COM 604: Theory Construction in Communication
Wednesday 3-5:45 PM – Fall Semester 2015
The Hugh Downs School of Human Communication
Arizona State University - Tempe

Teaching Team Information:

Professors:	Dr. Sarah J. Tracy, Ph.D.	Dr. Daniel Brouwer, Ph.D.	Dr. Bradley Adame, Ph.D.
Office:	STA 424	STA 428	STA 466
Office Hours:	Tu: 3:15-4:15pm W: 1:25-2:25pm & by appointment	Tu: 1:00-2:30pm Th: 1:00-2:30pm & by appointment	M: 1:00-3:00pm & by appointment
Email:	Sarah.Tracy@asu.edu	brouwer@asu.edu	badame@asu.edu
Phone	480.965.7709	480.965.5976	480.727.6563

Course Assistant: Versha J. Anderson   Versha.Anderson@asu.edu
Office: Stauffer A345   Office Hours: Tu/Th 4:30-5:30pm

Course Description:
This course reviews and analyzes philosophical issues inherent in communication research and addresses metatheoretical frameworks for illuminating communication phenomena. The notion of theory *construction* suggests that this class will go beyond cataloguing myriad theories of communication and will also examine the nature of crafting theory. In addition to addressing the fundamental question of what is theory, we will interrogate how to best evaluate theories, and examine how theories differ—ontologically, epistemologically, axiologically, and methodologically—across the discipline of Communication Studies, particularly within the School of Human Communication at Arizona State University. More, we will ask: In what ways are enduring and newly salient social problems *communication* problems? How can communication theories and efforts to theorize communication help to conceptualize, diagnose, understand, ameliorate, and/or solve these social problems? And, where do we find ourselves personally in the journey of using, understanding, and constructing communication theory?

Required Books:
Bochner, A. P. (2014). *Coming to narrative: A personal history of paradigm change in the human sciences*. Walnut Creek: CA: Left Coast Press.
Miller, K. (2005). *Communication theories: Perspectives, processes, and contexts* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
Shoemaker, P. J., Tankard Jr., J. W., & Lasorsa, D. L. (2004). *How to build social science theories*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Decorum:
While we will constitute our own norms of decorum throughout the semester, we believe that we should agree to some basic rules of decorum in the conduct of our class.

Attendance:
To honor our scholarly interdependence as participants in a graduate seminar, please commit to diligent, perfect attendance. We would appreciate notification of a necessary absence involving a serious illness or other extenuating circumstances.

Differences in scholarly positions and conscientious participation:
Throughout the semester, we will be discussing various positions one can take about scholarship and communication theory. We will compare and contrast theories and perspectives; however, this course is not about which perspective is "best." Rather, our goal is to introduce students to the various perspectives that typify the Communication discipline and encourage lively and civil discussion about these perspectives—both their advantages and disadvantages. Throughout the semester, we encourage a commitment to authentic listening, conscientious turn-taking, and mindfulness of the ways in which we offer, contemplate, and accept, revise, or reject ideas during our class discussions.

Academic honesty:
Here is the official version: The College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and the School of Human Communication strongly believe in academic integrity; thus, instructors in the College and School do not tolerate cheating and plagiarism. In the Student Academic Integrity Policy, ASU defines plagiarism (as) "using another's words, ideas, materials or work without properly acknowledging and documenting the source." Students are responsible for knowing the rules governing the use of another's work or materials and for acknowledging and documenting the source appropriately. If a student is charged with academic dishonesty and found to be in violation, disciplinary action will be taken, and a student's name will be kept of file. Disciplinary action may result in the student being suspended or expelled from the college, given an XE on his or her transcript, and/or referred to Student Judicial Affairs.

For further information, please read the Student Academic Integrity policy at: http://provost.asu.edu/files/AcademicIntegrityPolicyPDF.pdf. Here is where this policy might apply especially to a graduate seminar: With regard to graduate students, the most salient concern about academic honesty involves "double-dipping," or turning in the same or very similar work for credit in different courses. We support your efforts to extend previous work that you have conducted on materials pertaining to this course; however, please notify us if you choose to extend previous work, and please indicate how you intend to craft a unique project for this course.

