

COMMUNICATION STUDIES 970D: INTERGROUP COMMUNICATION COURSE SYLLABUS—Spring 2011

Instructor: Dr. Jordan Soliz

Office: 425 Oldfather

Phone: 472-8326 [office/voicemail]

E-mail: jsoliz2@unl.edu

Office Hours: My official office hours are 9:30-10:15 Mon and Wed. However, you should feel free to schedule other times to meet or simply stop by if my office door is open.

Required Texts

Giles, H., Reid, S., & Harwood, J. (2010). *The dynamics of intergroup communication*. New York: Peter Lang.

Reading Packet [Available for purchase from the Communication Studies office].

Course Description

The role and mission of the faculty and students of the Department of Communication Studies are to examine human symbolic activity as it shapes and is shaped by relationships, institutions, and societies. This work concerns the creation, analysis, and critique of messages. The department's research, teaching, and service devote particular attention to understanding the ways in which **communication** sustains and erodes **collaboration** within and among local, national, and global **communities**.

The course will provide an overview of theory and research on intergroup relations to demonstrate the manner in which communication both affects and reflects our social group memberships. The objective is to provide you with the theoretical foundation to view various contexts of communication through an “intergroup lens.” In doing so, you should have the skills to both research and critically evaluate historical, present, and future social issues associated with intergroup relations. The material we will cover comes from various social science areas (e.g., communication, social cognition, social psychology, sociolinguistics, sociology, history). Throughout the semester, we will address the question: **How can communication scholars or a communicative perspective enhance our understanding of identity and intergroup relations?** In addressing this question, consider the theoretical, methodological, and applied implications of a communicative perspective.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS & POLICIES

Attendance Policy

This is a graduate-level seminar... you should be here! Obviously, illness and personal/family emergencies may necessitate an absence from class. Frequent absence will result in an incomplete or failing grade for the course (most likely a failing grade). If you will be absent for any religious observance, please let me know prior to the dates you will be gone.

Academic Integrity

All course work should be original and unique for this class (i.e., do not use work from other courses even if it is your own). Plagiarism results in, at minimum, failure on the assignment, but can result in failure of the course and consequences to your graduate standing. Not knowing the definition of plagiarism does not excuse you from the consequences.

Services for Students with Disabilities

The UNL office of Services for Students with Disabilities (SSD) “provides special assistance to students with disabilities through individualized help and counseling.” If you have a disability for which you wish to request accommodations and have not contacted SSD, please do so as soon as possible. Their office is located in 132 Canfield Administration Building or you can contact SSD at (402) 472-3787. Information about their services can be found at <http://www.unl.edu/ssd/index.html>. Please also contact me privately in regard to your needs in this course.

Expectations, Assignments & Evaluation

In my approach to graduate education, a 900-level graduate seminar is a collaborative learning environment that is dependent on active involvement of all members of the seminar. As the instructor, my role is to facilitate discussion, guide us in certain directions when needed, and provide clarification and explanation.

Your role is to be a scholar! Read, immerse, think, question, apply--that is why you are here and that is what I expect from you in this course. As such, course activities will include a very limited amount of lecture. Rather, we will focus on discussion and activities that facilitate discussion (e.g., short films, documentaries, in-class activities). Your final evaluation will be based on discussion and a semester project.

Discussion (50% of final grade). In this course, student learning is contingent on completing assigned readings and **being an active member of the seminar**. You are expected to come to class having thoroughly read the assigned readings in a manner that allows you to be critically engaged in discussion. Thus, you should not only participate, but you should be **proactive in generating discussion**. In reading the material, you should identify what you believe are the important concepts and ideas, develop thought-provoking discussion questions, identify any clarification questions, and/or develop propositions for which fellow students can respond. Although not a formal requirement, it may be beneficial to develop a list of questions, propositions, etc. for each reading prior to class. Throughout the semester, I will evaluate your discussion involvement so you know if you need to maintain or change your approach to the course. Also, I encourage you to stay up-to-date on current events—local, national, and international—so we can discuss the applied implications of the material. In fact, I encourage you to share articles, personal experience, news reports, etc. that relate to material we are covering. We will devote a portion of each class period to answering the “so what?” question. In other words, we will focus on the applied aspect of the material. Early in the semester, I will assign you as a “discussion leader” for one of the weekly topics. In this capacity, you have the opportunity to lead, guide, direct, etc. a discussion (approx. 30 minutes) on the readings or a topic related to the readings. The purpose of this is to give the opportunity and experience facilitating a graduate-level seminar—a responsibility many of you will have in your academic careers.

