

# Communication 7850: Communication Technology

## Fall 2015

**Instructor:** Jesse Fox, Ph.D.

**Email:** fox.775@osu.edu

**Office hours:** W 11:30-1:30 & by appt.

**Office:** 3052 Derby (temporarily); 3084

**Office phone:** 614.247.2348

**Class Information:** Tues/Thurs 9:35-10:55, Journalism 106

### Course Objectives:

1. To explore and critically analyze the role of various technologies in communication.
2. To practice and develop skills related to various facets of academia.
3. To learn theories and methods related to the study of communication technologies.
4. To learn or further develop skills in a technology relevant to your research.
5. To develop multiple study ideas and produce a sound, executable study.

All required readings may be found on Carmen.

### Recommended texts:

Strunk, W., & White, E. B. (2000). *The elements of style* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon. (Or any later edition)

Note: Your writing will be held to the standards outlined in the 6<sup>th</sup> edition of *The American Psychological Association (APA) Style Manual*. The Strunk and White text provides additional guidance on writing style. You are pursuing an advanced degree in Communication; needless to say, excellent grammar and writing are expected.

### Policies & Legalese

**Academic Integrity:** I take academic dishonesty very seriously. All students are subject to the student code of conduct (see [http://studentaffairs.osu.edu/resource\\_csc.asp](http://studentaffairs.osu.edu/resource_csc.asp)), including the student code of academic integrity. Violations of the code will result in severe penalties in this course and all violations will be reported to the School of Communication and the Committee on Academic Misconduct.

\*One important note for graduate students is the fine line between re-using segments of one's work and re-submitting one's work. When you are writing multiple papers on the same topic across courses, it can be difficult to determine the difference. For this class, I want to see original ideas and original work that are relevant to the substance of the course. I do not want to see the same paper you've submitted multiple times with just a new population, a new treatment, or a few different variables to make it fit the class topic. If you have questions about the suitability of your work, please talk to me.

It is your responsibility to be aware of the rules of academic dishonesty—ignorance is not a defense. ***When in doubt, consult your instructor before doing anything about which you are uncertain.*** You should also read through the "Ten Suggestions for Preserving Academic Integrity" available at <http://oaa.osu.edu/coam/ten-suggestions.html>. **In this class, the penalty for academic dishonesty will be severe.**

**Disruptions:** Disruptions and distractions (including talking during lecture; text messaging or other phone use; nonclass computer activity; or reading nonclass materials), threatening behavior, and negative participation (e.g., use of inappropriate language or derogatory speech) will not be tolerated. Any student who engages in such behavior may be asked to leave class and will suffer grade penalties. Cell phones are considered a disruption. **Turn your cell phone off completely before the start of class. Not just the ringer—completely off.** Any student who is observed consulting or using their phone or whose cell phone rings, beeps, or audibly vibrates during class may be asked to leave and will suffer grade penalties.

**Attendance:** I expect that you will be here, physically and mentally, every day. A considerable portion of your course grade is contingent on active participation, which I track every class period. Thus, repeated unexcused absences will be penalized accordingly. Excused absences require appropriate documentation as I deem fit.

**Device Policy:** Laptops, tablets, etc. are not permitted in class unless we are working on research projects.

**Internet Policy:** For this course, you are required to have online access regularly (i.e., at least 2-3 times a week). Please use discretion in your emails: it is often much more efficient to answer questions or converse on a topic face-to-face than through email.

**Inclement Weather:** Unless the University is closed, you should assume class will be held. If I do not show up 30 minutes after the start of class, consider the class canceled. If the weather is bad, please check your email or contact a classmate with access; if conditions prevent me from making it to campus on time I will do my best to inform everyone via email.

**Disability Accommodations:** If you anticipate the need for accommodations to meet the requirements of this course, please contact the Office for Disability Services, Pomerene Hall, Room 150, or phone (614) 292-3307. Students with documented disabilities can meet with me privately within the first three weeks of class to coordinate reasonable accommodations.

## Assignments

*Study journal.* (5%) After reading an article, you should be left with as many questions as you found answers. As a researcher, it is essential to get into the habit of collecting your ideas, even if you don't have time to develop them into actual studies just yet. Your journal doesn't have to be neat or have a Hello Kitty cover or anything like that—it is for your benefit. Simply reference the article or topic at the top and sketch out approximately 1 page of your lingering questions, hypotheses, and/or future study ideas. The goal is to develop a collection of the kernels of executable studies. You don't have to do this for every topic, but you should do this for at least 12 dates/classes. **Midterm journal check:** Wed., October 14. **Final journal due:** Wed., December 9.

*Learning component.* (10%) Researching technologies means you must have a grasp on how to use them. For this class, you will identify technological skills you've been wanting/needing to improve and propose a learning path/timeline and method of assessment for these skills. Examples may include learning how to use or implement skills such as: coding/programming, website development, Photoshop, or Google Analytics. Resources you may consult include the Digital Union (and their workshops), online or offline courses, tutorials, or working with a tutor to learn. Examples of online resources include <http://code.google.com/edu>, <http://khanacademy.org>, and <https://coursera.org>.

