

CMST 7912: Seminar on Communication and Relationships

Spring 2016 (M 3:00 – 6 PM, Coates 153)

Dr. James Honeycutt

LSU Distinguished Professor

Dept. of Communication Studies

Office Hours: M, W, F and 10-am all day on Wednesday or by appointment

Phones: 578-6676 (office), 252-0032 (cell)

E-mail: sphone@lsu.edu

“There is nothing so practical as a good theory”— Robert *Lewin*, *Field Theory in Social Science*, NY: Harper & Row, 1951.

Sample of Famous Relationship Quotes

“The meeting of two personalities is like the contact of two chemical substances: if there is any reaction, both are transformed.”

— *C.G. Jung*

“If civilization is to survive, we must cultivate the science of human relationships - the ability of all peoples, of all kinds, to live together, in the same world at peace.” – *Franklin D. Roosevelt*

“Today's films are so technological that an actor becomes starved for roles that deal with human relationships.”— *Natalie Wood*

The kinds of roles dogs fill can be hard to come by in human relationships. We touch the dog or the pet at whim. There is a lack of self-consciousness and a fluidity to it that is absent from most human relationships. If someone acted that way to you, you'd feel claustrophobic pretty quickly. It's a boundary violation. – *Caroline Knapp*

Read more at: https://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/keywords/human_relationships.html

Course Description and Goals:

Rationale: Relational communication is the study of communication over the life cycle of interpersonal relationships across a variety of applied contexts (e.g., social media, dating partners, marital partners, roommates, office associates, sibling, parent-child, acquaintance, best friends, political rivals, etcetera). There are several theories purporting to explain the development, maintenance, and deterioration of relationships. We will critique several theories of relational development. We will also examine the "scripts" that people have for expected behavior in intimate and applied relationships in the form of expectancies for appropriate actions. (e.g., For example, what is behavioral communication script for yourself while answering a call from an important associate while driving or receiving a text and your car has limited wi-fi? What is the typical script for this behavior as instantiated by state law? and do you follow it?)

Theoretical approaches to the study of relational communication that will be examined in the seminar include: 1) cognitive script theory 2) interdependence theory, 3) physiological arousal, 4) affection exchange theory 5) rules perspectives, 6) attribution theory, 7) relational turbulence, 8) social penetration theory 9) dialectical approaches, 10) attachment theory, 11) imagined interaction theory

There will be a brief lecture at the beginning of each session that will preview assumptions of the approaches to be discussed in each session. Principal aims of the course include creating publishable papers and pedagogical applications you can use in your life and in your careers.

Texts and Readings:

Required Texts: Honeycutt, J. M., & Sheldon, P. (2017). *Scripts and communication for relationships* (2nd ed.). New York: Peter Lang.

Honeycutt, J. M., Sawyer, C. R., & Keaton, S. A. (2014). *The Influence of Communication on Physiology and Health*. New York: Peter Lang.

A series of journal articles, book chapters, or conference papers that are on Moodle.

Two Suggested Texts:

Gottman, J. M. (2011). *The science of trust: Emotional attunement for couples*. New York: W. W. Norton.-- (Note: This book is not required, but you can purchase it on Amazon for a cheap, reasonable price and the legacy of Gottman's research has been critical in the last 50 years for its impact on marital and couple relationships.

Gottman, J. M., Murray, J. D., Swanson, C. C., Tyson, R., & Swanson, K. R. (2005). *The mathematics of marriage: Dynamic nonlinear models*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. -- (Note, this book provides the foundation for a scientific theory of marital interaction. The book is the fulfillment of the goal to build a mathematical framework for the general system theory of families first suggested by Ludwig Von Bertalanffy of general systems theory fame in the 1960s. The book also presents a complete introduction to the mathematics involved in theory building and testing, and details the development of experiments and models. In one "marriage experiment," for example, the authors explored the effects of lowering or raising a couple's heart rates. Armed with their mathematical model, they were able to do real experiments to determine which processes were affected by their interventions.)

Requirements, Assignments, and Grading:

Due to the transformation of graduate study, there are two rubrics that you can use in this seminar; an applied and academic rubric. The applied rubric is designed for practical application to non-teaching jobs beyond higher education. This rubric consists of the following components: literature review and state of the art paper while the academic rubric consists of empirical study instead of a literature review. The appendix contains the format of the paper.

F < 60

Attendance/Participation:

You are expected to attend all class sessions, complete primary readings, and participate regularly in class discussions. The seminar will NOT be successful without your participation. In accordance with LSU Faculty Senate and university policy statement, LSU PS-22, attendance in this class is required. If you find out that you must miss class for an excused absence, you should inform me as soon in advance as possible. Excused Absences that are outlined in Policy Statement #22 include illness, family emergency, legal obligations, military obligations, religious obligations, special curricular activities. If you miss class for reasons other than excused absences, you are responsible for making an appointment with me or asking classmates for their notes.

CLASSROOM ETIQUETTE: Always be prepared to be called on in class and respond to questions. You are expected to respond respectfully to other viewpoints. You are expected to be in class on time. Coffee/soda/water/food is permissible if it's not a distraction and you bring a bag to discard the items.

Reaction Papers:

You should be familiar with all assigned readings each week, and come to class prepared to discuss their thoughts on the material, having written a (1-2 page summary (single-spaced) reaction paper by noon Tuesday at the latest. You must turn in reaction papers for each set of readings and post 3 questions about the readings that struck you as interesting. Your reaction paper should include at least one comment on each of that week's readings. Comments might include benefits of the research, criticisms of the research, and ideas for future research, or general thoughts on integrating the current week's reading with other assigned materials or with ideas discussed in class previously. Basically, these are notes of thoughts that occur to you as you read the materials, and that you would like to have brought up in our class discussion.

Position Papers:

At two points in the semester, students will write short position papers (6 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 issue in relational communication.

All papers should be type written, double-spaced, employ APA style, and be stapled together. It is particularly important to accurately and meticulously footnote (in APA style) all studies, ideas, and findings to avoid charges of plagiarism (i.e. copying a portion of another scholar's or student's work and submitting it as your own). The plagiarism policy is discussed in the appendix and is borrowed (note my citation) from the LSU policy manuals.

A good, quick electronic source for APA formatting, guidelines, examples is the following:

<https://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/560/01/>

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 students are expected to give feedback on ONE paper (and I will assign those roles later). Feedback is due seven (7) days after the paper's deadline.

Plagiarism, like receiving or giving aid during an exam, will result in failure in this course. Please familiarize yourself with the dept. plagiarism policy at the end of this syllabus.

Class Presentations and Discussions:

Because this is a class in relational communication, all presentations are done in dyads. **Remember, you must select 2 different partners for your 2 expert presentations.** Evaluation is based on the extent to which the discussion brings out the readings' important points. When you co-lead a discussion, you must provide the seminar with a list of discussion questions *before class begins* (i.e., you can bring the list to class or e-mail it to us earlier in the day).

During the first part of the presentation each week, the dyad will do a 10-minute *entertaining and content-laden* introduction to the topic. This presentation may involve visual aids, skits, PowerPoint presentations, exercises, quizzes, or audio/video material but these media are not a requirement. This presentation should evoke interest in the topic, and briefly summarize some important findings.

