

CMST 7900: Introduction to Graduate Study in Communication Studies

Fall 2014, M 3:30-6:20 p.m., 103 Coates

There are few earthly things more beautiful than a university, a place where those who hate ignorance may strive to know, where those who perceive truth may strive to make others see. John Masefield

The word "academic" is a synonym for irrelevant. Saul Alinsky

In order to understand alternative points of view it is important that a theorist be fully aware of the assumptions upon which his [sic] own perspective is based. Such an appreciation involves an intellectual journey which takes him [sic] outside the realm of his [sic] own familiar domain. — Burrell & Morgan

...communication research is a field, not a discipline. In the study of man, it is one of the great crossroads where many pass but few tarry. Wilbur Schramm

Work in the field of communications ... is a somewhat transient way- station where people can meet who don't quite want to commit themselves to the field of literature (as monopolized by English departments) or to the social science (as monopolized by departments of sociology or political science). David Riesman

In a sense, we have never really been a discipline ... Our reality is messier and much more interesting than that. Bill Keith & Pat Gehrke

Many of the differences within our field spring from the fact that most of us are either openly practicing or closet rhetoricians. Gary Cronkhite

...humans are hardwired by the privacy of their experience to have communication problems. John Durham Peters

Graham Bodie, Ph.D.

126 Coates Hall, 578.6683 (office), (601) 316.6117 (cell)

Office Hours: by appointment

gbodie@lsu.edu

Course Description:

CMST 7900 provides an introduction to graduate study and is required for students declaring an emphasis in Communication Studies. Taking this course seriously will provide you with a foundational understanding of the Communication Studies landscape as well as the larger academic culture within which that landscape is situated. The class requires you to think critically about a range of topics including, but not limited to, (a) the role of higher education in an increasingly diverse society, (b) the place of Communication Studies in the academy, (c) your own place within Communication Studies, (d) the metatheoretical and methodological commitments that mark scholars as taking positions on human communication, and (e) the possibility of synthesis. Ultimately, this class will give you the tools and vocabulary to speak to scholars inside and outside Communication Studies and who hold a range of perspectives. Too often, scholars critique the work of others without truly understanding the assumptions underlying that work and the vocabulary used therein. By increasing awareness of our differences, we come to a greater appreciation of each other as scholars looking to improve the lives of everyday communicators. Thus, this class also seeks to promote dialogue, conversation, and debate among students and faculty about the strengths and limitations of different approaches to the study of human communication.

Course Objectives:

1. To introduce students to academic culture.
2. To provide a core base of knowledge that promotes intellectual debate and dialogue.
3. To assist students in elaborating their own responses to foundational questions concerning different approaches to the study of human communication.
4. To encourage students to think about the idea of synthesis, its possibility, and its ramifications.

Required Texts:

Miller, K. (2005). *Communication theories: Perspectives, processes, and contexts* (2nd ed.). Boston: McGraw Hill.

The graduate faculty want to emphasize that writing is a *process*. Consequently, this seminar approaches the task of writing an essay by taking you through one version of that process and breaking it down into a series of smaller and more focused writing tasks and exercises. We do not have the time to devote to a complete explication of the process, but students are expected to familiarize themselves with the readings listed below. Revising and seeking the input of colleagues is at the heart of writing successfully for publication. Developing a schedule with good work habits that accomplish your writing goals on a regular and frequent basis will impact your success in all your coursework and, ultimately, in your academic career. Naturally, writing assignments will make up the bulk of your grade in this course.

Becker, H. S. (2007). *Writing for social scientists: How to start and finish your thesis, book, or article*, 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Belcher, W. L. (2009). *Writing your journal article in 12 weeks: A guide to academic publishing success*. Los Angeles: Sage.

Booth, W. C., Colomb, G. G., & Williams, J. M. (2008). *The craft of research*, 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Graff, G., & Birkenstein, C. (2010). *They say, I say: The moves that matter in academic writing*, 2nd ed. NY: W. W. Norton & Co.

Silvia, P. J. (2007). *How to write a lot*. Washington, D. C.: American Psychological Association.

All other readings are made available on the Moodle course page. Students are encouraged to purchase copies of books from which readings are pulled, to use this class not only as an introduction to Communication Studies and the academic life but to also start your personal library.

Assignments and Evaluation

NOTE: Deadlines are ***the last day the paper will be accepted***, not the day that I expect the paper. Early submissions are always welcomed and are, in fact, encouraged. When you find yourself thinking, “Wow, this is a slow week,” don’t be fooled! You should be equally full most weeks of the semester if you pace yourself appropriately. Feel free to take an extra nap during “slow weeks,” but certainly do some “catch-up work” and “read and work ahead” because it is the calm before the storm.

1. All students are expected to attend all class sessions, complete assigned readings, and participate regularly in class discussions. The class will NOT be successful without your participation. Thus, **attendance and participation will be worth 20% of the final course grade.**

2. To facilitate class discussion, you will prepare several brief (500-1000 words) **reaction statements**. The reaction statements should be read aloud during class meetings when appropriate and will help provide the basis for class discussions. The purpose of these reaction statements is to organize and stimulate discussion; hence, they should be focused and brief. Each weekly set of required readings is accompanied by discussion questions which may serve as a basis for your reaction statements. If, however, students are moved to write about an issue not reflected in these questions, they are free to write a reaction statement addressing that issue. Obviously, a brief reaction statement cannot provide detailed responses to the discussion questions; rather the purpose of the paper is help students begin drawing together ideas about what they have read. It is important to make a claim and back it up with evidence; the length of the assignment makes it impossible to do justice to more than one major claim.

Reaction statements will be turned in each week during class. Each week, multiple students will be responsible for a reaction statement. **Reaction statements will count a total of 10% of the final grade.** Students will sign up for their reaction statements the first class meeting of the course.

3. At three points in the semester, students will write short position papers (5 page max, 12-point font, 1 inch margins, double spacing, 1 additional page for references), each of which will require you to take a position on an important issue, provide reasons to support your position, and anticipate and respond to possible counter-arguments. **Each paper will count 10% toward the final course grade.**

- Paper I is meant to allow you to defend (or deride) Communication Studies as a viable disciplinary pursuit. This paper is due on September 26.
- Paper II is meant to explore your commitments as a scholar of human communication. This paper is due on October 31.
- Paper III is meant for you to take a position on an unresolved (and potentially unresolvable) issue within Communication Studies. This paper is due November 28.

You will turn in two copies of each paper. The first copy is for me and should be a hard copy. The second copy is for a group of your classmates and should be submitted through Moodle. All due dates are Fridays so that each paper can be peer-reviewed prior to the next Monday’s class. All studies are expected to give feedback on ONE paper (and I will assign those roles later).

4. All students will prepare a major paper. The paper should focus on a communication phenomenon of interest to the student and present a compelling rationale for its study.

My expectation is that these papers will involve a review and assimilation of the theoretical and empirical work related to a particular phenomenon. At the end of the semester, you should have a final product that would be suitable for revising with an eye toward submission to an academic conference.

This paper will be turned in over the course of three stages:

- *Stage 1* – The goal of the first part of the paper is to provide an explication of the phenomenon to be examined and a bibliography of research on the phenomenon. “Explication” is more than just a simple definition. It is a careful analysis of the labels attached to a phenomenon; the meaning of the labels; the operationalizations of the phenomenon; and the scope, specificity, and contextual elements that define the phenomenon. Students should make ample use of existing research to clarify how the phenomenon has been conceptualized in the literature. In addition to the resources cited in explicating the phenomenon, Stage 1 should include a separate bibliography of resources to be explored in developing the rest of the paper. Stage 1 is due in class on October 13.
- *Stage 2* – Stage 2 should include a revision of the explication presented in Stage 1 to reflect the feedback received and the student’s increasingly sophisticated understanding of the phenomenon. In addition, the student should examine the phenomenon from two of the metatheoretical perspectives discussed between October 6 and October 27. In each subsection addressing a perspective on the phenomenon, the student should review the main assumptions of the perspective (based on class readings and other supplemental materials) and identify questions about your phenomenon that might be answered by this metatheoretical perspective. In other words, how might the perspective explain some of the features of your phenomenon, how might it answer existing questions about the phenomenon, and what new questions are raised about the phenomenon in light of the theory’s assumptions? Stage 2 of the paper is due in class on November 17.
- *Final Paper* – The final paper builds on the draft from Stage 2 by reflecting the feedback received and the student’s increasingly sophisticated understanding of the phenomenon. In addition, the paper should compare and contrast the different perspectives applied to the study of your phenomenon of choice, highlight points of overlap and gaps, and discuss the strengths and limitations of each approach. Thus, this final section contributes to an integrated understanding of the phenomenon. The final paper is due on December 8.

Students should turn in two copies at each stage – one with author identification and one that is void of such identification for blind review. The copy with identification should be accompanied with a cover letter, formatting according to APA 6th edition (the manuscript can be whatever official style guide you will use for the majority of your writing career). For Stages 2 and 3, your cover letter should include information about the revisions you made, paying attention to how you addressed the feedback. The Moodle course page has examples of cover letters.

Each student will review another student's paper and provide feedback. The feedback you provide classmates will be written void of identification. Your feedback should be a minimum of 500 words; there is no max, but do not overdo it – you have your own work to do too. This is practice in balancing commitments. You will turn the feedback to me by the Thursday of the week the paper is due, 5:00 PM (over email is fine or in my campus mailbox). I will compile these reactions with my own.

The paper will be worth 30% (Stage 1 = 5%; Stage 2 = 10%; Stage 3 = 15%) and the feedback worth 10% (3%, 3%, 4%) of the final grade.

Calculating Course Grades

I am bound by PS-44, "Student Grading," to "determine and assign the grade for each student in the course beyond the final date for withdrawing with a W" and to do so "equitably and consistently."

