Comm 740　　　　Interpersonal Communication Seminar　　　Fall 2019

Professor: Rhonda Sprague　　　　　　　*Class Time and Location: W 5:30 – 8:00, CAC 227*
Office: CAC 208　　　　　　　　　　　　*Office Hours: M 3:30 – 4:30, T 10 – 11 and by appt.*
Phone w/ voice mail: 346-2812
e-mail: rsprague@uwsp.edu

Course Objectives:
Every student successfully completing this course should be able to…

1.　Describe major theories and methods driving research and scholarship in IPC;
2.　Read and make sense of research articles related to IPC;
3.　Conduct research on some aspect of IPC;
4.　Present the findings of this research in both written and oral forms; and
5.　Write using the scholarly standards set out in the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association*.

Required Readings:
See attached list at the end of this syllabus.

Assignments:

Trends Paper	10%	
Rationale	10%	
Review of Literature	20%	
Methods Paper	10%	*These are all parts of one major research-based paper.*
Results Paper	10%	
Final Paper	30%	
Paper Presentation	10%	

All assignments will be turned in via the Canvas Assignments dropboxes.

Trends Paper: Your first written assignment calls for you to examine contemporary research related to IPC and summarize what you feel to be the major trends or lines of inquiry happening in the field in the past 5 years. You should focus most heavily upon research in major communication journals (e.g., *Communication Monographs*, *Human Communication Theory*, *Western Journal of Communication*, *Communication Research, Communication Research Reports*, etc. A good place to start is in the *Communication and Mass Media Complete* database, which is available through the library's web site. You should identify at least 4 *content or topic* trends (What are researchers studying?), at least 2 *theoretical* trends (Which theories are underlying most of the recent published research?), and at least 2 *methodological* trends (Which methods are most common in contemporary research?). **This *paper is due September 19, before the start of class*.** It should be between 6 and 10 pages long, written in a normal font (i.e., nothing tiny or huge), and including a complete References page.

Research Paper:
The research paper will be constructed in five separate steps. During each step, the most important question you will answer is, "Why?" I'm going to turn into a 4-year old when I read your papers. EVERY decision you make MUST have a reason behind it.

　　1. *Rationale*. At the beginning of every research article you will read, you will find the authors setting out a reason why the particular research in which they are engaged needs to be done. For example, they might think the research follows nicely from a previous study, they might have imported a theory from another discipline and want to test it, or they might simply see a hole in the existing research that needs to be filled. This section is called the *rationale* for the study. Without a good rationale, a study is almost worthless. You have to provide a reason for conducting your study: Why is it important that research is done in this area? What can we learn from this?

Somewhere in this section, you also must set out the *exact* question you are trying to answer. It's your thesis statement. It has to be there. Your paper does not need to be written if the thesis is not clear. ***This paper is due by October 4, 12:00 noon.***

2. ***Review of Literature***. After you set out a rationale, you then expand the rationale into a full-blown review of existing literature. This means you look for articles, book chapters, books, and other sources that are related to your topic, and fit them together so they lead you toward an answer to your exact question. When conducting your literature review, it is important to keep this exact question in mind, so you don't stray off-track and gather lots of information that you either will never use or will use badly (try to force it to fit, for example). Most often, your exact question will be answered using several smaller questions or hypotheses. In this case, your literature review should help you focus upon each of the several smaller topics. You should have at least 12-15 good sources for the initial literature review. You might end up adding more, as you move through the semester. It is a good idea to start off by annotating your sources, or writing up summaries of their major findings, before you start right into the literature review. That will help you stay on track, and also might help show you whether you're missing an important component. ***The literature review paper is due October 25, by 12:00 noon***.

3. ***Methodology Paper***. This paper describes the methods you plan to use to conduct your study. It includes descriptions of your potential subjects, the instruments you plan to use (with citations when appropriate), the data you plan to uncover, and the qualitative or quantitative methods you plan to use to address each of your research questions and/or hypotheses. If you use instruments you make up yourself, it is especially important to detail the rationale and methods for creating them. If you're using existing tools, you need to explain why they seem to be most useful for your study (where they have been used before, for example). ***The methods paper is due November 15, by 12:00 noon.***

4. ***Results Paper***. This paper simply reports the results that you receive after conducting the appropriate analyses to address your questions/hypotheses. The biggest focus here is on reporting the findings clearly and correctly. There are certain ways to report statistical findings, for example. You need to start doing them properly, if you don't already know how to do so. ***The results paper is due December 6, by 12:00 noon***.