Go beyond the readings by summarizing and presenting current research. **Do not summarize our readings for this week (we already read those).**

Please provide a copy the class with your favorite recent article on this topic. The presentation will be followed with a ten-minute question/answer period from seminar participants that will provide a general transition into a class discussion of the topic readings.

Reading Posts:

On the class sessions that you do not lead discussion, you are required to provide a post to the forum posted on Moodle by **Noon** on the day of class. These posts should include two components. *First*, the post should include a thought-provoking paragraph indicating your reaction to, and/or evaluation of, the reading(s) for that night. Ideally, the information in this paragraph would be useful for stimulating thought about, and generating discussion of, the readings. Second, you should include a sentence or two on “*what I would like to talk about in class today is...*” This section should include the following two questions (and at least one question for each topic discussed) that you would like to discuss in class pertaining to journal articles:

Journal Article Required Questions:

Note: Two standardized questions that can apply to journal readings:

1. Does this reading (specify the article, ICA convention paper, or book chapter) reflect an analysis of input, thrupt, output, or some combination (e.g., input-thrupt, input-output, thrupt-output) of communication components? Provide specific examples
2. Which macro theory, if any does this reading represent that you have been exposed to in communication theory courses or readings (e.g., cognitive script theory, interdependence theory, physiological arousal, rules perspectives, attribution theory, relational turbulence, social penetration theory 8) dialectical approaches, 9) attachment theory?

Evaluation of these discussion questions will count toward your class participation grade. These are ongoing and reflect class participation as well as oral comments during the seminar meetings.

You will be evaluated on the quality of your contributions throughout the semester. Here are some ideas of what high quality comments may involve:

- Considering issues addressed in assigned readings and previous class discussions;
- Offering constructive criticism of the materials as well as innovative ideas on how you would improve the object of critique; (Criticism without offering feasible alternatives is lame)
- Contributing to moving the discussion and analysis forward;
- Providing some increment to others' comments;
- Transcending the "I feel..." syndrome. That is, making arguments that include some evidence or that rely on broader theoretical positions.

Research Paper (Academic Rubric):

You are expected to prepare a **research paper** for conference presentation and/or publication on a topic of your choosing (as approved by the instructor). You may work on an existing project with me or you can choose your own. The paper can take any of several forms, including a research review, a theoretical analysis, a detailed research proposal, the report of original research, or other forms negotiated with the instructor including working in the interaction lab.

Alternatively, during the first week of class (no later than Jan. __) you may select a partner with whom to conduct an empirical study in relational communication and report your choice to me. The empirical study should comprehensively investigate (including data collection) a problem of importance in relational communication. The paper may be qualitative and/or quantitative. The paper should demonstrate your ability to: a) select a problem of importance in relational communication research, b) exhaustively review and summarize research relevant to that

problem, c) incorporate any theory or theories that may help to make predictions as to the outcome of the problem, and d) derive hypothesis or questions which provide an empirical test of the problem. In short, an "A" paper should be a completed study like a convention paper or journal article. The paper is due in two segments: On ____, you should submit a complete rationale for your study including research questions, problems or hypotheses, a complete review of relevant literature and theory, and a sketchy idea of how you might conduct the study (the methods section).

The paper will include the standard components of a research paper including:

- Literature Review
- Research Question/Hypotheses
- Method
- Pilot or Full Results
- Beginning of a discussion section
- References

Here are some guidelines that may help you:

- A) See your instructor during the first two weeks to brainstorm your topic. Remember I am available each week during office hours or via email.
- B) Select a topic that is compelling and interesting to you. At the beginning of the semester pursue your book of readings and identify articles that are interesting to you and can be extended. Do not be afraid to replicate a study. It may be the easiest way to do this assignment. Also, I have a list of existing research projects that you can be assigned to that you can pursue independently with changes in your rationale.
- C) As you look over the readings also look at their methods. This study may be qualitative or quantitative, and conducted in the field, lab, or by questionnaire.
- D) Give me as complete a paper as possible before Spring Break. That way I can give you maximum feedback for the final study. I will give you one week or less turnaround.
- E) Because most of you will be collecting data on human subjects, you need to contact and obtain approval from the University's Institutional Review Board. Failure to do so is a violation of University policy and state and federal law.

The State of the Art Applied Paper (Applied Rubric):

A "state of the art" paper is a complete, analytic, critical review of our state of knowledge in each area of personal relationships. Here are some guidelines.

- A) This paper must be done *individually*. You can, of course, seek advice from your instructor as well as other students and faculty.
- B) Please brainstorm your topic with your instructor.
- C) State of the art articles are *comprehensive*. All relevant literature should be summarized. A *major weakness* would be that you failed to include relevant studies.
- D) Select a narrow topic: A topic like love, acquaintance, or intimacy could fill volumes.

- E) If a prior state-of-the-art article exists in your area, **build upon it.**
- F) The paper should culminate in conclusions about what we know regarding this area.
- G) On out line and complete set of reference is due on ____.
- H) Recommendations for future research and knowledge gaps should be provided.

Group Research Team Option:

This assignment can be substituted for the final exam. In many business organizations, you must work on collectively (committees) and individually.

I am working on several projects that you can participate with my approval

1. Signal detection theory and detecting conflict escalation in couples as a Function of Victimization (Jonathon Frost, Colton Krawietz)
2. Impression management in Interviewer-Interviewee Relationships (Skype lab study with Arthur Vanlear of the University of Connecticut)
3. Meta-emotion (Jonathon Frost)
4. Differences in Relational Quality as a Function of Individual, Parallel, and Interactive Activities (No one is assigned to this project, yet)
5. Relational prototypes and memory recall (Choose a relational prototype and conduct a memory recall test to see if the prototype is activated; e.g., child of divorce vs. married, Friends with Benefits vs. Casual friend, Single parent vs. dual parent, etcetera)

Peer Evaluation:

Students should turn in two copies of their initial research proposal 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 per APA 6th edition (the manuscript can be whatever official style guide you will use for the majority of your writing career). For the final paper, your cover letter should include information about the revisions you made, paying attention to how you addressed the feedback. 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 200 words; there is no maximum. You will submit the feedback by 10 am on Monday, the week following submission of original manuscripts. Emailed feedback is acceptable and preferred. I will compile these reactions with my own for a full editorial review of the manuscripts.

Final Exam Option: You can substitute a final exam for a group project. This exam will be a COMBINATION of take-home and in-class questions. The exam is designed to mimic preliminary and general exams for both MA and doctoral students.

Additional Policies:

ADA Statement: The American with Disabilities Act and the Rehabilitation Act of 1973: If you have a disability that may impact on your work in this class and for which you may require accommodations, please see a Coordinator in the Office for Disability Affairs (112 Johnston Hall) so that such accommodations may be arranged. After you receive your accommodation letters, please meet with me to discuss the provisions of those accommodations during the first two weeks of class.

Late Work. In general, papers (both reaction and research) may be turned in any time before the due date, and must be turned in not later than the class meeting of the week they are due. Late papers MAY be accepted at the discretion of the instructor, but will receive a substantial penalty. Typically, the grade on late papers will be dropped 1/2 letter for each day they are late (or a full letter grade for each 2 days late). If there are special circumstances pertaining to turning in your papers on time, especially your final (research) paper, please discuss these with me in advance.