The grade you EARN for this class is calculated based on a formula that weights the four assignments (listed above) by their respective percentages. **For all assignments, you will earn a letter grade** that corresponds to the "meaning of grades" found below. These letter grades will correspond to a traditional 4.0 scale, where a 4.0 equals and grade of "A" as follows:

A+ = 4.33	C = 2.0
A = 4.0	C- = 1.67
A- = 3.67	D+ = 1.33
B+ = 3.33	D = 1.0
B = 3.0	D- = .67
B- = 2.67	F+ = .33
C+ = 2.33	F = 0.0

As an example suppose you earned the following grades:

Participation	A
Reaction Papers (ave)	A-
Position Paper I	B+
Position Paper II	A
Position Paper III	A-
Final Paper (ave)	A-
Feedback	A

Your final grade would be calculated in the following manner:

$$(4.0)(.20) + (3.67)(.10) + (3.33)(.10) + (4.0)(.10) + (3.67)(.10) + (3.67)(.30) + (4.0)(.10) = 0.8 + 0.367 + 0.333 + 0.4 + 0.367 + 1.101 + 0.4 = 3.76 = \mathbf{A-}$$

Please note that for your three (3) credits, you are expected to attend class and commit a minimum of an additional 9 hours per week for a total of 12 hours a week for this course. With your other courses, that means a full time student in this Department has a 36 hour "work week" for her coursework. If you are funded, you are expected to spend an additional 20 hours per week on your teaching responsibilities. That is a total of 56 hours a week.

THE MEANING OF GRADES

- A - Excellent work.** The student went above and beyond assignment expectations. Furthermore, the student has represented mastery of course material, both conceptually and pragmatically. Although there is room for improvement, the argument was appropriate and well-articulated, the literature cited was appropriate with no germinal pieces missing, and the paper met appropriate style guide criteria. Well done, good and faithful servant.
- B - Acceptable work.** The student completed the assignment at an above average level. B work is good work, but still has room for significant improvement. There may be problems with articulating a central thesis or driving theoretical or practical problem; major grammatical or structure deficits; missing literature that is key to an important argument; etc. You're on your way, baby!
- C - Unacceptable work.** The student completed the assignment as specified by the assignment description. No more than "effort as expected" was achieved. Minimum requirements were met, minimum effort was put forth. Moreover, there are conceptual and/or methodological flaws that suggest the student is either not ready for graduate work or not putting forth the effort that is takes to be a successful graduate student. C work is basically failing work. You may want to reconsider this whole graduate school thing.
- D - Late work.** Late work is acceptable and will be negotiated on a case-by-case basis. If a student does not make prior arrangements, all late work, regardless of quality (and if granted post-due date), will be given a maximum grade of D. Your receiving a D means nothing more than you need to work on punctuality and prioritization.
- F - Unfulfilled assignment.** Any assignment not turned in by the deadline will be given a grade of F (but see "D" above). This is totally unacceptable for graduate school.
-

Relevant LSU Policy Statements for Graduate Students

There are 118 policy statements for LSU. Many are applicable to you, and for a list of them all, see <http://appl003.ocs.lsu.edu/ups.nsf/ByNumber?OpenView&Start=1>. Two that are especially salient are described below.

PS-21 “Graduate Assistantships” defines the “policies governing the appointment and evaluation of graduate assistants (GAs) ... [including] setting minimum academic qualifications for holding GA appointments, establishing appointments and renewal procedures, setting average workloads, and reviewing stipend levels and ranges.”

- A particularly salient point for those of you on assistantships is that you are expected to put 20 hours a week toward your TA responsibilities. Resist the temptation to overload your weeks preparing for the classes you teach. You should be able to fulfill your obligation and do so competently if you keep with the 20 hour rule. If you find yourself unable to stay under 20 hours a week, please seek guidance and advice.

PS-22 “Student Absence from Class” defines attendance as “the responsibility of the student” and an expectation that if unfulfilled requires the student to not only contact the professor beforehand (if applicable) but also to “[compensate] for what may have been missed.” The policy also defines “valid reasons for absences” which I will honor if you are honest, upfront, and apologetic (though some things are beyond your control, your attitude should suggest that you realize course work is your primary responsibility). I fundamentally believe in forgiveness and second chances, and I understand that “life happens.” Trust me, my life happens all the time. Be a responsible graduate student and come to class as you are physically and mentally able. Missing class is not excusable because, for instance, you have band practice or happy hour only lasts until 6:00 PM. Your first responsibility as a graduate student at this stage of your career is to your coursework. If you are late to class, please do not say it is because you could not find a parking space or that your alarm did not go off in time to wake from your afternoon nap. Don’t say that it took you longer than expected to walk. Do not say that other responsibilities were responsible; this is your number one responsibility. Nothing should come before it. If something does (consistently), then you should reconsider taking the course right now or, really, being in graduate school at this point. There are valid reasons for being late, and if not abused, will be forgiven and forgotten.

Summary of the Course

Week	Date	Topic
------	------	-------

Unit I: Orientation to University Life

1	8/25	Who Are We? (In two parts)
2	9/1	No Class, Labor Day Holiday
3	9/8	Continuing the Discussion: Relevant Tensions in the Life of an Academic

Unit II: Defining Communication Studies

4	9/15	The Place of Communication Studies in the Larger Academic Landscape
5	9/22	Philosophical Foundations of CS, I: Perspectives on Inquiry
6	9/29	Philosophical Foundations of CS, II: Paradigms and “Theory Choice”

Unit III: Ways of Studying Human Communication

- | | | |
|----|-------|---------------------------|
| 7 | 10/6 | Scientific Approaches |
| 8 | 10/13 | Interpretive Approaches |
| 9 | 10/20 | Critical Approaches |
| 10 | 10/27 | For and Against Synthesis |

Unit IV: Classic Debates in Communication Studies

- | | | |
|----|-------|--|
| 11 | 11/3 | The Paradigm Dialogues |
| 12 | 11/10 | What is Theory and (Why) is it So Important? |
| 13 | 11/17 | What is Communication? |
| 14 | 11/24 | No Class, NCA Convention |

Unit V: A Crystal Ball Unveiled

- | | | |
|----|------|--|
| 15 | 12/1 | The Future of Communication Studies |
| 16 | 12/8 | (Final Exam Period – Papers Due and Presentations) |

Detailed Course Outline with Readings

Below, I detail what we will discuss for each week. Under each week there are a set of “issues” that should direct your reading and your reflection paper (if you are scheduled to write for that week). Required readings are in **bold** font. I attempted to limit readings to 100 pages of text (not including reference lists), though I was more successful in some weeks than in others. I also included relevant, additional readings for the week in case you have “extra time” or are just “that into it,” but mainly as a resource for when you revisit this syllabus in the years to come.

Week Date Topic

Unit I: Orientation to University Life

- | | | |
|---|------|----------------------------|
| 1 | 8/25 | Who Are We? (In Two Parts) |
|---|------|----------------------------|

Part I – A brief vision of the academic life

Issues

What can you expect during your life as an academic? What are the general rites of passage for academics? How can you successfully navigate the academic life?

Required Readings

Adams, H. (1976). *The academic tribes*. New York: Liveright. Chapter 4, *Rites de passage: Coming of age in academe* (pp. 77-95).

Fischer, B. A., & Zigmond, M. J. (1998). Survival skills for graduate school and beyond. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 101, 29–40. doi:10.1002/he.10103

Part II – What is this class all about?

Issues

What are the purposes of CMST 7900? What are the expectations for CMST 7900? As a first rite de passage, how can you be successful in CMST 7900?

Required Readings

The syllabus

Supplemental Readings

Amran, N. N., & Ibrahim, R. (2012). Academic rites of passage: Reflection on a PhD journey. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 59, 528-534. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.09.310

Clark, B. R. (1986). *The higher education system: Academic organization in cross-national perspective*. Oakland, CA: University of California Press.

McConnell, K. F. (2011). Of careers and curricula vitae: Losing track of academic professionalism. *International Journal of Communication*, 5, 1776-1785. Available here: <http://ijoc.org/index.php/ijoc/article/view/1295/652>

Morreale, S., & Arneson, P. (Eds.). (2008). *Getting the most from your graduate education in communication: A student's handbook*. Washington, DC: National Communication Association.

Miller, N., & Brimicombe, A. (2004). Mapping research journeys across complex terrain with heavy baggage. *Studies in Continuing Education*, 26, 405-417. doi: 10.1080/0158037042000265962 (This is one among several articles in a special issue, “The working life of doctoral students,” of this journal.)

Nyquist, J. D., Manning, L., Wulff, D. H., Austin, A. E., Sprague, J., Fraser, P. K., . . . Woodford, B. (1999). On the road to becoming a professor: The graduate student experience. *Change*, 31, 18-27. doi:10.1080/00091389909602686

Schiappa, E. (2009). Professional development during your doctoral education. Washington, DC: National Communication Association. Available here: <http://www.comm.umn.edu/assets/pdf/ProfDevBK.pdf>

Stearns, S. C. (1987). Some modest advice for graduate students. *Bulletin of the Ecological Society of America*, 68, 145-150.

Huey, R. B. (1987). Reply to Stearns: Some acyncial advice for graduate students. *Bulletin of the Ecological Society of America*, 68, 150-153.

3 9/8 Continuing the Discussion: Relevant Tensions in the Life of an Academic

Tension 1: The Role of the UniversityIssues

What are the purposes of the modern university? How has this (if at all) changed over time? How do different stakeholders define the mission of the university? How can the political landscape of a particular state influence this mission? What is at stake when the mission of a particular University is defined in a particular way? Whose interests does it serve to define the mission as, for instance, “the development of a competent workforce” or “the development of engaged citizens” or “the dissemination of powerful research”?

