CMST 7910
Contemporary Theories of Interpersonal Communication
Spring 2017, H 15:00-17:50, 153 Coates

"Human relationships are not in any proper sense the subject matter of science. They are the stuff of insight and sympathy and spiritual comprehension." – Woodrow Wilson

---

Graham Bodie, Ph.D.
126 Coates Hall, 225.578.6683 (office), 601.316.6117 (cell); gbodie@lsu.edu
Office Hours: by appointment

Course Description:
This course explores what constitutes interpersonal communication scholarship. The class takes an historical approach to that task by situating contemporary theories in the formative texts from which most work seems to stem. We will discuss the history of the field through a few influential works and the progression of the ideas presented within them as illustrated by contemporary scholarship.

The class requires you to think critically about a range of topics including, but not limited to,

> (a) the philosophical underpinnings of interpersonal communication research,
> (b) the role and function of the individual in theories of communication,
> (c) theory and metatheory,
> (d) methods and methodologies, and
> (e) trends past and yet to come.

The class is theory heavy, but it will, at points, require some understanding of complex statistics. Ultimately, this class provides the tools and vocabulary necessary to speak to scholars of interpersonal communication who come from a variety of epistemological standpoints and to more fully understand the literature in the vast domain labeled Interpersonal Communication.

This class is structured to promote dialogue, conversation, and debate among attendees about the strengths and limitations of different approaches to the study of interpersonal communication.

Finally, this class seeks to debunk myths like "interpersonal communication is synonymous with relationships" and "interpersonal communication is about talk between two individuals face-to-face." These outdated notions of what it means to study interpersonal communication are simply caricatures of the field. Equally embarrassing is when students claiming to have studied IPC at LSU A&M claim that "93% of communication is nonverbal" or "when a person looks up and to the right it means she is lying." We will put to rest these and other myths by looking at research.

Course Objectives:

1. To introduce students to and develop understanding of the primary theoretical foundations of interpersonal communication.

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 interpersonal communication.

4. To encourage students to think about the idea of synthesis, its possibility, and its ramifications.

5. To enhance understanding of what constitutes interpersonal communication scholarship.

Texts:

In addition to individual articles and book chapters (made available on Moodle), the following texts are used:

> Kelly, G. (1963). *A theory of personality: The psychology of personal constructs*. New York: Norton.

> Mead, G. H. (1934). *Mind, self, and society*. University of Chicago Press.

> Thibaut, J. W., & Kelley, H. H. (1959). *The social psychology of groups*. New York: Wiley.

> Watzlawick, P., Beavin, J., & Jackson, D. (1967). *Pragmatics of human communication*. New York: Norton.

I also recommend the following basic reading, though you are welcome to browse my copy and make photocopies if you don't have the extra 30 bucks:

> Braithwaite, D. O., & Schrodt, P. (Eds.) (2015). *Engaging theories in interpersonal communication: Multiple perspectives* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. [The first edition is also worth perusing.]

For those of you who plan to make interpersonal communication a main focus of teaching and research, I also recommend the following:

> Berger, C. R., Roloff, M. E., & Roskos-Ewoldsen, D. R. (Eds.) (2010), *The handbook of communication science* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. [The first edition is good, too!]

> Greene, J. O., & Burleson, B. R. (Eds.) (2003). *The handbook of communication and social interaction skills*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

> Knapp, M. L., & Daly, J. A. (Eds.) (2011). *The SAGE handbook of interpersonal communication* (4th edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. [The first three editions are worth buying if you like a good looking bookshelf; otherwise, just have PDF copies of important and non-redundant articles.]

Assignments and Grading
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. **Attendance and participation is worth 10% of the final course grade**. Graduate students are held to a higher standard than undergraduates. If you miss class, you need to provide valid reasons for doing so. Clearly, do not come to class with a diagnosed and communicable disease only to infect us and our families. Extra-academic work or other job-related responsibilities are not valid reasons for missing class. In all cases, correspond with the instructor.

2. To help me resist the temptation to "lecture" for the first few weeks and to assist students in understanding the applicability of formative readings, students (in groups) will be responsible for leading a discussion for half of a single class period (i.e., an hour and 15 minutes). Discussion should illustrate the applicability of the concepts discussed in one of the four texts covered in the second unit of the course. This means that groups should look for elements in their book of choice that can be applied to some area of interest to the members of that group. There is no need to delve into all concepts or areas of application; the time is likely to be filled with one or a small subset of interrelated areas of interest.

As there are four texts, there will be four groups; as there are 9 people enrolled, there will be three groups of 2 students and one group of 3 students as follows:

1. Schares, Whitaker - WBJ
2. Frost, Bennett - Mead
3. Rasner, Langner - Kelly
4. Bybee, Eugene, Swirsky – T&K

The **discussion and supplementary material count for 10% of the course grade**. All groups should provide the class with a list of discussion questions and/or issues and an annotated bibliography (author abstracts will suffice). Visual aides are optional. I strongly oppose useless Prezi execution or bullet-filled PowerPoint slides.

3. To facilitate class discussion <u>after</u> our formative text readings, you are asked to 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 thought 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 statement is to help students begin drawing together ideas about what they have read. Most important, you should **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 starting on week 7. For each of the 9 relevant weeks, 2 students are responsible for reaction statements. Each student is responsible for 2 reaction statements over the course of the semester. Each r**eaction statement counts for 5% of the course grade for a total of 1*0%* of the final grade**. Students will sign up for their reaction statements during the first class meeting of the course.

4. 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 is worth 10% of the final course grade for a total of 30%**.

- Paper I is meant to allow you to **explore the applicability of a formative text that you did not explore as a group member**. Take a proposition from one of the remaining three texts and apply it to an area of interest, drawing from the literature that has done this already to propose interesting questions and possible answers.

- Paper II is meant for you to **explore the place of the individual within the study of IPC.**

- Paper III is meant for you to **explore some aspect of theorizing at the level of the dyad**.

5. All students will prepare a major paper and present that paper to the class on our final class meeting during final exam week. Working individually or as part of a group, students will write a paper in which they do one of the following:

   (a) describe, review, and evaluate an important theory of interpersonal communication;
   (b) sketch the beginnings of a theory of some phenomenon important to interpersonal communication scholarship that is undertheorized;
   (c) pull together several theories to build a larger framework for the study of some aspect of interpersonal communication;
   (d) prepare a proposal for a research study that tests key tenets of an existing or self-made theory of interpersonal communication; or
   (e) test key tenets of an existing or self-made theory of interpersonal communication.[1]

Other options are available and are only limited to your creativity and ability to convince me of their suitability for this class. If you are dissertating, you can propose to turn in a chapter of your dissertation. If you are about to take comprehensive exams, you can propose to practice for those exams in lieu of writing a final paper. Whatever the case may be, your choice should be useful for you given your progression in the program.

Final papers will be written in stages.

