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“We all aspire to talk, to dialogue in a world shaken by multimedia communication, but which paradoxically establishes an impersonal silence. Everything happens as if we didn’t transmit the main point.” (Raoul Pantanella)

Human groups organize and maintain themselves thanks to believes, opinions, prejudices common to all the members that make them up. However, not only the personality features of the subjects have repercussions over the group, but also the group influences the individual. Within the group, man learns to adopt an attitude towards the others, to time him to the circumstances, to see him in others – opportunity of personal probing, of rediscovering and awareness of the difference between what we believe we are and what we really are. As soon as man passes beyond the immediate knowledge, through sensations, as soon as he tears himself away from what it is given by the direct experience, by his memories, he disposes of two ways of drawing up explanations, of making assumptions and anticipations, of reasoning or imagining things. There are a logic of reasons and a logic of feelings; the last one – the most frequent in the individual and social life – is not a residuum of the other one, but it has a structure and a reason of its own.

Man represents a complex informational and communicative structure. He emits, intercepts and remakes information; he is source and receiver in the same time. Physically and biologically programmed, he is source of information and receiver; he transmits, receives, remakes information and includes it into his own structures. He cannot live outside the communication, communication being the sense, the support and the reason of being.

The content of communication, reflected by the way of thinking, by the logical rigour and correctness, by mental attitudes, represents the decisive factor, which gives sense and relevance to the communication.

The psychic inner, culturally shaped, acquired through education and self-education, represents the real basis of the communication’s efficiency, succeed and success.

In a certain way, relations are like games, having in view certain purposes and including rules, which define the roles the persons in relation with it must perform.
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“We all aspire to talk, to dialogue in a world shaken by multimedia communication, but which paradoxically establishes an impersonal silence. Everything happens as if we didn’t transmit the main point.” (Raoul Pantanella)

Human groups organize and maintain themselves thanks to believe their, opinions, prejudices common to all the members that make them up. However, not only the personality features of the subjects tell upon the group, but also the group influences the individual. Within the group, man learns to adopt an attitude towards the others, to time himself to circumstances, to see himself in others – opportunity of personal probing,
rediscovering and awareness of the difference between what we believe we are and what we really are. As soon as man passes beyond the immediate knowledge, through sensations, as soon as he tears himself away from what it is given by the direct experience, by his memories, he disposes of two ways of drawing up explanations, of making assumptions and anticipations, of reasoning or imagining things. There are a logic of reasons and a logic of feelings; the last one – the most frequent in the individual and social life – is not a residuum of the other one, but it has a structure and a reason of its own.

What is he like? What is she like? What do I have to do to become more communicative? How can I make myself better understood? How can I become more pleasant? There are some questions that we ask ourselves regarding our neighbour in different situations and circumstances, searching for starter to find within the physiognomy, the gestures, the content of communication or the other one’s vestimentation indexes to outline answers to questions, motivated mostly by the way we like, take notice, are attracted or, on the contrary the way we dislike the respective person.

The communication process indestructibly ties up the interpersonal relations. Their “match” is so solid that it is appreciated that we cannot stop communicating and that the simple presence of an interlocutor becomes a “sine qua non” condition for opening the act. More recent studies show that the silence itself answers in a multiple way in comparison with a code.

Introduced into this incredible potential of direct relations, the means of mass communication come to extend and multiply man’s communicational possibilities.

In a certain way, relations are like games, having in view certain purposes and including rules, which define the roles the persons in relation with it must perform.

Man represents a complex informational and communicative structure. He emits, intercepts and remakes information; he is both source and receiver. Physically and biologically programmed, he is source of information and receiver; he transmits, receives, remakes information and includes it into his own structures. He cannot live outside the communication, the last one being the sense, the support and the reason of being.

Nowadays man formalizes himself excessively, so to adapt to the more and more absorbing social requirements. As a consequence, man is forced to lead an existence which is more social than personal, to which he can survive only if he compromise, most of the time, the last one.

This way, under the communicational aspect, we can see that man is socially engaged in a continuous emission process – reception with a socio-professional and communitarian value, so as, from the psychological point of view, the man’s problems, substance and substantiality stay out of the process.

