

Syllabus: COM 504
Theories and Models in Communication
Fall 2007

Instructor: Steve Corman
Office: 325b Stauffer Hall
Phone: 965-3830
E-mail: steve.corman@asu.edu (preferred comm method)
Office hours: TBA

Course Description:

This course is designed to introduce students to the basics of communication theory construction, metatheoretical concerns, models, construct definition, and comparative analysis of current theories in communication.

Texts and Readings:

- Text: Abbott, A. (2006). *Methods of Discovery*. New York: WW. Norton.
- Other weekly readings as assigned, available from ASU online journals.

Assignments

- *Exams (200 pts)*: We will have a take home midterm, and an in-class final exam. they will focus on integration and application of the material we cover in class. For the in-class exam I will endeavor to make the questions as much like comps questions as possible. The final will take place at the time scheduled for the course final in the ASU Bulletin.
- *Discussion Board Posts (100 pts)*: This course will include Blackboard discussion board posts as a major portion of the assigned writing. Over the course of the semester you are responsible for posting:
 - 1 review of a research area in communication, to be assigned. (29 pts)
 - At least 2 posts, one before and one after the midterm, on some other topic of your choice relevant to the course, including citations. (29 pts each)
 - At least one comment per week (except first week) on someone else's post (13 of these total for 13 pts).
- *Exercises. (50 pts)*. These points cover 5 exercise assignments that are made periodically through the course of class.
- *Participation. (50 pts)*. These points cover attending class, being prepared for discussion, and participating.

Evaluation

Evaluation of all assignments is as follows: The presumptive grade is "B" (85% of the points) which indicates that you perfectly met the expectations of the assignment and performed consistent with the expectations for someone who has mastered the material. Work that exceeds expectations in some significant way earns a grade of "A," and work that falls short of expectations earns a "C."

Your final grade will be based on a percentage of the possible points, using the following scale

Grade	% of possible
A+	100 - 99
A	98.9 - 92
A-	91.9 - 90
B+	89.9 - 88
B	87.9 - 82
B-	81.9 - 80
C+	79.9 - 78
C	77.9 - 70
D	69.9 - 60
E	59.9 - 50

Policies

Attendance: Attendance at all classes is mandatory. While arrangements can be made for true emergencies, it is considered *unusual* for graduate students to miss *any* classes.

Academic Integrity: By taking this class you agree to abide by the academic integrity policies of the Hugh Downs School of Human Communication and the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, particularly those dealing with plagiarism.

Incompletes: I do not give incomplete grades except in case of bona fide catastrophes. Incompletes must be arranged before substantial work is missed.

Calendar

Week	Date	Topic	Readings	Due
1	8/20	Welcome, Survey, and Resources; what counts as theory		
2	8/27	Overview of communication theory	<p>Miller, K. I. (2002) <i>Communication theories</i>, Ch. 2. Boston: McGraw-Hill</p> <p>Delia, J. (1987). Communication research: A history. In C. R. Berger & S. H. Chaffee (Eds.), <i>Handbook of communication science</i> (pp. 20-90). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.</p> <p>Craig, R. T. (1993). Why Are There So Many Communication Theories? <i>Journal of Communication</i>, 43(3), 26-.</p> <p>Pavitt, A. C. (1999) The third way: Scientific realism and communication theory. <i>Communication Theory</i>, 9(2), 162-</p>	Assignment 1: Last six issues journals.
3	9/10	Theoretical discourse and argumentation	<p>Weick, K. (1989). Theory construction as disciplined imagination. <i>Academy of Management Review</i>, 14,516-531.</p> <p>van Emmeren, F., Grootendorst, R., and Henkemans, F. S. (2002). <i>Argumentation</i>. Mahwah, N. J.: Lawrence Erlbaum. Chapter 6.</p> <p>Shelly, C. (2004). Analogy counterarguments: A taxonomy for critical thinking. <i>Argumentation</i>, 18, 223-238.</p> <p>Egan, R. D., and Papson, S. D. (2005). "You either get it or you don't:" Conversion experiences and The Dr. Phil Show. <i>Journal of Religion and Popular Culture</i>. Available online: http://www.usask.ca/relst/jrpc/articles10.html</p>	
4	9/17	Explanation, Communication, Theory, and Research	<p>Abbott 1</p> <p>C. Powers, J. H. (1995). On the intellectual structure of the human communication discipline. <i>Communication Education</i>, 44, 191-222.</p> <p>Turner, J. (1986). The nature of sociological theorizing," Ch. 2 in <i>The Structure of Sociological Theory</i>, 4th Ed.,</p>	Assignment2: Counterargument to Egan and Papson