- *Stage 1* – The goal for State 1 is to **provide a rationale for the content and focus of your paper and initial bibliography** that includes germinal manuscripts and exemplar research studies. Your paper should include what you are studying: a careful analysis of the labels attached the phenomenon of interest; 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.

---

[1] Note that option (e) requires data collection and analysis.

- *Stage 2* – Stage 2 should include a revision of the paper submitted for Stage 1 to reflect the feedback received and the student's increasingly sophisticated understanding of the phenomenon. The student should **demonstrate an increasingly sophisticated understanding of the phenomenon and identify questions about the phenomenon that might be answered by the final paper**. The bibliography should grow and this point as well.

- *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. It is final at this point and should **be as close to "conference ready" as possible** given the student's progression in the program.

Students should <u>turn in two copies at stages 1 and 2</u> – 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 Stage 2, 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 submit the feedback by Tuesday the week following submission of original manuscripts. Feedback is due no later than 10:00. Hard copies are required, campus mailbox. I will compile these reactions with my own for a full editorial review of the manuscripts.

The paper will be worth 35% (Stage 1 = 5%; Stage 2 = 10%; Stage 3 = 20%) and the feedback worth 5% (2%, 3%) of the final grade.

**** Assigned grades follow a 4.0 scale that includes suffixes (.33 for each; A+ = 4.33, A = 4.0, A- = 3.67, B+ = 3.33, etc.). Final course grade will be calculated as the sum of the weighted assignment grades. Weights are detailed in the assignment descriptions above.

Policies:

Academic Integrity: Louisiana State University A&M adopted the Commitment to Community in 1995 to set forth a guiding mantra for student behavior inside and outside of the classroom. The Commitment to Community charges students to maintain high standards of academic and personal integrity. All students are required to read and be familiar with the LSU Code of Student Conduct and Commitment to Community, found at www.lsu.edu/saa. It is a student's individual responsibility to understand the standards of behavior for the LSU community.

Access: Please drop by my office when the door is open or make an appointment to speak with me at any point. Part of my job is to assist students in learning course material as well as providing advice for all things academic and professional. If you are having issues in your personal life that are impeding your ability to perform in this class as you normally would, it is vital that you speak to me about them before you begin to fall behind. If it can be prevented, I do not want you to slip through the cracks.

Accommodations: Louisiana State University A&M is committed to providing reasonable accommodations for all persons with disabilities. The syllabus is available in alternate formats upon request. Students with disabilities: If you are seeking classroom accommodations under the Americans with Disabilities Act, you are required to register with Disability Services (DS). DS is located in 115 Johnston Hall. Phone is (225)578-5919. **To receive academic accommodations for this class, please obtain the proper DS forms and meet with by January 26, 17:50.**

Classroom Climate: Classmates are likely to express opinions quite different than your own. Please respect your colleagues during class discussion. Your instructor and other classmates may also express opinions that are counter-attitudinal for the purpose of facilitating a debate about a core issues in Interpersonal Communication. We attack issues, not people.

Correspondence: I frequently use email as a means for getting in touch with the entire class or with individual students. It is important that regularly check your LSU email account. You should use email to correspond with me regarding areas of confusion, to make appointments, and to indicate whether you will miss class on a particular day. Do not use email to turn in assignments or ask me to pre-read those assignments.

Late Work: All written work is to be handed in on the due date stated in the syllabus (above) and reviewed in the table below. No emailed assignments will be accepted without prior arrangement. Papers submitted past the deadline will be placed at the bottom of the stack. If I have not yet finished grading the assignments, then there is no penalty for late work. If I have finished grading the assignments, then your work will be read and marked, but a grade of "F" will be assigned.

Personal Emergencies: If you experience an unavoidable personal situation that prevents you from completing work on time, you must take responsibility for informing your instructor prior to the date the work is due. A failure to contact your instructor prior to the due date will result in the application of the late work policy above. Extensions will only be granted for substantiated and documented emergencies.

Summary of the Course

Disclaimer: Clearly a single course cannot cover all aspects of IPC. The class focuses primarily on social scientific approaches to its study and even ignores key concepts within that literature because there are topical classes available at LSU on, for instance, the self (Edwards); emotion (Honeycutt); and health (Pechionni). In addition, we will not directly cover such important concepts as Face or Politeness because even though utilized by communication scholars their roots are in other disciplines –texts from which these concepts come are certainly "formative", and I would enjoy reading them as such but I had to make concessions somewhere. I assume everyone has had exposure to Goffman as well as Brown and Levinson in prior graduate work. If not, you should attempt to read them at some point soon. We also will not do justice to semiotics or the work of scholars like Grice, Austin, Searle, and Peirce – again, very notable and formative, but simply too much for this class and for one semester.

Week   Date   Topic

Unit I: Orientation and Contemporary Background

1   1/12   Class Overview, Introductions, Logistical Decision Making
                What is Interpersonal Communication? Historical and Contemporary Answers

Unit II: Formative Works in the Study of Interpersonal Communication

2   1/19   Kelly: *A theory of personality: The psychology of personal constructs.*
3   1/26   Mead: *Mind, self, and society.*
4   2/2   No class, NCA Leadership Retreat
5   2/9   Watzlawick, Beavin, & Jackson: *Pragmatics of human communication.*
6   2/16   Thibaut & Kelley: *The social psychology of groups.*

Unit III: Theorizing the Individual

7   2/23   Constructivism [**Position Paper I Due**]
8   3/2   Other "Cognitive" Approaches
9   3/9   Biological Approaches to the Study of Interpersonal Communication
                [Stage 2 of Final Paper Due]

Unit IV: Theorizing Interaction

10   3/16   Theories of Accommodation, Adaptation, and Behavioral Synchrony
11   3/23   Theorizing Communication in Romantic Relationships [**Position Paper II Due**]

Unit V: Contexts for the Study of IC

12   3/30   Interpersonal Influence
13   4/6   Supportive Communication **[Stage 2 of Final Paper Due]**
14   4/13   NO CLASS – SPRING BREAK
15   4/20   Lifespan Perspectives [**Position Paper III Due**]

Unit VI: "Alternative" Approaches to the Study of IC

16   4/27   Dialectics, Discourse Analysis, and Narrative

17   5/3   Final Exam Period – **Stage 3 of Final Paper Due by 5/3, 14:30**

Summary of Important Dates:

Date	Subject	Other
1/19	Kelly	Rasner, Langner
1/26	Mead	Frost, Bennett
2/9	WBJ	Schares, Whitaker
2/16	Thibaut & Kelley	Bybee, Eugene, Swirsky
2/23	Constructivism	**Position Paper I Due** R1: R2:
3/2	Other "Cognitive" Approaches	R1: R2:
3/9	Biological Approaches	**Stage 1 of Final Paper Due** R1: R2:
3/16	Theories of Accommodation, Adaptation, and Behavioral Synchrony	R1: R2:
3/23	Theorizing Communication in Romantic Relationships	**Position Paper II Due** R1: R2:
3/30	Interpersonal Influence	R1: R2:
4/6	Supportive Communication	**Stage 2 of Final Paper Due** R1: R2:
4/20	Lifespan Perspectives	**Position Paper III Due** R1: R2:
4/27	Dialectics, Discourse Analysis, and Narrative	R1: R2:
5/3	Final Exam Period	**Papers due 5/3, 14:30**

Detailed Course Outline with Readings

Week   Date   Topic

Unit I: Orientation and Contemporary Background

1   1/12   What is Interpersonal Communication? Historical and Contemporary Answers

Issues
What constitutes Interpersonal Communication scholarship? What makes (if anything) IPC a distinct area of study in the larger discipline we call Communication? Are the various approaches to the study of IPC incompatible? If not, how is synthesis broached?