Required Readings – Tension 1

Kerr, C. (2001). *The uses of the university* (5th ed.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Chapter 1, *The Idea of a Multiversity* (pp. 1-34)

Associated Press. (2013). UT-Austin at center of flight over the purpose of college. *USA Today*. Retrieved from <http://usat.ly/VByOIF>

Crisp, E. (2014, February). Jindal signs WISE legislation. *The Advocate*. Retrieved from <http://theadvocate.com/news/9502412-123/jindal-signs-wise-legislation>

Foster, G. (2013, August). Letter: LSU not a trade school. *The Advocate*. Retrieved from <http://theadvocate.com/news/opinion/6711766-123/university-not-a-trade-school>

Mission Statements of Exemplar LSU Institutions

- A&M, available at http://www.lsu.edu/faculty_staff/mission.shtml
- Eunice, available at <http://catalog.lsu.edu/content.php?catoid=2&navoid=568>

Tension 2: Fragmentation and the Rise of Disciplinary Territory WarsIssues

What is a “discipline?” Is there a set of criteria that can help identify when one discipline ends and another begins? How do disciplines emerge? What purposes do they serve? How should a university carve up academic specialties (if at all)? What current model of disciplinary structure is most productive (and for whom)? What stakeholders should have a say (and what kind and to what degree) in the development, maintenance, and termination of disciplines (at least those represented at a particular institution)?

Required Readings

Becher, T., & Trowler, P. R. (2001). *Academic tribes and territories* (2nd ed.). Philadelphia, PA: The Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press. Chapter 3, *Academic Disciplines* (pp. 41-57); Chapter 7, *Academic Careers* (pp. 131-158)

Tension 3: The Roles of the Academic

Issues

What are the roles academics are asked to balance? How can this balancing act lead to stress and burnout? How do you know how to balance? Can balance be achieved? Is balance a misnomer? What is balance? Who gets to define the roles of an academic? Who should be able to define the roles of an academic? Are the reasons cited for academic success the same that drew you to the profession? If not, how can this be reconciled? Can one publish and perish? Or is it one or the other? How do you, should you, could you, would you do service? What is service? How is service distinguished from activism? Should academics be activists? Why (not)? What is the role of the academic in the larger society? Should you drink local, think global?

Required Readings – Tension 3

Bok, C. (2013). *Higher education in America*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. Chapter 15, “*Publish or Perish*” (pp. 328-337).

Kerr, C. (2001). *The uses of the university* (5th ed.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Chapter 2, *The Realities of the Federal Grant University* (pp. 35-63).

Cancian, F. M. (1993). Conflicts between activist research and academic success: Participatory research and alternative strategies. *The American Sociologist*, 24, 92-106. doi: 10.1007/BF02691947

See here for “Why Activism and Academics Don’t Mix:

<http://orgtheory.wordpress.com/2013/03/31/why-activism-and-academia-dont-mix/>

Supplemental Readings - Tension 1

Haskins, C. H., & Mommsen, T. E. (1957). *The rise of universities*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Newman, J. H. (1982). *The idea of a university*. Notre Dame, IN: Notre Dame University Press.

Readings, B. (1996). *The university in ruins*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Supplemental Readings - Tension 2

Adams, H. (1976). *The academic tribes*. New York: Liveright. Chapter 1, *A primer of academic politics* (pp. 1-30); Chapter 3, *Tribes: Les purs et les appliqués* (pp. 63-76).

Griffin, M. (2011). The uneasy institutional position of Communication and Media Studies and its impact on academic labor in large universities versus small colleges. *International Journal of Communication*, 5, 1827-1836. Available here: <http://ijoc.org/index.php/ijoc/article/view/1323/659>

Supplemental Readings - Tension 3

Austin, A. E., & Gamson, Z. F. (1983). *Academic workplace: New demands, heightened tensions*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Research Report No. 10. Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education

Erickson, K. V., Fleuriot, C. A., & Hosman, L. A. (1993). Prolific publishing: Professional and administrative concerns. *Southern Communication Journal*, 58, 328-338. doi: 10.1080/10417949309372915

Fox, M. F. (1992). Research, teaching, and publication productivity: Mutuality versus competition in academia. *Sociology of Education*, 65, 293-305. doi: 10.2307/2112772

Price, D. H. (2004). *Threatening anthropology: McCarthyism and the FBI's surveillance of activist anthropologists*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Whitman, M. E., Hendrickson, A. R., & Townsend, A. M. (1999). Research commentary. Academic rewards for teaching, research, and service: Data and discourse. *Information Systems Research*, 10, 99-109. doi: 1047-7047/99/1002/0099

The Center for Studies in Higher Education (CSHE) has a great website and several resources that might be helpful as you think about issues related to what academics do and for what they are incentivized to do: <http://www.cshe.berkeley.edu/>

Unit II: Defining Communication Studies

4 9/15 The Place of Communication Studies in the Larger Academic Landscape

Issues

Why study human communication? What are the stories that constitute the history of communication as a field? What roles has communication played and what purposes has the study of communication served for different societies (e.g., Greek)? What role has communication inquiry played economically, politically, and socially? What purposes for communication study are associated with different epochs in the evolution of the field? Is the study of human communication destined to be a field? Can Communication Studies ever become a discipline? Has Communication Studies reached disciplinary status? What do you say when someone asks you what you do for a living? How do you respond with, "Oh, so like Psychology" or "Oh, so you're kind of like an English major"? How can we describe ourselves without invoking notions of other, more established (and arguably more mainstream) disciplines? Does this even matter? Is the notion of discipline by department antiquated and ultimately harmful?

Required Readings

Schramm, W. (1963). Communication research in the United States. In W. Schramm (Ed.), *The science of human communication: New directions and new findings in communication research* (pp. 1-16). New York: Basic Books.

Pearce, W. B., & Foss, K. A. (1990). The historical context of communication as a science. In G. L. Dahnke & G. W. Clatterbuck (Eds.), *Human communication: Theory and research* (pp. 1-20). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

O'Neill, J. M. (1915). The national association. *The Quarterly Journal of Public Speaking*, 1:1, 51-58, DOI: 10.1080/00335631509360458

Keith, W. M., & Gehrke, P. J. (2014, forthcoming). Introduction: A brief history of the National Communication Association. In P. J. Gehrke & W. M. Keith (Eds.), *The unfinished conversation: 100 years of Communication Studies*. New York: Routledge.

Madison, D. S., & Hamera, J. (2006). Performance studies at the intersections. In D. S. Madison & J. Hamera (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Performance Studies* (pp. xi-xxv). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Eadie, W. F. (2011) Stories we tell: Fragmentation and convergence in Communication disciplinary history. *Review of Communication*, 11, 161-176. doi: 10.1080/15358593.2011.578257

Donsbach, W. (2006). The identity of communication research. *Journal of Communication*, 56, 437-448. doi: 10.1111/j.1460-2466.2006.00294.x

Craig, R. T. (2008). Communication in the conversation of disciplines. *Russian Journal of Communication*, 1, 7-23. doi: 10.1080/19409419.2008.10756694

Supplemental Readings

Anderson, J., Birkhead, D., Eason, D., & Strine, M. (1988). The caravan of communication and its multiple histories: A dialogue. In R. P. Hawkins, J. M. Wiemann, & S. Pingree (Eds.), *Advancing communication science: Merging mass and interpersonal processes* (pp. 276-307). Newbury Park, CA Sage

Atwater, T. (1996). Communication theory and research: The quest for credibility in the social sciences. In M. B. Salwen & D. W. Stacks (Eds.), *An integrated approach to communication theory* (pp. 539-549). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Cohen, H. (1994). *The history of speech communication: The emergence of a discipline, 1914-1945*. Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

Crowley, S. (2004). Communication skills and a brief rapprochement of rhetoricians. *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, 34, 89-103. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40232422>

Delia, J. G. (1987). Communication research: A history. In C. R. Berger & S. H. Chaffee (Eds.), *Handbook of communication science* (pp. 20-98). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Dennis, E. E., & Wartella, E. (Eds.) (1996). *American communication research: The remembered history*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Harper, N. (1979). *Human communication theory: The history of a paradigm*. Rochelle Park, NJ: Hayden Book Co.

Jackson, S. (2006). Genealogies of performance studies. In D. S. Madison & J. Hamera (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Performance Studies* (pp. 73-86). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Jeffrey, R. (1964). History of the Speech Association of America, 1912-1964. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 50, 432-444.

Keith, W. M. (2008). Speech communication, history of. In W. Donsbach (Ed.), *International encyclopedia of communication* (Vol. 10, pp. 4775-4781). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Leff, M. C., & Procarios, M. O. (1985). Rhetorical theory in speech communication. In T. W. Benson (Ed.), *Speech communication in the 20th Century* (pp. 3-27). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Mountford, R. (2009). A century after the divorce: Challenges to a rapprochement between speech communication and English. In A. A. Lunsford, K. H. Wilson, & R. A. Eberly (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Rhetorical Studies* (pp. 407-423). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Nordenstreng, K. (2004). Ferment in the field: Notes on the evolution of Communication Studies and its disciplinary nature. *The Public*, 11, 5-18.

Rawlins, W. K. (1985). Stalking interpersonal communication effectiveness: Social, individual, or situational integration? In T. W. Benson (Ed.), *Speech communication in the 20th Century* (pp. 109-129). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Rogers, E. M. (1994). *A history of communication study: A biographical approach*. New York: The Free Press.

Rogers, E. M., Chaffee, S. H. (1994). *Communication and journalism from "Daddy" Bleyer to Wilbur Schramm*. Columbia, SC: Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication.

Schramm, W. L. (1997). *The beginnings of communication study in America: A personal memoir*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Shaffer, T. S., Allison, J., & Pelias, R. J. (in press). A critical history of the “live” body in performance within the National Communication Association. In P. J. Gehrke & W. M. Keith (Eds.), *The unfinished conversation: 100 years of Communication Studies*. New York: Routledge.