Preview of the Course:

Week	Date	Topic
1	Jan. 11	Introduction and Theories
2	Jan. 18	Attraction and Uncertainty
3	Jan. 25	Prototypes & Symbolic Interdependence
4	Feb. 1	Relational Dimensions and Emotion
5	Feb. 8	Attachment, exchange, evolutionary theories
6	Feb. 15	Emotions, Imagined Interactions, and Parasocial Relationships
7	Feb. 22	Physiological Arousal
8	Mar. 1	Schemata and Scenes for Developmental Stages
9	Mar. 8	Contents of Relational Scripts
10	Mar. 15	Facebook & Online Relationships
11	Mar. 22	Office Relationships
12	Mar. 29	Escalating conflict in relationships
13	Apr. 5	Scripts for effective relational communication
14	Apr. 12	No class; Spring Break (Work on papers)
15	Apr. 19	Reports on projects
16	Apr. 26	Wrap-Up

TENTATIVE WEEKLY SCHEDULE

Week , Date, Topics and Readings

Unit I: Introduction, Emotions, Imagination, & Physiology of Relationships

Week 1: W Jan. 11, Course Orientation and Introduction; Contemporary Theories

Overview of relational communication theories (interpersonal needs, cognitive script theory, symbolic interdependence, attachment, social exchange, social penetration, interdependence, attribution, dialectics, uncertainty reduction, conflict theory, social media uses)

Topics: Syllabus Review
 Course Overview
 Discussion of Assignments
 Content Topics: History of Relational Communication
 Key Definitions
 Relational Myths
 Relational Ideology
 Characteristics of Relationships
 Initial Interaction
 Initiation
 Relational Stage/Phases
 Social Penetration
 Shyness

Primary Reading:

This syllabus.

Honeycutt, J. M. (2015). Imagined interaction theory: Mental representations of interpersonal communication. In D. O. Braithwaite, & P. Schrodt (Eds.). *Engaging Theories in Interpersonal Communication (2nd ed.)* (pps. 75-87). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Note: **(To see communication components of input-thruput-output on p. 82)**

Week 2: W Jan. 18, Attraction and Uncertainty: The twin tests of initial relationships

Content Topics: Uncertainty
 Uncertainty Reduction Theory
 Attraction
 Task Attraction
 Physical Attraction
 Power

Primary Readings:

Honeycutt/Sheldon Chp. 1

Knobloch, L. K., (2015). The relational turbulence model. In D. O. Braithwaite & P. Schrodt (Eds.), *Engaging theories in interpersonal communication (2nd ed., pp. 377-388)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Knobloch, L. K., Ebata, A. T., McGlaughlin, P. C., & Theiss, J. A. (2013). Generalized anxiety and relational uncertainty as predictors of topic avoidance during reintegration following military deployment. *Communication Monographs, 80*, 452-477.

Knobloch, L. K., & Delaney, A. L. (2012). Themes of relational uncertainty and interference from partners in depression. *Health Communication, 27*, 750–765.

Lambert, N. M., Mulder, S., & Fincham, F. (2014). Thin slices of infidelity: Determining whether observers can pick out cheaters from a video clip interactions what tips them off. *Personal Relationships, 21*, 612-619.

Weber, K., Goodboy, A. K., & Cayanus, J. L. (2010). Flirting competence: An experimental study on appropriate and effective opening lines. *Communication Research Reports, 27*, 184-191.

Gottman, J. M. (1979). Excerpts from “The Structure of Interaction” adapted from *Marital interaction: Experimental investigations (pps. 68-76)*. NY: Academic Press.

Honeycutt, J. M., Wellman, L. B., & Larson, M. S. (1997). Beneath family role portrayals: An additional measure of communication influence using time-series analyses of turn-at-talk on a popular television program. *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media, 41*, 40-57.
doi:10.1080/08838159709364389

Supplemental Readings:

Afifi, W. A., & Robbins, S. (2015). Theory motivated information management: Struggles with uncertainty and its outcomes. In D. O. Braithwaite & P. Schrodt (Eds.), *Engaging theories in interpersonal communication (2nd ed. pps. 143-156)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gibbs, J. L., Ellison, N. B., & Chih-Lui, H. (2011). Reduction strategies and self-disclosure in online dating. *Communication Research, 38*, 70-100. doi: 10.1177/0093650210377091

Hughes, S., Farley, S., & Rhodes, B. (2010). Vocal and physiological changes in response to the physical attractiveness of conversational partners. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 34*, 155-167.
Doi: 10.1007/s10919-010-0087-9

Steuber, K. R., & Solomon, D. H. (2008). Relational uncertainty, partner interference, and infertility: A qualitative study of online forums. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 25, 831-855.

Theis, J. A. (2011). Modeling dyadic effects in the associations between relational uncertainty, sexual communication, and sexual satisfaction for husbands and wives. *Communication Research*, 38, 565-584.

Theis, J. A., & Knobloch, L. K. (2014). Relational turbulence and the post-deployment transition: Self, partner, and relationship focused turbulence. *Communication Research*, 41, 27-51. Doi: 0.1177/0093650211429285

Discussion Leaders: _____

Week 3: W Jan. 25, Prototypes, Symbolic Interdependence & Matching hypothesis

Primary Readings:

Amato, P. R. (1991). The "child of divorce" as a person prototype: Bias in the recall of information about children in divorced families. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 53, 59-69. doi: 10.2307/353133

Aron, A., Steele, J. L., Kashdan, T. B., & Perez, M. (2006). When similar do not attract: Tests of a prediction from the self-expansion model. *Personal Relationships*, 13, 387-396. doi: [10.1111/j.1475-6811.2006.00125.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6811.2006.00125.x)

Honeycutt, J. M. (2008-2009). Symbolic interdependence, imagined interaction, and relationship quality. *Imagination, Cognition, and Personality*, 28, 303-320. Doi: [10.2190/IC.28.4.b](https://doi.org/10.2190/IC.28.4.b)

Shaw, T. L., Fiore, A. T., Mendelsohn, G. A., & Cheshire, C. (2011). Out of My League: A Real-World Test of the Matching Hypothesis. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 37, 942-954. doi: [10.1177/0146167211409947](https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167211409947)

Eastwick, P. W., & Finkel, E. J. (2008). Sex differences in mate preferences revisited: Do people know what they initially desire in a romantic partner? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 94, 245-264. Doi: [10.1037/0022-3514.94.2.245](https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.94.2.245)

Lewandowski, G. W., Jr., Aron, A., & Gee, J. (2007). Personality goes a long way: The malleability of opposite-sex physical attractiveness. *Personal Relationships*, 14, 571-585. Doi: [10.1111/j.1475-6811.2007.00172.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6811.2007.00172.x)

Markey, P.M.; Markey, C. N. (2007). Romantic ideals, romantic obtainment, and relationship experiences: The complementarity of interpersonal traits among romantic partners. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* 24 (4): 517-533. Doi: [10.1177/0265407507079241](https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407507079241)

Supplemental Readings:

Stephen, T. (1994). Communication in the shifting context of intimacy: Marriage, meaning, and modernity. *Communication Theory*, 4, 191-218. Doi: [10.1111/j.1468-2885.1994.tb00090.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2885.1994.tb00090.x)

Stephen, T. (1986). Communication and interdependence in geographically separated relationships. *Human Communication Research*, 13, 191–210. Doi: [10.1111/j.1468-2958.1986.tb00102.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.1986.tb00102.x)

Stephen, T. (1984). Symbolic interdependence and post-break-up distress: A reformulation of the attachment construct. *Journal of Divorce*, 8, 1–16. Doi: [10.1300/J279v08n01_01](https://doi.org/10.1300/J279v08n01_01)

Stephen, T. (1984). A symbolic exchange framework for developing intimate relationships. *Human Relations*, 37, 393–408.