Readings
Bochner, A. P. (1989). Interpersonal communication. In E. Barnouw (Ed.), *International encyclopedia of communications* (pp. 336-339). New York: Oxford University Press.

Knapp, M. L., & Daly, J. A. (2011). Background and current trends in the study of interpersonal communication. In M. L. Knapp & J. A. Daly (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of interpersonal communication* (4th ed., pp. 3-22). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Burleson, B. R. (2010). The nature of interpersonal communication: A message-centered approach. In C. R. Berger, M. E. Roloff, & D. R. Roskos-Ewoldsen (Eds.), *The handbook of communication science* (2nd ed., pp. 145-163). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

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

Supplemental Readings
Berger, C. R. (2005). Interpersonal communication: Theoretical perspectives, future prospects. *Journal of Communication, 55*, 415-447.

Berger, C. R. (1977). Interpersonal communication theory and research: An overview. *Communication Yearbook, 1*, 217-243.

Bochner, A. P. (1978). On taking ourselves seriously: An analysis of some persistent problems and promising directions in interpersonal research. *Human Communication Research, 4*, 179-191.

Bochner, A. P. (1985). Perspectives on inquiry: Representation, conversation, and reflection. In M. L. Knapp & J. A. Daly (Eds.), *The handbook of interpersonal communication* (1st ed., pp. 27-58). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bochner, A. P. (1994). Perspectives on inquiry II: Theories and stories. In M. L. Knapp & J. A. Daly (Eds.), *The handbook of interpersonal communication* (2nd ed., pp. 21-41). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bochner, A. P., & Ellis, C. (1992). Personal narrative as a social approach to interpersonal communication. *Communication Theory, 2*, 65-72.

Braithwaite, D. O., & Baxter, L. A. (2008). Introduction: Meta-theory and theory in interpersonal communication research. In L. A. Baxter & D. O. Braithwaite (Eds.), *Engaging theories in interpersonal communication: Multiple perspectives* (pp. 1-18). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cappella, J. N. (1987). Interpersonal communication: Definitions and fundamental questions. In C. R. Berger & S. H. Chaffee (Eds.), *Handbook of communication science* (pp. 184-238). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Miller, G. R. (1978). The current status of theory and research in interpersonal communication. *Human Communication Research, 4*, 164-178.

Roloff, M. E., & Anastasiou, L. (2001). Interpersonal communication research: An overview. *Communication Yearbook, 24*, 51-72.

Unit II: Formative Works in the Study of Interpersonal Communication

2   1/19   Kelly: *A theory of personality: The psychology of personal constructs.*

Issues
Whence do constructs come? Are they inborn? Learned? Do all constructs really have two extreme points? Is it really as simple as a dichotomy? Kelly suggests humans can act like scientists by organizing our experiences and testing the accuracy of our constructed knowledge by performing actions. Do you buy this? What is the main tenet of personal construct theory? How does PCT help define the study of interpersonal communication? Think of a particular context in the study of IC and of the ramifications of applying Kelly's theory to that area. What are the implications for the study of IC more generally?

Readings
Kelly, G. (1963). *A theory of personality: The psychology of personal constructs*. New York: Norton.

Supplemental Readings
In addition to the full two volumes of this work, a host of contemporary scholarship can be classified as "constructivist" in nature including, but not limited to, articles published in the *Journal of Constructivist Psychology* and *Personal Construct Theory & Practice*.

3   1/26   Mead: Mind, Self, and Society

Issues
What is Mead's thesis? How does his proposal help define the study of interpersonal
communication? Is his idea really that radical? Why was it so when it was proffered? Think
of a particular context in the study of IC and of the ramifications of applying Mead's theory
to that area. What are the implications for the study of IC more generally?

Readings
Mead, G. H. (1934). *Mind, self, and society*. University of Chicago Press.

Supplemental Readings
Blumer, H. (1969). *Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and method*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Mead, G. H.
- 1982. *The individual and the social self: Unpublished essays by G. H. Mead*. Ed. by David L. Miller. University of Chicago Press
- 2001. *Essays in Social Psychology*. Ed. by M. J. Deegan. Transaction Books.
- 2011. *G.H. Mead. A Reader*. Ed. by F.C. Silva. Routledge.

Kuhn, M. H. (1964). Major trends in Symbolic Interaction Theory in the past twenty-five
years. *The Sociological Quarterly, 5*, 61-84.

Silva, F. C. (2007) *G.H. Mead. A critical introduction*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

There are also lots and lots of books with "Symbolic Interaction(ism)" in the title. One of
the most influencial is by Manis and Meltzer.

4   2/2   No Class, NCA Leadership Retreat

5   2/9   Watzlawick, Beavin, and Jackson: Pragmatics

Issues
What is the main tenet of *Pragmatics*? How does this tenet help define the study of
interpersonal communication? Think of a particular context in the study of IC and of the
ramifications of applying this theory to that area. What are the implications for the study of
IC more generally? Take one of the five "axioms" and draw out its most logical conclusions.
Based on this analysis, do you buy the axiom? Why (not)? For instance, is it possible to not
communicate? Depending on your answer, what does that say about your view of
interpersonal communication? Can you find others (scholars in particular, not your mom)
that agree with you?

Readings
**Watzlawick, P., Beavin, J., & Jackson, D. (1967). *Pragmatics of human
communication*. New York: Norton**

Supplemental Readings
Bavelas, J. B. (1992). Research into the Pragmatics of human communication. *Journal of Strategic and Systemic Therapy, 11*(2), 15-29.

Sluzki, C. E., & Bavelas, J. B. (1995). A note on meta-communication (with a Prologue by J. B. Bavelas). In J. H. Weakland & W. A. Ray (Eds.), *Propagations: Thirty years of influence from the Mental Research Institute* (pp. 27-32). New York: Haworth.

Watzlawick, P., & Beavin, J. (1967). Some formal aspects of communication. *American Behavioral Scientist, 10*, (8), 4-8.

An Axiomatic Debate
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.