**Proposal due:** Wed., September 9. **Final demonstration due:** Wed., November 18.

*Middish-term exam.* (20%) This exam will be an in-class, closed-book, short essay exam. The purpose of this format is twofold: first, to prepare you for the demands of your comprehensive exams; second, it is designed to prepare you for the demands of teaching and presenting your work. Although we are in an era of having information at our fingertips, you should have the ability to clearly, accurately, and spontaneously answer questions without having to consult other sources. **Date:** Friday, October 30.

*Research project.* (45%) Your final project for the course will be a research project incorporating theories and concepts covered in class. The only two major restrictions are: 1) Your idea for this paper should be unique to this class. Although your paper may continue a line of research you are conducting, it should not be a rehash of ideas you have submitted elsewhere. 2) The study must have a feasible design given your current resources, because you will be launching it this semester. You will submit a journal-worthy paper including an introduction, lit review, hypotheses, and detailed method. A final section will discuss implications if the hypotheses are supported and acknowledge limitations in the design. All measures should be submitted as appendices. The paper should be 14-16 pages without references or appendices. APA 6<sup>th</sup> ed. format is required. Because I see this as a kickstart to a study rather than merely a class assignment, I strongly advise you to find an appropriate faculty member for advisement/collaboration (I am happy to serve this role if appropriate.) You should be the first author, however, and these ideas should be your own. You will submit an initial proposal (~2 pages indicating theory, method, & possible hyps, with references) no later than **September 25**. Because I think peer collaboration is invaluable, you may also work with other classmates if you wish (max group of 3). You will share the grade regardless of individual contribution, so choose wisely. Pitches: **Wednesday, September 16**. Proposal due: **Friday, September 25**. IRB due: **October 2**. Final presentations: **December 2 & 4**. Final paper due: **Friday, December 11 by 3 pm**. A hard copy must be submitted.

*Class participation and discussion questions.* (20%) On three occasions, you will be responsible for submitting two discussion questions no later than midnight Friday for the subsequent week's topics. You will be graded for the relevance, thoughtfulness, and timeliness of your questions. Active and thoughtful class participation will account for the remaining part of your grade. Active doesn't mean nodding, breathing, and/or not falling asleep; it means making meaningful and relevant contributions to the discussion, asking challenging or interesting questions, knowing when to listen, and being a supportive participant *every* class.

*This syllabus is an agreement between the instructor and the student. The instructor reserves the right to make changes to the syllabus as deemed necessary. By staying enrolled in this class, the student agrees to abide by the policies described herein.*

## Course Readings

**Wednesday, August 26** – Intro, no readings

**Friday, August 28** – Technology in modern society; defining technology; scope

Bush, V. (1945, July). As we may think. *Atlantic Monthly*, 101-8.

McOmber, J. B. (1999). Technological autonomy and three definitions of technology. *Journal of Communication*, 137-153.

Newhagen, J. E., & Rafaeli, S. (1996). Why communication researchers should study the Internet: A dialogue. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 1(4).

### Recommended:

The full issue of *Journal of Computer Mediated Communication*, 1(4).

Rafaeli, S. (1988). Interactivity: From new media to communication. *Sage annual review of communication research: Advancing communication science*, 16, 110-134.

**Wednesday, September 2** – Channels & affordances

Feaster, J. C. (2010). Expanding the impression management model of communication channels: an information control scale. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 16, 115-138.  
doi: 10.1111/j.1083-6101.2010.01535.x

Treem, J., & Leonardi, P. (2012). Social media use in organizations: Exploring the affordances of visibility, editability, persistence, and association. *Communication Yearbook*, 36, 143-189.

Walther, J. B. (2007). Selective self-presentation in computer-mediated communication: Hyperpersonal dimensions of technology, language, and cognition. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 23(5), 2538-2557.  
doi: 10.1016/j.chb.2006.05.002

### Recommended:

Eveland, W. P. (2003). A “mix of attributes” approach to the study of media effects and new communication technologies. *Journal of Communication*, 53, 395-410. doi: 10.1111/j.1460-2466.2003.tb02598.x

Meyrowitz, J. (2009). Medium theory: An alternative to the dominant paradigm of media effects. In

Ramirez, Jr., A., & Burgoon, J. K. (2004). The effect of interactivity on initial interactions: The influence of information valence and modality and information richness on computer-mediated interaction. *Communication Monographs*, 71, 422-447.

Ruppel, E. (in press). The affordance utilization model: Communication technology use as relationships develop. *Marriage & Family Review*. doi: 10.1080/01494929.2015.1061628

Walther, J. B., Gay, G., & Hancock, J. T. (2005). How do communication and technology researchers study the internet? *Journal of Communication*, 55, 632-657.

