

**Proseminar in Interpersonal Communication
Fall 2019**

CI 631 Section 001, Monday 5-7:45 PM
Room: Patterson Hall Room 128

Instructor Contact Information:

Dr. Jennifer A. Scarduzio, Ph.D. Email: jennifer.scarduzio@uky.edu
Office: Blazer Dining Room 240 Office Phone: 859-257-2954
Office Hours: TTH 10:00-11:00, and by appointment

Course Description:

The course reviews existing and emerging theoretical perspectives relevant to the context of interpersonal communication. Emphasis is on theories of message production and reception, identity management, relationship development, and related processes. Methods of investigation unique to the study of interpersonal interaction are also addressed. Students are expected to be familiar with general communication theory and basic research methods prior to enrolling in the course.

Prerequisites: CI graduate standing in communication or consent of instructor.

Course Objectives:

- To provide a broad overview of the history and current trends and topics within interpersonal communication (IPC).
- To examine fundamental units of study within IPC.
- To investigate fundamental processes of IPC (e.g., influence, conflict management).
- To develop a study proposal or conduct an actual study using interpersonal theory as a basis for the study.

Required Textbooks:

American Psychological Association. (2010). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (6th ed). Washington, D.C.: Author. Checkout:
<https://libraries.uky.edu/record.php?lir id=1077>

Supplemental journal articles and book chapters will also be required throughout the course. All supplemental articles will be available on Canvas.

Optional Textbooks:

Braithwaite, D. O., & Schrodtt, P. (Eds.). *Engaging theories of interpersonal communication: Multiple perspectives*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Knapp, J. A., & Daly, J. A. (Eds.) (2011). *Handbook of interpersonal communication* (4th ed.). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Seminar Format, Policies, and Decorum:

While we will create our own norms of decorum throughout the semester, it is important that we agree to some basic rules of decorum in the conduct of this seminar.

Method of Instruction

This is a seminar class. The lecture method of dispensing information is for the most part impractical and inefficient in a graduate seminar. However, there will be times when I do provide a brief lecture to introduce course material. I expect you to acquire information with minimal teacher direction and employ your own personal learning strategies. I will come to class prepared to help manage and facilitate your discussion and to help keep the discussion on track. Ideally, the discussion leader will keep the discussion on track with minimal interaction from me. Active participation in class will facilitate all students' understanding of course material.

Religious Holidays

Students anticipating an absence for a major religious holiday are responsible for notifying me in writing of anticipated absences due to their observance of such holidays no later than the last day of add/drop. Information regarding dates of major religious holidays may be obtained through the religious liaison, Dr. David Beach (859-258-2754).

Accommodations for Disabilities

If you have a documented disability that requires academic accommodations, please see me by the end of the second week of class during scheduled office hours. In order to receive accommodations in this course, you must provide me with a Letter of Accommodation from the Disability Resource Center (725 Rose Street, Multidisciplinary Science Building, Suite 407, Lexington, KY 40536-0082, (859) 257-2754, email address susan.fogg@uky.edu) for coordination of campus disability services available to students with disabilities.

<http://www.uky.edu/StudentAffairs/DisabilityResourceCenter/index.html>

Academic Honesty

Per university policy, students shall not plagiarize, cheat, falsify, or misuse academic records. Students are expected to adhere to University policy on cheating and plagiarism in all courses. The minimum penalty for a first offense is a zero on the assignment on which the offense occurred. If the offense is considered severe or the student has other academic offenses on their record, more serious penalties, up to suspension from the university may be imposed. Plagiarism and cheating are serious breaches of academic conduct. Each student is advised to become familiar with the various forms of academic dishonesty as explained in the Code of Student Rights and Responsibilities. Complete information can be found at the following website: <http://www.uky.edu/Ombud>. A plea of ignorance is not acceptable as a defense against the charge of academic dishonesty. It is important that you review this information as all ideas borrowed from others need to be properly credited.

Part II of Student Rights and Responsibilities (available online <http://www.uky.edu/StudentAffairs/Code/part2.html>) states that all academic work, written or otherwise, submitted by students to their instructors or other academic supervisors, is expected to be the result of their own thought, research, or self-expression. In cases where students feel unsure about the question of plagiarism involving their own work, they are obliged to consult their instructors on the matter before submission.

When students submit work purporting to be their own, but which in any way borrows ideas, organization, wording or anything else from another source without appropriate acknowledgement of the fact, the students are guilty of plagiarism. Plagiarism includes reproducing someone else's work, whether it be a published article, chapter of a book, a paper from a friend or some file, or something similar to this. Plagiarism also includes the practice of employing or allowing another person to alter or revise the work which a student submits as his/her own, whoever that other person may be.

