

Communication Studies 510
Survey of Interpersonal Communication
Fall 2016

Meeting Days: Tuesday
Meeting Time: 11:10a – 1:55p
Meeting Place: CMST Seminar Room (293 COM)
Instructor: Michael R. Kotowski, Ph.D.
Email: mkotowsk@utk.edu

Description

The goal of this graduate seminar is to introduce the common concepts and principles that underlie interpersonal communication through discussion of relevant theory and research. This class will provide a greater awareness and understanding of the role communication plays in human interaction. Issues that will be discussed include defining interpersonal communication; cognitive, affective, and interaction processes (e.g., theory of mind, mood, uncertainty reduction theory, etc.); interpersonal communication contexts (e.g., romantic relationships, family relationships, mediated communication, etc.); message production and message processing (e.g., action assembly theory, communication competence, etc.); individual differences (e.g., argumentativeness, verbal aggressiveness, etc.); persuasion and compliance-gaining (e.g., bases of social power, etc.); deception (e.g., truth bias, etc.). Students will exit the seminar with an understanding of the current state of interpersonal communication theory and research.

Contact Information

Given the size of this class, I will likely learn most of your names over the course of the semester. Thus, I will refer to you by your first name and you may refer to me by mine. If you are uncomfortable with that level of informality, let me know and I will adapt accordingly.

Office: 293 COM

I am willing to meet at places other than my office. If you prefer to meet elsewhere, such as a coffee shop, the library, etc., it can be arranged.

Office Phone: (865) 974-0696

You can leave a message for me at the above number. I cannot, however, guarantee that I will be in the office everyday to check my messages. Consequently, if you leave a message for me it may be a day or two before it is retrieved.

Email: mkotowsk@utk.edu

I almost always check my email daily. Email is, therefore, the best way to contact me.

Office Hours: 8:30a – 9:30a Tuesday and 11:00a – 12:00p Thursday

If you cannot make these hours, you are welcome to make an appointment for another time. Contacting me by email is the best way of making one of these appointments.

Please do not see office hours exclusively as a time to address problems with the course. You can use them to clarify points you do not understand, to get additional reading material, to talk about the subject matter in relation to your other interests, to review work in progress, to offer feedback or input about the course, to talk about employment or research possibilities, or for other reasons. In other words, you do not need a crisis to make productive use of this time.

Texts

Required:

Allen, M., Preiss, R. W., Gayle, B. A., & Burrell, N. (2002). *Interpersonal Communication Research: Advances through meta-analysis*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Smith, S. W. & Wilson, S. R. (2010). *New Directions in Interpersonal Communication Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Recommended:

Knapp, M. L., & Daly, J. (2011). *Handbook of Interpersonal Communication*, (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Journals and Book Chapters:

Beatty, M. J., & Heisel, A. D. (2007). Spectrum analysis of cortical activity during verbal planning: Physical evidence for the formation of social interaction routines. *Human Communication Research*, 33, 48-63.

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, 99-192.

Canary, D. J., & Spitzberg, B. H. (1990). Attribution biases and associations between conflict strategies and competence outcomes. *Communication Monographs*, 57, 139-151.

Canary, D. J., Stafford, L., Hause, K. S., & Wallace, L. A. (1994). An inductive analysis of relational maintenance strategies: Comparisons among lovers, relatives, friends, and others. *Communication Research Reports*, 10, 5-14.

Cohen, D., Nisbett, R. E., Bowdle, B. F., & Schwarz, N. (1996). Insult, aggression, and the southern culture of honor: An "experimental ethnography." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70, 945-960.

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.

Eagly, A. H., & Carli, L. L. (1981). Sex of researchers and sex-typed communications as determinants of sex differences in influenceability: A meta-analysis of social influence studies. *Psychological Bulletin*, 90, 1-20.

Festinger, L. (1954). An analysis of compliant behavior. In M. Sherif & M. O. Wilson (Eds.), *Group relations at the crossroads* (pp. 232-256). New York, NY: Harper & Row.