6   2/16   Thibaut and Kelley: *The social psychology of groups*

Issues
What is interdependence? How does this construct help define the study of interpersonal communication? Why is (or why is not) "the proper starting place for an understanding of social behavior…the analysis of dyadic interdependence"? Is the focus represented in this book similar to the other two positions (i.e., Kelly and Mead)? How so? How does the concept of interdependence differ from ideas presented in the other readings? Think of a particular context in the study of IC and of the ramifications of applying this theory of the dyad to that area. What are the implications for the study of IC more generally? How is interdependence formed? Is it an inherent part of forming relationships? Does it look different depending on various aspects of relationships? Thibuat and Kelley assert their

framework makes only very simple assumptions then adds to them complexity only as needed. Is this way to structure a theory appropriate given it analyzes human behavior, a very complex construct to be sure? Can one really assume that "[the] phenomena considered are entirely too complex to be dealt with in their raw form"?

Readings
Thibaut, J. W., & Kelley, H. H. (1959). *The social psychology of groups.* **New York: Wiley.**

Supplemental Readings
The new introduction (pp. v-xviii) provides several citations that might be of interest. The most direct use of this theory and most relevant for the study of interpersonal communication is Interdependence Theory of Caryl Rusbult. There is a good treatment of this theory in the second edition of the *Handbook of Personal Relationships: Theory, Research and Interventions* edited by Steve Duck and published by John Wiley & Sons.

Laura Stafford provides a good overview of "Social Exchange Theories" in her chapter in the Baxter/Braithwaite book; and her reference list is a good starting point for readings.

Unit III: Theorizing the Individual

7   2/23   Constructivism [**Position Paper I Due**]

Issues
What does the constructivist perspective tell us about the origins of IC? What are the strengths and weaknesses of the constructivist perspective as an explanation for how world views and communicative behavior are socialized? Is the characterization by Burleson that constructivism is a theory of "functional communication skills" an accurate depiction in light of the other writings? Why did this perspective seem to do so well in the Communication discipline after it was introduced? What are the factors leading to its success?

Readings
Delia, J. G., O'Keefe, B. J., & O'Keefe, D. J. (1982). The constructivist approach to communication. In F. E. X. Dance (Ed.), *Human communication theory: Comparative essays* **(pp. 147-191). New York: Harper & Row.**

Bodie, G. D., & Jones, S. M. (in press). Constructivism. In C. R. Berger & M. E. Roloff (Eds.), *International Encyclopedia of Interpersonal Communication*: **Wiley-Blackwell.**

Burleson, B. R., Delia, J. G., & Applegate, J. L. (1995). The socialization of person-centered communication: Parents' contributions to their children's social-cognitive and communication skills. In M. A. Fitzpatrick & A. L. Vangelisti (Eds.), *Explaining family interactions* **(pp. 34-76). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.**

Supplementary Readings

Burleson, B. R. (2007). Constructivism: A general theory of communication skill. In B. B. Whaley & W. Samter (Eds.), *Explaining communication: Contemporary theories and exemplars* (pp. 105-128). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Burleson, B. R. (2011). A constructivist approach to listening. *International Journal of Listening, 25*, 27-46.

Burleson, B. R., & Bodie, G. D. (2008). Constructivism and interpersonal processes. In W. Donsbach (Ed.), *The international encyclopedia of communication* (Vol 3, pp. 950-954). Oxford, United Kingdom: Blackwell.

Burleson, B. R., & Rack, J. J. (2007). Constructivism theory: Explaining individual differences in communication skill. In L. A. Baxter & D. O. Braithwaite (Eds.), *Engaging theories in interpersonal communication: Multiple perspectives* (pp. 51-63). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Chiari, G., & Nuzzo, M. L. (1996). Personal Construct Theory within Psychological Constructivism: Precursor or Avant-Garde? In: B. M. Walker, J. Costigan, L. L. Viney & B. Warren (Eds.), *Personal Construct Theory: A psychology for the future* (pp. 25-54). Melbourne: Australian Psychological Society Imprint Series.

Chiari, G., & Nuzzo, M. L. (1996). Psychological Constructivisms: A metatheoretical differentiation. *Journal of Constructivist Psychology, 9*, 163-184.

Delia, J. G. (1977). Constructivism and the study of human communication. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 63*, 66-83.

O'Keefe, B. J., & Delia, J. G. (1982). Impression formation and message production. In M. E. Roloff & C. R. Berger (Eds.), *Social cognition and communication* (pp. 33-72). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Raskin, J. D. (2002). Constructivism in psychology: Personal Construct Psychology, Radical Constructivism, and Social Constructivism. In J. D. Raskin & S. K. Bridges (Eds.), *Studies in meaning: Exploring constructivist psychology* (pp. 1-25). New York: Pace University Press.

Rogers, C. R. (1959). A theory of therapy, personality and interpersonal relationships as developed in the client-centered framework. In S. Koch (Ed.), *Psychology: A study of a science* (3rd edition, pp. 84–256). New York: McGraw-Hill.

There was a special section in the third issue of volume five of the *American Communication Journal* devoted to "constructivism."

8   3/2   Other "Cognitive" Approaches

Issues
What does it mean to study IPC from a "cognitive" perspective? What is the utility (if any) of the "goal" concept? What are its limitations? Is all communication goal-directed? Depending on your answer, what does that say about your view of IC?

Readings
Hewes, D. E., & Planalp, S. E. (1987). The individual's place in communication science. In C. R. Berger & S. H. Chaffee (Eds.), *Handbook of communication science* (pp. 146-183). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Berger, C. R., & Palomares, N. A. (2011). Knowledge structures and social interaction. In M. L. Knapp & J. A. Daly (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of interpersonal communication* (4th ed., pp. 169-200). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Wilson, S. R., & Feng, H. (2007). Interaction goals and message production: Conceptual and methodological developments. In D. R. Roskos-Ewoldsen & J. L. Monahan (Eds.), *Communication and social cognition: Theories and methods* (pp. 71-95). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Bavelas, J. B. (1991). Some problems with linking goals to discourse. In K. Tracy (Ed.), *Understanding face-to-face interaction. Issues linking goals and discourse* (pp. 119-130). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

McPhee, R. D. (1995). Cognitive perspectives on communication: Interpretive and critical responses. In D. E. Hewes (Ed.), *The cognitive bases of interpersonal communication* (pp. 225-246). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Supplemental Readings
Berger, C. R. (1997). *Planning strategic interaction*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Berger, C. R. (2010). Message production processes. In C. R. Berger, M. E. Roloff, & D. R. Roskos-Ewoldsen (Eds.), The handbook of communication science (2nd ed., pp. 111-127). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Craig, R. T. (1986). Goals in discourse. In D. G. Ellis & W. A. Donohue (Eds.), *Contemporary issues in language and discourse processes* (pp. 257-273). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Dillard, J. P. (1997). Explicating the goal construct: Tools for theorists. In J. O. Greene (Ed.), *Message production: Advances in communication theory* (pp. 47-70). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Kellerman, K. (1990). Communication: Inherently strategic and primarily automatic. *Communication Monographs, 59*, 288-300.