Assignments:

> *1.0   Course Participation / Discussion Boards -* **100 pts***:*
>
> *1.1   Course Participation -* **50 pts***:*
> As in most graduate seminars, it is our hope that engaged and lively discussion by all members of the collective will be the engine that drives our seminar. Thus, the primary form of your participation should be engaged and lively discussion. Students should complete assigned readings, read other students' discussion board posts, and make notes about all these 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, and providing support to class members (fostering collective focus on the course material). Notes about participation will be recorded for each student after every course session.
>
> Recognizing the fact of multiple learning styles, we also note the following as supplementary forms of participation: listening alertly and taking notes during the seminar, focused attention for the full class period, online contributions such as posted responses to discussion questions or other issues related to readings and course topics on Blackboard, and course-related but non-assignment-related office visits.
>
> *1.2   Discussion Board Posts -* **50 pts** *(10 @ 5 points). Posts are due the Monday before class at 11:59pm.*
>
> The purposes of this assignment are twofold: first, to jump-start your critical examination of the week's readings thus providing a foundation for the week's in-class discussion; second, to facilitate the practice of expressing complex ideas in a limited space.
>
> The Blackboard discussion portals are structured so that you must create your post before you are able to read your peers' responses. We do this to facilitate and encourage your originality and freedom in crafting a post that reflects your thoughts, instincts, and impressions related to the week's materials, while minimizing any potential priming effects. We strongly encourage you to read through your peers' responses and reference your and others' post during class.
>
> For each unit Weeks 2 through 14, you will respond to *one* question or statement crafted by the teaching team. You will then post *one thought provoking* discussion question/statement of your own, and craft a response to your *own* question/statement. Your question may be an actual question you have about the readings, in which case, you should give your best attempt at a response, or a question you have for the rest of the class, in which case you should offer your answer. You may also craft a position statement indicative of the week's theme,

and then respond to the statement. You should creatively present original ideas and provide external examples. ***Simply reiterating the content from the readings will earn no points – you must contribute something new that is grounded within the reading content***.

You will be responsible for 10 of the 11 boards. Your total post for each week should be at least 750 words and no more than 1000 words – you are free to decide how to distribute this allotment. Please note the word count at the close of your post (e.g., 932 words). Be sure, though, to provide adequate responses to each post. You should also proofread your posts for grammar and spelling.

2.0   *Uses, functions, and consequences of theory and paradigms in one scholar's trajectory. – Supervising Instructor: Sarah J. Tracy – Due Friday, Oct. 2, by 5pm.* **100 pts.**

This project asks you to examine one scholar's research trajectory, and explicate the uses, functions, and consequences of theory and paradigmatic lenses in their work. Choose a communication scholar in the Graduate Faculty of Communication - http://humancommunication.clas.asu.edu/content/graduate-faculty. To engage this paper, read at least five of this scholar's most influential publications and meet with the scholar to discuss his or her ideas and viewpoints. Based on your analysis, in the paper, discuss how theory and paradigmatic allegiances are used in this scholar's work, their functions, and their consequences. How has this transformed throughout their career? What does the scholar have to say about theory, and how does their unpublished discussion with you about these topics overlap with or contrast with their written published work? Create an argument for the way theory functions (or doesn't function) in this scholar's work—and its intended, and potentially unintended, consequences. What can you and others learn from this scholar's approach to and use of theory? As part of your paper, summarize and respond to at least two objections to and two applaudable points to this scholar's use of theory. In your paper, be sure to make use of at least five readings from our first three weeks of class (August 26 through September 9). This paper should be about 10 pages, not including cover page, abstract, endnotes, and references.