			1986, Chicago: Dorsey Press, 1-33. Glaser, B. G., "Theoretical coding," pp. 55-82 in his <i>Theoretical Sensitivity</i> , 1978, Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.	
5	9/24	Basic Debates, Methodological Practices, and Cycles of Critique	Abbott 2 Corman, S. R. (2000). The need for common ground. In S.R. Corman & M. S. Poole (Eds.) <i>Perspectives on Organizational Communication: Finding Common Ground</i> (pp. 1-15). New York: Guilford Publications. Brummett, B. (1984). Rhetorical theory as heuristic and moral: A pedagogical justification. <i>Communication Education</i> , 33, 97-108. Phillips, D. C. (2000). Values and Social Inquiry. Chapter 13 of <i>The Expanded Social Scientist's Bestiary</i> . New York: Rowman and Littlefield.	
6	10/1	Basic Heuristics	Abbott 3 Berger, C. R. & Calabrese, R. J. (1975). Some explanations in initial interaction and beyond: Toward a developmental theory of interpersonal communication and beyond. <i>Human Communication Research</i> , 1, 99-112. Wiseman, R. L., & Schenck-Hamlin, W. S. (1981). A multidimensional scaling validation of an inductively-derived set of compliance-gaining strategies. <i>Communication Monographs</i> , 48, 251-270. Kontopolous, K. M. (1993) <i>The logics of social structure</i> . Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (Appendix)	
7	10/8	Search and Argument Heuristics	Abbott 4 Bearman, P. S. and Stovel, K. (2000). Becoming a Nazi: A model for narrative networks. <i>Poetics</i> , 27, 69-90. Hewes, D. E. (1986). A socio-egocentric model of group decision-making. In R. Y. Hirokawa & M. S. Poole (Eds.),	Assignment 3 Post theory examples

			<p><i>Communication and group decision-making</i> (pp. 265-291). Beverly Hills, Ca: Sage.</p> <p>Planalp, S. & Honeycutt, J. (1985). Events that increase uncertainty in interpersonal relationships. <i>Human Communication Research, 11(4)</i>, 593-604.</p> <p>Canary, D. J. & Hause, K. S. (1993). Is there any reason to research sex differences in communication? <i>Communication Quarterly, 41(2)</i>, 129-144.</p> <p>Sunnafrank, M. Predicted outcome value during initial interactions: A reformulation of uncertainty reduction theory. <i>Human Communication Research, 13(1)</i>, 3-32.</p> <p>Bochner, A. P., & Ellis, C. (1992). Personal narrative as a social approach to interpersonal communication. <i>Communication Theory, 2</i>, 165-172.</p> <p>Medhurst, M. J. (1994). Reconceptualizing historical history: Eisenhower's farewell address. <i>Quarterly Journal of Speech, 80</i>, 193-218.</p>	
8	10/15	Description, Narration, & Fractal Heuristics	<p>Abbott 5,6</p> <p>Lammers, J. C., & Krikorian, D. H. (1997). Theoretical extension and operationalization of the bona fide group construct with an application to surgical teams. <i>Journal of Applied Communication Research, 25</i>, 17-38.</p> <p>Greene, S. M. & Anderson, E. R. (1999). Observed negativity in large family systems: Incidents and reactions. <i>Journal of Family Psychology, 13(3)</i>, 372-392.</p> <p>Braithwaite, D. O., & Baxter, L. A. (1995). 'I do' again: The relational dialectics of renewing marriage vows. <i>Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 12(2)</i>, 177-198.</p> <p>Trethewey, A., and Corman, S. R. (2001). Anticipating K-Commerce: E-Commerce, knowledge management, and organizational communication. <i>Management Communication Quarterly,</i></p>	