## **Friday, September 4** – Channels & affordances

Lee, K. M. (2004). Presence, explicated. *Communication Theory*, 14, 27-50.  
doi:10.1111/j.14682885.2004.tb00302.x

Suler, J. (2004). The online disinhibition effect. *Cyberpsychology & Behavior*, 7, 321-326.  
doi:10.1089/1094931041291295

Sundar, S. S., & Limperos, A. M. (2013). Uses and grats 2.0: New gratifications for new media. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 57, 504-525. doi: 10.1080/08838151.2013.845827

### Recommended:

Biocca, F. (1997). The cyborg's dilemma: Progressive embodiment in virtual environments. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 3(2), n. p. Available at:  
<http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol3/issue2/biocca2.html>

Cumiskey, K. M., & Ling, R. (2015). The social psychology of mobile communication. In S. S. Sundar (Ed.), *The handbook of the psychology of communication technology* (pp. 228-246). New York: Wiley & Sons.

Lombard, M., & Ditton, T. (1997). At the heart of it all: The concept of presence. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 3(2), n. p. Available at: <http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol3/issue2/lombard.html>

Norman, D. A. *The design of everyday things*. New York: Basic Books.

Trevino, L. K., Lengel, R. H., & Daft, R. L. (1987). Media symbolism, media richness, and media choice in organizations: A symbolic interactionist perspective. *Communication Research*, 14, 553-574. doi: 10.1177/009365087014005006

## **Wednesday, September 9** – CMC theories and perspectives

Cathcart, R., & Gumpert, G. (1983). Mediated interpersonal communication: Toward a new typology. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 69(3), 267-277.

Postmes, T., Spears, R., & Lea, M. (1998). Breaching or building social boundaries? SIDE-effects of computer-mediated communication. *Communication Research*, 25, 689-715. doi: 10.1177/009365098025006006

Walther, J. B. (2011). Theories of computer-mediated communication and interpersonal relations. In M. L. Knapp & J. A. Daly, *The SAGE handbook of interpersonal communication* (pp. 443-479). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

### Recommended:

Ledbetter, A. (2015). Media multiplexity theory: Technology use and interpersonal tie strength. In D. O. Braithwaite & P. Schrodt, *Engaging theories in interpersonal communication* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.; pp. 363-375). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Spears, R., & Postmes, T. (2015). Group identity, social influence, and collective action online: Extensions and applications of the SIDE model. In S. S. Sundar (Ed.), *The handbook of the psychology of communication technology* (pp. 23-46). New York: Wiley & Sons.

Tanis, M., & Postmes, T. (2003). Social cues and impression formation in CMC. *Journal of Communication*, 53, 676-693.

Walther, J. (1996). Computer-mediated communication: Impersonal, interpersonal and hyperpersonal interaction. *Communication Research*, 23, 3-43.

Walther, J. B. (2009). Theories, boundaries, and all of the above. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 14, 748-752.

Walther, J. B., Van Der Heide, B., Ramirez, Jr., A., Burgoon, J. K., & Pena, J. (2015). Interpersonal and hyperpersonal dimensions of computer-mediated communication. In S. S. Sundar (Ed.), *The handbook of the psychology of communication technology* (pp.). New York: Wiley & Sons.

### **Friday, September 11** – CMC theories (cont.) – Guest speaker: Dr. Dave DeAndrea

DeAndrea, D. C. (2014). Advancing warranting theory. *Communication Theory*, 24(2), 186-204. doi: 10.1111/comt.12033

Parks, M. (2011). Boundary conditions for the application of three theories of computer-mediated communication to MySpace. *Journal of Communication*, 61, 557-574.

#### Recommended:

DeAndrea, D. C., Van Der Heide, & Easley, N. (2015). How modifying third-party information affects interpersonal impressions and the evaluation of collaborative online media. *Journal of Communication*, 65, 62-78. doi: 10.1111/jcom.12139

Van Der Heide, B., D'Angelo, J. D., & Schumaker, E. M. (2011). The effects of verbal vs. photographic self-presentation on impression formation in Facebook. *Journal of Communication*, 62, 98-116.

Walther, J. B., & Parks, M. R. (2002). Cues filtered out, cues filtered in. In M. L. Knapp & J. A. Daly, *Handbook of interpersonal communication* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed., pp. 529-563). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Walther, J. B., Van Der Heide, B., Hamel, L. M., & Shulman, H. C. (2009). Self-generated versus other-generated statements and impressions in computer-mediated communication: A test of warranting theory using Facebook. *Communication Research*, 36, 229-253.

### **Wednesday, September 16** – (Mostly) HCI theories

Nass, C., & Moon, Y. (2000). Machines and mindlessness: Social responses to computers. *Journal of Social Issues*, 56, 81-103.

Vishwanath, A. (2015). The psychology of the diffusion and acceptance of technology. In S. S. Sundar (Ed.), *The handbook of the psychology of communication technology* (pp. 313-331). New York: Wiley & Sons.