5. ***Final Paper***. The final paper will be a complete report of the study you've conducted, combining revised versions of the previous sections with an additional *discussion* section. In the discussion, authors typically do three things. First, they begin with a less formal description of the major findings (no statistics, for example), usually including how these findings fit with or contradict past research (more citations). Often, you'll see them offering possible explanations for contradictory findings during this section, as well. The second thing typically done is a discussion of the limitations of your study. As you work through the study, for example, you might realize that another population might have given you better results, or that one of your instruments wasn't what you'd hoped. These types of limitations need to be noted or you sound arrogant, which is not a good thing in scholarly writing! The third section of the discussion usually talks about the directions for future research inspired by this study. What could be the next question asked? How might you fix one of the major limitations? ***The final paper is due by Friday, Dec. 13 at 12:00 noon.***

Paper Presentations: One of the most important skills I learned while in graduate school was the ability to take my research and explain it to others in a way that made sense. I'm giving you the opportunity to do the same. On the night of our scheduled final exam (Wednesday, December 18), you will be presenting a colloquium featuring your research. Each of you will be given 12 minutes to summarize your study. (Remember that you're giving a presentation. Think visual aids, especially if you have numbers.) After all of the presentations are complete, I will ask for questions from the audience. You should be prepared to answer these questions. Any and all audience members will be welcome to attend. Bring your friends, family members, etc. I'll put up signs and bring refreshments.

My General Philosophy

I tend to expect that students will treat college like a job. In other words, if you're not going to be able to attend class, you'll let me know in advance. If you need to turn in work late, you'll let me know in advance. In both of these cases, you will accept any penalties that are incurred. Finally, if you don't understand something, I expect that you'll ask. One of the most frustrating things I encounter as a teacher happens when students do not understand an assignment, turn it in anyway, then get mad after it's been graded and they find out they didn't do what I expected. I do not deliberately write vague assignment descriptions. If I don't hear any questions, I assume that you know what I want. Please, please ask me if you aren't sure about whether you're interpreting something correctly. I want to give you some freedom to explore the areas in which you're most interested, but I also want to be able to be fair in my grading. I will try to make assignment descriptions as clear as I can. The rest is up to you.

Tentative Schedule (I reserve the right to deviate from this schedule)

Date	Topic	Readings Due
W Sep 5	Introduction to Course; Methods Basics	Babbie (2010) Davis (1971)
W Sep 12	Biology and Cognition	Kearney (2017) Kellermann (1992) Koerner & Floyd (2010)
W Sep 19	Nonverbal Communication ***Trends Papers due by 5:30 PM***	Burgoon, Schuetzler, & Wilson (2015) Malachowski & Martin (2011) Prinsen & Punyanunt-Carter (2009)
W Sep 26	Language, Conversation, and Messages	Caughlin & Scott (2010) Jackl (2016) Palomares & Dermin (2019)
W Oct 2	Power, Persuasion, and IPC	Dunbar (2015) Flanagin (2017) Moore (2017) Vallade, Booth-Butterfield, & Vela (2013)
F Oct 4	***Rationales due by noon***	
W Oct 9	Emotion, Support, and IPC	Hanasono & Yang (2016) Middleton et al. (2016) Utz & Beukeboom (2011)
W Oct 16	Relationships	Baxter & Braithwaite (2010) Huanani Solomon et al. (2016)
W Oct 23	Computer-Mediated Communication	Crowley et al. (2018) Pettegrew & Day (2015) Walther (2017)
F Oct 25	***Lit Reviews due by noon***	
F Nov 15	***Methods Papers due by noon***	
F Dec 6	***Results Papers due by noon***	
F Dec 13	***Final Papers due by noon***	
W Dec 18	***Final Paper Presentations***	

Additional Readings for Comm 740   **Fall 2019**

Babbie, E. (2010). *The practice of social research* (12ᵗʰ ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Baxter, L. A., & Braithwaite, D. O. (2010). Relational dialectics theory, applied. In S. W. Smith & S. R. Wilson (Eds.), *New directions in interpersonal communication research* (pp. 48 - 66). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Burgoon, J. K., Schuetzler, R., & Wilson, D. W. (2015). Kinesic patterning in deceptive and truthful interactions. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, *39*, 1-24.