- Fitness, J., & Fletcher, G. J. O. (1993). Love, hate, anger, and jealousy in close relationships: A prototype and cognitive appraisal analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 65*, 942-958.
- French, J. R. P., Jr., & Raven, B. (1960). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright & A. Zander (Eds.), *Group dynamics* (pp. 607-623). New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Gilbert, D. T. (1991). How mental systems believe. *American Psychologist, 46*, 107-119.
- Greene, J. O. (1984). A cognitive approach to human communication: An action assembly theory. *Communication Monographs, 51*, 289-305.
- Hamilton, M. A., Hunter, J. E., Boster, F. J. (1993). The elaboration likelihood model as a theory of attitude formation: A mathematical analysis. *Communication Theory, 3*, 50-65.
- Hunter, J. E., & Boster, F. J. (1989). A model of compliance-gaining message selection. *Communication Monographs, 54*, 63-84.
- Hunter, J. E., & Schmidt, F. L. (2004). *Methods of Meta-Analysis: Correcting error and bias in research findings* (2nd ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Johnson, M. P., & Leslie, L. (1982). Couple involvement and network structure: A test of the dyadic withdrawal hypothesis. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 45*, 34-43.
- Kilmann, R. H., & Thomas, K. W. (1977). Developing a forced-choice measure of conflict-handling behavior: The "MODE" instrument. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 37*, 309-325.
- Knapp, M., & Vangelisti, A. (1992). Human communication in developing relationships, chapters 1 & 2 (pp. 1-61). From *Interpersonal Communication and Human Relationships*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Kotowski, M. R., Levine, T. R., Baker, C. R., & Bolt, J. M. (2009). A Multi-Trait Multi-Method Validity Assessment of the Verbal Aggressiveness and Argumentativeness Instruments. *Communication Monographs, 76*, 443-462.
- Kruglanski, A. W., & Thompson, E. P. (1999). Persuasion by a single route: A view from the unimodel. *Psychological Inquiry, 10*, 83-109.
- Langer, E., Blank, A., & Chanowitz, B. (1978). The mindlessness of ostensibly thoughtful action: The role of "placebic" information in interpersonal interaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36*, 635-642.
- Levine, T. R., Park, H. S., & McCornack, S. A. (1999). Accuracy in detecting truths and lies: Documenting the 'veracity effect.' *Communication Monographs, 66*, 125-144.
- Madey, S. F., Simo, M., Dillworth, D., Kemper, D., Toczynski, A., & Perella, A. (1996). They do get more attractive at closing time, but only when you are not in a relationship. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 18*, 387-393.

- McCornack S. A., & Levine, T. R. (1990). When lies are uncovered: Emotional and relational outcomes of discovered deception. *Communication Monographs*, 57, 119-138.
- McGuire, W. J. (1968). Personality and attitude change: An information-processing theory. In A. C. Greenwald, T. C. Brock, & T. M. Ostrom (Eds.), *Psychological Foundations of Attitudes* (pp. 171-196). New York: Academic Press.
- Miller, G. R., & Steinberg, M. (1975). *Between People: A new analysis of interpersonal communication*. Chicago, IL: Science Research Associates.
- Petty, R. E., Wegener, D. T., Fabrigar, L. R., Priester, J. R., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1993). Conceptual and methodological issues in the elaboration likelihood model of persuasion: A reply to the Michigan State critics. *Communication Theory*, 3, 336-342.
- Planalp, S., & Honeycutt, J. M. (1985). Events that increase uncertainty in personal relationships. *Human communication Research*, 11, 593-604.
- Roloff, M. E., Soule, K. P., & Carey, C. M. (2001). Reasons for remaining in a relationship and responses to relational transgressions. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 18, 362- 385.
- Spitzberg, B. H. (1983). Communication competence as knowledge, skill, and impression. *Communication Education*, 32, 323-331.
- Stafford, L., & Canary, D. J. (1991). Maintenance strategies and romantic relationship type, gender and relational characteristics. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 8, 217-242.

Evaluation

The purpose of assigning grades in a course is to assess the extent to which the students in the course mastered the material covered. Therefore, I strive to create a valid and reliable method of evaluation. In the case of this course, the evaluation is based on the average of your performance across participation in class discussions, discussion facilitation, critical paper, and one research proposal.

It is anticipated that students choosing to turn their research proposals into completed papers will have the opportunity to submit the paper to a communication conference (SSCA) as part of an interpersonal research panel that will be organized by the instructor. This opportunity is recommended highly for the PhD students in the course and encouraged for the Master's students but does not factor into the course evaluation.

Class Discussion:

Students are expected to 1) read the assigned articles before class, 2) come to each class prepared to discuss the reading assignments, and 3) actively participate in the class (e.g., respond to questions and comments posed by others, ask questions about the readings). Participating in class does not just mean talking. Good class participation involves coming to class with questions about the readings to share with the class, volunteering answers to questions that are insightful and provide contrasts and integration, actively listening to others' contributions to discussion, and moving the discussion along toward a shared understanding. Comments about personal experiences can be helpful in discussion as long as a connection is

made between the experience and the assigned readings. Class participation will be evaluated on a 60 point metric.