Yee, N., & Bailenson, J. (2007). The Proteus effect: The effect of transformed self-representation on behavior. *Human Communication Research*, 33, 271-290.

#### Recommended:

Bailenson, J. N., Yee, N., Blascovich, J., & Guadagno, R. E. (2008). Transformed social interaction in mediated interpersonal communication. In E. A. Konijn, S. Utz., M. Tanis, & S. B. Barnes (Eds.) *Mediated interpersonal communication* (pp. 77-99). New York: Taylor & Francis.

Reeves, B., & Nass, C. (1996). *The media equation: How people treat computers, television, and new media like real people and places*. New York: Cambridge.

Sundar, S. S., Jia, H., Waddell, T. F., & Huang, Y. (2015). Toward a theory of interactive media effects (TIME). In S. S. Sundar (Ed.), *The handbook of the psychology of communication technology* (pp. 47-86). New York: Wiley & Sons.

Yee, N., & Bailenson, J. N. (2009). The difference between being and seeing: The relative contribution of self-perception and priming to behavioral changes via digital self-representation. *Media Psychology, 12*, 195-209.

### **Friday, September 18:** Methods for studying technology

Milgram, S. (2010). [Assorted readings.] In T. Blass (Ed.), *The individual in a social world: Essays and experiments* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). London, UK: Pinter & Martin.

Slater, M. (2004). How colorful was your day? Why questionnaires cannot assess presence in virtual environments. *Presence, 13*, 484-493.

Plus choice of: Hargittai & Karr, Walejko, or Williams & Xiong from below:

Hargittai, E., & Karr, C. (2009). Wat r u doin? Studying the thumb generation using text messaging. In E. Hargittai, *Research confidential: Solutions to problems most social scientists pretend they never have* (pp. 192-216). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Walejko, G. (2009). Online survey: Instant publication, instant mistake, all of the above. In E. Hargittai, *Research confidential: Solutions to problems most social scientists pretend they never have* (pp. 101-121). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Williams, D., & Xiong, L. (2009). Herding cats online: Real studies of virtual communities. In E. Hargittai, *Research confidential: Solutions to problems most social scientists pretend they never have* (pp. 122-140). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

### Recommended:

Greenwald, A. G. (2012). There is nothing so theoretical as a good method. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 7*, 99-108. doi: 10.1177/1745691611434210

Kahn, A. S., Ratan, R., & Williams, D. (2014). Why we distort in self-report: Predictors of self-report errors in video game play. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 19*, 1010-1023. doi: 10.1111/jcc4.12056

### **Wednesday, September 23:** Methods: Technology as method

Blascovich, J., Loomis, J., Beall, A., Swinth, K., Hoyt, C., & Bailenson, J. N. (2002). Immersive virtual environment technology as a methodological tool for social psychology. *Psychological Inquiry, 13*, 103-124.

Kramer, A. D., Guillory, J. E., & Hancock, J. T. (2014). Experimental evidence of massive-scale emotional contagion through social networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 111(24), 8788-8790. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1320040111 **[Skim to understand method.]**

Vitak, J., Shilton, K., & Ashktorab, Z. (2016). Beyond the Belmont principles: Ethical challenges, practices, and beliefs in the online data research community. *Paper to be presented at CSCW 2016*.

Recommended:

Boyd, D., & Crawford, K. (2012). Critical questions for big data: Provocations for a cultural, technological, and scholarly phenomenon. *Information, Communication & Society*, 15, 662-679. doi: 10.1080/1369118X.2012.678878

Lewis, K., Kaufman, J., Gonzalez, M., Wimmer, A., & Christakis, N. (2008). Taste, ties, and time: A new social network dataset using Facebook.com. *Social Networks*, 30, 330-342. doi: 10.1016/j.socnet.2008.07.002

Parks, M. R. (2014). Big data in communication research: Its contents and discontents. *Journal of Communication*, 64, 355-360. doi: 10.1111/jcom/12090

Toma, C. L., & Hancock, J. T. (2012). What lies beneath: The linguistic traces of deception in online dating profiles. *Journal of Communication*, 62, 78-97. doi: 10.1111/j.1460-2466.2011.01619.x

**Friday, September 25** – Development day

**Wednesday, September 30**—Historical and philosophical approaches

Licklider, J. C. R., & Taylor, R. W. (1968). The computer as a communication device. *International Science & Technology*.

Turing, A. (1950, Oct.) Computing machinery & intelligence. *Mind*, 59, 433-460.

Wiener, N. (1954). *The human use of human beings* (ch. 2, 3). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Recommended:

Edwards, P. N. (1996). *The closed world: Computers and the politics of discourse in the cold war*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Licklider, J. C. R. (1960, March). Man-computer symbiosis. *IRE Transactions on Human Factors in Electronics*.