Students may discuss assignments among themselves or with an instructor or tutor, but when the actual work is done, it must be done by the student, and the student alone. When a student's assignment involves research in outside sources of information, the student must carefully acknowledge exactly what, where, and how he/she employed them. If the words of someone else are used, the student must put quotation marks around the passage in question and add an appropriate indication of its origin. Making simple changes while leaving the organization, content, and phraseology intact is plagiaristic. However, nothing in these Rules shall apply to those ideas which are so generally and freely circulated as to be a part of the public domain (Section 6.3.1).

Please note: Any assignment you turn in may be submitted to an electronic database to check for plagiarism.

Late Work

Due dates for all assignments are provided on the semester course calendar at the end of this syllabus. I will expect all assignments to be submitted on Canvas on the day they are due. A hard copy of each assignment should also be brought to class. Graduate students should not be submitting late assignments. However, in extreme circumstances, deemed by me to be extreme, I will accept an assignment late. In that case, your assignment will receive a 10% deduction for every day that it is submitted late. **NOTE: Completion of *all* assignments is necessary for successful completion of the course. No one may receive a passing grade without completing all of the assignments.**

Incomplete grades ("Is") are given in CI 631 only in extreme situations, where a documented late-in-the-semester medical or family emergency is presented to the instructor before incomplete assignments are due. Finally, it is expected that all assignments for this class be original. To re-work or "extend" a paper from another

course is academic plagiarism. However, students are welcome to build upon previous work in an area of inquiry. If you have any question about this policy, I would be delighted to discuss your projects with you early in the term.

Technology Policy

I recognize that we live in a digital world and staying connected is important. However, during seminar, I expect you to turn your cell phone on silent and any other things that you own that vibrate, beep, ring, or are distracting to you and others while in this class should be silenced too.

I see the value of having your laptop in the classroom and I realize that many of you will use your laptop to take notes and consult readings for the week. Your laptop should not be viewed as an opportunity to surf the web, update your Facebook or Instagram page, etc. There will be certain times in class when I ask everyone to put away your laptops (e.g., guest lectures, classmate presentations, etc.). If computer use becomes a distraction to learning/teaching, I will not hesitate to ban them.

Food/Drink in the Classroom

Small snacks and drinks are permitted in class, as long as they do not distract (e.g., large food items, crinkly wrappers, strong odors, etc.) others from learning.

Course Requirements and Assignments (out of 500 points total):

1. Semester Research Paper Project & Presentation (up to 225 points). The culminating course project is a 18-20 page paper (APA style) on an issue related to interpersonal communication. Students are encouraged to make use of the readings in this class. Format possibilities include original research studies (either qualitative or quantitative in nature), comprehensive critical literature reviews (e.g., check out examples in the *Annals of the International Communication Association*), advanced case analyses, theory-based papers, or study proposals. Original research studies require examinations of previously collected data or new studies that will require Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval.

If there is another type of project you would like to complete, please feel free to set up a meeting with me.

During our last class period, you will be asked to provide a 10-minute oral presentation of your final paper (25 of the listed points). This is a great opportunity to practice a conference-quality presentation, complete with visual aids if appropriate.

2. Research Paper Building Blocks (up to 120 pts). The research paper is segmented into 6 “building block” assignments that lead toward the final paper. Building blocks A, B, C, D, & F are worth 15 points each, with BB E (the first draft) worth 45 points. Please type these assignments, submit them on Canvas before class on the day they are due,

and bring one paper copy to turn in to class and be prepared to share ideas. Details of each assignment appear below.

A. Three potential topics: Humans often go with the first decision we stumble upon, rather than the “best” possible decision. In the effort to determine a “better” semester project, describe three potential project ideas. For each, come up with an overall research question, hypothesis, or research problem, that your project will tackle. For inspiration, consider syllabus readings, interpersonal problems you have faced in your on life, unanswered questions in the literature, hot topics, or issues that confuse and/or make you excited. Briefly discuss the rationale or significance of each topic idea.

B. Abstract: Usually in scholarly writing, we write the abstract after we are finished writing the paper. In this class, you’ll be asked to write one before you begin. Examine models of course reading abstracts, and write something that is 200-350 words. Writing this first provides a road map. Your abstract will change over the course of the semester but this is a good place to start.