Discussion Facilitation and Critical Paper:

Two students will facilitate each class discussion for 30 minutes each class by preparing discussion questions for the class, clarifying and critiquing the assigned readings for other students, and developing optional in-class exercises, handouts, summary sheets, etc. Facilitators should try to integrate the class' readings with other readings from the course. Facilitators may meet with me to receive assistance with and feedback on their facilitation plans. Each student is expected to facilitate once during the course. Facilitation will be evaluated on a 20 point metric.

Each class' facilitators will be required to write a critical paper. Each paper should be a short (three to four APA pages) critique, analysis, and/or integration of the readings for a particular class period. The paper should not be mere summaries of the readings. Rather, the paper should reflect critically on the specified readings, integrating them with each other and past readings from the course. The critical paper should comment on the importance of the research and what it implies about interpersonal communication. The critical paper will be evaluated on a 20 point metric.

Research Proposal:

You can work individually or in groups of up to two students on this project. Each individual or team will be responsible for carrying out a research proposal including the establishment of a need for the research, the specification of a relevant theory or theories, a background section, research questions and/or hypotheses. A method section describing how you would answer the research question or test the hypothesis is also required. The ultimate goal of this assignment is that you gain practical experience with applying interpersonal communication literature to an area of interest to you. The research proposal will be evaluated on a 100 point metric. More complete instructions will be emailed to you.

At the end of the term, earned points for class discussion, the discussion facilitation, the critical paper, and the research proposal will be summed. This sum will be divided by the number of points that could have been earned in the course (60 class discussion points plus 20 discussion facilitation points plus 20 critical paper points plus 100 research proposal points). This number, the proportion of points earned, is multiplied by 100 to transform it into a percentage. Effort will be considered in the event your final course grade is within one percent of the next higher grade.

Grading Scale

Grade	Percentage
A	90%-100%
B+	85%-89%
B	80%-84%
C+	75%-79%
C	70%-74%
Failure	0%-69%

Policy

Attendance is optional. I do not take roll. I shall, however, pass on the benefit of my experience. There is a substantial positive correlation between attendance and course performance.

Generally, I do **not** accept late work or give incompletes. I realize that in **rare cases** they are necessary. If circumstances should arise that cause you to submit a paper late or need an incomplete, then it is your responsibility to contact me and make the request. In the absence of a request you will receive a zero on the paper and (or) receive a grade in lieu of the incomplete.

If caught engaging in academic dishonesty in this course you will receive a zero in the course.

Lest there be misunderstanding, the University of Tennessee policy on academic dishonesty is reproduced in subsequent paragraphs from Hilltopics.

An essential feature of The University of Tennessee is a commitment to maintaining an atmosphere of intellectual integrity and academic honesty. As a student of the University, I pledge that I will neither knowingly give nor receive any inappropriate assistance in academic work, thus affirming my own personal commitment to honor and integrity.

Students are also responsible for any act of plagiarism. Plagiarism is using the intellectual property or product of someone else without giving proper credit. The undocumented use of someone else's words or ideas in any medium of communication (unless such information is recognized as common knowledge) is a serious offense, subject to disciplinary action that may include failure in a course and/or dismissal from the University. Specific examples of plagiarism are:

1. Copying without proper documentation (quotation marks and a citation) written or spoken words, phrases, or sentences from any source;
2. Summarizing without proper documentation (usually a citation) ideas from another source (unless such information is recognized as common knowledge);
3. Borrowing facts, statistics, graphs, pictorial representations, or phrases without acknowledging the source (unless such information is recognized as common knowledge);
4. Collaborating on a graded assignment without the instructor's approval;
5. Submitting work, either in whole or in part, created by a professional service and used without attribution (e.g., paper, speech, bibliography, or photograph).

Faculty members also have responsibilities which are vital to the success of the Honor Statement and the creation of a climate of academic integrity within the University community. Each faculty member is responsible for defining, in specific terms, guidelines for preserving academic integrity in a course. Included in this definition should be a discussion of the Honor Statement.

Student classroom conduct, including academic dishonesty, is the immediate responsibility of the instructor. He/she has full authority to suspend a student from his/her class, to assign an "F" in an exercise or examination, or to assign an "F" in the course. In addition to or prior to establishing a penalty, the instructor may refer the case to an Academic Review Board by notifying the administrative head of his/her academic unit and the Office of the Dean of Students, which shall prepare and present the case to the appropriate Academic Review Board.

