Chapter 1, Application Question 2: Floyd describes 3 models of human communication. Which model do you think is the strongest? Do you think there is anything that needs to be added to the model to fully depict the communication process?

   It is clear that the transaction model is the strongest model of interpersonal communication. Floyd (2021, p. 11) notes that this model, unlike the action and interaction models, recognizes that both participants in a conversation are simultaneously receivers and senders of messages. The example given of a medical assistant is very illustrative: it shows that the feedback referred to in the interaction model (Floyd, 2021, pp. 10-11) can be considered as a message. Thus the transaction model encompasses and is more complete than the interaction model. Because the interaction model in turn completely includes the action model (Floyd, 2021, p. 10) the transaction model must include the action model too.

   From personal experience it is clear that the transaction model is the most complete model of communication. Humans do not neatly take turns when speaking nor cease non-verbal communication when they are not speaking. Neither the action nor interaction model can account for this simultaneous flow of information between participants in the communication. If we limited our communications to those which can be successfully modeled by the first two models life would be quite boring indeed. Indeed this essay is an example of the transaction model: I have already answered the question, but the assignment requires a minimum of 500 words so I must keep writing to receive an acceptable grade. Floyd (2021, p. 12) assesses the models and claims that some are more useful in describing some situations than the transaction model. This is incorrect and shows a poor grasp of logic. Examples include sending an email being described by the action model and submitting a paper for review, but these can be considered as special cases of the transaction model when responses and feedback are not present. Furthermore once a recipient reads the email and replies it becomes at least interactional. Submitting a draft paper for review and comments is not done simply for the sake of communicating and receiving feedback: the author hopes to improve the paper and get a better grade, a better chance of being published, or some other transactional benefit.

   There may or may not be things that could be added to the transaction model to improve it, but I feel that this would be an exercise in futility. Since a model is not the thing it represents, all models should not be judged on their correlation to underlying structures, but how useful they are in application. In communication this is even more relevant because a message can take many forms: physical or non-physical, cryptic or direct, imbued with emotion or delivered stoically. The strength of a good model comes from its ability to handle these variations and still produce realistic results. Simplifying the model to abstract concepts such as *message, channel, feedback*, et cetera (Floyd, 2021, p. 11) allows it to be applied in a wide range of contexts. It has been said that all models are wrong, but some are useful. This seems to be yet another example of that old aphorism.

Word count: 500

Works Cited:
Floyd, K. (2021). *Interpersonal communication* (4th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.