

For a sampling of this literature, see Lazarsfeld and Berelson (1960), Schramm (1960), Berelson and Steiner (1964), Berelson and Janowitz (1966), McGuire (1969, 1985), Schramm and Roberts (1971),

Chaffee (1977), Comstock et al. (1978), Lang and Lang (1981), Roberts and Bachen (1981), Bryant and Zillmann (1986, 1994), Delia (1987), DeFleur and Ball-Rokeach (1988), Jeffres (1997), Katz (2001b), Perse (2001), Bryant and Thompson (2002b), Bryant and Miron (2004), Preiss, Gayle, Burrell, Allen, and Bryant (2007), Keppinger (2008), and Nabi and Oliver (2009).

Our strategy was to take a careful look at the literature of the field with an eye to who was citing whom. It was an iterative process moving back and forth between reading the highly cited articles and developing a typology of dominant theories that accurately reflected their central themes. We were inspired particularly by the typologies of Katz (2001a), Bryant and Miron (2004), and Nabi and Oliver (2009) and ultimately identified six historically sequential media effects theory clusters.¹ Each of these theoretical stages encompasses a number of explicitly labeled contributing subtheories, such as parasocial theory or agenda-setting theory. As is frequently the case in such scholarly traditions, the first publication or two utilizing and popularizing each theory became a routine and increasingly obligatory seminal citation for all who would follow. As a result, the tracking of intellectual parentage by citation analysis is relatively straightforward. Thus for the analysis of parasocial interaction, the citation of Horton and Wohl's (1956) paper is de rigueur and for agenda setting it is McCombs and Shaw's (1972) celebrated paper in *Public Opinion Quarterly*. We iterated back and forth between our basic typology and the active literature to try to capture, as best we could, all the explicit theories and associated seminal citations that were in active usage. Passing references were set aside to keep the list manageable and reserved to those theories that had not become abandoned and ignored. Our final working typology is composed of 6 clusters and 29 active subtheories, which are in turn defined by a total of 36 seminal books and articles (Table 1).

If we were just sorting prominent theories into labeled categories this would be but an artificial exercise. But the historically grounded six-stage model highlights what we believe is a significant and underappreciated structure of theoretical evolution in the field. In the earliest stage of persuasion research, the hypotheses are built around a rather straightforward notion of persuasive messages and attitude change. There is little attention to the motivational orientation of the audience member, the social context of message exposure, the accumulation of effects over time, and so on. Such matters were the theoretical refinements that characterize the successive stages as scholarship systematically addressed which conditions might facilitate or diminish media effects as indentified in the right-hand column of Table 1. We will review each of the six stages and then turn to the citation data, which describe the structure of cross-referencing.