C. Conceptual researcher party: Consider your paper’s audience. Who are the handful of scholars you most want to talk with about your project? Choose 3 scholars who you would chose to be reading/responding to/critiquing your research. Collect at least two articles from each scholar, and provide an overview with the citation and a brief explanation as to why you have chosen this person to be part of your conceptual party. Ultimately, in your final paper, you should be citing these scholars in the first few paragraphs.

D. Article format models: Find three published articles that, format-wise, “do” the same thing that you want to do in your own paper. For example, if you are conducting a focus-group study in which you meld two theoretical points of view, find other articles that do the same (the model need not be on the same topic). Cite the source in APA style, and for each of the “models”, create an outline of what is done in the article (e.g., “rationalizes the use of theory abc as a new way of making sense of xyz behavior”) and the amount of space (number of pages or paragraphs) used to do it in. These will assist you in determining the framework of your own paper.

E. First Draft: Write the first full draft of the semester paper.

F. First Draft Peer Feedback: Provide structured feedback and suggestions to one of your colleagues’ papers. Students will bring a hard copy of the first draft to class and papers will be exchanged for feedback. This is an opportunity to practice skills in reviewing scholarly papers.

3. Discussion Leading (up to 80 pts). Each student will lead discussion of the assigned readings. Doing this provides an opportunity to practice concept-integration skills and presentation abilities. Dates for discussion leading will be chosen on the first day of class.

Discussion leaders will be graded on thoughtfulness and timeliness of discussion questions; thoroughness, readability and format of outlines; liveliness and organization of discussion leading; and command of topic.

Discussion leading includes the following activities:

- a. Prepare 6-8 discussion questions for us to think about and respond to verbally in class. Please feel free to solicit questions from class members.
- b. If there are any, provide a brief overview of the recommended but not required additional readings.
- c. In class, provide a brief overview of the readings, (to get us warmed up), cover any key terms or theories (turning to the instructor for assistance if desired), present/integrate the main concepts in an interactive, lively manner – making use of the discussion questions, any activities you bring in, and application to course projects.

5. Attendance and Participation (up to 75 pts).

This is a *discussion* class. The primary focus of your participation should be engaged and lively discussion. Students should complete assigned readings and make notes about readings before class so they can participate in an enthusiastic and informed manner. Other components of active, in-class participation include thoughtful and appropriate verbal participation (more does not always = better), concentrating on course material rather than distractions (e.g., laptops, cell phones), and providing support to class members. I will evaluate students' participation by watching the following: 1) informed reflection of required readings consistently throughout the semester, 2) careful and respectful listening to others and dialoguing with alternate views, 3) mindful reflection of "floor-time" and efforts to integrate others' contributions, 4) evident class preparation (finished assignments, course readings), 5) attendance and professionalism (arriving on time, avoiding early departures, paying attention, avoiding side conversations, and cell phone/laptop interference), and 6) bringing value and contribution to our learning community.

I also recognize that there are multiple learning styles and I will take note of supplementary forms of participation such as active listening and taking notes during seminar, providing focused attention for the entire class period, and course-related but non-assignment-related office hour visits.

If you must miss a single class, you can make up the attendance points by creating an outline of an unassigned reading (please propose to me before completing).

Grading Scale:

Letter grades are figured as to the following guidelines (out of 500 points).

A = 450-500 B = 400-449 C = 350-399 E = 349 or less

CI 631 - Survey of Interpersonal Communication
Tentative Course Schedule

Week 1 (8/26): Introductions/Definitions and Welcome

- Burleson, B. R. (2010). The nature of interpersonal communication: A message-centered approach. In C. R. Berger, M. E. Roloff, & D. R. R. Roskos-Ewoldsen (Eds.), *The handbook of communication science* (pp. 145-163). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Knapp, M. L., & Daly, J. L. (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. 3-24). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Berger, C. R. (2014). Interpersonal communication: Historical foundations and emerging directions. In C. R. Berger (Ed.), *Handbook of interpersonal communication* (pp. 3-26). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Week 2 (9/2): Labor Day – No Class!**Week 3 (9/9): Goals, Plans, and Competence**