Greene, J. O. (1995). An Action-Assembly perspective on verbal and nonverbal message production: A dancer's message unveiled. In D. E. Hewes (Ed.), *The cognitive bases of interpersonal communication* (pp. 51-85). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Greene, J. O. (1997). Introduction: Advances in theories of message production. In J. O. Greene (Ed.), *Message production: Advances in communication theory* (pp. 3-14). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Waldron, V. R. (1997). Toward a theory of interactive conversational planning. In J. O. Greene (Ed.), *Message production: Advances in communication theory* (pp. 195-220). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

9   3/9   Biological Approaches to the Study of Interpersonal Communication

Issues
What role should biology and genetics play in explaining human communication? What needs to be done in the future to determine the utility of biological approaches? Are biological approaches necessarily "reductionist" and/or "deterministic"? Is it really possible to determine an exact percent contribution for biological factors in predisposing people to communication in particular ways? Why (not)?

Readings
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). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Beatty, M. J., McCroskey, J. C., & Pence, M. E. (2009). Communication and biology: The view from evolutionary psychology and psychophysiology. In M. J. Beatty, J. C. McCroskey, & K. Floyd (Eds.), *Biological dimensions of communication*. Hampton Press.

Theoretical exemplar: Affection Exchange Theory
Floyd, K. (2006). *Communicating affection*. New York: Cambridge. Chapter 7: "A New Theoretic Approach"

Floyd, K., Sargent, J. E., & Di Corcia, M. (2004). Human Affection exchange: VI. Further tests of reproductive probability as a predictor of men's affection with their fathers and their sons. *Journal of Social Psychology, 144*, 191-206.

Floyd, K., Mikkelson, A. C., Hesse, C., & Pauley, P. M. (2007). Affectionate writing reduces total cholesterol: Two randomized, controlled trials. *Human Communication Research, 33*, 119-142.

Supplemental Readings
Kory Floyd has a list of publications at www.koryfloyd.com that might be of interest.

Buck, R. (1997). From DNA to MTV: The spontaneous communication of emotional messages. In J. O. Greene (Ed.), *Message production: Advances in communication theory* (pp. 313-340). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Cappella, J. N. (1991). The biological origins of automated patterns of human interaction. *Communication Theory, 1*, 4–35.

Cappella, J. N. (1995). An evolutionary psychology of Gricean cooperation. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 14*, 167–181.

Knapp, M. L. (2009). A "new" frontier for communication studies. In M. J. Beatty, J. C. McCroskey, & K. Floyd (Eds.), *Biological dimensions of communication*. Hampton Press.

Gearhart, C. G., & Bodie, G. D. (2012). Sensory-Processing Sensitivity and its relation to self-reported stress and communication apprehension in a college student sample. *Communication Reports, 25*, 27-39.

Communibiology:
Beatty, M. J., McCroskey, J. C., & Heisel, A. D. (1998). Communication apprehension as temperamental expression: A communibiological paradigm. *Communication Monographs, 65*, 197-219.

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, & M. J. Beatty (Eds.), Communication and personality: Trait perspectives (pp. 41–68). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton.

Beatty, M. J., McCroskey, J. C., & Valencic, K. M. (2001). The biology of communication: A communibiological perspective. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton.

There is a special issue (volume 49, issue 1) of *Communication Education* (2000) entitled "The Nature/Nurture Balance" that includes a few good articles on Communibiology (and a few response from Condit).

Christian Nelson published a piece in *Communication Theory* (2004) entitled "Classifying communibiology's texts: Implications for genre theory" that got a good reaction in the 15 (4) edition of that journal a year later. In the initial response to Nelson's critique, Beatty opens his essay with the following sentence: In this essay, I expose the gross errors made by Nelson (2004) in his critique of our work. Classic.

Unit IV: Theorizing Interaction

10   3/16   Theories of Accommodation, Adaptation, and Behavioral Synchrony

<u>Issues</u>
What does it mean for people to "coordinate" and "adapt" communicatively to others? What does a distinctly communication view about the concepts *accommodation*, *adaptation*, *behavioral synchrony*, *coordination*, and *adaptation* look like? How does a communication perspective on these concepts differ from a more psychologically or sociologically oriented approach? What are the biggest challenges for communication scholars interested in the study of accommodation, adaptation, and behavioral synchrony?

Readings
McGlone, M. S., & Giles, H. (2011). Language and interpersonal communication. In M. L. Knapp & J. A. Daly (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of interpersonal communication* (4th ed., pp. 201-237). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bavelas, J. B., Black, A., Chovil, N., Lemery, C. R., & Mullett, J. (1988). Form and function in motor mimicry. Topographic evidence that the primary function is communicative. *Human Communication Research, 14*, 275-299.

Exemplar Theory: Communication Accommodation Theory
Giles, H. (2008). Communication Accommodation Theory. In L. A. Baxter & D. O. Braithwaite (Eds.), *Engaging theories in interpersonal communication: Multiple perspectives* (pp. 161-173). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Soliz, J., & Giles, H. (2014). *Relational and identity processes in communication: A contextual and meta-analytical review of Communication Accommodation Theory. Communication Yearbook, 38, 107-143.*

<u>Supplemental Readings</u>
Bavelas, J. B., Black, A., Lemery, C. R., & Mullett, J. (1987). Motor mimicry as primitive empathy. In N. Eisenberg & J. Strayer (Eds.), *Empathy and its development* (pp. 317-338). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Bavelas, J. B., Black, A., Lemery, C. R., & Mullett, J.(1986). "I show how you feel." Motor mimicry as a communicative act. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50*, 322-329.

Bavelas, J.B., & Gerwing, J. (2011). The listener as addressee in face-to-face dialogue. *International Journal of Listening, 25*, 1-21.

Bodie, G. D., Cannava, K., Vickery, A. J., & Jones, S. M. (in press). Patterns of nonverbal adaptation in supportive interactions. *Communication Studies.*

Burgoon, J. K., & White, C. H. (1997). Researching nonverbal message production: A view from Interaction Adaptation Theory. In J. O. Greene (Ed.), *Message production: Advances in communication theory* (pp. 279-312). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Burgoon, J. K., Floyd, K., & Guerrero, L. K. (2010). Nonverbal communication theories of interaction adaptation. In C. R. Berger, M. E. Roloff, & D. R. Roskos-Ewoldsen (Eds.), *The handbook of communication science* (2nd ed., pp. 93-108). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Burgoon, J. K., Stern, L. K., & Dillman, L. (1995). *Interpersonal adaptation: Dyadic interaction patterns*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Clark, H. H. (1996). *Using language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Giles, H., Coupland, N. & Coupland, J. (eds.). (1991). The contexts of accommodation: Dimensions in applied sociolinguistics. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Jones, S. M., & Wirtz, J. (2007). "Sad monkey see, monkey do:" Nonverbal matching in emotional support encounters. *Communication Studies, 58*, 71-86.