			<p>14(4), 619-628.</p> <p>Fulk, J., Steinfeld, C. W. , Schmitz, J., & Power, J. G. (1987). A social information processing model of media use in organizations. <i>Communication Research, 14(5)</i>, 529-552.</p> <p>McPhee, R. D., & Corman, S. R. (1995) An activity-based theory of communication networks in organizations, applied to the case of the local church. <i>Communication Monographs, 62</i>, 132-151.</p>	
9	10/22	Puzzles; Ethnography and Grounded Theory approach	<p>Abbott 7</p> <p>Lindoff (1995). Sources of the interpretive paradigm. Chapter 2 of <i>Qualitative communication research methods</i>. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.</p> <p>Trujillo, N. & Krizek, R. (1994). Emotionality in the stands and in the field: Expressing self through baseball. <i>Journal of Sports and Social Issues</i>.</p> <p>Carbaugh, D., & Hastings, S. O. (1992). A role for communication theory in ethnography and cultural analysis. <i>Communication Theory, 2</i>, 156-165.</p> <p>Murphy, A. M. (2003) The dialectical gaze: Exploring the subject-object tension in the performances of women who strip. <i>Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 32(3)</i>, 305-335.</p>	Midterm due
10	10/29	Modeling and Simulation approach	<p>Dooley, K. J. (2004). Complexity science models of organizational change. In M. S. Poole and A. Van De Ven (Eds.), <i>Handbook of Organizational Change and Development</i> (pp. 354-373). London: Oxford University Press.</p> <p>Corman, S. R. and Kuhn, T. (2005). Detectability of socio-egocentric group speech: A quasi-Turing test. <i>Communication Monographs, 72(2)</i>, 117-143.</p> <p>Matei, S. A. & Ball-Rokeach, S. (2005). Watts, the 1965 Los Angeles riots, and the communicative construction of the fear epicenter of Los Angeles. <i>Communication Monographs, 72(3)</i>, 301-323.</p> <p>Spatial dynamics simulations: http://faculty.ucr.edu/~hanneman/spatial/s</p>	Assignment 4 Propose a theoretical innovation that applies one of Abbott's heuristics

			chelling/schelling.html	
11	11/5	Narrative & Text Approach	<p>Bruner, J. The narrative construction of reality. <i>Critical Inquiry</i>, Autumn91, Vol. 18 Issue 1, p1, 21p</p> <p>Fisher, W. R. (1984). Narration as a human communication paradigm,” <i>Communication Monographs</i> 51:1-22.</p> <p>P. Abell, Narrative Explanation: An Alternative to Variable-Centered Explanation? <i>Annual Review of Sociology</i>, Vol. 30: 287-310.</p> <p>Phillips, D. C. (2000). Narrative Research: Telling Stories about Stories. Chapter 4 of <i>The Expanded Social Scientist’s Bestiary</i>. New York: Rowman and Littlefield.</p>	
12	11/19	Conversation and Behavior Approach	<p>Duck, S. (2002). Hypertext in the key of G: Three types of “history” as influences on conversational structure and flow. <i>Communication Theory</i>, 12(1), 41-62.</p> <p>Searle, J. (1996). What is a speech act? In P. Cobley (Ed.), <i>The communication theory reader</i>, (pp. 263-281). New York: Routledge.</p> <p>D. Floyd, K., & Haynes, M. T. (2005). Applications of the theory of natural selection to the study of family communication. <i>Journal of Family Communication</i>, 5, 79-101.</p> <p>The Great Communibiology Debate!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Nelson, C. K. (2004). Classifying communibiology’s texts: Implications for genre theory. <i>Communication Theory</i>, 14(2), 142-166. ○ Commentaries from 2005, <i>Communication Theory</i>, 15(1), by Beatty, Babrow, McCrosky, & Nelson 	
13	11/29	Critical & cultural Approach	<p>Hall, B.J. (1992). Theories of Culture and Communication. <i>Communication theory</i> : 2(1), 50-</p> <p>McKerrow, R. E. (1989). <i>Critical rhetoric: Theory and praxis</i>.</p>	

			<p><u>Communication Monographs</u>, 56, 91-111.</p> <p>Agger, B., "Critical Theory, Poststructuralism, Postmodernism: Their Sociological Relevance." <u>Ann Rev Soc</u> 1991, 17:105-131.</p> <p>Tracy, S. J., & Trethewey, A. (2005). Fracturing the real-self←→fake-self dichotomy: Moving toward crystallized organizational identities. <u>Communication Theory</u>, 15, 168-195.</p> <p>Hammersley, M. (1995). A critique of critical research. Chapter 2 of <i>The politics of Social Research</i>. London: Sage.</p>	
14	12/3	Causal Approach	<p>Chaffee, S. H., & Berger, C. R. (1987). What communication scientists do. In C. R. Berger & S. H. Chaffee (Eds.), <u>Handbook of communication science</u> (pp. 91-122). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.</p> <p>Threats to Experimental Validities ala Cook & Campbell, 1979</p> <p>Burgoon, J., Dillman, L., & Stern L. A. (1993). Adaptation in dyadic interaction: Defining and operationalizing patterns of reciprocity and compensation. <u>Communication Theory</u>, 4, 293-316.</p> <p>Benoit, W. L., Hansen, G. J., and Verser, R. M.(2003) A meta-analysis of the effects of viewing U.S. presidential debates. <u>Communication Monographs</u> 70(4), 335-350.</p>	Assignment 5 Propose a combination of two of our approaches to deal with some human communication problem.
	TBA	Final Exam		