Stephen, T., & Markman, H. (1983). Assessing the development of relationships: A new measure. *Family Process*, 22, 15–25. Doi: [10.1111/j.1545-5300.1983.00015.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1545-5300.1983.00015.x)

Week 4: W Feb. 1, Relationship Dimensions, Emotions, Intensification, Trajectories and Turning Points

Topics: Fundamental Relationship Topoi

Cognitive Scripts

Dialectics

Emotions

Relational Schemas

Primary Readings:

Honeycutt/Sheldon Chp. 2, Honeycutt, Sawyer & Keaton , Chp. 1

Baxter, L. A. & Braithwaite, D. O. (2015). Relational dialectics theory. In . In L.A. Baxter, D. Braithwaite, & P. Schrodt (Eds.). *Engaging Theories in Interpersonal Communication (2nd ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Fitness, J. (2001). Betrayal, rejection, revenge, and forgiveness: An interpersonal script approach. In M. Leary (Ed.), *Interpersonal Rejection (pp. 73-103)*. New York: Oxford University.

Sanford, K. (2012). The communication of emotion during conflict in married couples. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 26, 297-307

Supplemental Readings:

Hubbard, A. E., & Burgoon, J. K. (2009). Nonverbal communication. In D. Stack & M. B. Salwen (Ed.), *An Integrated Approach to Communication Theory and Research, 2nd edition* (pp. 336-347). NY: Taylor Francis.

Kammrath, L. K., & Dweck, C. (2006). Voicing conflict: Preferred conflict strategies among incremental and entity theorists. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 32(11), 1497-1508. doi: 10.1177/0146167206291476

Kreibig, S. D., Samson, A. C., & Gross, J. J. (2013). The psychophysiology of mixed emotional states. *Psychophysiology*, 50, 799-801. Doi: 10.1111/psyp.12425

Sanford, K., & Grace, A. J. (2011). Emotion and underlying concerns during couples' conflict: An investigation of within-person change. *Personal Relationships*, 18, 96-109.

Discussion Leader(s): _____

Week 5: W Feb. 8: Attachment, equity, exchange, and evolutionary theories**Primary Readings:**

Baumeister, R. F. (2005). *The cultural animal: Human nature, meaning, and social life*. New York: Oxford University Press. Chapter 3.

Buss, D. M. (2007). The Evolution of Human Mating. *Acta Psychologica Sinica*, 3, 502-512.

Hughes, M., Morrison, K., & Asada, K. J. K. (2005). What's love got to do with it? Exploring the impact of maintenance rules, love attitudes, and network support on friends with benefits relationships. *Western Journal of Communication*, 69, 49-66

Confer, J. C., Perilloux, C., & Buss, D. M. (2010). More than just a pretty face: Men's priority shifts toward bodily attractiveness in short-term versus long-term mating contexts. *Evolution & Human Behavior*, 31, 348-353.

Mikulincer, M. & Shaver, P. R (2007). The attachment behavioral system B. Chapter 1 in *Attachment in Adulthood: Structure, Dynamics and Change*. New York: Guilford Press.

Parade, S. H., & Leerkes, E. M. (2010). Attachment to parents, social anxiety, and close relationships of female students over the transition to college. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 39, 127-137.

Markey, P.M.; Markey, C. N. (2007). "Romantic ideals, romantic obtainment, and relationship experiences: The complementarity of interpersonal traits among romantic partners". *Journal of social and Personal Relationships*, 24, 517–533. doi:[10.1177/0265407507079241](https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407507079241)

Supplemental Readings:

Brumbaugh, C. C., & Fraley, R. C. (2014). Too fast, too soon? An empirical investigation into rebound relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 32, 99-118.

Letcher, A., & Carmona, (2015). Friends with benefits: Dating practices of rural high school and college students. *Journal of Community Health*, 40, 522-529.

Manthos, M., Owen, J., & Fincham, F. D. (2014). A new perspective on hooking up among college students: Sexual behavior as a function of distinct groups. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 31, 815-829.

Owen, J., & Fincham, F. D. (2012). Friends with benefits relationships as a start to exclusive romantic relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 29, 982-996.

Discussion Leader(s): _____

Week 6: W Feb. 15, Emotions, Imagined Interactions, and Parasocial Relationships

Primary Readings:

Honeycutt/Sheldon Chps. 2-3

Honeycutt, J. M., Pence, M. E. & Gearhart, C. C. (2013). Using imagined interactions to predict covert narcissism. *Communication Reports*, 26, 26-38. Doi: 10.1080/08934215.2013.773051

Van Kelegom, M. J., & Wright, C. N. (2013). The use of imagined interactions to manage relational uncertainty. *Southern Communication Journal*, 78, 91-106.

Dibble, J. L, Hartmann, T., & Rosean, S. F. (2016). Parasocial interaction and parasocial relationship: Conceptual clarification and a critical assessment of measures. *Human Communication Research*, 42, 21-44. doi: doi:10.1111/hcre.12063

Tsiotsou, R. H. (2015). The role of social and parasocial relationships on social networking sites loyalty. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 48, 401-414. doi: 10.1016/j.chb.2015.01.064

Supplemental Readings:

Gola, A. N., Richards, M. N., Lauricella, A. R., Calvert, S. L. (2013). Building meaningful parasocial relationships between toddlers and media characters to teach early mathematical skills. *Media Psychology, 16*, 390-411. doi: 10.1080/15213269.2013.783774

Horton, D., & Wohl, R. R. (1956). Mass communication and para-social interaction: Observations on intimacy at a distance. *Psychiatry, 19*, 215-29.

Shin, D. (2016). Do users experience real sociability through social TV? Analyzing parasocial behavior in relation to social TV. *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media, 60*, 140-159. Doi: 10.1080/08838151.2015.1127247.

Week 7: W Feb. 22, Physiological Arousal in Relationships

Primary Readings: Honeycutt/Sheldon, 4, Honeycutt, Sawyer & Keaton, Introduction, Chp. 4, 6

Lindsey, S. A., & Solomon, D.H. (2015). The physiology of argumentative skill deficiency: Cognitive ability, emotional competence, communication qualities, and responses to conflict. *Communication Monographs, 82*, 315-338. Doi: 10.1080/03637751.2014.989868

Manczak, E. M., DeLongis, A. & Chen, E. (2016). Does empathy have a cost? Diverging psychological and physiological effects within families. *Health Psychology, 35*, 211-218.

Timmons, A. C., Margolin, G. & Saxbe, D. E. (2015). Physiological linkage in couples and its implications for individual and interpersonal functioning: A literature review. *Journal of Family Psychology, 29*, 720-731. Doi: 10.1037/fam000115

Supplemental Readings:

Floyd, K., Hesse, C. & Generous, M. A. (2015). Affection exchange theory: A bio-evolutionary look at affectionate communication. In D. O. Braithwaite, & P. Schrodt (Eds.), *Engaging theories in interpersonal communication (2nd ed.)* (pps. 309-320) Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Inagaki, T. K., & Eisenberger, N. L. (2016). Giving support to others reduces sympathetic nervous system-related responses to stress. *Psychophysiology, 53*, 427-435.