McLuhan, M. (1967). *Understanding media: The extensions of man*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

**Friday, October 2** – Historical and philosophical approaches

Barlow, J. P. (1996). A declaration of the independence of cyberspace. Available at: <https://projects.eff.org/~barlow/Declaration-Final.html>

*Industrial Society & Its Future* (selections).



Rheingold, H. (1993). A slice of life in my virtual community. Available at: [http://www.cs.indiana.edu/docproject/bdgtti/bdgtti\\_18.html](http://www.cs.indiana.edu/docproject/bdgtti/bdgtti_18.html)

Recommended:

Castells, M. (1996). *The rise of the network society: The information age, economy, society, and culture*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Rice, R. E. (1984). *The new media: Communication, research, and technology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Turner, F. (2006). *From counterculture to cyberculture: Stewart Brand, the Whole Earth Network, and the rise of digital utopianism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

**Wednesday, October 2** – Psychological effects

Gonzales, A. L., & Hancock, J. T. (2011). Mirror, mirror on my Facebook wall: Effects of exposure to Facebook on self-esteem. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, & Social Networking*, *14*, 79-83. doi: 10.1089/cyber.2009.0411

Toma, C. L. (2013). Feeling better but doing worse: Effects of Facebook self-presentation on implicit self-esteem and cognitive task performance. *Media Psychology*, *16*, 199-220. doi: 10.1080/15213269.2012.762189

Wang, Z., & Tchernev, J. M. (2012). The “myth” of media multitasking: Reciprocal dynamics of media multitasking, personal needs, and gratifications. *Journal of Communication*, *62*(3), 493-513. doi: 10.1111/j.1460-2466.2012.01641.x

Recommended:

Carr, N. (2010). *The shallows: What the internet is doing to our brains*. New York: W. W. Norton.

Kraut, R., Patterson, M., Lundmark, V., Kiesler, S., Mukophadhyay, T., & Scherlis, W. (1998). Internet paradox: A social technology that reduces social involvement and psychological well-being? *American Psychologist*, *53*, 1017-1031. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.53.9.1017

Kraut, R., Kiesler, S., Boneva, B., Cummings, J., Helgeson, V., & Crawford, A. (2002). Internet paradox revisited. *Journal of Social Issues*, *58*(1), 49-74. doi: 10.1111/1540-4560.00248

Kross, E., Verduyn, P., Demiralp, E., Park, J., Lee, D. S., Lin, N., ... & Ybarra, O. (2013). Facebook use predicts declines in subjective well-being in young adults. *PLoS One*, *8*(8), e69841.

Thompson, C. (2013). *Smarter than you think: How technology is changing our minds for the better*. New York: Penguin.

Toma, C. L., & Hancock, J. T. (2013). Self-affirmation underlies Facebook use. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin*, *39*, 321-331. doi: 10.1177/0146167212474694

Verduyn, P., Lee, D. S., Park, J., Shablack, H., Orvell, A., Bayer, J., ... & Kross, E. (2015). Passive Facebook usage undermines affective well-being: Experimental and longitudinal evidence. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, *144*, 480-488. doi: 10.1037/xge0000057

**Friday, October 9** – Self & Identity

Cathcart, R., & Gumpert, G. (1986). I am a camera: The mediated self. *Communication Quarterly*, 34(2), 89-102. doi: 10.1080/01463378609369625

Lanier, J. (2011). *You are not a gadget* (ch. 1). New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Turkle, S. (2011). *Alone together: Why we expect more from technology and less from each other*. Philadelphia, PA: Basic Books. ch. 8, 9

Recommended:

Bargh, J.A., McKenna, K. Y. A., & Fitzsimons, G. M. (2002). Can you see the real me? Activation and expression of the “true self” on the Internet. *Journal of Social Issues*, 58, 33-48.

Fox, J., & Ahn, S. J. (2013). Avatars: Portraying, exploring, and changing online and offline identities. In R. Lippicini (Ed.), *Handbook of research on technoself: Identity in a technological society* (pp. 255-271). Hershey, PA: IGI Global. doi: 10.4018/978-1-4666-2211-1.ch014

Gonzales, A. L., & Hancock, J. T. (2008). Identity shift in computer-mediated environments. *Media Psychology*, 11, 167-185.

Papacharissi, Z. (Ed.) (2011). *A networked self: Identity, community, and culture on social network sites*. New York: Routledge.

Papacharissi, Z. (2012). Without you, I’m nothing: Performances of the self on Twitter. *International Journal of Communication*, 6, 1989-2006.

Turkle, S. (1995). *Life on the screen: Identity in the age of the Internet*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Zhao, S., Grasmuck, S., & Martin, J. (2008). Identity construction on Facebook: Digital empowerment in anchored relationships. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 24, 1816-1836.