Shepherd, G. J. (1993). Building a discipline of communication. *Journal of Communication*, 43, 83-91. doi: 10.1111/j.1460-2466.1993.tb01279.x

Tate, E. D., Osler, A., Fouts, G., & Siegel, A. (2000). The beginnings of Communication Studies in Canada: Remembering and narrating the past. *Canadian Journal of Communication*, 25, Online at <http://www.cjonline.ca/index.php/journal/article/view/1139/1058>

Wallace, K. R. (Ed.) (1954). *History of speech education in America: Background studies*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Woolbert, C. H. (1916). The organization of departments of speech science in universities. *The Quarterly Journal of Public Speaking*, 2, 64-77. doi: 10.1080/00335631609360516

5 9/22 Philosophical Foundations of CS, I: Perspectives on Inquiry

Issues: What kinds of knowledge are there? How can we come to have various types of knowledge about human communication? How can we warrant our knowledge claims about or representations of human communication? Why is such knowledge or representation worthwhile? What are some major approaches to the study of human communication? What assumptions do these approaches share about the processes of inquiry? In what important ways do these approaches differ from each other?

Required Readings

Miller, K. (2005). *Communication theories: Perspectives, processes, and contexts* (2nd ed.). Boston: McGraw Hill. Chapter 2, "Philosophical foundations: What is theory?"

Burrell, G., & Morgan, G. (1979). *Sociological paradigms and organizational analysis: Elements of the sociology of corporate life*. London: Heinemann. Chapter 1, "Assumptions about the Nature of Social Science" (pp. 1-9).

Anderson, J. A., & Baym, G. (2004). Philosophies and philosophic issues in communication, 1995-2004. *Journal of Communication*, 54, 589-615. doi: 10.1111/j.1460-2466.2004.tb02647.x

Craig, R. T. (1999). Communication theory as a field. *Communication Theory*, 9, 119-161.

Myers, D. (2001). A pox on all compromises: Reply to Craig (1999). *Communication Theory*, 11, 218-230.

Craig, R. T. (2001). Mending my metamodel, mending Myers. *Communication Theory*, 11, 231-240.

Supplemental Readings

Anderson, J. A. (1996). *Communication theory: Epistemological foundations*. New York: Guilford Press.

- Bell, E. (2008). *Theories of performance*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. Chapter 1, "Introducing theories of performance."
- Chaffee, S. H. (1996). Thinking about theory. In M. B. Salwen & D. W. Stacks (Eds.), *An integrated approach to communication theory* (pp. 15-32). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Cherwitz, R. A., & Hikins, J. W. (1983) Rhetorical perspectivism. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 69, 249-266. Doi: 10.1080/00335638309383653
- Craig, R. T. (2009). Metatheory. In S. W. Littlejohn & K. A. Foss (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Communication Theory* (volume 2; pp. 657-661). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Craig, R. T. & Muller, H. L. (2007). *Theorizing communication*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cushman, D. P., & Pearce, W. B. (1977). Generality and necessity in three types of theory about human communication, with special attention to rules theory. *Human Communication Research*, 3, 344-353.
- Dervin, B., Grossberg, L., O'Keefe, B. J., & Wartella, E. (Eds.) (1989). *Rethinking communication, Vol. 1: Paradigm issues*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publication.
- Fisher, B. A. (1978). *Perspectives on human communication*. New York: Macmillan.
- Littlejohn, S. W., & Foss, K. A. (2009). *Theories of human communication* (8th ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth. Chapter 1, "Communication theory and scholarship." Chapter 2, "The idea of theory."
- Martin, J. N., & Nakayama, T. K. (1999). Thinking dialectically about culture and communication. *Communication Theory*, 9, 1-25.
- Morgan, G. (1980). Paradigms, metaphors, and puzzle solving in organization theory. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 25, 605-622.
- Powers, J. H. (1995). On the intellectual structure of the human communication discipline. *Communication Education*, 44, 191-222. doi:10.1080/03634529509379012
- Salwen, M. B., & Stacks, D. W. (Eds.) (1996). *An integrated approach to communication theory*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Scott, R. L. (1967). On viewing rhetoric as epistemic. *Central States Speech Journal*, 18, 9-17. doi: 10.1080/10510976709362856

6 9/29 Philosophical Foundations of CS, II: Paradigms and “Theory Choice”

Issues: What, for Kuhn, is a paradigm? That is, what are the major constituents that compose what Kuhn terms a "scientific paradigm?" Is any particular constituent more important than others in establishing or defining a paradigm? Why and how do paradigms change? Why does Kuhn regard paradigm changes as revolutionary rather than evolutionary (i.e., scientific change occurring through discontinuous rather than continuous development)? Does Kuhn's analysis of paradigm change seem reasonable to you? Why or why not? Is there any logic or rationality to paradigm changes?

Required Readings

Kuhn, T. S. (1998). The nature and necessity of scientific revolutions. In M. Curd & J. A. Cover (Eds.), *Philosophy of science: The central issues* (pp. 86-101). New York: W. W. Norton.

Kuhn, T. S. (1998). Objectivity, value judgment, and theory choice. In M. Curd & J. A. Cover (Eds.), *Philosophy of science: The central issues* (pp. 102-118). New York: W. W. Norton.

Gutting, G. (1980). Introduction. In G. Gutting (Ed.), *Paradigms and revolutions: Appraisals and applications of Thomas Kuhn's philosophy of science* (pp. 1-21). South Bend, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.

Hanson, N. R. (1973). Observation. In R. E. Grandy (Ed.), *Theories and observation in science* (pp. 129-146). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Phillips, D. C. (2000). New philosophy of science. In D. C. Phillips (Ed.), *The expanded social scientist's bestiary* (pp. 101-116). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Supplemental Readings

Brown, H. I. (1977). *Perception, theory, and commitment: The new philosophy of science*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Feyerabend, P. (1975). *Against method*. London: Verso Press.

Hanson, N. R. (1958). *Patterns of discovery*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kuhn, T.S. (1970). *The structure of scientific revolutions* (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lakatos, I., & Musgrave, A. (Eds.) (1970). *Criticism and the growth of knowledge*. London: Cambridge University Press.

Polanyi, M. (1958). *Personal knowledge: Towards a post-critical philosophy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Scheffler, I. (1967). *Science and subjectivity*. Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill.

Toulmin, S. (1960). *The philosophy of science*. New York: Harper & Row.

Toulmin, S. E. (1961). *Foresight and understanding: An enquiry into the aims of science*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Toulmin, S. (1972). *Human understanding*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

**The Kuhnian notion of scientific revolution has been particularly influential on a branch of rhetorical studies that can be called rhetoric of science. Exemplar readings in this area include a special issue of *Southern Communication Journal* (1993, Vol. 58, Issue 4) as well as the following:

Campbell, J. A. (1986). Scientific revolution and the grammar of culture: The case of Darwin's Origin. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 72, 351-376. doi: 10.1080/00335638609383782

Gaonkar, D. P. (1990). Rhetoric and its double: Reflections on the rhetorical turn in the human sciences. In H. W. Simons (Ed.), *The rhetorical turn: Invention and persuasion in the conduct of inquiry*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Gross, A. G. (2006). *Starring the text: The place of rhetoric in science studies*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP.

Latour, B., & Woolgar, S. (1979). *Laboratory life: The social construction of scientific facts*. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Waddell, C. (1990). The role of pathos in the decision-making process: A study in the rhetoric of science policy. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 76, 381-400. doi: 10.1080/00335639009383932

Wander, P. C., & Jaehne, D. (2000). Prospects for 'a rhetoric of science.' *Social Epistemology*, 14, 211-233. doi: 10.1080/02691720050199243 (This is part of a larger special issue of this journal on climate change that was motivated by the debate between two climate scientists, James Hansen and Patrick Michaels, at the 1998 American Association for Rhetoric of Science and Technology meeting.)

Zagacki, K. S., & Keith, W. (1992). Rhetoric, topoi, and scientific revolutions. *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, 25, 59-78. doi: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40238279>

Unit III: Ways of Studying Human Communication

7 10/6 Scientific Approaches

Issues: What is science? What are the critical elements of the scientific approach to the world? What are the limits of a scientific understanding of the world? Is a science of humans possible? How can a creature that *interprets* and *acts* be studied scientifically? Is it possible to predict, control, and generalize about meaningful human conduct? Can scientific explanations of such conduct be developed and tested? In what sense would such explanations be “scientific?”

Overviews

Required Readings

Wilson, P. K. (1996). The origins of science. *National Forum*, 76 (Winter), 39-43.

Popper, K. (1998). Science: Conjectures and refutations. In M. Curd & J. A. Cover (Eds.), *Philosophy of science: The central issues* (pp. 3-10). New York: W. W. Norton.

Lakatos, I. (1998). Science and pseudoscience. In M. Curd & J. A. Cover (Eds.), *Philosophy of science: The central issues* (pp. 20-26). New York: W. W. Norton.

Miller, K. (2005). *Communication theories: Perspectives, processes, and contexts* (2nd ed.). Boston: McGraw Hill. Chapter 3, “Post-positivist perspectives on theory development.”

“Three Ways” to Conceptualize Science: Naturalism, Perspectivism, and Realism

Required Readings

Pavitt, C. (1999). The third way: Scientific realism and communication theory. *Communication Theory*, 9, 162-188. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2885.1999.tb00356.x

Phillips, D. C. (2000). Naturalistic ideals for social science. In D. C. Phillips (Ed.), *The expanded social scientist's bestiary* (pp. 85-100). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield

Schutz, A. (1967). Concept and theory formation in the social sciences. In M. Natanson (Ed.), *Collected papers of Alfred Schutz, Vol. 1: The problem of social reality* (pp. 48-66). The Hague: Martinus Nijoff.

Berger, C. R., Roloff, M. E., & Roskos-Ewoldsen, D. R. (2010). What is communication science? In C. R. Berger, M. E. Roloff, & D. R. Roskos-Ewoldsen (Eds.), *The Handbook of Communication Science* (2nd ed.; pp. 3-20). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Supplemental Readings

Beatty, M. J., & McCroskey, J. C. (1998). Interpersonal communication as temperamental expression: A communibiological paradigm. In J. C. McCroskey, J. A. Daly, M. M. Martin, & J. J. Beatty (Eds.), *Communication and personality: Trait perspectives* (pp. 41-67). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Beatty, M. J., McCroskey, J. C., & Floyd, K. (Eds.). (2009). *Biological dimensions of communication: Perspectives, research, and methods*. New York: Hampton Press.