Robles, T. F., Shaffer, V.A., Malarkey, W. B., & Kiecolt-Glaster, J. K. (2006). Positive behaviors during marital conflict: Influences on stress hormones. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 23*, 305-325.

Priem, J. S., & Solomon, D. H. (2011). Relational uncertainty and cortisol responses to hurtful and supportive messages from a dating partner. *Personal Relationships, 18*, 198-223.

Timmons, A. C., Margolin, G. & Saxbe, D. E. (2015). Physiological linkage in couples and its implications for individual and interpersonal functioning: A literature review. *Journal of Family Psychology, 29*, 720-731. Doi: 10.1037/fam000115

Discussion Leader(s): _____

Unit II: Bases of Relational Scripts

Week 8: W Mar. 1, Schemata and Scenes for Developmental Stages

Primary Readings:

Honeycutt/Sheldon, Chps. 5-6

Field, C. J., Kimuna, S. R., & Straus, M. A. (2013). Attitudes toward interracial relationships among college students: Race, class, gender, and perceptions of parental views. *Journal of Black Studies, 44*, 741-776. Doi: 0021934713507580

LaFrance, B. H., Henningsen, D. D., Oates, A., & Shaw, C. M. (2009). Social-sexual interactions? Meta-analyses of sex differences in perceptions of flirtatiousness, seductiveness, and promiscuousness. *Communication Monographs, 76*, 263-285.

Montesi, J. L., Fauber, R. L., Gordon, E. A., & Heimberg, R. G. (2011). The specific importance of communicating about sex to couples' sexual and overall relationship satisfaction. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 28*, 591-609.

Supplemental Readings:

Campbell, M. E., & Herman, M. R. (2015). Both personal and public: Measuring interethnic marriage attitudes. *Journal of Social Issues, 71*, 712.

Flannagan, D., Marsh, D., & Fuhrman, R. (2005). Judgments about the hypothetical behaviors of friends and romantic partners. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 22*, 797-815.

Wiederman, M. W. (2015). Sexual script theory: Past, present, and future. In J. DeLamater & R.F. Plante (Eds.), *Handbook of the Sociology of Sexualities, Handbooks of Sociology and Social Research*. Switzerland: Springer International Publishing. DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-17341-2_2.

Discussion Leader(s): _____

Unit III: Scripts for Relational Escalation and De-escalation

Week 9: Mar. 8, Contents of Relational Scripts

Primary Readings:

Honeycutt/Sheldon, Chps. 7-8

Afifi, T. D., Joseph, A., & Aldeis, D. (2011). The “standards for openness hypothesis”: Why women find (conflict) avoidance more dissatisfying than men. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 29, 102-125.

Theiss, J. A., Knobloch, L. K., Checton, M. G., & Magsamen-Conrad, K. (2009). Relationship characteristics associated with the experience of hurt in romantic relationships: A test of the relational turbulence model. *Human Communication Research*, 35, 588-615.

Supplemental Readings:

Kuperberg, A., & Padgett, J. E. (2016). The role of culture in explaining college students’ selection into hookups, dates, and long-term romantic relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 33, 1070-1096. Doi: 10.1177/0265407515616876

Roggensack, K., & Sillars, A. (2013). Agreement and understanding about honesty and deception rules in romantic relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 31, 178-199.

Yoshimura, S. (2007). Goals and emotional outcomes of revenge activities in interpersonal relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 24, 86-98.

Tan, K. Agnew, C. R., VanderDrift, L. E., & Harvey, S. M. (2015). Committed to us: Predicting relationship closeness following nonmarital romantic relationship breakup. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 32, 456-471. doi: 10:1177/0265407514536293

Watkins, S. J., & Boon, S. D. (2016). Expectations regarding partner fidelity in dating relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 33, 237-256. doi: 10.1177/0265407515574463

Lawler-Row, K. A., Hyatt-Edwards, L., Wuensch, K. L., & Karremans, J. C. (2011). Forgiveness and health: The role of attachment. *Personal Relationships*, 18, 170-183.

Discussion Leader(s): _____

Unit IV: Relationships in Contexts

Week 8: W Mar. 15 Facebook & Online Relationships

Primary Readings:

Honeycutt/Sheldon, Chp. 9

Fox, J., Warber, K. M., & Makstellar, D. C. (2013). The role of Facebook in romantic relationship development: An exploration of Knapp's relational stage model. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 30*, 771-794. Doi: 10.1177/026540751246837

Baker, L. R., & Oswald, D. L. (2010). Shyness and online social network services. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 27*-873-889. Doi: 10.1177/0265407510375261

LeFebve, L., Blackburn, K., & Brody, N. (2014). Navigating romantic relationships on Facebook: Extending the relationship dissolution model to social networking environments. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, doi: 10.1177/0265407514524848

Sheldon, P. (2008). The relationship between unwillingness-to-communicate and students' facebook use. *Journal of Media Psychology, 20*, 67-75.

Supplemental Readings:

Craig, E., & Wright, K. B. (2012). Computer-mediated relational development and maintenance on facebook. *Communication Research Reports, 29*, 111-129.

Ward, C. C., & Tracey, T. J. G. (2004). Relation of shyness with aspects of online relationship involvement. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 21*(5), 611-623.

Tong, S. T., & Walther, J. B. (2011). Just say "no thanks": Romantic rejection in computer-mediated communication. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 28*, 488-506.

Discussion Leader(s): _____

Week 9: W Mar. 22, Office Relationships

Primary Readings:

Honeycutt/Sheldon, Chp. 10

Lickey, N. C., Berry, G. R., Whelan-Berry, K. S. (2009). Responding to workplace romance: A proactive and pragmatic approach. *Journal of Business Inquiry, 8*, 100-119.

Pierce, C., & Herman, A. (2001). A framework for investigating the link between workplace romance and sexual harassment. *Group Organization Management*, 26, 206-229. doi: 10.1177/1059601101262005

.Salvaggio, Amy Nicole; Streich Michelle (April 2011). "Why Do Fools Fall in Love (At Work?)". *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 41, 4. doi:[10.1111/j.1559-1816.2011.00741](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2011.00741).

Supplemental Readings:

Baker, A.N. (2016). Antecedents and consequences of observing workplace sexual behavior. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 31, 265-279. doi:10.1108/JMP-05-2014-0167.

Salvaggio, A. N., Hopper, J. E., & Packell, K. M. (2011). Coworker reactions to observing sexual behavior at work. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 26, 604-622. doi: 10.1108/02683941111164508

Discussion leaders: _____

Unit V: Cautions and Recommendations

Week 10: W Mar. 29, Escalating conflict in relationships

Primary Readings:

Honeycutt/Sheldon Chps. 11-12, Honeycutt, Sawyer, & Keaton Chps. 5, 7-8

Supplemental Readings:

Basow, S., & Minieri, A. (2011). "You owe me": Effects of date cost, who pays, participant gender, and rape myth beliefs on perceptions of rape. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 26, 479-497.