The interpersonal relations require a complex scale of manifestations of bio – psycho – socio cultural behaviours which form the system of human personality, each individual becoming both source of influence for the other and source of solicitation from the other, and within the social environment appears as a complex system of interpersonal relation, where the relational space can regarded as a complex system of interpersonal relation, where the relational space can

“Unlike formal relation, informal relation characterises itself by the partners’ liberty to establish or interrupt, by the absence of some stiff norms or standards of the role performing, the partners being relatively on equal positions”. (M. Golu)

Even if the situation climate influence the opinions about the other one, even if no man can understand perfectly the other one, because he shares directly the same thoughts, reasons and feelings, we can say that the correct evaluation of the other will depend very much on the difference that follows from a result of the relation between individual and the world of his realities.
In spite of this, trying to evaluate the other will also depend very much on what the individual points out in his interaction with the external world namely three moments relatively distinctive that consist in the perception of loadings, their evaluation and reaction to loadings, the last one depending on personality’s durable characteristics, on the opening degree, the forms of motion and defence of the individual, on the situation significance, concrete situational tasks that are to be required and expected from the loading.

Meeting other personality enriches our register of ideas, attitudes and behaviours. We are attracted both of the persons where we see ourselves, and of the ones, which offer psychological aspects that we lack of – at which side we have the possibility to “give birth of the features we wish”. But, for this, there must be an “intersection” area, certain common characteristics of psychological, social and moral, axiological order, so to forward an authentic communication.

In these conditions, the content of communication, reflected by the way of thinking, of rigour and logical correctness, mental attitudes, represents the decisional factor that offers sense and relevance to the communication. The psychic inner, culturally shaped, gained through education and self-education, represents the real fundamental of communication, succeed and success efficiency.

The non-communication implications are so deep that we can appreciate man as detaining, among other characteristics with social value, a certain necessity of self-objectivity that, in spite the multitude of contacts and social interactions, can be unexpressed.

The way the individual finds himself bearings within the interpersonal expressible or inexpressible influences the self-perception and that of the other one’s.

Another main constituent, with implications within the evaluation/self-evaluation process, is represented by the interpersonal sensibility that, correlated with life experience, intelligence and self-intuition, contributes to understanding the others. This way, there are proves revealing the fact that it is best to be able to understand people having the same gestures and features like we do, people belonging to our culture and generation.

Nevertheless, there can be incorrect sources in evaluating the others, the main cause being due to the fact that, many times, people evaluate the others only fragmentarily, following certain patterns that could outline a relation, many of them trying to see the other one as a whole, as a unique personality. Here, the status-roll ensemble can also tend to image distortion through over-evaluation and under-evaluation of the others according to the status and the role he possess. The tendency of categorising, simplifying and stereotyping the perception tied up to other person leads to the formation of some block schemes, that make the other one appear similar to us, and if de doesn’t express this, there is the risqué to be seen as a “doubtful” type.

The communication phenomenon and competence is generally risen at the intersection of two plans:
- The psychological plan – decisively guided by temperamental particularities;
- Psyco-social plan – guided by a certain ability of reasoning, certain interaction facility.

The psychological plan, is obviously, the first responsible for the individual’s behaviour, for his options, decisions, orientations, attitudes and guarantees a specific behavioural constancy, determined by the temperamental particularities, by a certain way of acting and reacting.

The psychosocial plan identifies itself in connection with the person’s activity to easily establish relationships with the others and ensures the main condition of communication, the partner. The communication competence passes the interpersonal relations or the micro group’s level for sociability and acquires, in a public relation and using his interactive function, a great persuasive force.

In the same time, relations stand out in purposes, actions and rules. Studies, which stopped over the way men appreciate the
purposes’ importance for different relations, discovered the fact that they are looking for three things: proper physical welfare, social acceptance, purposes tied up by the situation’s specific task.

This being told, the relational abilities are particularly important in structuring the relations, for example, the ability of making friends and maintain friendships, the ability of avoiding conflicts and negotiating solutions when there are dissensions.

Relation, which constitutes the nucleus of social behaviour, can be analysed and conceptualised depending on the aims, in terms of the regulating activities and rules, in terms of attachment and abilities – necessity. Partially native and unlearned, partially thought, the relations are motivated and rewarding for people. They can be source of satisfaction and pleasure, attachment and support, and also, source of conflicts people can learn how to avoid, approaching, by practice and exercise, certain rules and abilities of getting into relation with different persons.

A wide place of research stands out concerning the study of what is constant and variable within the human relationships, concerning some differences that appear in relation, in the context of some different classes and social groups, of some cultures and characteristics regarding age and sex problems. Investigating the way the relations’ dynamic affect these frames of reference, can explain many aspects of man’s implication into social, of his openness or resistance to changing.

Conclusions

We create and transform different rules and norms so to attain certain situational objects. The groups of individuals are looking for attaining their objects, and these paths are to be viewed as some collective solutions, including the necessary coordination of some behaviours and excluding others. Without acquiring this sort of coordination, namely the purposes, will not be attained.
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