Semester Project (50% of final grade). For the semester project, you have two options. First, you may choose to develop a research proposal on a topic relevant to intergroup communication. The research proposal will follow a standard manuscript format: a literature review/warrant, research questions/hypotheses, method section, analysis plan, and conclusion. Second, you may choose to write a chapter-length manuscript (approx. 25-30 pages) in which you argue for taking an intergroup perspective on a specific context of inquiry. As an example of this type of chapter, you may want to review the Scott (2007) article in *Communication Studies* in which he articulates a vision for a social identity perspective on organizational communication. In addition to these two options, I am open to ideas you may have about a semester project. When considering your project, you should choose an option that best fits with your academic goals and program of study. I would suggest meeting with me early in the semester to brainstorm ideas or discuss a specific idea. I would also encourage you to keep me updated on the progress of the project throughout the semester. Depending on the nature of your project, I may recommend that you read some of the articles/chapters in subsequent weeks and/or recommend supplemental readings. We will discuss your semester projects on the last class period of the semester and I will provide you more information on this later in the semester.

Grades will be assigned by a traditional breakdown of points (i.e., A: 94% and above, A-: 90-93%, B+: 87%-89%, B: 84-86%, B-: 80%-83%, etc.).

Semester Schedule and Readings

The readings for each week do not represent the depth and scope of each topic. Rather, the readings were chosen to give you a “glimpse” into the theories or research within the specific topic. Readings are listed in the order they should be read. The goal is to adhere to the semester schedule as much as possible. However, depending on the circumstance, there may be slight modifications. If you have any questions about the material, please let me know.

Week 4 (1/31): Theoretical Foundation for a Social Identity Perspective

- Giles, Reid, & Harwood (Ch. 1, GRH)
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup conflict. In S. Worchel & W.G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 7-24). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Hornsey, M. J. (2008). Social identity theory and self-categorization theory: A historical review. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 2/1, 204-222.
- Deaux, K. (2000). Models, meanings, and motivation. In D. Capozza & R. Brown (Eds.), *Social identity processes: Trends in theory and research* (pp. 1-14). London. Sage.
- Jetten, J., & Postmes, T. (2006). Introduction: The puzzle of individuality and the group. In T. Postmes & J. Jetten (Eds.), *Individuality and the group: Advances in Social Identity* (pp. 1-10). London: Sage.
- Pickett, C. L., & Leonardelli, G. J. (2006). Using collective identities for assimilation and differentiation. In T. Postmes & J. Jetten (Eds.), *Individuality and the group: Advances in Social Identity* (pp. 56-73). London: Sage.

Week 5 (2/7): Three Theories of Communication and Identity

- Gallois, C., Ogay, T., & Giles, H. (2005). Communication accommodation theory. In W. B. Gudykunst (Ed.), *Theorizing about intercultural communication* (pp. 121-148). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Barker, V, Giles, H., Hajek, C., Ota, H., Noels, K., Lim, T.S., & Somera, L. (2008). Police-civilian interaction, compliance, accommodation, and trust in an intergroup context: International data. *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication*, 1, 93-112.
- Hecht, M. L., Warren, J. R., Jung, E., & Krieger, J. L. (2005). A communication theory of identity: Development, theoretical perspective, and future directions. In W. B. Gudykunst (Ed.), *Theorizing about intercultural communication* (pp. 257-278). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Wadsworth, B.C., Hecht, M.L., & Jung, E. (2008). The role of identity gaps, discrimination, and acculturation in international students' educational satisfaction in American classrooms. *Communication Education*, 57, 64-87.
- Orbe, M. P., & Spellers, R. E. (2005). From the margins to the center: Utilizing co-cultural theory in diverse contexts. In W. B. Gudykunst (Ed.), *Theorizing about intercultural communication* (pp. 173-192). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Groscurth, C. R., & Orbe, M. P. (2006). The oppositional nature of civil rights discourse: Co-cultural communicative practices that speak truth to power. *Atlantic Journal of Communication*, 14, 123-140.

Week 6 (2/14): Social Categorization & Prejudice

- Oakes, P. (2003). The root of all evil in intergroup relations? Unearthing the categorization process. In R. Brown & S. Gaertner (Eds.), *Blackwell handbook of social psychology: Intergroup Processes* (pp. 3-21). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Mummendey, A., & Otten, S. (2003). Aversive discrimination. In R. Brown & S. Gaertner (Eds.), *Blackwell handbook of social psychology: Intergroup Processes* (pp. 112-132). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

- Maass, A., Castelli, L., & Arcuri, L. (2000). Measuring prejudice: Implicit versus explicit techniques. In D. Capozza & R. Brown (Eds.), *Social identity processes: Trends in theory and research* (pp. 96-116). London. Sage.
- Aboud, F. E., & Amato, M. (2003). Developmental and socialization influences on intergroup bias. In R. Brown & S. Gaertner (Eds.), *Blackwell handbook of social psychology: Intergroup Processes* (pp. 65-85). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Reicher (Ch. 14, GRH)

Week 7 (2/21): Language, Identity, and Intergroup Attitudes

- Reid & Anderson (Ch. 8, GRH)
- Sutton (Ch. 9, GRH)
- Clement, Shulman, & Rubenfeld (Ch. 10, GRH)
- Barker, V., Giles, H., Noels, K., Duck, J., Hecht, M., & Clément, R. (2001). The English-only movement: A communication analysis of changing perceptions of language vitality. *Journal of Communication, 51*, 3-37.
- Nesdale, D. (2001). Language and the development of children's ethnic prejudice. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 20*, 90-110.