Berger, C. R. (1977). The covering law perspective as a theoretical basis for the study of human communication. *Communication Quarterly*, 25, 7-18.

Bostrom, R. N. (2003). Theories, data, and communication research. *Communication Monographs*, 70, 275-294

Bostrom, R. N., & Donohew, L. (1992). The case for empiricism: Clarifying fundamental issues in communication theory. *Communication Monographs*, 59, 109-129.

Condit, C. M. (2000). Culture and biology in human communication: Toward a multi-causal model. *Communication Education*, 49, 7-24.

Daniels, T. D., & Frandsen, K. D. (1984). Conventional social science inquiry in human communication: Theory and practice. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 70, 223-240.

Floyd, K., & Afifi, T. D. (2011). Biological and physiological perspectives on interpersonal communication. In M. L. Knapp & J. A. Daly (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of interpersonal communication* (4th ed., pp. 87-127). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Hornsey, M. J., Gallois, C., & Duck, J. M. (2008). The intersection of Communication and Social Psychology: Points of contact and points of difference. *Journal of Communication*, 58, 749-766. doi: 10.1111/j.1460-2466.2008.00412.x

Lustig, M. W. (1986). Theorizing about human communication. *Communication Quarterly*, 34, 451-459.

Kincaid, H. (1990). Defending laws in the social sciences. *Philosophy of Social Science*, 20, 56-83.

Pavitt, C. (2000). Answering questions requesting scientific explanations for communication. *Communication Theory*, 10, 379-404.

Peirce, C. S. (1901). Pearson's Grammar of Science. *Popular Science Monthly*, 58, 296-306.

Peirce, C. S. (1901). Laws of nature. Found as Chapter 7 in *The Essential Peirce* (volume 2, 1893-1913; pp. 67-74), The Peirce Edition Project, Indiana University Press.

Peirce, C. S. (1903). A detailed classification of the sciences, *The Collected Papers*, vol. 1, pp. 180-202.

Peirce, C. S. (1902). An outline classification of the sciences, *The Collected Papers*, vol. 1, pp. 203–283.

Scheidel, T. M. (1977). Evidence varies with phases of inquiry. *Western Journal of Speech Communication*, 41, 20-31.

Supplemental Readings – Exemplars

Berger, C. R. (1995). A plan-based approach to strategic communication. In D. E. Hewes (Ed.), *The cognitive bases of interpersonal communication* (pp. 141-179). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Burleson, B. R. (1989). The constructivist approach to person-centered communication: Analysis of a research exemplar. In B. Dervin, L. Grossberg, B. J. O'Keefe, & E. Wartella (Eds.), *Rethinking communication, Volume 2: Paradigm exemplars* (pp. 29-46). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Dillard, J. P. (2004). The goals-plan-action model of interpersonal influence. In J. S. Seiter & R. H. Gass (Eds.), *Perspectives on persuasion, social influence, and compliance gaining* (pp. 185-206). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Greene, J. O. (1997). A second generation action assembly theory. In J. O. Greene (Ed.), *Message production: Advances in communication theory* (pp. 151-170). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Meyer, J. R. (1997). Cognitive influences on the ability to address interaction goals. In J. O. Greene (Ed.), *Message production: Advances in communication theory* (pp. 71-90). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Wilson, S. R. (1995). Elaborating the cognitive rules model of interaction goals: The problem of accounting for individual differences in goal formation. In B. R. Burleson (Ed.), *Communication yearbook 18* (pp. 3-25). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

8 10/13 Interpretive Approaches

Issues

What are the philosophical foundations of interpretive theory? Are these foundations different for different “types” of interpretive approaches (e.g., social construction, phenomenology)? What counts as interpretive theory? What does not count? How is “interpretive” theory different from “scientific” theory? How does interpretive theory shape methodological choices? What is the relationship between interpretive theory and interpretive research? What are the key characteristics of interpretive research? Are there certain interpretive methodologies that could only be used for the purposes of interpretive theory? How would you position the relationship between interpretive research and post-positivistic research? What contributions can interpretive research make to knowledge? How might we develop a set of criteria to evaluate interpretive research?

Interpretive Theory – Overview

Required Readings

Winch, P. (1977). The idea of a social science. In F. R. Dallmayr & T. A. McCarthy (Eds.), *Understanding and social inquiry* (pp. 142-158). Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.

Miller, K. (2005). *Communication theories: Perspectives, processes, and contexts* (2nd ed.). Boston: McGraw Hill. Chapter 4, “Interpretive perspectives on theory development.”

Supplemental Readings

Abel, T. (1977). The operation called *Verstehen*. In F. R. Dallmayr & T. A. McCarthy (Eds.), *Understanding and social inquiry* (pp. 81-92). Notre Dame, IN: Notre Dame University Press.

Farrell, T. B. (1987). Beyond science: Humanities contributions to communication theory. In C.R. Berger & S.H. Chaffee (Eds.), *Handbook of communication science* (pp. 123-139). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Vannini, A. (2009). Interpretive theory. In S. W. Littlejohn & K. A. Foss (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Communication Theory* (volume 1; pp. 557-562). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Social Constructionism

Required Readings

Gergen, K. J. (1985). The social constructionist movement in modern psychology. *American Psychologist*, 40, 255-265.

Supplemental Readings

Pearce, W. B. (2009) *Communication and social construction: Claiming our birthright* (pp. 33-56) In Wendy Leeds-Hurwitz and Gloria Galanes (Eds.). (2009) *Socially Constructing Communication*. Cresskill, N. J.: Hampton Press.

Phillips, D. C. (2000). Social construction of knowledge. In D. C. Phillips (Ed.), *The expanded social scientist's bestiary* (pp. 187-208). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Stroebe, W., & Kruglanski, A. W. (1989). Social psychology at epistemological cross-roads: On Gergen's choice. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 19, 485-489.

Zuriff, G. (1998). Against metaphysical social constructionism in psychology. *Behavior and Philosophy*, 26, 5-28.

Hermeneutics

Required Readings

Ricoeur, P. (1977). The model of the text: Meaningful action considered as a text. In F. R. Dallmayr & T. A. McCarthy (Eds.), *Understanding and social inquiry* (pp. 316-334). Notre Dame, IN: Notre Dame University Press.

Supplemental Readings

Dilthey, W. (1900/1976). The rise of hermeneutics. In P. Connerton (Ed.), *Critical sociology* (pp. 104-116). Harmondsworth, England: Penguin.

Gadamer, H. G. (1976). The historicity of understanding. In P. Connerton (Ed.), *Critical sociology* (pp. 117-133). Harmondsworth, England: Penguin.

Phillips, D. C. (2000). Hermeneutics and naturalistic social inquiry. In D. C. Phillips (Ed.), *The expanded social scientist's bestiary* (pp. 19-40). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Symbolic Interactionism

Required Readings

Blumer, H. (1969). Sociological implications of the thought of George Herbert Mead. In G. P. Stone & H. A. Farberman (Eds.), *Social psychology through symbolic interaction* (pp. 282-293). Waltham, MA: Xerox College Publishing.

Burke, K. (1963/1964). Definition of man. *The Hudson Review*, 16, 491-514. doi: 10.2307/3848123

- Also in *Philosophy of literary form*. 1973, University of California Press. "Definition of Man" (pp. 3-24). *Note: The first several editions of this book were published by LSU Press.*

Littlejohn, S.W. (1977). Symbolic interactionism as an approach to the study of human communication. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 63, 84-91. doi: 10.1080/00335637709383369

Supplemental Readings

Blumer, H. (1969). The methodological position of symbolic interactionism. In H. Blumer (Ed.), *Symbolic interactionism: Perspective and method* (pp. 1-60). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Blumer, H. (1973). A note on symbolic interactionism. *American Sociological Review*, 38, 797-798.

Cheesebro, J. W. (1988). Epistemology and ontology as dialectical modes in the writings of Kenneth Burke. *Communication Quarterly*, 36, 175-191. doi: 10.1080/0146337880936972

Huber, J. (1973). Symbolic interaction as a pragmatic perspective: The bias of emergent theory. *American Sociological Review*, 38, 274-284.

Huber, J. (1973). Reply to Blumer: But who will scrutinize the scrutinizers? *American Sociological Review*, 38, 798-800.

Rhetorical Criticism Approaches

Required Readings

Zarefsky, D. (2008). Knowledge claims in rhetorical criticism. *Journal of Communication*, 58, 629-640. doi: 10.1111/j.1460-2466.2008.00405.x

McKerrow, R., & St. John, J. (2009). Critical rhetoric and continual critique. In J. A. Kuypers (Ed.), *Rhetorical Criticism: Perspectives in action* (pp. 321-362) (Lexington Books, 2009).

Supplemental Readings

Brockriede, W. E. (1968). Dimensions of the concept of rhetoric. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 54, 1-12.

Frank, D. A. (2007). A traumatic reading of twentieth-century rhetorical theory: The Belgian Holocaust, Malines, Perelman, and de Man. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 93, 308-343. Doi: 10.1080/00335630701426793

Goodall, H. L., Jr., & Phillips, G. M. (1982). Assumption of the burden: Science or criticism? *Communication Quarterly*, 29, 283-296.

Hart, R. P. (1976). Theory-building and rhetorical criticism: An informal statement of opinion. *Central States Speech Journal*, 27, 70-77.

Millar, F. E. (1983). Science as criticism: The burden of assumptions. *Communication Quarterly*, 31, 224-232.

Nilsen, T. R. (1968). Interpretive function of the critic. In T. R. Nilsen (Ed.), *Essays on rhetorical criticism* (pp. 86-97). New York: Random House.

Walter, O. M. (1968). On the varieties of rhetorical criticism. In T. R. Nilsen (Ed.), *Essays on rhetorical criticism* (pp. 158-172). New York: Random House.