- Dillard, J. P. (2015). Goals-plans-action theory of message production: Making influence messages. In D. O. Braithwaite & P. Schrodt (Eds.), *Engaging theories in interpersonal communication: Multiple perspectives* (2nd ed., pp. 63-74). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Rubin, R. B., & Martin, M. M. (1994). Development of a measure of interpersonal communication competence. *Communication Research Reports*, 11, 33-44. doi:10.1080/08824099409359938
- Dillard, J. P., Segrin, C., & Harden, J. M. (1989). Primary and secondary goals in the production of interpersonal influence messages. *Communication Monographs*, 56, 19-38. doi:10.1080/03637758909390247
- Berger, C. R. (2015). Planning theory of communication: Goal attainment through communicative action. In D. O. Braithwaite & P. Schrodt (Eds.), *Engaging theories in interpersonal communication: Multiple perspectives* (2nd ed., pp. 89-102). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Recommended:

- Palomares, N. A. (2013). When and how goals are contagious in social interaction. *Human Communication Research*, 39, 74-100. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2958.2012.01439.x

Discussion Leader: _____

Week 4 (9/16): Language, Face, and Politeness

- 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. 201-238). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Metts, S. & Cupach, W. R. (2015). Face theory: Goffman's dramaturgic approach to interpersonal interaction. In D. O. Braithwaite & P. Schrodt (Eds.), *Engaging theories in interpersonal communication: Multiple perspectives* (2nd ed., pp. 229-240). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Week 4 (Continued):

- Goldsmith, D. J., & Normand, E. L. (2015). Politeness theory: How we use language to save face. In D. O. Braithwaite & P. Schrodt (Eds.), *Engaging theories in interpersonal communication: Multiple perspectives* (2nd ed., pp. 267-278). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dragojevic, M. (2018). Language attitudes. In H. Giles & J. Harwood (Eds.), *Oxford research encyclopedia of intergroup research* (Vol. 2, pp. 179-192). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Recommended:

- Dragojevic, M., Giles, H., Beck, A. C., & Tatum, N. T. (2017). The fluency principle: Why foreign accent strength negatively biases language attitudes. *Communication Monographs*, 84, 385-405. doi:10.1080/03637751.2017.1322213

Discussion Leader: _____

ASSIGNMENT DUE (9/16): bbA – Three Potential Topics**Week 5 (9/23): Nonverbal**

- Burgoon, J. K., Guerrero, L. K., & Manusov, V. (2011). Nonverbal signals. In M. L. Knapp & J. A. Daly (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of interpersonal communication* (4th ed., pp. 239-280). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Burgoon, J. K. (1993). Interpersonal expectations, expectancy violations, and emotional communication. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 12, 30-48. doi:10.1177/0261927X93121003
- White, C. H. (2015). Expectancy violations theory and interaction adaption theory: From expectations to adaptation. In D. O. Braithwaite & P. Schrodt (Eds.), *Engaging theories in interpersonal communication: Multiple perspectives* (2nd ed., pp. 217-228). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Patterson, M. L., Iizuka, Y., Tubbs, M. E., Ansel, J., Tsutsumi, M., & Anson, J. (2007). Passing encounters East and West: Comparing Japanese and American pedestrian interaction. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, 31, 155-166. doi:10.1007/s10919-007-0028-4

Recommended:

- Andersen, P. A., Guerrero, L. K., Buller, D. B., & Jorgensen, P. F. (1998). An empirical comparison of three theories of nonverbal immediacy exchange. *Human Communication Research*, 24, 501-535. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2958.1998.tb00429.x

Discussion Leader: _____

Week 6 (9/30): Social Support and Coping

- 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.
- Bodie, G. D., Burleson, B. R., Gill-Rosier, J., McCullough, J. D., Holstrom, A. J., Rack, J. J., Hanasono, L., & Mincy, J. (2011). Explaining the impact of attachment style on evaluations of supportive messages: A dual-process framework. *Communication Research*, 38, 228-247. doi:10.1177/0093650210362678

Week 6 (Continued):

- Afifi, T. D., Hutchinson, S., & Krouse, S. (2006). Toward a theoretical model of communal coping in postdivorce families and other naturally occurring groups. *Communication Theory, 16*, 378-409. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2885.2006.00275.x
- Scarduzio, J. A., Sheff, S. E., & Smith, M. (2018). Coping and sexual harassment: How victims cope across multiple settings. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 47*, 327-340. doi:10.1007/s10508-017-1065-7

Recommended:

- Xu, Y., & Burlison, B. R. (2001). Effects of sex, culture, and support type on perceptions of spousal social support: An Assessment of the "support gap" hypothesis in early marriage. *Human Communication Research, 27*, 535-566. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2958.2001.tb00792.x