Honeycutt, J. M., Sheldon, P., Pence, M. E., & Hatcher, L. C. (2014). Predicting aggression, conciliation, and concurrent rumination in escalating conflict. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. doi: 10.1177/0886260514532717

Sanford, K., & Grace, A. J. (2011). Emotion and underlying concerns during couples' conflict: An investigation of within-person change. *Personal Relationships*, 18, 96-199. doi: 10.1111/j.1475-6811.2010.01317.x

Mergjonen, P., Pulkki-Raback, L., Lipsanen, J., Lehtimaki, T., Rontu, R., Viikari, J. Hintsanen, M., & Keltikangas-Jarvinen, L. (2011). Development of adulthood hostile attitudes: Childhood environment and serotonin receptor gene interactions. *Personal Relationships*, 18, 184-197. DOI: 10.1111/j.1475-6811.2010.01321.x

Logan, T. & Walker, R. (2010). Toward a deeper understanding of the harms caused by partner stalking. *Violence and Victims*, 25, 4, 440-455.

Spitzberg, B. H., Cupach, W. R., & Ciceraro, L D. L. (2010). Sex differences in stalking and obsessive relational intrusion: Two meta-analyses. *Partner Abuse*, 1, 259-285.

Spitzberg, Brian (2001). "Obsessive Relational Intrusion, Coping, and Sexual Coercion Victimization". *Communication Report*, 14., 19–31. [doi:10.1080/0893421010936773](https://doi.org/10.1080/0893421010936773)

Chaulk, K., & Jones, T. (2011). Online Obsessive Relational Intrusion: Further Concerns About Facebook. *Springer Science and Business Media*, 26, 245–254. [doi:10.1007/s10896-011-9360-x](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-011-9360-x)

Week 11: W Apr. 5, Scripts for effective relational communication

Primary Readings:

Honeycutt/Sheldon, Chp. 13

Gottman, J. M. (2011). The importance of repairing negativity during conflict. Adapted from *The science of trust: Emotional attunement in marriage*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Honeycutt, J. M. (2017). Predicting divorce and the legacy of John Gottman's research. In J. M. Honeycutt (Eds.). *Communication diversity in families*. San Diego, CA: Cognella.

Supplemental Readings:

Honeycutt, J. M., Woods, B. L., & Fontenot, K. (1993). The endorsement of communication conflict rules as a function of engagement, marriage, and marital ideology. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 10, 285-304. doi:10.1177/026540759301000208

Kelly, A. B., Fincham, F. D., & Beach, S. R. H. (2003). Communication skills in couples: A review and discussion of emerging perspectives. In J. O. Greene & B. R. Burleson (Eds.) *Handbook of communication and social interaction skills* (pp. 723-752). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Discussion leaders: _____

Week 12: W Apr. 12—No class, Spring break; Work diligently on projects

Week 13: W Apr. 19—Reports on projects

Week 14: W Apr. 26--Reports on projects

Appendix: Paper Format and Evaluation Components

Semester Project Assignments

This purpose of this project is to allow you to investigate an aspect of relational communication in great depth. Given the nature of the assignment, it is important that you choose a topic of interest to you or you may work with me on an existing project.

Nature of the Assignment

This paper can come in any of several formats. Students could perform a unique study of relationship issues, write a state-of-the-art review of the literature, develop a detailed research proposal, prepare a conference paper for eventual journal submission.

State-of-the-Art Literature Review. A state-of-the-art literature review should review, in depth and detail, the literature relevant to a relatively specific topic within development, maintenance, or deterioration. Part of the literature review should involve defining the concept(s) in question and other important variables. Beyond the definitions, the primary task is to describe what we know (and what we do not know) about the topic you have chosen. You should use appropriate data sources (e.g., google scholar, books, book chapters, journal articles, and/or conference papers) to synthesize what they have to say into a coherent package. Moreover, your review of the literature should lead to a specific prediction (or set of predictions) or question (i.e., set of questions) that you feel are important as directions for future research. By using the term a “state-of-the-art” review, we mean that your task is to clearly demonstrate your mastery of this particular area of scholarship (think in terms of a handbook chapter).

Research Proposal. If you choose to write a research proposal, the literature review and predictions (see above) should provide a context for a proposed study. We expect the literature review to be nearly as extensive as a state-of-the-art review (see above). In addition to the detailed literature review, you will need to describe the methods used to test the prediction(s) made or the question(s) posed. Follow the standard format for a social science methods section (e.g., participants, design, instrumentation, procedures). Be explicit. Develop your methods to an extent that you (or someone else) could actually perform the study. If you choose to write a proposal, you do not need to carry out the study (though if you want to, you can do so in the future).

Perform a Study. To fulfill this assignment, you may perform a study individually or with me, in a pair or triad. This project will entail several major steps. First, you are to decide, what you want to study and review the relevant literature (or literatures, see above). You are then to develop a (set of) testable research question(s) and/or hypothesis(es) that focus on important issues left unanswered in the literature. Second, you are to develop the methods necessary to test those hypotheses or answer those research questions. This will include gaining IRB approval, through formal channels, of the project before collecting data. Third, you are to collect, code, and analyze the data following social science principles and methods. Finally, you are to write a research report for submission to the instructor. The research report should be prepared in a manner consistent with the sixth edition of the APA manual as earlier noted. As such, the research report should have a cover page, abstract, and the traditional sections of a social science research report (e.g., rationale, methods, results, and discussion). Each part of the report (e.g.,

source citations, references, methods, and statistics) should be prepared consistent with *APA* guidelines.

Develop a Journal Submission. The next option for this assignment would be to take a conference paper you have presented (or will present, say, at a conference) and convert it into a journal submission. This assignment also comes in several parts. First, you are to receive (ideally detailed) feedback on your conference paper. This feedback should go beyond the feedback you might have received in the conference evaluation process or from the respondent at your conference panel. Choose a scholar who is clearly expert in the focus of your paper.

Approach that scholar and ask him/her if he/she would have time to provide ample feedback on your work. Once you have received that feedback, modify your paper based on your own evaluation but, importantly, the suggestions of your expert. Students choosing this option should submit the following materials:

- The original conference paper
- The feedback generated by your chosen expert
- A statement of how you modified your conference paper including a point-by-point description of how you modified your paper based on the expert's feedback
- The final version of the paper submitted to the journal
- Notification from the journal acknowledging receipt of your manuscript.

Evaluative Criteria

The primary criteria used to evaluate your paper will include completeness, organization, clarity, and validity. **Completeness** refers to the extent to which you fulfill the requirements of the particular option that you choose (e.g., rationale and literature review of a body of literature). In this example, completeness would include the extent to which you describe the existing research and theory development relevant to your topic.

Organization refers to the extent to which your various ideas flow together. Sentences should blend effectively into paragraphs, while paragraphs should blend well in the major sections of your paper. **Clarity** refers to the extent to which you present your ideas in an understandable manner. This would include the extent to which you word your own (and other researchers' and theorists') ideas clearly. Finally, **validity** refers to the extent to which the arguments you provide follow in a clear and organized manner. Evaluation will also tap the technical (or stylistic) issues including *APA* style. For more information on evaluative criteria, see the *General Criteria for Evaluating Papers* presented later in this syllabus. In order to give yourself adequate time to complete the paper, you should choose a topic (and inform me of that choice in writing, e.g., via e-mail) in the next few weeks. If you choose to perform a study, the sooner you get started, the better. Again, the topic may be something we discussed in class or could be a topic not discussed in detail during class. If you chose a topic we covered in detail in class, the paper must go well beyond the readings discussed in class.