Street, R. L., Jr., & Giles, H. (1982). Speech Accommodation Theory: A social cognitive approach to language and speech behavior. In M. E. Roloff & C. R. Berger (Eds.), Social cognition and communication (pp. 193-226). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

11   3/23   Theorizing Communication in Romantic Relationships [**Position Paper II Due**]

Issues

What is the role of communication in romantic relationships? What is a "relational message" and how is this concept key to understanding communication in close relationships? Does the way in which "relational messages" are cast align with the view first put forward by Watzlawick et al.? According to the Relational Turbulence Model, the shift from casual to seriously dating is marked by the most uncertainty in close relationships. Do you agree from experience? Are there other points where uncertainty is heightened? Can the RTM be applied to these points in relationships? What perspectives (from our formative texts) do you see represented in the RTM? What other perspectives can be applied to explain communication in romantic relationships? How would theories stemming from those perspectives differ from, for instance, the RTM?

Readings
Burgoon, J. K., & Hale, J. L. (1984). The fundamental topoi of relational communication. *Communication Monographs, 51*, 193-214.

Vangelisti, A. L. (2011). Interpersonal processes in romantic relationships. In In M. L. Knapp & J. A. Daly (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of interpersonal communication* (4th ed., pp. 597-631). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Solomon, D. H., & Vangelisti, J. A. (2010). Establishing and maintaining relationships. In C. R. Berger, M. E. Roloff, & D. R. Roskos-Ewoldsen (Eds.), *The handbook of communication science* (pp. 327-344). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Exemplar Theory: Relational Turbulence Model
Solomon, D. H., & Knobloch, L. K. (2004). A model of relational turbulence: The role of intimacy, relational uncertainty, and interference from partners in appraisals of irritations. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 21, 795-816.

Knobloch, L. K., & Theiss, J. A. (2011). Relational uncertainty and relationship talk within courtship: A longitudinal actor-partner interdependence model. Communication Monographs, 78, 3-26.

Supplemental Readings
Believe it or not, a great first resource is a textbook! *Close Encounters* by Guerrero, Andersen, and Afifi. I use this book when I teach 4012.

There are several core concepts that seem to define (for better or worse) published work on relationships. Those include, but are not limited to,
- Uncertainty
    Berger, C. R., & Calabrese, R. J. (1975). Some explorations in initial interaction and beyond: Toward a developmental theory of interpersonal communication. *Human Communication Research*, *1*, 99-112.

    Berger, C. R., & Gudykunst, W. B. (1991). Uncertainty and communication. In B. Dervin & M. J. Voight (Eds.), *Progress in communication sciences* (Vol. 10, pp. 21-66). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

    Uncertainty is also covered in the Braithwaite & Schrodt Engaging Theories book.

- Attachment – see Guerrero's work and her chapter in the Baxter/Braithwaite book

- Demand-Withdraw Conflict Pattern in marriages – see work by John Caughlin

- The work of John Gottman has been instrumental in shaping the study of marital relationships. A good place to start is one of his many popular press books.

- There exists a line of research on "relational maintenance" that documents those communicative behaviors contributing to the sustainability and satisfaction of various types of relationships with a particular focus on romantic relationships. A recent meta-analysis will be published in the *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*: http://spr.sagepub.com/content/early/2012/11/20/0265407512463338.full.pdf+html

- There is a long line of work on "disclosure" within relationships, perhaps the most interesting of which if the work on secrets. A good article to start with is Caughlin et al., 2005, Reasons for, and consequences of, revealing personal secrets in close relationshps, *Personal Relationships* volume 12, pp. 43-59.

- There is quite a bit of work on "forgiveness"
    Kelley, D. L. (2012). Forgiveness as restoration: The search for well-being, reconciliation, and relational justice. In T. J. Socha & M. J. Pitts (Eds.), *The positive side of interpersonal communication* (pp. 193-210). New York: Peter Lang.

- as well as relational transgressions (Laura Guerrero has done some work here)

- Finally, there is quite a bit of work on different "types" of romantic relationships – on again/off again (Rene Dailey), friends with benefits (lots of folks)

Extra Readings for Relational Turbulence Model
Knobloch, L. K., & Theiss, J. A. (2012). Experiences of U.S. military couples during the post-deployment transition: Applying the relational turbulence model. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships 29*, 423-450.

Solomon, D. H., & Theiss, J. A. (2008). A longitudinal test of the relational turbulence model of romantic relationship development. *Personal Relationships, 15*, 339-357.

Theiss, J. A., & Solomon, D. H. (2006a). Coupling longitudinal data and hierarchical linear modeling to examine the antecedents and consequences of jealousy experiences in romantic relationships: A test of the relational turbulence model. *Human Communication Research, 32*, 469-503.

Theiss, J. A., & Solomon, D. H. (2006b). A relational turbulence model of communication about irritations in romantic relationships. *Communication Research 33*, 391-418.

Unit V: Contexts for the Study of IC

12   3/30   Interpersonal Influence

Issues
Some have argued that all communication is about influence – that is, every communicative act is an attempt to reach some goal, and usually a goal related to influencing others. The claim: all primary goals of communication are related to influence. Do you agree? Why (not)? If not, what are some other primary goals that can describe interpersonal communication? How does the study of interpersonal influence exemplify the study of IC? What formative texts do you see represented in the readings for this week? What about Inoculation Theory makes it a "communication" theory? have Compton and his colleagues made a case for why communication scholars should be interested in a fundamentally psychological mechanism driving attitude change?

Readings
Dillard, J. P., & Knobloch, L. K. (2011). Interpersonal influence. In M. L. Knapp & J. A. Daly (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of interpersonal communication* (4th ed., pp. 389-422). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Wilson, S. R. (2010). Seeking and resisting compliance. In C. R. Berger, M. E. Roloff, & D. R. Roskos-Ewoldsen (Eds.), *The handbook of communication science* (2nd ed., pp. 219-235). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Exemplar Theory: Inoculation Theory
Compton, J. (2013). Inoculation theory. In J. P. Dillard & L. Shen (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of persuasion: Developments in theory and practice* (2nd ed., pp. 220-236). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Compton, J., & Pfau, M. (2009). Spreading inoculation: Inoculation, resistance to influence, and word-of-mouth communication. *Communication Theory, 19*, 9-28.

Ivanov, B. et al. (2012). Effects of postinoculation talk on resistance to influence. *Journal of Communication, 62*, 701-718.

Supplemental Readings
Cialdini, R. B. (2009). *Influence: Science and practice*. Boston: Pearson.

Wilson, S. R. (2002). *Seeking and resisting compliance: Why people say what they do when trying to influence others*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Depending on interests, there are several chapters in both the first and second edition of *The Persuasion Handbook*. I have copies of both if you are interested.

13   4/6   Supportive Communication [**Position Paper III Due**]

Issues
What does social support mean from a communication perspective? What role to communication processes play in the feeling better process? How *does* the comforting process work? Have Burleson and Goldsmith accounted for how all people, in all contexts feel better? What other mechanisms might be at work? And under what conditions are these various mechanisms likely to be activated and drive change? According to the dual-process theory of supportive message outcomes, it is necessary to attend to both the content of messages and how they are processed. Does this theory cover all necessary variables important to the impact of supportive communication? What else needs to be (should be) considered?