3.0   *Theorize a communication issue/phenomenon/variable from two perspectives. – Supervising Instructor: Dan Brouwer – Due Friday, Oct. 23, by 5pm.* **100 pts.**

This paper calls upon you to select one meso- or micro-level topic of communication inquiry (e.g., identity, agency, voice, body, relationships, audience, affection, health disparities, etc.) and discuss how it would be defined, conceptualized, and studied by two of the theoretical traditions we have addressed this semester. Both the choice of topic and the choice of which two theoretical traditions to feature are up to you. In your discussion, be sure to attend to the ontological, epistemological, praxeological, axiological, and methodological assumptions that undergird the theoretical traditions you are featuring.

Additionally, you should articulate both the advantages and the limitations of your featured traditions in relation to the topic you have chosen: What can each tradition distinctly or uniquely illuminate about the topic, and what is each tradition unable or less able to illuminate about the topic? This paper should make appropriate use of class readings and should be constituted by about 10 pages, not including cover page, abstract, endnotes, and references.

4.0   *Self-Reflection Paper. – Supervising Instructor: Bradley J. Adame – Due Friday, Dec. 4, by 5pm.* **100 pts.**

"Twenty years earlier, I had been drawn to communication studies because I thought it could help answer deep and troubling questions about how to live a meaningful, useful, and ethical life. ...[W]hen I began listening more closely, students were still coming with many of the same searching questions." ~ Bochner (p. 292)

In this final paper, offer your description, explanation, and narration of where you fit in the discipline of Communication Studies from topical, methodological, and theoretical/metatheoretical perspectives. Where are you located in the field of Communication Studies? How has this changed or flowed over the course of the semester? What is your central question, or problem you would like to solve? What goals do you have for your research and your career? Which theoretical base(s), and methodological approach(es) do you anticipate using? Be sure to use and cite relevant readings from the course.

Include a title that accurately and succinctly represents your domain and your orientation. This paper should be about 10 pages, not including cover page, abstract, endnotes, and references.

Be prepared to give a 5-7 minute oral presentation and bring copies of the written text to be distributed. Individual presentations are scheduled for the final exam period.

Grading:

Generally in this seminar, "excellent" work earns "A"-range grades, "good" work earns "B"-range grades, and unsatisfactory work earns "C"-range grades or lower. More specifically, we employ the following grading scale:

A+ = 99-100% (396-400 pts)	B- = 80-82% (320-331.5 pts)
A = 93-98% (372-395.5 pts)	C+ = 77-79% (308-319.5 pts)
A- = 90-92% (360-371.5 pts)	C = 70-76% (280-307.5 pts)
B+ = 87-89% (348-359.5 pts)	D = 60-69% (240-279.5 pts)
B = 83-86% (332-347.5 pts)	E = 0-59% (0-239.5 pts)

Course Schedule (changes may be made via course announcement):

Week	Date	Topic	Assignment Due (see schedule below for readings due)
1	8/26/15	Foundations One: Introductions and Philosophies	
2	9/2/15	Foundations Two: Frameworks of Communication	First discussion board entries 8/31/15 by 11:59pm (and Mondays thereafter)
3	9/9/15	Foundations Three: Perspectives on Communication	
4	9/16/15	Rhetorical Theories—Classical through Modern Variations on Enduring Themes	
5	9/23/15	Rhetorical Theories—Postmodern, Poststructural, and Critical/Cultural Variations on Enduring Themes	
6	9/30/15	Theory Construction of "the Public Sphere"—A "Case Study"	Scholarly trajectory/theory use paper 10/2/15 by 5pm
7	10/7/15	Interpretive, Indigenous, and Sociocultural Approaches	
8	10/14/15	A Sampling from Phenomenology, Critical, and Post-structuralism Approaches	
9	10/21/15	A Tour of Organizational Communication Theory and Case Study of Theory Building	Theorizing from two perspectives 10/23/15 by 5pm
10	10/28/15	The Social Scientific Approach to Communication	
11	11/4/15	Theory Building in Persuasion and Social Influence	
12	11/11/15	Veteran's Day - No Class	
13	11/18/15	NCA Annual Convention – No Class	

14	11/25/15	Theory Building and Debate in Interpersonal Communication: Deception	Final discussion board opportunity
15	12/2/15	Creating Interesting Scholarship That Matters & Where Do We Go From Here?	Self-Reflection Paper 12/4/15 by 5pm
16	Final 12/9/15	Student Self-Reflection Presentations	Presentations

Reading List

1 - Foundations One: Introductions and Philosophies

Bochner, A. P. (2014). *Coming to narrative: A personal history of paradigm change in the human sciences*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press. Pages 1-100.