**Wednesday, October 14 – Self-presentation and impression management**

Lanier, J. (2011). *You are not a gadget* (ch. 3). New York: Alfred A. Knopf. **only pp. 68-70**

Rosenberg, J., & Egbert, N. (2011). Online impression management: Personality traits and concerns for secondary goals as predictors of self-presentation tactics on Facebook. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 17, 1-18. doi: 10.1111/j.1083-6101.2011.01560.x

Toma, C. L., & Hancock, J. T. (2011). A new twist on love’s labor: Self-presentation in online dating profiles. In K. B. Wright & L. M. Webb (Eds.), *Computer-mediated communication in personal relationships* (pp. 41-55). New York: Peter Lang.

Recommended:

Bazarova, N. N., Taft, J. G., Choi, Y. H., & Cosley, D. (2012). Managing impressions and relationships on Facebook: Self-presentational and relational concerns revealed through the analysis of language style. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 32, 121-141. doi: 10.1177/0261927X12456384

Ellison, N., Heino, R., & Gibbs, J. (2006). Managing impressions online: Self-presentation processes in the online dating environment. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 11, article 2. Available at: <http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol11/issue2/ellison.html>

Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. New York: Anchor Books.

Krämer, N. C., & Winter, S. (2008). Impression management 2.0: The relationship of self-esteem, extraversion, self-efficacy, and self-presentation within social networking sites. *Journal of Media Psychology, 20*(3), 106-116. doi: 10.1027/1864-1105.20.3.106

O'Sullivan, B. (2000). What you don't know won't hurt me: Impression management functions of communication channels in relationships. *Human Communication Research, 26*, 403-431. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2958.2000.tb00763.x

Pearce, K. E., & Vitak, J. (in press). Performing honor online: The affordances of social media for surveillance and impression management in an honor culture. *New Media & Society*. doi: 10.1177/1461444815600279

### **Friday, October 16 – Fall break – no class**

### **Wednesday, October 21 – Perceptions & attributions**

Bazarova, N. N. (2012). Public intimacy: Disclosure interpretation and social judgments on Facebook. *Journal of Communication, 62*(5), 815-832. doi: 10.1111/j.1460-2466.2012.01664.x

DeAndrea, D. C., & Walther, J. B. (2011). Attributions for inconsistencies between online and offline presentations. *Communication Research, 38*, 805-825. doi: 10.1177/0093650210385340

Metzger, M. J., & Flanagin, A. J. (2015). Psychological approaches to credibility assessment online. In S. S. Sundar (Ed.), *The handbook of the psychology of communication technology* (pp. 445-466). New York: Wiley & Sons.

### **Recommended:**

Carr, C. T., & Walther, J. B. (2014). Increasing attributional certainty via social media: Learning about others one bit at a time. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 19*, 922-937. doi: 10.1111/jcc4.12072

Jiang, L. C., Bazarova, N. N., & Hancock, J. T. (2011). From perception to behavior: Disclosure reciprocity and the intensification of intimacy in computer-mediated communication. *Communication Research, 40*, 125-143.

Nowak, K. L. (2015). Examining perception and identification in avatar-mediated interaction. In S. S. Sundar (Ed.), *The handbook of the psychology of communication technology* (pp. 89-114). New York: Wiley & Sons.

Spitzberg, B. H., & Manusov, V. (2015). Attribution theory: Finding good cause in the search for theory. In D. O. Braithwaite & P. Schrodt, *Engaging theories in interpersonal communication* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.; pp. 37-49). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

### **Friday, October 23 – Relationships**

Antheunis, M. L., Valkenburg, P. M., & Peter, J. (2010). Getting acquainted through social network sites: Testing a model of online uncertainty reduction and social attraction. *Computers in Human Behavior, 26*(1), 100-109. doi: 10.1016/j.chb.2009.07.005

Fox, J., & Anderegg, C. (in press). Turbulence, turmoil, and termination: The dark side of social networking sites for romantic relationships. In E. Gilchrist & S. Long (Eds.), *Contexts for dark side communication*. Peter Lang.

Ramirez, A., Sumner, E. M. B., Fleuriet, C., & Cole, M. (2014). When online dating partners meet offline: The effect of modality switching on relational communication between online daters. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 20, 99-114. doi: 10.1111/jcc4.12101

Recommended:

Baym, N. K. (2010). *Personal connections in the digital age*. Malden, MA: Polity Press.

Bazarova, N. N., & Choi, Y. H. (2014). Self-disclosure in social media: Extending the functional approach to disclosure motivations and characteristics on social network sites. *Journal of Communication*, 64(4), 635-657. doi: 10.1111/jcom.12106

McEwan, B. (2015). *Navigating new media networks: Understanding and managing communication challenges in a networked society*. New York: Lexington Books.

Trepte, S., & Reinecke, L. (2013). The reciprocal effects of social network site use and the disposition for self-disclosure: A longitudinal study. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 29(3), 1102-1112. doi: 10.1016/j.chb.2012.10.002

Wright, K. B., & Webb, L. M. (2011). *Computer-mediated communication in personal relationships*. New York: Peter Lang.

