the characteristic only of this type of communication. ‘Interactivity’ is defined as: a degree to which communication technology can create an environment in which its users (one-to-one, one-to-many, many-to-many) can communicate both synchronically and synchronically and take part in the exchange of information. With reference to human users it refers to their ability to perceive, experience a simulation of interpersonal contact and increasing their consciousness of telepresence.⁷ So a characteristic feature of the Internet is that it can be treated as an environment for direct interpersonal communication, in which there is a feedback as a receiver's reaction to the encoded sender's message. Does this fact, however, allow making equal the direct interpersonal communication and internet interactive communication? The author of „Listy do redakcji” sent to *Gazeta Wyborcza*⁸ scaring reflections concerning Internet communication: ‘there are times of silent people what is really scaring. Not a long time ago apart from intensive work there was time for talking and a great relationship among people. However, since the rise of the Internet people at work became almost a group without any contact. Each of them looks only at the computer screen is busy with e-mails, surfing the net or chatting. Any trials to start a conversation make people feel intruders and this makes them avoid any contact seeing the look of colleagues.

People only say hello and each person from a talkative, energetic, curious person changes into a silent person and feels lonely. People, who as it seems after many years of knowing each other, as it could seem would be difficult to leave, become more and more distant, they do not bring anything into life, become useless, melt with artificial intelligence to which they stick for hours. We start to lose the ability to make friendships, not to mention the art of taking care about them⁹.

The above presented characteristics of interpersonal communication and Internet communication create the possibility of further reflection over global development and accompanying it, communication revolution that has its results not only globally, but directly influencing social groups and individuals. Technological advancements play a huge role and are important for the created social changes and interpersonal relationships. Apart from the feeling of community and close relations globalization influences the rise of new barriers in the human relations which are associated with the feeling of isolation and loneliness. This antagonistic situation is the result of rare direct human communication.

Although, the natural advantages of internet communication are indisputable and when we talk about i.e. being in touch with any Internet user at any place on the globe, we have the possibility to use the knowledge and experience of Internet users not losing a lot of time, we have the chance to get to know many people in virtual reality, and then in reality, however it is not difficult to see that all means of global communication exist between people not machines. Internet communication gives no possibility to receive all signals, especially non-verbal ones, send by the interlocutor while interpersonal communication. There was research by different scientist, including: psychologists, philosophers, neurophysiologists concerning internet communication who were trying to find the answer to a question what influence has and will have global communication on people, including widely used by the net users - internet communication. A human melts into the net becoming its part – next to technological tools and other people. A human is more and more distant from other humans, walks away from nature and gets involved with technology creating a new, not natural Internet environment which creates certain type of people. Despite the fact that Internet is not a new world, totally independent of real world, the borders between them are disappearing. People function in them simultaneously and carry some ways of behaviour from one world to the other. New moral norms, new values and customs are created. People start to function differently due to lack of time for meetings and creating deep bonds by the use of interpersonal communication, despite the fact that we are able to use the Internet for hours (Sieńko 2002, 97). Internet is more and more often becoming a thief of time as each person is prone to this. Using Internet very often does not necessarily influence the human well-being or social life in a positive way what was proved in an experiment done by scientist from Carnegie Mellon University

performed not far from Pittsburgh (Wallace 2001, 226). It was confirmed that together with the growing amount of time spent on the net, net surfers had weaker relationships with family and friends from real life. What is interesting with the growing amount of time spent on the net there was a growing feeling of loneliness and depression as well.

Internet is referred to not only as a new tool serving the use, processing of the data or human communication. Deeper analysis of the subject shows that the results of using the Internet at a wider scale are threatening. These new tools of global communication contributed to the rise of a new environment. 'It is not nature, but dialectical devices that create natural environment for people living in the new geotechnical era. (...) Electronic Babel Library is a set of citations and references, but not complete Works. (...) computers replace us, allow overcoming biological restrictions of memory and its ability to process. Simultaneously we are getting used to live with information which does not create a system of knowledge, closing in theories, but become rather a hyper textual encyclopaedia (...) people change as well. Their expectations towards the world, the way of functioning among people and objects change. Internet people are getting used to living in virtual reality. The values they believe in, the needs they have, all belong to virtual reality. That is the effect of associating with time and space characteristic for the net museum of imagination. Consequences of using the Net for communication with other people have to be included as well. These result in a specific type of making other people, and in consequence ourselves, not real. In its extreme it leads to cheating and creating a new type of attitude – a net citizen. It is someone who identifies himself with the internet community, respects its rules, and stands at its side in case of conflict in a so called real world. By creating virtual, net personalities, we start to function more at words level and imaginations than at physical level. A person, in a sense, becomes virtual (Sienko 2002, 113). Knowledge about partners' traits of character may in an essential way create the dynamics of the process of communication within the Net, by for example enlarging or restricting the reliability of partners or influencing the attractiveness of the person we talk to. It is essential to create valuable relationships by the use of internet communication so that the understanding of rules existing in the internet reality and the fact whether they are considered such in real life or the same as in children's games, or something between one or the other, or something totally different. If everyone has a role and everyone knows about it is then something different. The problem is when internet user plays a role, where his/her Internet identity is totally different from his/her real 'I', and a participant of communication does not make the same. Then playing roles is a form of cheating (Wallace 2001, 57).