Anderson, J. A., & Baym, G. (2004). Philosophies and philosophic issues in communication, 1995–2004. *Journal of Communication, 54,* 589-615. doi: 10.1111/j.1460-2466.2004.tb02647.x

Miller, K. (2005). *Communication theories: Perspectives, processes, and contexts* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill. Chapters 1 and 2 (pages 2-34).

2 - Foundations Two: Frameworks of Communication

Bochner, *Coming to narrative,* pages 128-158; 171-180; 191-205; 242-245; and 251-317.

Craig, R. T. (1999). Communication theory as a field. *Communication Theory, 9,* 119-161.

Powers, J. H. (1995). On the intellectual structure of the human communication discipline. *Communication Education, 44,* 191-222.

3 - Foundations Three: Perspectives on Communication

Miller, *Communication theories,* "Post-Positivist Perspectives on Theory Development," 35-50.

Miller, C. H., Adame, B. J., & Moore, S. D. (2013). Vested interest theory and disaster preparedness. *Disasters, 37*(1), 1-27. doi:10.1111/j.1467-7717.2012.01290.x

Miller, *Communication theories,* "Interpretive Perspectives on Theory Development," 51-65.

Tracy, S. J. (2010). Qualitative quality: Eight "big-tent" criteria for excellent qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry, 16*, 837-851. AND 2-page paradigm grid (excerpted from Tracy, S. J. (2013). *Qualitative research methods: Collecting evidence, crafting analysis, communicating impact.* Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.

Miller, *Communication theories,* "Critical Perspectives on Theory Development," 66-82.

Brouwer, D. C., & Paulesc, M.-L. (in press). Counterpublic theory goes global: A chronicle of a concept's emergences and mobilities (pp. 1-30). In C. R. Foust, A. Pason, & K. Z. Rogness (Eds.), *Social movements and counterpublics: Connections, contradictions, and possibilities for understanding rhetorics of social change*. Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press.

4 - Rhetorical Theories—Classical through Modern Variations on Enduring Themes

Lucaites, J. L., & Condit, C. M. (1999). Introduction. In J. L. Lucaites, C. M. Condit, & S. Caudill (Eds.), *Contemporary rhetorical theory: A reader* (pp. 1-18). New York: The Guilford Press.

Brummett, B. (1984). Rhetorical theory as heuristic and moral: A pedagogical justification. *Communication Education, 33,* 97-107.

Hill, F. (1972). Conventional wisdom—traditional form—The president's message of November 3, 1969. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 58,* 373-386.

Campbell, K. K. (1972). "Conventional wisdom—traditional form": A rejoinder. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 58,* 451-454.

Hill, F. (1972). Reply to Professor Campbell. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 58,* 454-460.

Crowley, S. (1992). Reflections on an argument that won't go away: Or, a turn of the ideological screw. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 78,* 450-465.

5 - Rhetorical Theories—Postmodern, Poststructural, and Critical/Cultural Variations on Enduring Themes

McKerrow, R. E. (1989). Critical rhetoric: Theory and praxis. *Communication Monographs*, *56,* 91-111.

McGee, M. C. (1990). Text, context, and the fragmentation of contemporary culture. *Western Journal of Speech Communication, 54,* 274-289.

Conquergood, D. (1991). Rethinking ethnography: Towards a critical cultural politics. *Communication Monographs, 58,* 179-194.