**Wednesday, October 28—Relationships**

Caughlin, J. P., & Sharabi, L. L. (2013). A communicative interdependence perspective of close relationships: The connections between mediated and unmediated interactions matter. *Journal of Communication*, 63(5), 873-893. doi: 10.1111/jcom.12046

Ellison, N. B., & Vitak, J. (2015). Social network site affordances and their relationship to social capital processes. In S. S. Sundar (Ed.), *The handbook of the psychology of communication technology* (pp. 205-227). New York: Wiley & Sons.

Stafford, L., & Hillyer, J. D. (2012). Information and communication technologies in personal relationships. *Review of Communication*, 12, 290-312. doi: 10.1080/15358593.2012.685951

Recommended:

Boase, J., & Wellman, B. (2006). Personal relationships: On and off the Internet. In A. L. Vangelisti & D. Perlman (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of personal relationships* (pp. 709-723). New York: Cambridge.

Ellison, N. B., Steinfield, C., & Lampe, C. (2007). The benefits of Facebook “friends:” Social capital and college students’ use of online social network sites. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 12, 1143-1168. doi: 10.1111/j.1083-6101.2007.00367.x

Kim, H., Kim, G.-J., Park, H. W., & Rice, R. E. (2007). Configurations of relationships in different media: FtF, email, instant messenger, mobile phone, and SMS. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 12*, 1183-1207.

Parks, M. R., & Floyd, K. (1996). Making friends in cyberspace. *Journal of Communication, 46*, 80-97.

Parks, M. R. (2011). Social network sites as virtual communities. In Z. Papacharissi (Ed.), *A networked self: Identity, community, and culture on social network sites* (pp. 105-123). New York: Routledge.

Steinkeuhler, C. A., & Williams, D. (2006). Where everybody knows your (screen) name: Online games as “third places.” *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 11*, 995-909. doi: 10.1111/j.1083-6101.2006.00300.x

### **Friday, October 30 – MIDTERM EXAM**

#### **Wednesday, November 4—Social identities, intragroup and intergroup communication**

Herring, S. C. (1999). The rhetorical dynamics of gender harassment on-line. *The Information Society, 15*(3), 151-167.

Lee, E.-J., & Oh, S. Y. (2015). Effects of visual cues on social perceptions and self-categorization in computer-mediated communication. In S. S. Sundar (Ed.), *The handbook of the psychology of communication technology* (pp. 115-136). New York: Wiley & Sons.

Marwick, A. (2014). Gender, sexuality, and social media. In J. Hunsinger & T. M. Senft (eds.), *The social media handbook* (pp. 59-75). New York: Routledge.

#### Recommended:

Brock, A. (2012). From the blackhand side: Twitter as a cultural conversation. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 56*, 529-549. doi: 10.1080/08838151.2012.732147

Fox, J., & Warber, K. M. (2015). Queer identity management and political self-expression on social networking sites: A co-cultural approach to the spiral of silence. *Journal of Communication, 65*, 79-100. doi: 10.1111/jcom.12137

Grasmuck, S., Martin, J., & Zhao, S. (2009). Ethno-racial identity displays on Facebook. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 15*, 158-188. doi: 10.1111/j.1083-6101.2009.01498.x

Lee, E.-J. (2007). Categorical person perception in computer-mediated communication: Effects of character representation and knowledge bias on sex inference and informational social influence. *Media Psychology, 9*, 309-329. doi: 10.1080/15213260701286007

Lee, J.-E. R., & Park, S. G. (2011). “Whose Second Life is this?” How avatar-based racial cues shape ethno-racial minorities’ perception of virtual worlds. *CyberPsychology, Behavior, & Social Networking, 14*, 637-642. doi: 10.1089/cyber.2010.0501

Nakamura, L. (2002). *Cybertypes: Race, ethnicity, and identity on the Internet*. New York: Routledge.

#### **Wednesday, November 11 – Health contexts**

Kim, H. S. (2015). Attracting views and going viral: How message features and news-sharing channels affect health news diffusion. *Journal of Communication*, 65, 512-534. doi: 10.1111/jcom/12160

Oh, J., & Sundar, S. S. (2015). How does interactivity persuade? An experimental test of interactivity on cognitive absorption, elaboration, and attitudes. *Journal of Communication*, 65, 213-236. doi: 10.1111/jcom.12147

Ruppel, E. K., & Rains, S. A. (2012). Information sources and the health information-seeking process: An application and extension of channel complementarity theory. *Communication Monographs*, 79, 385-405. doi: 10.1080/03637751.2012.697627

#### Recommended:

Centola, D. (2010). The spread of behavior in an online social network experiment. *Science*, 329, 1194-1197.

Hu, Y., & Sundar, S. S. (2010). Effects of online health sources on credibility and behavioral intentions. *Communication Research*, 37, 105-132. doi: 10.1177/0093650209351512

Mackert, M., Champlin, S. E., Holton, A., Muñoz, I. I., & Damásio, M. J. (2014). eHealth and health literacy: A research methodology review. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 19, 516-528. doi: 10.1111/jcc4.12044

Noar, S. M., & Harrington, N. G. (Eds.), *eHealth applications: Promising strategies for behavior change*. New York: Routledge.