Caughlin, J. P., & Scott, A. M. (2010). Toward a communication theory of the demand-withdraw pattern of interaction in interpersonal relationships. In S. W. Smith & S. R. Wilson (Eds.), *New directions in interpersonal communication research* (pp. 180 - 200). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Crowley, J. P., Allred, R. J., Follon, J., & Volkmer, C. (2018). Replication of the mere presence hypothesis: The effects of cell phones on face-to-face conversations. *Communication Studies*, *69*, 283-293.

Davis, M. S. (1971). That's interesting! Towards a phenomenology of sociology and a sociology of phenomenology. *Philosophy and Social Science*, *1*, 309-344.

Dunbar, N. E., (2015). A review of theoretical approaches to interpersonal power. *The Review of Communication*, *15(1)*, 1-18.

Flanagin, A. J. (2017). Online social influence and the convergence of mass and interpersonal communication. *Human Communication Research*, *43*, 450-463.

Hanasono, L, K., & Yang, F. (2016). Computer-mediated coping: Exploring the quality of supportive communication in an online discussion forum for individuals who are coping with racial discrimination. *Communication Quarterly*, *64*, 369-389.

Huanani Solomon, D., Knobloch, L, K., Theiss, J. A., & McLaren, R. M. (2016). Relational turbulence theory: Explaining variation in subjective experiences and communication within romantic relationships. *Human Communication Research*, *42*, 507-532.

Jackl, J. A. (2016). "Love doesn't just happen…": Parent-child communication about marriage. *Communication Quarterly*, *64*, 193-209.

Kearney, M. W. (2017). Interpersonal goals and political uses of Facebook. *Communication Research Reports*, *34*, 106-114.

Kellermann, K. (1992). Communication: Inherently strategic and primarily automatic. *Communication Monographs, 59*, 288-300.

Koerner, A. F., & Floyd, K. (2010). Evolutionary perspectives on interpersonal relationships. In S. W. Smith & S. R. Wilson (Eds.), *New directions in interpersonal communication research* (pp. 27 - 47). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Malachowski, C. C., & Martin, M. M. (2011). Instructors' perceptions of teaching behaviors, communication apprehension, and student nonverbal responsiveness in the classroom. *Communication Research Reports*, *28*, 141-150.

Middleton, A. V., McAninch, K. M., Pusateri, K. B., & Delaney, A. L. (2016). "You just gotta watch what you say in those situations": A normative approach to confidant communication surrounding sexual assault disclosure. *Communication Quarterly*, *64*, 232-250.

Moore, J. (2017). Performative face theory: A critical perspective on interpersonal identity work. *Communication Monographs*, *84*, 258-276.

Palomares, N. A., & Derman, D. (2019). Topic avoidance, goal understanding, and relational perspectives: Experimental evidence. *Communication Research*, *46*, 735-756.

Pettegrew, L. S., & Day, C. (2015). Smart phones and mediated relationships: The changing face of relational communication. *The Review of Communication*, *15*, 122-139.

Prinsen, T., & Punyanunt-Carter, N. M. (2009). The difference in nonverbal behaviors and how it changes in different stages of a relationship. *Texas Speech Communication Journal*, *34*, 1-7.

Utz, S., & Beukeboom, C. J. (2011). The role of social network sites in romantic relationships: Effects on jealousy and relationship happiness. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, *16*, 511–527.

Vallade, J. I., Booth-Butterfield, M., & Vela, L. E. (2013). Taking back power: Using superiority theory to predict humor use following a relational transgression. *Western Journal of Communication*, *77*, 231-248.

Walther, J. B. (2017). The merger of mass and interpersonal communication via new media: Integrating metaconstructs. *Human Communication Research*, *43*, 559-572.