In contrast to internet communication, within interpersonal communication we have the chance to detect lies thanks to non-verbal signs. These are breaks in talk-

ing, tone of voice, facial expressions, and lack of eye contact or body movements. All these are invisible on the Internet, unless the interlocutors use interactive video transmission. Even by having excellent possibilities to detect lies in real life, in virtual life these would not be useful. That is why an essential characteristic of internet communication distinguishing it from interpersonal communication is the easiness to cheat one internet user by the other ones and allowing such situation without any consequences and knowing that they hurt other people. Despite denying that false identities are created by the users of virtual reality, there are voices for experimenting with Internet identity – mentioned by P. Wallace (Ibid. 77).

C. Licklider pointed that the influence of global Network may have a good or bad influence of the society. Unfortunately nowadays the Internet which essential function is to allow fast communication across borders is not a common medium everywhere. The result of such a state is the lack of telecommunications infrastructure, means as well as preparation to use electronic tools of communication in poor countries. As it was mentioned earlier in this paper using tools of global communication is common only in the region of rich countries. There is a threat of dividing people into on and off-line ones with respect to daily life. Travelling, work and ways of spending free time. Without any doubt they make many daily life things easier and give a full freedom of communicating at a chosen time and at any distance. On the other hand, however, the jungle of tools of global communication surrounding people requires eagerness to constantly confront real life with virtual one depending on whether access to it will be a privilege, or law.

Conclusion

Globalization is not, as John Paul II wrote, neither a bad nor a good process – only its management processes may be bad. It should be a process that integrates through taking into account interpersonal relations, family and social bonds, made mainly by interpersonal communication and supported by global communication. Globalization is meant to serve the human and not the other way round.

Paradoxically the Internet which nowadays is a social technology was to improve and enrich human contact giving us the feeling of rich social life, but it makes our life poorer. In Real, true and more emotional human relationships. That is why the author of this chapter suggests further consideration which will in the future allow to find answers to the following questions: Do the tools of global communication make the beginning or the end of traditional human communication?, maybe they are the beginning of a new form of global attachment and community? Is it only a temporary stage in the changing reality? However, by being participants of the irreversible process of globalization we should consider the words of the person, who

for many years was the Father of our common 'global village' and who by looking at the directions of the development of this process precisely stated that '*Globalization will be what people will make it be*' (Jan Paweł II 2001, 48).

References

- Bauman Z. (2000). *Globalizacja. I co z tego wynika?*, Warszawa.
- Bielska B. (2001). *Konteksty społeczeństwa globalnego a perspektywy tożsamości*, [w:] *Tożsamość osobowa a tożsamości społeczne*, red. T. Bajkowski, K. Sawicki, Białystok.
- Cynarski W. J. (2003). *Globalizacja a spotkanie kultur*, Rzeszów.
- Demiński P., H. (2001). *Globalizacja – wyzwanie i szansa*, [w:] *Globalizacja*, red. J. Klich, Kraków.
- Dobek-Ostrowska B. (1999). *Podstawy komunikowania społecznego*, Wrocław.
- Dymek M. (1996). *Komunikacja niewerbalna też ważna*, „Nowa Szkoła”, nr 3.
- Dzwończyk J. (2004). *Spółczesność informacyjna wobec wyzwań globalizacji*, [w:] *Globalizacja, integracja, transformacja*, red. R. Backera, J. Marszałek-Kawy, J. Modrzyńskiej, Toruń.
- Garstka W. (1999). *Komunikacja niewerbalna a terapeutyczna rola nauczyciela*, „Życie Szkoły”, nr 7.
- Gazeta Wyborcza, 26 stycznia 2002. *Listy do redakcji, Nastaly czasy milczków*.
- Głodowski W. (2001). *Komunikacja interpersonalna*, Warszawa.
- Goban-Klas T. (2005). *Cywilizacja medialna. Geneza, ewolucja, eksplozja*, Warszawa.
- Goban-Klas T. (1978). *Komunikowanie masowe*, Kraków.
- Goban-Klas T. (2009). *Media i komunikowanie masowe*, Kraków.
- Jan Paweł II. (2001). *Globalizacja będzie tym co uczynią z niej ludzie*, „Więź”, nr 11/2001.
- Jędrzykowski J. (2006). *Prezentacje multimedialne w procesie uczenia się studentów*, Toruń.
- Knapp M. L., Hall J. A. (2008). *Komunikacja niewerbalna w interakcjach międzyludzkich*, Wrocław.
- Łęcki K., Szóstala A. (1999). *Komunikacja interpersonalna w pracy socjalnej*, Katowice.
- Miotk-Mrozowska M. (2009). *Komunikacja interpersonalna w Internecie*, Bydgoszcz 2009.
- Mojsiewicz Cz. (2003). *Świat w którym żyjemy*, Poznań.
- Mojsiewiczem C. (2003). *Świat w którym żyjemy*, Poznań.
- Nęcki Z. (2000). *Komunikacja między ludzka*, Kraków.
- Ociepka B. (2003). *Komunikacyjne ścieżki globalizacji* [w:] *Wkraczając w XXI wiek-między globalizacją a różnicowaniem*, red. Stadtmuller E., Wrocław.
- Parks M. R., Floyd K., *Making friends In cyberspace*. *Journal of Communication*, 46.