I will be available to discuss possible topics and, within reason, to examine your preliminary written drafts of your paper. The phrase "within reason" indicates that at some point I would have to remind you that the paper is a test of your own thinking and communicating skills, and

that I should not end up writing the paper for you. In addition, I will not be available to review drafts on the evening before the papers are due. You should set some reasonable period for the submission and return of rough drafts. You should count on a *one-week* turn-around time in returning a variety of drafts (i.e., not only this paper, but also drafts of other papers as well).

PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION LEADERSHIP ASSIGNMENT

As one of the assignments for this course, you will lead the class discussion for two sets of readings during the semester. Evaluation depends on the extent to which the important points in the reading are brought out during the discussion. There is no single best way of doing this.

1. Know your readings. The better you know what your readings must say, the better you will be able to do the things you need to best complete this assignment.
2. Manage your time well. You have approximately the entire class period to lead discussion. Make sure that you do not spend too much time on a single issue (particularly if that issue is tangential to the reading) that might cause you to go over other, more important, issues in less detail later in the discussion. Make sure that the class adequately discusses the important points in the article.
3. Provide a brief introduction to your reading. Provide class with an idea of what the readings about, but do not include much information that might work better as discussion fodder.

Remember that your task is to lead discussion, not to lecture.

4. Follow up on student comments (sometimes this can be as simple as asking someone “why?” or “how so?”). This forces you to really *listen* to what students are trying to say and turn their contribution into a question, even if it means bringing a topic up “out of order.”
5. Do not answer your own question. If the class does not respond, wait. They might have to think about your question (especially if it is a complex one). If the class does not understand your question, they will ask you to rephrase it.
6. **Handouts might (and might not) be helpful. Handouts should facilitate, rather than restrict discussion.**
7. Be innovative. Try something new. Have fun.
8. Ask good questions.

GOOD DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

1. Are open-ended. Closed-ended (e.g., yes-no) questions do not give the class any room to *discuss* ideas (e.g., “do you agree?” “Does this make sense?”). Closed-ended questions *can* be useful if you have an open-ended as a follow-up (e.g., asking “why” or “on what grounds” after a “do you agree” type question).
2. Are clear. Do not use vague terms. Do not use terms from outside class that other students will not know (unless you spend the time to explain them).
3. Are simple. Short questions tend to be clearer than long questions. One thing that can make for unnecessary complexity is that you ask two (or more things at once). Make sure that you are asking only one thing at a time.

4. Do not have objective, verifiable, answer to the question (particularly from the reading). Do not ask questions where the answer is likely to be someone reading from the text (unless you have a good, open-ended, follow-up).
5. Give the class several directions that they could go. Don't be afraid to let the class to choose the topic or answer they want to give. Though keep in mind that it is important to manage your time well.
6. Attempt to identify (and/or challenge) implicit assumptions in a piece. These questions force students to look beyond what the authors must say.
7. Relate back to earlier readings from class. Again, this forces students to go beyond what the authors must say and to start making connections between concepts and theories. Do not be afraid to bring in concepts from other classes or from your own experience (but be prepared to explain that material or experience).
8. Potentially keeps the discussion on track. There will be times when the discussion focus will meander. Under these circumstances, a good question takes the class from the secondary topic back to the reading (though sometimes you have to bring the class' attention to the reading more abruptly).
9. Assumes that students have read and understood the reading. Be prepared, however, to explain basic issues (e.g., definitions).
10. Might ask for applications of theoretical positions (or theoretical explanations for applied issues).
11. Are questions. Do not make a statement, state an opinion, or read a passage without including a question to accompany it. If you do not ask a question, the class will likely not know how to respond.
12. Can be answered by more than one person and in more than one way. Do not fall into the pattern of: question, answer, question, answer...
13. Either specific or general. Neither specific nor general questions are always preferred. All of one kind (especially specific) gets somewhat tedious. Make sure that there is some combination of specific and general questions.

GENERAL CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING PAPERS

Some criteria that I use in evaluating written assignments are specific to the assignment. On the other hand, while the specific content of the various papers differs, several *general criteria* that I use to evaluate them (and pieces I read in my other professional capacities) remain pretty much the same. I want to spend a bit of time here discussing these general criteria. These criteria are not mutually exclusive (e.g., a lack of organization influences perceptions of clarity); however, I hope that this gives you a good idea of what yardsticks I use when I grade papers. I generally use five general criteria in evaluating student papers.

CRITERION 1: CLARITY

The primary criterion that I use when I evaluate a paper (a draft of my own work, a manuscript that I receive as a reviewer for a professional journal, or a [undergraduate or graduate] student's paper) is clarity. Simply put, are you communicating whatever it is that you are trying to say unambiguously? It does not matter if you are trying to describe a relationship that you have been part of, a reaction to a lecture, or reviewing the theoretical literature on relationship initiation,

you must do so clearly. Saying something simply is better than saying something using complex, convoluted, language. Do not feel as though you must use a lot of technical jargon because the research you have read does it. If I consistently cannot understand what you are trying to say, your grade is going to suffer.

CRITERION 2: COMPLETENESS

I evaluate completeness on two levels. First, I evaluate completeness on a *macro* level. Most of my paper assignment includes multiple parts. For example, a reaction/application paper requires that you first describe course material and then either apply that material to your life experiences or describe how and why you reacted the way that you did. When I evaluate completeness on the macro level, I am looking for the extent to which you perform each of the tasks that I require. Failure to complete a major part of a paper is a serious error that will result in substantial point deductions. Therefore, it is important that I know what you are doing as you work your way through your paper. It is in your best interest to inform me where you are and what you are doing in your paper. Signposting and transitions between parts helps immensely in keeping me informed as to what you are doing in your paper.

I also evaluate completeness on a *micro* level. Completeness on a micro level represents the extent to which you adequately tackle each of the tasks required in the paper. The question here is how well did you perform each of the tasks required? How completely you should describe something, of course, depends on the nature and length of your paper. If you are describing interpersonal needs theory in a reaction paper, it does not make sense to spend the entire paper describing the theory. You need to complete all parts of the assignment given the page restrictions.

CRITERION 3: ORGANIZATION

The third criterion I use in evaluating papers is organization. Your ideas should develop in a logical manner. Words should fit together to form phrases. Phrases should fit together to form sentences. Sentences should fit together to make paragraphs. Paragraphs should fit together to form the major sections of your paper. What I do not want is a paper that rambles from point to point without any connection between them. The paper assignments suggest an organizational scheme for the major parts of your papers and I strongly suggest that you stick to them. Within major sections, however, the choice of an organizational scheme is up to you.

CRITERION 4: VALIDITY

The fourth major criterion I use in grading papers has to do with the validity of the presented arguments. The arguments that you make in your papers must be valid. This means that the conclusions of your arguments must follow from the premises. Further, the premises and conclusions that you draw should be explicit. I should not have to dig through a paper to identify and understand the arguments you are trying to make.

Part of the validity of an argument has to do with the data supporting a particular conclusion. Specifically, properly document all statements of fact from a reputable primary source. For example, if you are making the claim that men and women communicate differently in some

important ways, you need to support that conclusion (or claim) with a reference from a reputable and primary source.