Readings
MacGeorge, E. L., Feng, B., & Burleson, B. R. (2011). Supportive communication. In M. L. Knapp & J. A. Daly (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of interpersonal communication* (4th ed., pp. 317-354). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Jones, S. M., & Bodie, G. D. (2014). Supportive communication. In C. R. Berger (Ed.), *Interpersonal Communication* (Vol. 6, pp. 371-394). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Burleson, B. R., & Goldsmith, D. J. (1998). How the comforting process works: Alleviating emotional distress through conversationally induced reappraisals. In P. A.

Andersen & L. K. Guerrero (Eds.), *Handbook of communication and emotion: Research, theory, applications and contexts* (pp. 246-281). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Jones, S. M., & Wirtz, J. (2006). How does the comforting process work?: An empirical test of an appraisal-based model of comforting. *Human Communication Research, 32*, 217-243.

Exemplar Theory: Dual-Process Theory of Supportive Message Outcomes
Bodie, G. D., & Burleson, B. R. (2008). Explaining variations in the effects of supportive messages: A dual-process framework. *Communication Yearbook, 32*, 355-398.

Bodie, G. D. (2013). The role of thinking in the comforting process: An empirical test of a dual-process framework. *Communication Research, 40*, 533-558. doi: 10.1177/0093650211427030

Supplemental Readings
Albrecht, T. L., Burleson, B. R., & Goldsmith, D. (1994). Supportive communication. In M. L. Knapp & G. R. Miller (Eds.), *Handbook of interpersonal communication* (2nd ed., pp. 419-449). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Albrecht, T. L., & Goldsmith, D. J. (2003). Social support, social networks, and health. In T. L. Thompson, A. M. Dorsey, K. I. Miller & R. Parrott (Eds.), *Handbook of health communication* (pp. 263-284). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Barbee, A. P. (1990). Interactive coping: The cheering-up process in close relationships. In S. Duck (Ed.), *Personal relationships and social support* (pp. 46-65). London: Sage.

Barbee, A. P., Rowatt, T. L., & Cunningham, M. R. (1998). When a friend is in need: Feelings about seeking, giving, and receiving social support. In P. A. Andersen & L. K. Guerrero (Eds.), *Handbook of communication and emotion: Research, theory, applications, and contexts* (pp. 281-301). San Diego: Academic.

Bodie, G. D., Jones, S. M., Vickery, A. J., Hatcher, L., & Cannava, K. (2014). Examining the construct validity of enacted support: A multitrait-multimethod analysis of four perspectives for judging immediacy and listening behaviors. *Communication Monographs*, 80, 495-523. doi: 10.1080/03637751.2014.957223

Bodie, G. D., & MacGeorge, E. L. (2015). Theories of supportive communication. In D. O. Braithwaite & P. Shrodt (Eds.), *Engaging Theories of Interpersonal Communication* (2nd ed.).

Bolger, N., Zuckerman, A., & Kessler, R. C. (2000). Invisible support and adjustment to stress. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 79*, 953-961.

Burleson, B. R. (1990). *Comforting as everyday social support: Relational consequences of supportive behaviors.* In S. Duck (Ed.), Personal relationships and social support (pp. 66-82). London: Sage.

Burleson, B. R., Albrecht, T. L., & Sarason, I. G. (1994). (Eds.) *Communication of social support: Messages, interactions, relationships, and community*.

Cunningham, M. R., & Barbee, A. P. (2000). Social support. In C. Hendrick & S. S. Hendrick (Eds.), *Close relationships: A sourcebook* (pp. 272-285). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cutrona, C. E. (1990). Stress and social support: In search of optimal matching. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 9*, 3-14.

Goldsmith, D. J. (2004). *Communicating social support*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

High, A. C., & Dillard, J. P. (2012). A review and meta-analysis of person-centered messages and social support outcomes. *Communication Studies, 63*, 99-118.

High, A. C., & Solomon, D. H. (in press). Communication channel, sex, and the immediate and longitudinal outcomes of verbal person-centered support. *Communication Monographs*.

Lakey, B., & Orehek, E. (2011). Relational regulation theory: A new approach to explain the link between perceived social support and mental health. *Psychological Review, 118*, 482-495.

Priem, J. S., & Solomon, D. H. (in press). Emotional supportive and physiological stress recovery: The role of support matching, adequacy, and invisibility. *Communication Monographs*.

Priem, J. S., Solomon, D. H., & Steuber, K. R. (2009). Accuracy and bias in perceptions of emotionally supportive communication in marriage. *Personal Relationships, 16*, 531-552. doi: 10.1111/j.1475-6811.2009.01238.x

Uchino, B. N. (2004). *Social support and physical health: Understanding the health consequences of relationships*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Readings on Dual-Process Theory

Bodie, G. D. (2012). Task stressfulness moderates the effects of verbal person centeredness on cardiovascular reactivity: A dual-process account of the reactivity hypothesis. *Health Communication, 27*, 569-580.

Bodie, G. D., Burleson, B. R., Gill-Rosier, J. N., McCullough, J. D., Holmstrom, A. J., Rack, J. J., . . . Mincy, J. R. (2011). Explaining the impact of attachment style on evaluations of supportive messages: A dual-process framework. *Communication Research, 38*, 228-247.

Bodie, G. D., Burleson, B. R., Holmstrom, A. J., Rack, J. J., McCullough, J. D., Hanasono, L., & Gill Rosier, J. (2011). Effects of cognitive complexity and emotional upset on processing supportive messages: Two tests of a dual-process theory of supportive communication outcomes. *Human Communication Research, 37*, 350-376.

Bodie, G. D., Burleson, B. R., & Jones, S. M. (2012). Explaining the relationships among message quality, message evaluations, and message outcomes: A dual-process approach. *Communication Monographs, 79*, 1-22.

Bodie, G. D., & Jones, A. C. (forthcoming). Dual process theory of supportive message outcomes. *International Encyclopedia of Interpersonal Communication*.

Burleson, B. R. (2009). Understanding the outcomes of supportive communication: A dual-process approach. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 26*, 21-38.

Burleson, B. R. (2010). Explaining recipient responses to supportive messages: Development and tests of a dual-process theory. In S. W. Smith & S. R. Wilson (Eds.), *New directions in interpersonal communication* (pp. 159-179). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Burleson, B. R., Hanasono, L., Bodie, G. D., Holmstrom, A. J., Rack, J. J., Gill-Rosier, J. N., & McCullough, J. D. (2009). Explaining gender differences in responses to supportive messages: Two tests of a dual-process approach. *Sex Roles, 61*, 265-280.

Burleson, B. R., & Hanasono, L. K. (2010). Explaining cultural and sex differences in responses to supportive communication: A dual-process approach. In J. Davila & K. Sullivan (Eds.), *Support processes in intimate relationships* (pp. 291-318). New York: Oxford University Press.