Ono, K. A. (2009). Critical/cultural approaches to communication. In W. F. Eadie (Ed.), *21st Century Communication: A Reference Handbook* (pp. 74-81). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

6 - Theory Construction of "the Public Sphere"—A "Case Study"

Habermas, J. (1974). The public sphere: An encyclopedia article (1964). (Sara Lennox & Frank Lennox, Trans.). *New German Critique, 3,* 49-55.

Jasinski, J. (2001). Public sphere. In *Sourcebook on rhetoric: Key concepts in contemporary rhetorical studies* (pp. 473-477). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Fraser, N. (1990). Rethinking the public sphere: A contribution to the critique of actually existing democracy. *Social Text, 25/26,* 56-80.

Asen, R. (2000). Seeking the 'counter' in counterpublics. *Communication Theory, 10,* 424-446.

Dube, R. (2011). Making your own media: The Oaxacan feminist subaltern counterpublic sphere. *Works and Days, 29,* 217-240.

Note: For Weeks 7&8, below, ~114 pages come from the following book.
> Craig, R. T., & Muller, H. L. (2007). *Theorizing communication: Readings across traditions* (1 ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Although you may desire to purchase this book for your personal library, the material will also be made available to you in an alternate fashion at least two weeks before its due date.

7 - Interpretive, Indigenous, and Sociocultural Approaches
Miller Chapter #10 – Theories of Discourse and Interaction (Speech Act Theory, Coordinated Management of Meaning, Communication Accommodation, Expectancy Violation) pp. 145-163.
Craig Unit VIII – sociocultural tradition – pp. 365-390 & 405-424 – Mead, Poster, Cameron
hooks, b. (1994). T*eaching to transgress. Education as the practice of freedom*. New York:
> Routledge. Chapter on "Theory as Liberatory Practice." - pps. 59-75.
Davydd, J., Greenwood, D. J., Whyte, W. F., & Harkavy, I. (1993). Participatory action research
> as a process and as a goal. *Human Relations, 46,* 175-192*,
> doi:10.1177/001872679304600203.*

8 - A Sampling from Phenomenology, Critical, and Post-structuralism Approaches
Craig - Unit V – Phenomenological Tradition – pp. 217-250 (Intro, Husserl, Buber, Gadamer)
Craig – Unit IX – Critical– p. 425-436 & 447-472 (Intro, Marx & Engels, Habermas, Deetz)
Mumby, D. K. (1997) Modernism, postmodernism, and communication studies: A rereading of
> an ongoing debate. *Communication Theory, 7,* 1–28.

9 - A Tour of Organizational Communication Theory and Case Study of Theory Building
Miller Chapter #12 – Theories of Organizational Communication – pp. 208-226
McPhee, R. D., & Zaug, P. (2000). The communicative constitution of organizations: A
> framework for explanation. *Electronic Journal of Communication. 10 (1, 2)*. Note: Full
> article available via HTML on ASU libraries; alternately a Microsoft copy available on
> Blackboard.
Fairhurst, G. T., & Putnam, L. (2004). Organizations as discursive constructions.
> *Communication Theory, 14*, 5–26.
Tracy, S. J., & Trethewey, A. (2005). Fracturing the real-self↔fake-self dichotomy: Moving
> toward crystallized organizational identities. *Communication Theory, 15*, 168-195.

Read just the Abstract & Theoretical Implications (pages marked) of the following (~9 pps.)
> Tracy, S. J., & Tracy, K. (1998). Emotion labor at 911: A case study and theoretical
> > critique. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 26*, 390-411. (pp. 406-408)
> Tracy, S. J. (2000). Becoming a character for commerce: Emotion labor, self
> > subordination and discursive construction of identity in a total institution.
> > *Management Communication Quarterly, 14*, 90-128. (pp. 118-120)
> Tracy, S. J. (2005). Locking up emotion: Moving beyond dissonance for understanding
> > emotion labor discomfort. *Communication Monographs*, *72, 261-283.* (pp. 278-
> > 280)

Note: For sessions 10-13, you should read the articles/chapters in the order in which they are listed.