CRITERION 5: MECHANICS

My evaluation also focuses on the technical (or stylistic) aspects of the paper. I expect that submitted drafts should be devoid of grammatical errors, typographical errors, misspellings, punctuation errors, sentence fragments, and so on. In this respect, it would be helpful to develop the habit of completing rough drafts of your work and then spending time cleaning and polishing your writing. If you try to write the entire paper the last day or two before it is due, you will almost certainly encounter stylistic problems, not to mention substantive ones. I will also evaluate the format of source citations and references provided (if any). The format of the paper, source citations, and reference lists must be consistent with the sixth edition of the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association*.

PLAGIARISM (This is reprinted from the LSU policy. Source: <http://students.lsu.edu/saa/students/plagiarism> Adapted with permission from the University of Texas, Austin)

Understanding Academic Integrity

Plagiarism is an extremely serious violation of academic integrity.

The LSU Code of Student Conduct defines plagiarism as “the unacknowledged inclusion, in work submitted for credit, of someone else’s words, ideas, or data.” (8.1-C.6) Plagiarism can occur in a myriad of forms and media. Although most commonly associated with writing, all types of scholarly work, including computer code, music, scientific data and analysis, and electronic publications can be plagiarized. The aim of this section is to help students and faculty deal with the complex and important issue of plagiarism on campus.

Tools & Tips

For an overview of academic integrity and how to avoid academic misconduct at LSU, please complete [the online Moodle module](#). You can self-enroll in the module and you will receive a certification upon completion.

A bibliography is a list of sources, usually placed at the end of a document, that you consulted or cited in creating the document. In Microsoft Office Word, you can automatically generate a bibliography based on the source information that you provide for the document. [Read more at Microsoft.com](#) » or [watch this tutorial](#) to learn more about using the Microsoft References tool.

[Easybib.com](#) also offers a free method for formatting sources you relied on for research for a works cited page.

A Question of Intent?

Plagiarism, strictly speaking, is not a question of intent. Any use of the content or style of another's intellectual product without proper attribution constitutes plagiarism. However, students plagiarize for a variety of reasons, and awareness of these reasons is essential for understanding the problem of plagiarism.

Some students choose to plagiarize. Whether claiming to be overworked, compensating for their own perceived academic or language deficiencies, or simply hoping to gain an academic advantage, those who choose to claim credit for another's work are guilty of plagiarism. Those who intentionally plagiarize "borrow" either from published sources, such as books, journal articles, or electronic information, or from unpublished sources, such as a friend's paper or a commercial writing service. Whatever the source, such conduct is a direct and serious violation of accepted standards of academic integrity.

Others, however, stumble into plagiarism. Negligent plagiarism can result from ineffective proofreading, sloppy note taking, or, most commonly, simple ignorance about the nature of plagiarism itself. Such inadvertent plagiarism, while not an excuse for what is still a serious

breach of academic standards, is a more complex area of academic conduct than straightforward copying. Addressing the issue of negligent plagiarism requires a careful examination of both the definition of plagiarism and the appropriate techniques for scholarly attribution.

What is Plagiarism?

Nearly everyone understands that copying passages verbatim from another writer's work and representing them as one's own work constitute plagiarism. Yet plagiarism involves much more. At LSU plagiarism is defined to include any use of another's work and submitting that work as one's own. This means not only copying passages of writing or direct quotations but also paraphrasing or using structure or ideas without citation. Learning how to paraphrase and when and how to cite is an essential step in maintaining academic integrity.

LSU Academic Integrity Overview (Moodle Module)

Plagiarism is one of the most egregious types of academic misconduct. It represents several ethics violations:

1. **Theft** of intellectual property. In the academe, a scholar's words, ideas, and creative products represent essential intellectual property, which are the primary measures of scholarly identity, status and achievement.
2. It is **fraud**. Students should be assessed on their own ideas and abilities; not the ideas and abilities of others.
3. It is **unfair**. It introduces bias and inequity in the assessment process, producing grades for fellow students based on disadvantaged standards and expectations.
4. It is **corruption**. It undermines the credibility of higher education by misrepresenting the meaning of university grades and degrees to the rest of the public. The offense, no matter how minor in quantity, is still serious.

Source citation:

Proper source citations occur by specifying the source of content or ideas. This is done by (a) providing quotation marks around text, when directly quoted, and (b) clearly designating the source of the text or information relied upon in an assignment.

Intellectual contents: Intellectual contents include all forms of 'text' produced by another person or persons. It includes: writings, course syllabi, course lectures and recordings of lectures, visual information such as models, videos, lyrics, software, etc.

Secondary citations: Secondary citation is not strictly a form of plagiarism, but in blatant forms, it can present similar ethical challenges. A secondary citation is citing source A, which in turn cites source B, but it is source B's ideas or content that provide the basis for the claims the student intends to make in the assignment. For example, assume that

there is an article by Samson (2015) in the student's hands, in which there is a discussion or quotation of an article by Justice (2008). Assume further that what Justice seems to be saying is very important to the student's analysis. In such a situation, the student should always try to locate the original Smith source. *In general, if an idea is important enough to discuss in an assignment, it is important enough to locate and cite the original source for that idea.* There are several reasons for these policies: (a) Authors sometimes commit citation errors, which might be replicated without knowing it; (b) Authors sometimes make interpretation errors, which might be ignorantly reinforced (c) Therefore, reliability of scholarly activity is made more difficult to assure and enforce; (d) By relying on only a few sources of review, the learning process is short-circuited, and the student's own research competencies are diminished, which are integral to any liberal education; (e) By masking the actual sources of ideas, readers must second guess which sources come from which citations, making the readers' own research more difficult; (f) By masking the origin of the information, the actual source of ideas is misrepresented. Some suggestions that assist with this principle:

- When the ideas Justice discusses are clearly ascribed to Justice, then find the Justice source and citation.
- When the ideas Samson is discussing are historically associated more with Justice than with Samson, then find the Justice source and citation.
- In contrast, Samson is sometimes merely using Justice to back up what Samson is saying and believes, and is independently qualified to claim, whether or not Justice would have also said it; in such a case, citing Samson is sufficient.
- Never simply copy a series of citations at the end of a statement by Samson, and reproduce the reference list without going to look up what those references report—the only guarantee that claims are valid is for a student to read the original sources of those claims.

Self-plagiarism: Students often practice some form of 'double-dipping,' in which they write on a given topic across more than one course assignment. In general, there is nothing wrong with double-dipping *topics or sources*, but there is a problem with double dipping *exact and redundant text*. It is common for scholars to write on the same topic across many publication outlets; this is part of developing expertise and the reputation of being a scholar on a topic. Scholars, however, are not permitted to *repeat exact text* across papers or publications except when noted and attributed, as this wastes precious intellectual space with repetition and does a disservice to the source of original presentation by 'diluting' the value of the original presentation. Any time that a writer simply 'cuts-and-pastes' exact text from former papers into a new paper without proper attribution, it is a form of *self-plagiarism*. Consequently, a given paper should never be turned in to multiple classes. Entire paragraphs, or even sentences, should not be repeated word-for-word across course assignments. Each new writing assignment is precisely that, a new writing assignment, requiring new composition on the student's part.