Holmstrom, A. J., Bodie, G. D., Burleson, B. R., Rack, J. J., McCullough, J. D., Hanasono, L. K., & Rosier, J. G. (in press). Testing a dual-process theory of supportive communication outcomes: How source, message, contextual, and recipient factors influence outcomes in support situations. *Communication Research*.

General Dual-Process Readings
Chaiken, S., & Trope, Y. (Eds.). (1999). *Dual-process theories in social psychology*. New York: Guilford.

Epstein, S., & Pacini, R. (1999). Some basic issues regarding dual-proecss theories from the perspective of cognitive-experiential self-theory. In S. Chaiken & Y. Trope (Eds.), *Dual-process theories in social psychology* (pp. 462-482). New York: Guilford.

Moskowitz, G. B., Skurnik, I., & Galinsky, A. D. (1999). The history of dual-process notions, and the future of preconsious control. In S. Chaiken & Y. Trope (Eds.), *Dual-process theories in social psychology* (pp. 12-36). New York: Guilford.

Smith, E. R., & DeCoster, J. (2000). Dual process models in social and cognitive psychology: Conceptual integration and links to underlying memory systems. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 4*, 108-131.

14   4/13   NO CLASS – SPRING BREAK

15   4/20   Lifespan Perspectives

<u>Issues</u>
What does it mean to study communication from a "life-span" perspective? What are its advantages? Disadvantages? Does failing to account for the developmental nature of communication processes negatively impact our ability to theorize communication? What about our ability to offer useful pragmatic guidelines for policy makers and ordinary people (i.e. non-scholars)? For your own research interests, how would taking a "life-span" perspective change how you have already thought about core concepts and theories?

<u>Readings</u>
Harwood, J. (2014). Lifespan communication theory. In J. F. Nussbaum (Ed.), *The handbook of lifespan communication* (pp. 9-27). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Selected readings from Pecchioni, L. L., Wright, K. B., & Nussbaum, J. F. (2005). *Life-span communication*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- **family relationships in childhood through adolescence and in later life**
- **interpersonal conflict management**

Fisher, C. L., & Canzona, M. R. (2014). Health care interactions in older adulthood. In J. F. Nussbaum (Ed.), *The handbook of lifespan communication* (pp. 385-404). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Giles, H., Thai, C., & Prestin, A. (2014). End-of-life interactions. In J. F. Nussbaum (Ed.), *The handbook of lifespan communication* (pp. 405-423). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

<u>Supplemental Readings</u>
Hummert, M. L., Wiemann, J. M., & Nussbaum, J. F. (Eds.) (1994). *Interpersonal communication in older adulthood: Interdisciplinary theory and research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Nussbaum, J. F. (in press). The communication of wisdom: The nature and impact of communication and language change across the life span. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*.

Nussbaum, J. F., & Fisher, C. L. (2009). A communication model for the competent delivery of geriatric medicine. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 28*, 190-208.

Nussbaum, J. F., Pechionni, L. L., & Wright, K. B. (2011). Interpersonal communication across the lifespan. In M. L. Knapp & J. A. Daly (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of interpersonal communication* (4th ed., pp. 715-731). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Nussbaum, J. F., Ragan, S., & Whaley, B. (2003). Children, older adults, and women: Impact on provider-patient interaction. In T. L. Thompson, A. Dorsey, K. I. Miller, & R. Parrott (Eds.), *Handbook of health communication* (pp. 183-204). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Exemplar "age related issue" – Presbycusis
Bodie, G. D., & Pecchioni, L. (forthcoming). Age-related hearing loss. In T. Thompson (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Health Communication*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kidd, A., & Jianxin, B. (2012). Recent advances in the study of age-related hearing loss: A mini-review. *Gerontology, 58*.

Pichora-Fuller, M. Kathleen, Johnson, Carolyn E., & Roodenburg, Kristin E. J. (1998). The discrepancy between hearing impairment and handicap in the elderly: Balancing transaction and interaction in conversation. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 26*(1), 99-119. doi: 10.1080/00909889809365494

Villaume, W. A., Brown, M. H., & Darling, R. (1994). Presbycusis, communication, and older adults. In M. L. Hummert, J. M. Wiemann & J. F. Nussbaum (Eds.), *Interpersonal communication in older adulthood: Interdisciplinary theory and research* (pp. 83-106). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Villaume, William A., & Reid, Tami. (1990). An initial investigation of aging, aligning actions and presbycusis. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 18*, 8-31. doi: 10.1080/00909889009360312

Unit VI: "Alternative" Approaches to the Study of IC

16   4/27   Dialectics, Discourse Analysis, and Narrative

<u>Issues</u>
Why is "alternative" in quotation marks? What does it mean to think about IC from a dialectical, discourse analytic, and/or narrative approach? Do these approaches have fundamentally different epistemological standpoints? Ontological starting places? Do they really offer vastly different viewpoints on what it means to "communicate" and for the role of communication in relationships and other aspects of our lives? Given your particular interests, do any of these "alternative" perspectives offer any useful insights? Compare and contrast these perspectives with the formative texts read at the beginning of the semester. Are you more informed about interpersonal communication (as a phenomenon or a field or both) because of any of these "alternative" perspectives?

Readings

Dialectics
Baxter, L. A. (1988). A dialectical perspective on communication strategies in relationship development. In S. Duck (Ed.), *Handbook of Personal Relationships* (pp. 257-273). New York: John Wiley & Son.

Petronio, S. (2002). Boundaries of privacy: Dialectics of disclosure. Albany, NY: SUNY Press. [Chapter 1: Overview of Communication Privacy Management]

Discourse Analysis
Bavelas, J. B., Kenwood, C., & Phillips, B. (2002). Discourse analysis. In M. Knapp & J. Daly (Eds.), *Handbook of Interpersonal Communication* (3rd ed., pp. 102-129). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Jackson, S. (1986). Building a case for claims about discourse structure. In D. G. Ellis & W. A. Donohue (Eds.), *Contemporary issues in language and discourse processes* (pp. 129-147). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Narrative
Fisher, W. R. (1984). Narration as a human communication paradigm: The case of public moral argument. *Communication Monographs, 51*, 1-22.

Bochner, A. P., & Ellis, C. (1992). Personal narrative as a social approach to interpersonal communication. *Communication Theory, 2*, 65-72.

Supplemental Readings
Baxter, L.A., & Montgomery, B.M. (1996). *Relating: Dialogues and dialectics*. New York: Guilford.

Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge 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). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Montgomery, B.M. & Baxter, L.A. (1998). *Dialectical approaches to studying personal relationships*. New York: Psychology Press.

Petronio, S. (1991). Communication boundary management: A theoretical model of managing disclosure of private information between married couples. *Communication Theory, 1*, 311–335.

Tracy, K. (2002). *Everyday talk: Building and reflective identities*. New York: Guilford.

Tracy, K., & Munoz, K. F. (2011). Qualitative methods in interpersonal communication. In M. L. Knapp & J. A. Daly (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of interpersonal communication* (4th ed., pp. 59-86). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

17   5/3   Final Exam Period – **Final Papers Due, 5/3, 14:30**