Interpretive Research – Overview

Cheney, G. (2000). Interpreting interpretive research: Toward perspectivism without relativism. In S. R. Corman & M. S. Poole (Eds.), *Perspectives on organizational communication: Finding common ground* (pp. 17-45). New York: Guilford Press.

Collinson, D. (1988). "Engineering humor": Masculinity, joking and conflict in shop-floor relations. *Organization Studies*, 9, 181-199.

Ellis, C. (1995). Emotional and ethical quagmires in returning to the field. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 24, 68-98.

Forester, J. (1992). Critical ethnography: On fieldwork in a Habermasian way. In M. Alvesson & H. Willmott (Eds.), *Critical management studies* (pp. 47-65). London: Sage.

Geertz, C. (1994). Thick description: Toward an interpretive theory of culture. In M. Martin & L. C. McIntyre (Eds.), *Readings in the philosophy of social science* (pp. 213-231). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Rowland, R. C. (1987). Narrative mode of discourse or paradigm? *Communication Monographs*, 54, 264-275.

Warnick, B. (1987). The narrative paradigm: Another story. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 73, 172-182.

Willis, P. (1977). *Learning to labor: How working-class kids get working-class jobs*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Phenomenology

Bodie, G. D., & Crick, N. (2014). Listening, hearing, sensing: Three modes of being and the phenomenology of Charles Sanders Peirce. *Communication Theory*, 24, 105-123. doi: 10.1111/comt.12032

- This article was written in response to Lipari, L. (2010). Listening, thinking, being. *Communication Theory*, 20, 348-362. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2885.2010.01366.x
- Also see:
 - Gehrke, P. J. (2009). Introduction to listening, ethics, and dialogue: Between the ear and the eye: A synaesthetic introduction to listening ethics. *International Journal of Listening*, 23, 1-6. doi: 10.1080/10904010802631023
 - Hyde, R. B. (1994). Listening authentically: A Heideggerian perspective on interpersonal communication. In K. Carter & M. Presnell (Eds.), *Interpretive approaches to interpersonal communication* (pp. 179-195). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
 - Ihde, D. (2007). *Listening and voice: Phenomenologies of sound*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
 - Lipari, L. (2009). Listening otherwise: The voice of ethics. *International Journal of Listening*, 23, 44-59. doi: 10.1080/10904010802591888
 - Lipari, L. (2012). Rhetoric's other: Levinas, listening, and the ethical response. *Philosophy & Rhetoric*, 45, 227-245. doi: 10.5325/philtrhet.45.3.0227
 - Purdy, M. W. (2000). Listening, culture, and structures of consciousness: Ways of studying listening. *International Journal of Listening*, 14, 47-68.

Heidegger, M. (1982) *The basic problems of Phenomenology*. Trans. by Albert Hofstadter. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Husserl, E. (2001). *Logical investigations*. Vols. One and Two, Trans. J. N. Findlay. Ed. with translation corrections and with a new Introduction by Dermot Moran. With a new Preface by Michael Dummett. London and New York: Routledge.

Merleau-Ponty, M. (2012). *Phenomenology of perception*. Trans. Donald A. Landes. London and New York: Routledge.

Peirce, C. S. (1955). The principles of phenomenology. In J. Buchler (Ed.), *Philosophical writings of Peirce* (pp. 74–97). Mineola, NY: Dover Publications.

Ransdell, J. (1978). A misunderstanding of Peirce's phenomenology. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, 38, 550-553. doi: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2106579>

Rosensohn, W. L. (1974). *The phenomenology of Charles S. Peirce: From the doctrine of categories to phaneroscopy*. John Benjamins Publishing.

Sartre, J.-P. (1956). *Being and nothingness*. Trans. Hazel Barnes. New York: Washington Square Press.

Stjernfelt, F. (2007). *Diagrammatology: An investigation of the borderlines of phenomenology, ontology, and semiotics*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Taylor, C. (1994). Interpretation and the sciences of man. In M. Martin & L. C. McIntyre (Eds.), *Readings in the philosophy of social science* (pp. 181-211). Boston: MIT Press.

Martin, M. (1994). Taylor on interpretation and the sciences of man. In M. Martin & L. C. McIntyre (Eds.), *Readings in the philosophy of social science* (pp. 259-279). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

"Social" Approaches (Post-modernism, autoethnography)

Bochner, A. P. (2002). Perspectives on inquiry III: The moral of stories. In M. L. Knapp & J. A. Daly (Eds.), *Handbook of interpersonal communication* (3rd ed., pp. 73-101). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Phillips, D. C. (2000). Narrative research: Telling stories about stories. In D. C. Phillips (Ed.), *The expanded social scientist's bestiary* (pp. 61-84). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Stewart, J. (1992). Philosophical dimensions of social approaches to interpersonal communication. *Communication Theory*, 2, 337-346.

Sigman, S. (1992). Do social approaches to communication constitute a contribution to communication theory? *Communication Theory*, 2, 347-356.

Taylor, B. C. (2005). Postmodern theory. In S. May & D. K. Mumby (Eds.), *Engaging organizational communication theory and research: Multiple perspectives* (pp. 113-140). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Other Viewpoints

Lannaman, J. W. (1991). Interpersonal communication research as ideological practice. *Communication Theory*, 1, 179-203.

Louch, A. R. (1960). *Explanation and human action*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Penman, R. (1992). Good theory and good practice: An argument in progress. *Communication Theory*, 3, 252-266.

9 10/20 Critical Approaches

Issues

To what extent does the study of human behavior “contain the essence of criticism?” How does knowledge inform politics and vice versa? Is there such a thing as apolitical research? What is the relationship between communication and structure? Is the primary function of theory to critique? To what extent is critique a mode of social action? What is the role of “power” in explaining human communication?

OverviewReadings

Miller, K. (2005). *Communication theories: Perspectives, processes, and contexts* (2nd ed.). Boston: McGraw Hill. Chapter 5, “Critical perspectives on theory development.”

McKinnon, S. L. (2009). Critical theory. In S. W. Littlejohn & K. A. Foss (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Communication Theory* (volume 1; pp. 237-243). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Foundations

Horkheimer, M. (1937/1976). Traditional and critical theory. In P. Connerton (Ed.), *Critical sociology* (pp. 206-224). Harmondsworth, England: Penguin.

Foucault, M. (1982). The subject and power. *Critical Inquiry*, 8, 777-795.

Gramsci, A. (2001). History of the subaltern classes. In M. G. Durham & D. M. Kellner (Eds.), *Media and cultural studies: Key works* (pp. 43-47). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Habermas, J. (2001). The public sphere: An encyclopedic article. In M. G. Durham and D. Kellner (Eds.), *Media and cultural studies: Key works* (pp. 102-107). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Exemplars

McKerrow, R. E. (1993). Critical rhetoric and the possibility of the subject. In I. Angus & L. Langsdorf (Eds.), *The critical turn: Rhetoric and philosophy in postmodern discourse* (pp. 51-67). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Conquergood, D. (1991). Rethinking ethnography: Toward a critical cultural politics. *Communication Monographs*, 58, 179-194. doi: 10.1080/03637759109376222

Shome, R., & Hedge, R. (2002). Postcolonial approaches to communication: Charting the terrain, engaging the intersections. *Communication Theory*, 12, 249-270. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2885.2002.tb00269.x

Supplemental Readings

Burleson, B. R., & Kline, S. L. (1979). Habermas' theory of communication: A critical explication. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 65, 412-428.

Buzzanell, P. M. (1994). Gaining a voice: Feminist organizational communication theorizing. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 7, 339-383.

Chakravorty Spivak, G. (1988). Can the subaltern speak? G. Nelson & L. Grossberg (Eds.), *Marxism and the interpretation of culture* (pp. 271-313). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Chandavarkar, R. (2000). The making of the working class: E.P. Thompson and Indian history. In V. Chaturvedi (Ed.), *Mapping subaltern studies and postcolonial*. London: Verso Books, New Left Review.

Comstock, D. E. (1994). A method for critical research. In M. Martin & L. C. McIntyre (Eds.), *Readings in the philosophy of social science* (pp. 625-639). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Deetz, S. (2005). Critical theory. In S. May & D. K. Mumby (Eds.), *Engaging organizational communication theory and research: Multiple perspectives* (pp. 85-111). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dutta, M. (2011). *Communication social change: Structure, culture, agency*. Taylor & Francis

Dutta-Bergman, M. (2005). Civil society and communication: Not so civil after all. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 17, 267-289.

Dutta, M. J. (2012). Hunger as health: Culture-centered interrogations of alternative rationalities of health. *Communication Monographs*, 79, 366-384. doi: 10.1080/03637751.2012.697632

Dutta-Bergman, M. (2004). The unheard voices of Santalis: Communicating about health from the margins of India. *Communication Theory*, 14, 237-263.

Foss, S. K., & Griffin, C. L. (1995). Beyond persuasion: A proposal for an invitational rhetoric. *Communication Monographs*, 62, 2-18.