Discussion Leader: _____

ASSIGNMENT DUE (9/30): bbB - Abstract**Week 7 (10/7): 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. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2958.1975.tb00258.x
- Goldsmith, D. J. (2001). A normative approach to the study of uncertainty and communication. *Journal of Communication, 51*, 514-533. doi:10.1111/j.1460-2466.2001.tb02894.x
- Brashers, D. E., Neidig, J. L., Haas, S. M., Dobbs, L. K., Cardillo, L. W., & Russell, J. A. (2000). Communication in the management of uncertainty: The case of persons living with HIV or AIDS. *Communication Monographs, 67*, 63-84. doi:10.1080/03637750009376495
- Afifi, W. A., Morgan, S. E., Stephenson, M. T., Morse, C., Harrison, T., Reichert, T., & Long, S. D. (2006). Examining the decision to talk with family about organ donation: Applying the theory of motivated information management. *Communication Monographs, 73*, 188-215. doi:10.1080/03637750600690700

Discussion Leader: _____

Week 8 (10/14): Relationships Part I

- Solomon, D. H., Vangelisti, A. L. (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). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Knobloch, L. K. (2015). The relational turbulence model: communicating during times of transition. In D. O. Braithwaite & P. Schrodtt (Eds.), *Engaging theories in interpersonal communication: Multiple perspectives* (2nd ed., pp. 377-388). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Knobloch, L. K., McAninch, K. G., Abendschein, B., Ebata, A. T., & McGlaughlin, P. C. (2016). Relational turbulence among military couples after reunion following deployment. *Personal Relationships, 23*, 741-758. doi:10.1111/perc.12148
- Baxter, L. A. (1990). Dialectical contradictions in relationship development. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 7*, 69-88. doi:10.1177/0265407590071004

Week 8 (Continued):

Discussion Leader: _____

ASSIGNMENT DUE (10/14): bbC – Conceptual Researcher Party**Week 9 (10/21): Fall Break – No Class!****Week 10 (10/28): Relationships Part II**

- 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: Multiple perspectives* (2nd ed., pp. 309-320). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Stafford, L. (2015). Social exchange theories: Calculating the rewards and costs of personal relationships. In D. O. Braithwaite & P. Schrodt (Eds.), *Engaging theories in interpersonal communication: Multiple perspectives* (2nd ed., pp. 403-416). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Guerrero, L. K. (2015). Attachment theory: A communication perspective. In D. O. Braithwaite & P. Schrodt (Eds.), *Engaging theories in interpersonal communication: Multiple perspectives* (2nd ed., pp. 321-334). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Caughlin, J. P. (2010). A multiple goals theory of personal relationships: Conceptual integration and program overview. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 27, 824-848.
doi:10.1177/0265407510373262

Discussion Leader: _____

ASSIGNMENT DUE (10/28): bbD – Article Format Models**Week 11 (11/4): Privacy**

- Petronio, S., & Reiersen, J. (2009). Regulating the privacy of confidentiality: Grasping the complexities through communication privacy management theory. In T. A. Afifi & W. A. Afifi (Eds.), *Uncertainty, information management, and disclosure decisions: Theories and applications* (pp. 365-383). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Goldsmith, D. J., & Domann-Scholz, K. (2013). The meanings of “open communication” among couples coping with a cardiac event. *Journal of Communication*, 63, 266-286.
doi:10.1111/jcom.12021
- Afifi, T. D., & Steuber, K. (2009). The risk revelation model (RRM) and strategies used to reveal secrets. *Communication Monographs*, 76, 144-176. doi:10.1080/03637750902828412
- Caughlin, J. P., Scott, A. M., Miller, L. E., & Hefner, V. (2009). Putative secrets: When information is supposedly a secret. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 26, 713-743.
doi:10.1177/0265407509347928

Recommended:

- Petronio, S., & Durham, W. T. (2015). Communication privacy management theory: Significance for interpersonal communication. In D. O. Braithwaite & P. Schrodt (Eds.), *Engaging theories in interpersonal communication: Multiple perspectives* (2nd ed., pp. 335-348). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Discussion Leader: _____