10 - The Social Scientific Approach to Communication

Chaffee, S., & Berger, C. (1987). The study of communication as a science. In C. Berger & S. Chaffee (Eds.), *Handbook of communication science* (pp. 15-19). Newbury Park: Sage.

Chaffee, S., & Berger, C. (1987). What communication scientists do. In C. Berger & S. Chaffee (Eds.), *Handbook of communication science* (pp. 99-122). Newbury Park: Sage.

Shoemaker et al: Chapters 1-3, & 9 (pp. 1-49, & 167-181).

Miller: Chapter 8 (pp. 124-144).

11 - Theory building in Persuasion & Social Influence

The Heuristic-Systematic Model.

Chaiken, S. (1980). Heuristic versus systematic information processing and the use of source versus message cues in persuasion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39(5),* 752-766.

Todorov, A., Chaiken, S., & Henderson, M. (2002). The heuristic-systematic model of social information processing. In J. P. Dillard & M. Pfau (Eds.), *The persuasion handbook: Developments in theory and practice* (pp. 195-213). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Kopfman, J. E., Smith, S. W., Ah Yun, J. K., & Hodges, A. (1998). Affective and cognitive reactions to narrative versus statistical evidence organ donation messages. Journal of *Applied Communication Research, 26(3),* 279-300. doi: 10.1080/00909889809365508

Vested Interest Theory.

Crano, W. D. (1983). Assumed consensus of attitudes: The effect of vested interest. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 9(4),* 597-608. doi: 10.1177/0146167283094009

Crano, W. D., & Prislin, R. (1995). Components of vested interest and attitude-behavior consistency. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 17(1 & 2),* 1-21. doi: 10.1080/01973533.1995.9646129

Adame, B. J., & Miller, C. H. (2014). Vested interest, disaster preparedness, and strategic campaign message design. *Health Communication,* 1-11. doi: 10.1080/10410236.2013.842527

12 - Veteran's Day - No readings

13 - National Communication Association Annual Convention - No readings

14 - Theory Building and Debate in Interpersonal Communication: Deception

Buller, D. B., & Burgoon, J. K. (1996). Interpersonal Deception Theory. *Communication Theory, 6(3),* 203-242.

Levine, T. R., & McCornack, S. A. (1996). A critical analysis of the behavioral adaptation explanation of the probing effect. *Human Communication Research, 22(4),* 575-588.

Buller, D. B., Stiff, J. B., & Burgoon, J. K. (1996). Behavioral adaptation in deceptive transactions fact or fiction: Reply to Levine and McCornack. *Human Communication Research, 22(4),* 589-603.

Burgoon, J. K. (2015). Rejoinder to Levine, Clare et al.'s comparison of the Park–Levine probability model versus interpersonal deception theory: Application to deception detection. *Human Communication Research, 41(3),* 327-349. doi: 10.1111/hcre.12065

Park, H. S., & Levine, T. R. (2015). Base rates, deception detection, and deception theory: A reply to Burgoon (2015). *Human Communication Research, 41(3),* 350-366. doi: 10.1111/hcre.12066

Bond, C. F. J., Omar, A., Mahmoud, A., & Bonser, R. N. (1990). Lie detection across cultures. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 14*(3), 189-204. doi: 10.1007/BF00996226

15 - Creating Interesting Scholarship that Matters and Where Do We Go From Here?

Shoemaker et al: Chapters 7 & 8 (pp.107-166)

Flyvbjerg, B. (2012). Making social science matter. In G. Papanagnou (Ed.), *Social science and policy challenges: Democracy, values, and capacities* (pp. 25-56). Paris: UNESCO Publishing. Available at SSRN: http://ssrn.com/abstract=2278218

Davis, M. S. (1971). That's interesting! Towards a phenomenology of sociology and a sociology of phenomenology. *Philosophy of the Social Sciences, 1*, 309-344.

Currah, P., Green, J., & Stryker, S. (2008). The state of transgender rights in the United States [white paper]. San Francisco, CA: National Sexuality Resource Center.

16 - Final Exam Meeting Period - No readings – Final Presentations