Week 8 & Week 9 (2/28 & 3/7): Reducing Intergroup Bias and Conflict

- Pettigrew (1998). Intergroup contact theory. *Annual Review of Psychology, 49*, 65-68.
- Gaertner, S. L., Dovidio, J. F., Nier, J. A., Banker, B. S., Ward, C. M., Houlette, M., & Loux, S. (2000). The common ingroup identity model for reducing intergroup bias: Progress and challenges. In D. Capozza & R. Brown (Eds.), *Social identity processes: Trends in theory and research* (pp. 133-148). London. Sage.
- Ellis (Ch. 11, GRH)
- Klocek, Novoa, & Moghaddam (Ch. 7, GRH)
- On-line reading of "Israeli-Palestinian" conflict (TBA)

Week 10 (3/14): Social Identity and Mediated Communication

- Mastro (Ch. 16, GRH)
- Walther & Carr (Ch. 17, GRH)
- Cohen, J. (2001). Defining identification: A theoretical look at the identification of audiences with media characters. *Mass Communication & Society, 4*, 245-264.
- Schiappa, E., Gregg, P. B., Hewes, D. E. (2005). The parasocial contact hypothesis. *Communication Monographs, 72*, 95-118.
- Pfister, D. S., & Soliz, J. (forthcoming). Six theses on digital media and intergroup communication. *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication*.

- Paluck, E. L. (2009). Reducing intergroup prejudice and conflict using the media: A field experiment in Rwanda. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 96, 574-587.

Week 11 (3/21): Spring Break

- No readings

Week 12 (3/28): Communication and Ethnic Identity

- Verkuyten (Ch. 2, GRH)
- Phinney, J. S. (1990). Ethnic identity in adolescents and adults: Review of research. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108, 499-514.
- Jackson, R. L., Shin, C. I., & Wilson, K. B. (2000). The meaning of whiteness: Critical implications of communicating and negotiating race. *World Communication*, 29, 69-86.
- Leonard, M. F. (2004). Struggling for identity: Multiethnic and biracial individuals in America. In A. González, M. Houston, & V. Chen (Eds.), *Our voices: Essays in culture, ethnicity, and communication* (pp. 228-239). Los Angeles: Roxbury.
- Combs, G. M. & Griffith, J. (.). An examination of interracial contact: The influence of cross-race interpersonal efficacy and affect regulation. *Human Resource Development Review*, 6, 222-244.

Week 13 (4/4): Urban Gangs and Social Identity

- Documentary and Discussion: “Made in America”

Week 14 (4/11): Gender, Sexual Identity, and Communication

- Kalbfleisch (Ch. 3, GRH)
- Swim, J. K., & Campbell, B. (2003). Sexism: Attitudes, Beliefs, and Behaviors. In R. Brown & S. Gaertner (Eds.), *Blackwell handbook of social psychology: Intergroup Processes* (pp. 218-237). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Zucker, A. N. (2004). Disavowing social identities: What it means when women say, “I’m not feminist, but...” *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 28, 423-435.
- Hajek, C., Abrams, J. R., & Murachver, T. (2005). Female, straight, male, gay and worlds betwixt and between: An intergroup approach to sexual and gender identities. In J. Harwood & H. Giles (Eds.), *Intergroup communication: Multiple perspectives* (pp. 43-64). New York: Peter Lang.
- Herek, G. M., & Capitano, J. P. (1996). “Some of my best friends”: Intergroup contact, concealable stigma, and heterosexuals’ attitudes toward gay men and lesbians. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 22, 412-424.

Week 15 (4/18): No Class! Where is Jordan?!?! Read for Enjoyment!

- Hughes, P. C., & Dickson, F. C., (2005). Communication, marital satisfaction, and religious orientation in interfaith marriages. *Journal of Family Communication*, 5, 25-41.
- Chinitz, J. G., & Brown, R. A. (2001). Religious homogamy, marital conflict, and stability in same-faith and interfaith Jewish marriages. *Journal for Scientific Study of Religion*, 40, 723-733.

Week 16 (4/25): Intergroup Perspective on Organizational Identity/Age Identity/Intergroup Perspective on Family

▪Scott, C. R. (2007). Communication and social identity theory: Existing and potential connections in organizational identification research. *Communication Studies*, 58, 123-138.

▪Paulsen, N., Graham, P., Jones, E., Callan, V. J., & Gallois, C. (2005). Organizations as intergroup contexts: Communication, discourses, and identification. In J. Harwood & H. Giles (Eds.), *Intergroup communication: Multiple perspectives* (165-188). New York: Peter Lang.

▪Allen, B. J., Orbe, M. P., & Olivas, M. R., (1999). The complexity of our tears: Dis/enchantment and (In)difference in the academy. *Communication Theory*, 9, 402-429.

▪Hummert (Ch. 4, GRH)

▪Drury (Ch. 5, GRH)

▪Soliz (Ch. 15, GRH)

Week 17 (5/2): Project Discussions