Week 12 (11/11): The Dark Side

- Spitzberg, B. H., & Cupach, W. R. (2007). Disentangling the dark side of interpersonal communication. In B. H. Spitzberg & W. R. Cupach (Eds.) *The dark side of interpersonal communication* (pp. 3-28). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Metts, S., & Cupach, W. R. (2007). Responses to relational transgressions: Hurt, anger, and sometimes forgiveness. In B. H. Spitzberg & W. R. Cupach (Eds.) *The dark side of interpersonal communication* (pp. 243-276). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Spitzberg, B. H., Cupach, W. R., Hannawa, A. F., & Crowley, J. P. (2014). A preliminary test of a relational goal pursuit theory of obsessive relational intrusion and stalking. *Studies in Communication Sciences*, 14, 29-36. doi:10.1016/j.scoms.2014.03.007
- Scarduzio, J. A., Carlyle, K. E., Harris, K. L., & Savage, M. W. (2017). "Maybe she was provoked": Exploring gender stereotypes of male and female victims of intimate partner violence. *Violence Against Women*, 23, 89-113. doi:10.1177/1077801216636240

Discussion Leader: _____

ASSIGNMENT DUE (11/11): bbE – Complete First Draft

Week 13 (11/18): Influence and Power

- Dillard, J. P., & Wilson, S. R. (2014). Interpersonal influence. In C. R. Berger (Ed.), *Handbook of interpersonal communication* (pp. 155-176). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Dunbar, N. E., & Abra, G. (2010). Observations of dyadic power in interpersonal interaction. *Communication Monographs*, 77, 657-684. doi:10.1080/03637751.2010.520018
- Dunbar, N. E., & Burgoon, J. K. (2005). Perceptions of power and interactional dominance in interpersonal relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 22, 207-233. doi:10.1177/0265407505050944
- Cloven, D. H., & Roloff, M. E. (1993). The chilling effect of aggressive potential on the expression of complaints in intimate relationships. *Communication Monographs*, 60, 199-219. doi:10.1080/03637759309376309
- LePoire, B. A., Hallett, J. S., & Erlandson, K. (2000). An initial test of inconsistent nurturing as control theory: How partners of drug abusers assist their partners' sobriety. *Human Communication Research*, 26, 423-457. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2958.2000.tb00764.x

Discussion Leader: _____

Week 14 (11/25): Conflict and Deception

- Sillars, A. L. (2014). Interpersonal conflict. In C. R. Berger, M. E. Roloff, & D. R. Roskos-Ewoldsen (Eds.), *The handbook of communication science* (pp. 273-289). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Caughlin, J. P., & Huston, T. L. (2002). A contextual analysis of the association between demand/withdraw and marital satisfaction. *Personal Relationships*, 9, 95-119. doi:10.1111/1475-6811.00007
- Bevan, J. L. (2010). Serial argument goals and conflict strategies: A comparison between romantic partners and family members. *Communication Reports*, 23, 52-64. doi:10.1080/08934211003598734
- Burgoon, J. K., & Levine, T. R. (2010). Advances in deception detection. In S. W. Smith & S. R. Wilson (Eds.), *New directions in interpersonal communication research* (pp. 201-220). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Week 14 (Continued):

Dunbar, N. E., Gangi, K., Coveleski, S., Adams, A., Bernhold, Q., & Giles, H. (2016). When is it acceptable to lie? Interpersonal and intergroup perspectives on deception. *Communication Studies*, 67, 129-146. doi:10.1080/10510974.2016.1146911

Discussion Leader: _____

ASSIGNMENT DUE (11/25): bbF – Peer Feedback**Week 15 (12/2): Computer-Mediated Communication (CMC)**

Walther, J. B., & Lee, E.-J. (2014). Computer-mediated communication. In C. R. Berger (Ed.), *Handbook of interpersonal communication* (pp. 541-563). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Tom-Tong, S., & Walther, J. B. (2011). Just say “no thanks”: Romantic rejection in computer-mediated communication. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 28, 488-506. doi:10.1177/0265407510384895

Muise, A., Christofides, E., & Desmarais, S. (2009). More information than you ever wanted: Does Facebook bring out the green-eyed monster of jealousy? *Cyberpsychology & Behavior*, 12, 441-444. doi:10.1089/cpb.2008.0263

Toma, C. L., & Hancock, J. T. (2010). Looks and lies: The role of physical attractiveness in online dating self-presentation and deception. *Communication Research*, 37, 335-351. doi:10.1177/0093650209356437

Kanter, M., Afifi, T., & Robbins, S. (2012). The impact of parents “friending” their young adult child on Facebook on perceptions of parental privacy invasions and parent-child relationship quality. *Journal of Communication*, 62, 900-917. doi:10.1111/j.1460-2466.2012.01669.x

Discussion Leader: _____

ASSIGNMENT DUE (SUNDAY DECEMBER 8th on CANVAS by 11:59PM) – FINAL PAPER**Week 16 (12/9): Final Paper Presentations**

Have a nice break! I hope you enjoyed the course! ☺