- Garrouette, E. M. (1999). Getting serious about “interrogating representation”: An indigenous turn. *Social Studies of Science*, 29(6), 945-956.
- Guha, R. (1992). *Selected subaltern studies*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Habermas, J. (1998). *On the pragmatics of communication*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Hall, S. (1985). Signification, representation, ideology: Althusser and the poststructuralist debates. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 2, 91-114
- Hegde, R. (1998). A view from elsewhere: Locating difference and the politics of representation from a transnational feminist perspective. *Communication Theory*, 8, 271-297.
- Held, D. (1980). *Introduction to critical theory*. Berkeley: University of California Press, Chapters 2 and 3.
- Horkheimer, M., & Adorno, T. (2002). The concept of enlightenment. In M. Horkheimer & T. Adorno, *Dialectic of Enlightenment: Philosophical Fragments* (pp. 1-34). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. 34
- McKerrow, R. (1989). Critical rhetoric: Theory and praxis. *Communication Monographs*, 56, 91-111.
- Mumby, D. (1992). Two discourses on communication, power, and the subject: Jürgen Habermas and Michel Foucault. In G. Levine (Ed.), *Constructions of the self* (pp. 81-104). New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Mumby, D. K. (2000). Common ground from the critical perspective: Overcoming binary oppositions. In S. R. Corman & M. S. Poole (Eds.), *Perspectives on organizational communication: Finding common ground* (pp. 17-45). New York: Guilford Press.
- Pandey, G. (2000). Voices from the edge: The struggle to write subaltern studies. In V. Chaturvedi (Ed.), *Mapping subaltern studies and postcolonial*. London: Verso Books, New Left Review.
- Sarkar, S. (2000). Orientalism revisited: Saidian frameworks in the writing of modern Indian history. In V. Chaturvedi (Ed.), *Mapping subaltern studies and postcolonial*. London: Verso Books, New Left Review.
- Williams, R. (1980). Base and superstructure in Marxist cultural theory. In R. Williams (Ed.), *Problems in Materialism and Culture: Selected Essays* (pp. 31-49). London: Verso and NLB.

10 10/27 For and Against Synthesis

Issues

What are the goals of synthesis? What are the possible advantages of synthesis? What are the disadvantages? Is it possible to synthesize meaningfully? How would a scholar interested in synthesis proceed in his/her work (steps)? What are the possible arguments presented by traditionalists (post-positivists, interpretive scholars, and critical theorists) against synthesis? How might one respond to these arguments? What are the epistemological, ontological, and axiological foundations of scholarship that seeks to synthesize? Could one argue that synthesis is rootless, and hence superficial? Why? Why not? Based on the assigned readings, how would you respond to this criticism? How would a methodology of synthesis look like? How would it be different from other more “traditional” types of research endeavors? How would you evaluate the quality of scholarship that synthesizes?

Required Readings – Overview

Craig, R. T. (1990). The speech tradition. *Communication Monographs*, 57, 309-314, doi: 10.1080/03637759009376205

Pfau, M. (2008). Epistemological and disciplinary intersections. *Journal of Communication*, 58, 597-602. doi: 10.1111/j.1460-2466.2008.00414.x

Required Readings – For Synthesis

Corman, S. R. (2000). The need for common ground. In S. R. Corman & M. S. Poole (Eds.), *Perspectives on organizational communication: Finding common ground* (pp. 3-13). New York: Guilford.

Cronkhite, G. (1986). On the focus, scope, and coherence of the study of human symbolic activity. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 72, 231-246

Berger, C. R. (1998). Big questions and communication theory: Finding the cure for communication. In J. S. Trent (Ed.), *Communication: Views from the helm for the 21st century* (pp. 13-17). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Fay, B., & Moon, J. D. (1994). What would an adequate philosophy of social science look like? In M. Martin & L. C. McIntyre (Eds.), *Readings in the philosophy of social science* (pp. 21-35). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Required Readings – Against Synthesis

Rorty, R. (1998). Against unity. *Wilson Quarterly*, 53, 46-62. [you can also read EO Wilson's piece but it is not required]

Burgoon, M., & Bailey, W. (1992). PC at last! PC at last! Thank God Almighty, we are PC at last! *Journal of Communication*, 42, 95-104.

Capella, J. N. (1989). Remaking communication inquiry. In B. Dervin, L. Grossberg, B. J. O'Keefe, & Wartella, E. (Eds.), *Rethinking communication: Volume I: Paradigm issues* (pp. 139-143). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Cronen, V. E. (1998). Communication theory for the twenty-first century: Cleaning up the wreckage of the psychology project. In J. S. Trent (Ed.), *Communication: Views from the helm for the 21st century* (pp. 18-38). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Supplemental Readings

Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. New York: Doubleday.

Bernstein, R. J. (1978). *The restructuring of social and political theory*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Bernstein, R. J. (1983). *Beyond objectivism and relativism: Science, hermeneutics, and praxis*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Giddens, A. (1976). *New rules of sociological method: A positive critique of interpretive sociologies*. New York: Basic Books. Chapter 3: "The production and reproduction of social life" (pp. 93-129).

Orr, C.J. (1978). How shall we say: "Reality is socially constructed through communication?" *Central States Speech Journal*, 29, 263-274. doi: 10.1080/10510977809367986

Poole, M.S., Seibold, D.R., & McPhee, R.D. (1985). Group decision-making as a structurational process. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 71, 74-102.

Unit IV: Classic Debates in Communication Studies

11 11/3 The Paradigm Dialogues

Issues: What are the purposes of communication scholarship? On what types of problems should scholars of human communication work? Are there various ways to answer these questions? Or only one? In other words, is Communication Studies marked by monomania and exclusivism or excessive fragmentation and diversity? Does fragmentation lead to stagnation or to better scholarship? What are the positive and negative consequences of fragmentation? Of uniformity? What mode of science is claimed to be the "dominant paradigm" for Communication Studies scholarship? Can Communication Studies really be said to have a "dominant paradigm?" Has the "dominant paradigm" finally been toppled?

Required Readings

Dervin, B., Grossberg, L., O'Keefe, B. J., & Wartella, E. (1989). Introduction. In B. Dervin, L. Grossberg, B. J. O'Keefe, & E. Wartella (Eds.), *Rethinking communication: Volume I, Paradigm issues* (pp. 13-17). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Rosengren, K. E. (1989). Paradigms lost and regained. In B. Dervin, L. Grossberg, B. J. O'Keefe, & E. Wartella (Eds.), *Rethinking communication: Volume I, Paradigm issues* (pp. 21-39). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Hall, S. (1989). Ideology and communication theory. In B. Dervin, L. Grossberg, B. J. O'Keefe, & E. Wartella (Eds.), *Rethinking communication: Volume I, Paradigm issues* (pp. 40-52). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Giddens, A. (1989). The orthodox consensus and the emerging synthesis. In B. Dervin, L. Grossberg, B. J. O'Keefe, & E. Wartella (Eds.), *Rethinking communication: Volume I, Paradigm issues* (pp. 53-65). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Krippendorff, K. (1989). On the ethics of constructing communication. In B. Dervin, L. Grossberg, B. J. O'Keefe, & E. Wartella (Eds.), *Rethinking communication: Volume I, Paradigm issues* (pp. 66-96). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Craig, R. T. (1989). Communication as a practical discipline. In B. Dervin, L. Grossberg, B. J. O'Keefe, & E. Wartella (Eds.), *Rethinking communication: Volume I, Paradigm issues* (pp. 97-122). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Becker, S. L. (1989). Communication studies: Visions of the future. In B. Dervin, L. Grossberg, B. J. O'Keefe, & E. Wartella (Eds.), *Rethinking communication: Volume I, Paradigm issues* (pp. 125-129). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Berger, C. R. (1989). Back to the future: Paradigm monologues revisited. In B. Dervin, L. Grossberg, B. J. O'Keefe, & E. Wartella (Eds.), *Rethinking communication: Volume I, Paradigm issues* (pp. 130-134). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Supplemental Readings

1983 Special Issue of Journal of Communication (also a book), "Ferment in the Field"

1993, two-issue sequel in JoC, "The Future of the Field"

Selections from JoC from 2005 on "state of the art" in Communication research

There are other excellent response essays in the Dervin et al "Rethinking Vol. I" book, and there is a full second volume that provides paradigm exemplars.

Mumby, D. K. (1977). Modernism, postmodernism, and communication studies: A rereading of an ongoing debate. *Communication Theory*, 7, 1-28. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2885.1997.tb00140.x

Burgoon, J. B. (Ed.). (1990). Are rhetoric and science incompatible? [Special section] *Communication Monographs*, 57, 309-332. Contains the following articles:

Craig, R. T. The speech tradition. 310-314. doi:10.1080/03637759009376205

Prelli, L. J. Rhetorical logic and the integration of rhetoric and science. 315-322. 10.1080/03637759009376206

Condit, C. M. The birth of understanding: Chaste science and the harlot of the arts. 323-27. doi:10.1080/03637759009376207

Cushman, D. P. A window of opportunity argument. 328-332. doi:10.1080/03637759009376208

12 11/10 What is Theory and (Why) is it So Important?

Issues:

What makes a theoretical contribution a theory of communication? What does not count as a communication theory? Are communication theories flourishing or withering away? Is Communication Studies too rich or too poor in theoretical frameworks? Is it necessary (or advised) to have a “touchstone theory around which communication researchers might organize their efforts” (Berger)? What are the perspectives from which you can judge whether something counts as a communication theory? What should communication theory accomplish? Is the purpose of research to build theory? To create knowledge? To help the public? To ... ?

Required Readings

Berger, C. R. (1991). Communication theories and other curios. *Communication Monographs*, 58, 101-113.

Purcell, W. M. (1992). Are there so few communication theories? *Communication Monographs*, 59, 94-97, doi: 10.1080/03637759209376252

Craig, R. T. (1993). Why are there so *many* communication theories? *Journal of Communication*, 43, 26-33.

Burleson, B. R. (1992). Taking communication seriously. *Communication Monographs*, 59, 79-86, doi: 10.1080/03637759209376250

Proctor, R. F., II. (1992) Preserving the tie that binds: A response to Berger's essay. *Communication Monographs*, 59, 98-100, doi: 10.1080/03637759209376253

Berger, C. R. (1992). Curiouser and curiouser curios. *Communication Monographs*, 59, 101-107. doi: 10.1080/03637759209376254

Keyton, J., Bisel, R. S., & Ozley, R. (2009). Recasting the link between applied and theory research: Using applied findings to advance communication theory development. *Communication Theory*, 19, 146-160.

Roy, A., & Oludaja, B. (2009). Hans-Georg Gadamer's *Praxis*: Implications for connection and action in communication studies. *Communication, Culture, and Critique*, 2, 255-273.

Condit, C. M. (2009). You can't study and improve communication with a telescope. *Communication Monographs*, 76, 3-12.