For more detail than what is possible here please refer back to Hilltopics.

Important Dates

Research Proposal Work Session 11th October
 Research Proposal Due 5th December

Schedule**Week 1**

23rd August *Topic:* Introductions
Readings: Syllabus

Week 2

30th August *Topic:* Meta-Analysis
Readings: Allen – Interpersonal Communication Research Ch 1
 Hunter – Methods of Meta-Analysis Ch 1 (PDF)

Week 3

6th September *Topic:* Defining IPC
 Allen – Interpersonal Communication Research Ch 20
 Miller – Between People Ch 1 (PDF)
 Eagly – Social Influence Sex Effects (PDF)

Week 4

13th September *Topic:* Overview of IPC Research I
Readings: Allen – Interpersonal Communication Research Ch 2
 Allen – Interpersonal Communication Research Ch 7
 Smith – IPC Research Ch 1
 Smith – IPC Research Ch 2
 Smith – IPC Research Ch 5

Week 5

20th September *Topic:* Overview of IPC Research II
Readings: Knapp – Handbook of IPC Ch 1 (PDF)
 Berger – Uncertainty Reduction Theory (PDF)

Week 6

27th September *Topic:* Message Production
Readings: Allen – Interpersonal Communication Research Ch 6
 Spitzberg – Communication Competence (PDF)
 Knapp – Handbook of IPC Ch 15 (PDF)
 Greene – Action Assembly Theory (PDF)
 Beatty – Cortical Activity During Verbal Planning (PDF)

Week 7

4th October *Topic:* Message Processing
Readings: McGuire – Information Processing Theory (PDF)
 Hamilton – Specifying the ELM (PDF)
 Petty – Specifying the ELM: A reply (PDF)
 Kruglanski – Unimodel (PDF)

Week 8 11 th October	Research Proposal Work Session
Week 9 18 th October	<p><i>Topic:</i> Interpersonal Influence I</p> <p><i>Readings:</i> Allen – Interpersonal Communication Research Ch 11 Allen – Interpersonal Communication Research Ch 9 Dillard – Primary and Secondary Goals (PDF) Hunter - Compliance-Gaining Message Selection (PDF)</p>
Week 10 25 th October	<p><i>Topic:</i> Interpersonal Influence II</p> <p><i>Readings:</i> Festinger – An Analysis of Compliant Behavior (PDF) French – Bases of Social Power (PDF) Gilbert – Mental Systems (PDF) Langer – Mindlessness (PDF)</p>
Week 11 1 st November	<p><i>Topic:</i> Individual Differences</p> <p><i>Readings:</i> Allen – Interpersonal Communication Research Ch 3 Allen – Interpersonal Communication Research Ch 5 Allen – Interpersonal Communication Research Ch 16 Kotowski – Verbal Aggressiveness (PDF) Cohen – Culture of Honor (PDF)</p>
Week 12 8 th November	<p><i>Topic:</i> Developing Relationships</p> <p><i>Readings:</i> Allen – Interpersonal Communication Research Ch 10 Smith IPC Research Ch 4 Knapp – Coming Together (PDF) Planalp – Events that increase uncertainty (PDF) Madey – Closing Time (PDF)</p>
Week 13 15 th November	<p><i>Topic:</i> Maintaining Relationships</p> <p><i>Readings:</i> Allen – Interpersonal Communication Research Ch 12 Smith – IPC Research Ch 6 Smith – IPC Research Ch 8 Stafford – Maintenance Strategies (PDF) Canary – Relational Maintenance Strategies (PDF) Johnson – Network Structure (PDF)</p>
Week 14 22 nd November	<p><i>Topic:</i> Interpersonal Conflict</p> <p><i>Readings:</i> Allen – Interpersonal Communication Research Ch 18 Smith – IPC Research Ch 9 Knapp – Handbook of IPC Ch 1 (PDF) Kilmann – Conflict Mode (PDF) Canary – Conflict Strategies (PDF)</p>

Week 15
29th November

Topic: Dark Side
Readings: Smith – IPC Research Ch 10
Smith – IPC Research Ch 11
Fitness – Love, Hate, Anger (PDF)
Roloff – Relational Transgression (PDF)
McCornack – Discovered Deception (PDF)
Levine – Veracity Effect (PDF)

Final Exam
5th December
10:15a

Research Proposals Due