Schramm W. (1973). *Man, Messages and Media*, New York 1973.

Sieńko M. (2002). *Człowiek w pajęczynie, Internet jako zjawisko kulturowe*, Wrocław.

Słownik łacińsko-polski. (1999). *Warszawa: PWN*.

Sugier-Szerega A. (2006). *Komunikacja globalna – próba definicji*, *Roczniki Nauk Społecznych, Tom XXXIV, Zeszyt I: Socjologia – Katolicka nauka społeczna – Politologia, Tom 34*, Lublin.

Wallace P. (2001). *Psychologia Internetu*, Poznań.

Żylińska M., *Internet a identyfikacja. Wpływ na spływanie systemu wartości. Wpływa Internetu na zachowanie dzieci i młodzieży – szkodliwość jego działania*. <http://www.sni.edu.pl/godn/publik/doc/mzyl-sosw.2gdy.doc/maj2011>. <http://eversed.wordpress.com/2007/12/12/interaktywnosc/> marzec 2010.

(Endnotes)

1. Anna Pawiak, Ph. D., Faculty of Mathematics, Physics and Technical Sciences, Faculty of Pedagogy and Psychology, Kazimierz Wielki University in Bydgoszcz.. anamar.p@op.pl
2. Słownik łacińsko-polski, PWN, Warszawa 1999, s. 101.
3. Contemporary research concerning communication includes two clear approaches: empirical school and critical one. Empirical school includes such basic trends as: functionalism, theories of use, Palo Alto School, interactionism, theory of 'daily order' and Gerbner's theory of culture. Critical school includes such trends as: Frankfurt school, Habermas's theory of communicative action, political economy of communication, hegemonic theory, theory of imperialistic culture, Cultural studies, structuralism and semiology. The third group includes 'other' which are technological determinism and the hypothesis of the spiral of silence. B. Dobek-Ostrowska, *Podstawy komunikowania społecznego*, Wrocław 1999.
4. Other basic models of communication according to H. Lasswell (1948), T. Newcomb (1953), W. Schramm (1954), G. Gerbner (1956), B. Westley and M. MacLean (1957), M. i J. Rileys (1959) were introduced and described by: B. Dobek-Ostrowska, *Podstawy komunikowania społecznego*, Wrocław 1999; Z. Nęcki, *Komunikacja międzyludzka*, Kraków 1996.
5. Other basic models of communication according to H. Lasswell (1948), T. Newcomb (1953), W. Schramm (1954), G. Gerbner (1956), B. Westley and M. MacLean (1957), M. i J. Rileys (1959) were introduced and described by: B. Dobek-Ostrowska, *Podstawy komunikowania społecznego*, Wrocław 1999; Z. Nęcki, *Komunikacja międzyludzka*, Kraków 1996.
6. M.R. Parks, K. Floyd, Making friends in cyberspace. *Journal of Communication*, 46, s. 80-97.
7. See <http://eversed.wordpress.com/2007/12/12/interaktywnosc/> marzec 2010.
8. Listy do redakcji, *Nastały czasy milczków*, 26 stycznia 2002, s. 46.
9. M. Żylińska, *Internet a identyfikacja. Wpływ na spływanie systemu wartości. Wpływa Internetu na zachowanie dzieci i młodzieży – szkodliwość jego działania*. <http://www.sni.edu.pl/godn/publik/doc/mzyl-sosw.2gdy.doc/maj2011>.