Seeger, M. (2009). Does communication research make a difference: Reconsidering the impact of our work. *Communication Monographs*, 76, 12-19.

Hummert, M. L. (2009). Not just preaching to the choir: Communication scholarship does make a difference. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 37, 215-224.

Supplemental Readings

Ellis, D. G. (1982, March). The shame of speech communication. *Spectra*, pp. 1–2.

Ellis, D. G. (1991). The oneness of opposites: Applied communication and theory. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 19, 116–122. doi:10.1080/00909889109365295

Keyton, J., Bisel, R. S., & Ozley, R. (2009). Recasting the link between applied and theory research: Using applied findings to advance communication theory development. *Communication Theory*, 19, 146–160. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2885.2009.01339.x

Miller, G. R. (1995). “I think my schizophrenia is better today,” said the communication research unanimously: Some thoughts on the dysfunctional dichotomy between pure and applied communication research. In K. N. Cissna (Ed.), *Applied communication in the 21st century* (pp. 47–55). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Seibold, D. R. (1995). *Theoria* and *praxis*: Means and ends in applied communication research. In K. N. Cissna (Ed.), *Applied communication in the 21st century* (pp. 23–38). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Wood, J. T. (1995). Theorizing practice, practicing theory. In K. N. Cissna (Ed.), *Applied communication in the 21st century* (pp. 157–167). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

The complete “Has Communication Research Made a Difference” Forum

Berger, C.R. (2010). Making a differential difference. *Communication Monographs*, 77, 44-451.

Condit, C.M. (2009). You can’t study and improve communication with a telescope. *Communication Monographs*, 76, 3-12.

Frey, L.R. (2009). What a difference more difference-making communication scholarship might make: Making a difference from and through communication research. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 37, 205-214.

Garcí’a-Jime’nez, L., & Craig, R.T. (2010). What kind of difference do we want to make? *Communication Monographs*, 77, 429-431.

Harwood, J. (2010). A difference we can call our own. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 38, 295-298.

Hummert, M.L. (2009). Not just preaching to the choir: Communication scholarship does make a difference. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 37, 215-224.

- Kahl, D.H. (2010). Making a difference: (Re)Connecting communication scholarship with pedagogy. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 38, 298-302.
- Keyton, J., Beck, S.J., Messersmith, A.J., & Bisel, R.S. (2010). Ensuring communication research makes a difference. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 38, 306-309.
- Koschmann, M. (2010). Communication as a distinct mode of explanation makes a difference. *Communication Monographs*, 77, 431-434.
- Kramer, M.W. (2010). It depends on your criteria. *Communication Monographs*, 77, 434-436.
- Manning, J. (2010). There is no agony like bearing an untold story inside you: Communication research as interventive practice. *Communication Monographs*, 77, 437-439.
- Milburn, T. (2010). The relevance of cultural communication: For whom and in what respect. *Communication Monographs*, 77, 439-441.
- Rush, E. K., & Tracy, S. J. (2010). Wikipedia as public scholarship: Communicating our impact online. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 38, 309-315.
- Seeger, M. (2009). Does communication research make a difference: Reconsidering the impact of our work. *Communication Monographs*, 76, 12-19.
- Sherry, J.L. (2010). The value of communication science. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 38, 302-306.
- Sprain, L., Endres, D., & Peterson, T.R. (2010). Research as a transdisciplinary networked process: A metaphor for difference-making research. *Communication Monographs*, 77, 441-444.

13 11/17 What is Communication?

Issues

What is communication? What isn't communication? What makes human communication possible? Is communication different from behavior? Action? Meaning? What are popular myths about communication? To what extent are these myths accurate?

Readings

Miller, K. (2005). *Communication theories: Perspectives, processes, and contexts* (2nd ed.). Boston: McGraw Hill. Chapter 1, "Conceptual foundations: What is communication?" (Read pgs. 1-11).

Reddy, M. J. (1979). The conduit metaphor: A case of frame conflict in our language about language. In A. Ortony (Ed.), *Metaphor and thought* (pp. 285-310). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Peters, J. D. (1999). *Speaking into the air: A history of the idea of communication*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. "Introduction: The Problem of Communication" (pp. 1-32); Chapter 1, "Dialogue and Dissemination" (pp. 33-62); "Conclusion: A Squeeze of the Hand" (pp. 263-272)

Supplemental Readings

Cartier, F. A. (1974). Three misconceptions of communication. In J. Civikly (Ed.), *Messages* (pp. 358-365). New York: Random House.

Dance, F. E. X. (1970). The concept of communication. *Journal of Communication*, 20, 201-210.

Dance, F. E. X., & Larson, C. E. (1976). Appendix A: Some definitions of communication. In F. E. X. Dance & C. E. Larson, *The functions of human communication: A theoretical approach* (pp. 171-192). New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Ellis, D. G. (1991). Post-structuralism and language: Non-sense. *Communication Monographs*, 58, 213-224.

Ellis, D. G. (1995). Fixing communicative meaning: A coherentist theory. *Communication Research*, 22, 515-544.

Gibbs, R. W., Jr. (1998). The varieties of intentions in interpersonal communication. In S. R. Fussell & R. J. Kreuz (Eds.), *Social and cognitive approaches to interpersonal communication* (pp. 19-38). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Krauss, R. M., & Fussell, S. R. (1996). Social psychological models of interpersonal communication. In E. T. Higgins & A. W. Kruglanski (Eds.), *Social psychology: Handbook of basic principles* (pp. 655-701). New York: Guilford.

Miller, G. R. (1966). On defining communication: Another stab. *Journal of Communication*, 16, 88-98.

Motley, M. T. (1986). Consciousness and intentionality in communication: A preliminary model and methodological approaches. *Western Journal of Speech Communication*, 50, 3-23.

Lessig, L. (2009). *Against transparency*. New Republic (online at : <http://www.newrepublic.com/article/books-and-arts/against-transparency>)

Debate over Axiom 1 (one cannot (not) communicate)

Watzlawick, P., Bavelas, J. B., & Jackson, D. D. (1967). *Pragmatics of human communication*. Chapter 2, "Some tentative axioms of communication."

Motley, M. T. (1990). On whether one can(not) not communicate: An examination via traditional communication postulates. *Western Journal of Speech Communication*, 54, 1-20.

Bavelas, J. B. (1990). Behaving and communicating: A reply to Motley. *Western Journal of Speech Communication*, 54, 593-602.

Beach, W. A. (1990). On (not) observing behavior interactionally. *Western Journal of Speech Communication*, 54, 603-612.

Motley, M. T. (1990). Communication as interaction: A reply to Beach and Bavelas. *Western Journal of Speech Communication*, 54, 613-623.

Andersen, P. A. (1991). When one cannot not communicate: A challenge to Motley's traditional communication postulates. *Communication Studies*, 42, 309-325.

Motley, M. T. (1991). How one may not communicate: A reply to Andersen. *Communication Studies*, 42, 326-339.

Clevenger, T., Jr. (1991). Can one not communicate? A conflict of models. *Communication Studies*, 42, 340-353.

Stewart, J. (1991) A postmodern look at traditional communication postulates. *Western Journal of Speech Communication*, 55, 354-379.

14 11/24 No Class, NCA Convention

Unit V: A Crystal Ball Unveiled

15 12/1 The Future of Communication Studies

Issues: What is the future of Communication Studies? Can you point to a turning point, catalyst, or crucial time in the past 2, 5, 10, 15 years that seems to point the way? Is the future of Communication Studies similar to other academic tribes? What power will the larger discipline have given other societal and administrative pressures? Is the future of the discipline similar to the future of this Department? Your career? What is your place in the larger field? Are disciplines dead? If not, do they need to be abolished so that we can get onto the work that is necessary to create theory and improve lives? Does it really make sense to divide people by department? By discipline? Or will these structures live long past our discussion in CMST 7900?

Required Readings

Hunt, E. L. (1915). The scientific spirit in public speaking. *The Quarterly Journal of Public Speaking*, 1, 185-193. doi: 10.1080/00335631509360478

Deetz, S. (1994). Future of the discipline: The challenges, the research, and the social contribution. In S. Deetz (Ed.), *Communication Yearbook 17* (pp. 565-600). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mokros, H. B., & Friedrich, G. W. (2010). The future of communication theory and research. In D. Stacks & M. B. Salwen (Eds.), *An integrated approach to communication theory and research* (2nd ed., pp. 546-552). New York: Routledge.

Eadie, W. (2014, forthcoming). Afterward: What next? In P. J. Gehrke & W. M. Keith (Eds.), *The unfinished conversation: 100 years of Communication Studies*. New York: Routledge.

Wang, G. (2011). Paradigm shift and the centrality of Communication discipline. *International Journal of Communication*, 5, 1458-1466. Available here: <http://ijoc.org/index.php/ijoc/article/view/1335/618>

Menand, L. (2001). The marketplace of ideas. In (American Council of Learned Societies Occasional Paper No. 49, pp. 1–23). Retrieved July 2014 from http://archives.acsls.org/op/49_Marketplace_of_Ideas.htm

Herbst, S. (2008). Disciplines, intersections, and the future of communication research. *Journal of Communication*, 58, 603-614. doi: 10.1111/j.1460-2466.2008.00402.x

Condit, C. M. (1989). Replacing oxymora. In B. Dervin, L. Grossberg, B. J. O'Keefe, & E. Wartella (Eds.), *Rethinking communication: Volume I, Paradigm issues* (pp. 154-156). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Sprain, L., Endres, D., & Peterson, T. R. (2010). Research as a transdisciplinary networked process: A metaphor for difference-making research. *Communication Monographs*, 77, 441-444. doi: 10.1080/03637751.2010.523600

Supplemental Readings

Chen, G. M. (2006). Asian communication studies: What and where to now. *Review of Communication*, 6, 259–311.

Chung, W. W. (2011). To Westernize or not: That's NOT the question. In G. Wang (Ed.), *De-Westernizing communication research: Altering questions and changing frameworks* (pp. 93–98). London: Routledge.