Stephens, K. K., & Rains, S. A. (2011). Information and communication technology sequences and message repetition in interpersonal interaction. *Communication Research*, 38, 101-122.

Thackeray, R., & Hunter, M. (2010). Empowering youth: Use of technology in advocacy to affect social change. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 15, 575-591.

Vishwanath, A., (2006). The effect of the number of opinion seekers and leaders on technology attitudes and choices. *Human Communication Research*, 32, 322-350.

#### **Friday, November 13** – Political contexts

Bond, R. M., Fariss, C. J., Jones, J. J., Kramer, A. D. I., Marlow, C., Settle, J. E., & Fowler, J. H. (2012). A 61-million-person experiment in social influence and political mobilization. *Nature*, 489(7415), 295-298. doi: 10.1038/nature11421

Garrett, R. K., & Resnick, P. (2011). Resisting political fragmentation on the Internet. *Daedalus*, 140(4), 108-120. doi: 10.1162/DAED\_a\_00118

Stromer-Galley, J. (2014). Political discussion and deliberation online. In K. Kenski & K. H. Jamieson (Eds.), *Oxford handbook of political communication*. Oxford University Press.

#### Recommended:

Bakshy, E., Messing, S., & Adamic, L. (2015). Exposure to ideologically diverse news and opinion on Facebook. *Science*. doi: 10.1126/science.aaa1160

Deibert, R., Palfrey, J. G., Rohozinski, R., & Zittrain, J. (2008). *Access denied: the practice and policy of global Internet filtering*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Garrett, R. K. (2006). Protest in an information society: A review of literature on social movements and new ICTs. *Information, Communication & Society*, 9, 202-224. doi: 10.1080/13691180600630773

Hindman, M. (2009). *The myth of digital democracy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Knobloch-Westerwick, S., Johnson, B. K., & Westerwick, A. (2015). Confirmation bias in online searches: Impacts of selective exposure before an election on political attitude strengths and shifts. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 20, 171-187. doi: 10.1111/jcc4.12105

Morozov, E. (2011). *The net delusion: the dark side of Internet freedom*. New York, NY: PublicAffairs.

Prior, M. (2007). *Post-broadcast democracy: How media choice increases inequality and political involvement and polarizes elections*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Stroud, N. J. (2011). *Niche news: the politics of news choice*. New York: Oxford University Press.

### **Wednesday, November 18** – Societal issues

Andrejevic, M. (2002). The work of being watched: Interactive media and the exploitation of self-disclosure. *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, 19(2), 230-248.

Hartzog, W., & Selinger, E. (2013). Big data in small hands. *Stanford Law Review Online*, 66, 81.

Terranova, T. (2000). Free labor: Producing culture for the digital economy. *Social Text*, 63, 33-58.

### Recommended:

Andrejevic, M. (2010). Social network exploitation. In Z. Papacharissi (ed.), *A networked self: Identity, community, and culture on social network sites* (pp. 82-101). New York: Routledge.

Debatin, B., Lovejoy, J. P., Horn, A.-K., & Hughes, B. N. (2009). Facebook and online privacy: Attitudes, behaviors, and unintended consequences. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 15, 83-108.

Hartzog, W., & Stutzman, F. D. (2013). The case for online obscurity. *California Law Review*, 101(1), 1-49.

Lessig, L. (2006). *Code and other laws of cyberspace: Version 2.0*. New York: Basic Books.

Solove, D. J. (2007). 'I've got nothing to hide' and other misunderstandings of privacy. *San Diego Law Review*, 44, 745-772.

### **Friday, November 20** – NCA, no class

### **Wednesday, November 22** – Thanksgiving, no class

### **Friday, November 24** – Thanksgiving, no class

### **Wednesday, December 2** – Research Presentations

**Friday, December 4** – Research Presentations

**Wednesday, December 9** – Relationships with technologies

Jonze, S. (Director). (2013). *Her*. Warner Bros.

Kramer, N. C., Rosenthal-von der Putten, A., M., & Hoffmann, L. (2015). Social effects of virtual and robot companions. In S. S. Sundar (Ed.), *The handbook of the psychology of communication technology* (pp. 137-159). New York: Wiley & Sons.

Levy, D. L. (2007). *Love and sex with robots: The evolution of human-robot relationships* (ch. 3 & 4). New York: Harper Collins.

Recommended:

Calo, R. (2015). Robotics and the lessons of cyberlaw. *California Law Review*, 103, 2014-08.

Takayama, L. (2015). Telepresence and apparent agency in human-robot interaction. In S. S. Sundar (Ed.), *The handbook of the psychology of communication technology* (pp. 160-175). New York: Wiley & Sons.

Ullman, E. (1997). *Close to the machine: Technophilia and its discontents*. San Francisco: City Lights.