UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
CJT 616: Foundations of Instructional Communication (Online)

Semester/Term: Spring 2022 (16 weeks)
Class Meeting Dates: 1/10/2022 – 5/6/2022
Meeting Days/Time/Location: Asynchronous online (conducted via Canvas)

Instructor Information

Instructor: Kody Frey, Ph.D.
Office Address: 317 Lucille Little Library
Email: tkfr222@uky.edu
Student Q&A hours: MWF 8:30 am – 10:00 am via Zoom
Or available by appointment (email me to schedule)

Course Description

"…It is the quality of this communication, more than any other factor, that determines the success of instruction" - Basset & Smythe, 1979

Instructional communication is a blending of three disciplines, including pedagogy (teaching), educational and cognitive psychology (learning), and communication. Although each area is embedded in its own theoretical and research tradition, this course will focus on where the three disciplines intersect. We will examine and criticize various communication and instructional models, along with the programs of research produced from these models, plan for and deliver instruction in both in-person and computer-aided venues, learn various methods for assessing teaching and learning, and discuss the managerial and political aspects of instructional delivery in various professional contexts, with a special emphasis on those in academic, information, and organizational settings. Seminar topics will include student learning, the transactional nature of teacher-student communication, and instructional communication theory building.

Please note: This course is designed for two different types of graduate students. First, it is designed for graduate students who have an interest in instructional communication research and the generation of such research. These individuals will pursue study in the field and will teach and supervise educators and trainers at various institutions across the country. Second, it is designed for the practitioner. Since a high percentage of students graduating with advanced degrees in the social sciences, regardless of area of specialization, will pursue careers in which instruction plays a primary or secondary role, this course will enhance their instructional effectiveness. Understanding and applying knowledge claims produced from instructional communication research will benefit graduate students who become primary and secondary educators, college, community college, or university faculty members, communication consultants within or outside organizations, training and development managers, public relations/sales/marketing representatives, etc.

Required Materials

1. M. Houser and A. Hosek (Eds.) The Handbook of Instructional Communication: Rhetorical and Relational Perspectives. Second Edition. Available through through UKY Libraries.
2. Additional readings listed in the schedule. All readings available through UKY Libraries. Please note that you will be responsible for obtaining these readings. Considering copyright constraints, they will not be distributed for you.

Recommended (But not required) readings
1. APA Manual 7th Edition

2. Mottet, T. P., Richmond, V. P., & McCroskey, J. C. (2006). Handbook of Instructional Communication: Rhetorical and Relational Perspectives. First Edition.
3. D.L. Fasset & J.T. Warren (Eds.). *The SAGE Handbook of Communication and Instruction*. Sage.

Student Learning Outcomes

By end of this course, students should be able to:

Learning Outcome (LO):
1. Explain the evolution and foundations of instructional communication.
2. Discuss, apply, critique, and extend instructional communication theory, constructs, and processes.
3. Deliver effective and research-based instruction in a variety of contexts.
4. Plan methodologically sound and translational instructional communication research.

Assignment (A):
1. Weekly Reaction Papers
2. Discussion Board Participation
3. Discussion Board Management
4. Concept Book Chapter
5. Pragmatic Training Manual
6. Extended Forum Essay
7. Research Prospectus
8. Build-Your-Own Instructional Model
9. Online Teaching Portfolio

How you will demonstrate mastery of the LO:

	A1	A2	A3	A4	A5	A6	A7	A8	A9
LO 1	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	
LO 2	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	
LO 3			✓		✓		✓	✓	✓
LO 4				✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Technology Information and Requirements

Technology Requirements

Minimum technical requirements for UK courses and suggested hardware, software, and internet connections are available at ITS Student Hardware & Software Guidelines.

For this course, students will also need:

- Recording equipment (it could be a laptop, phone, iPad, etc.)
- Students may also need access to Google Drive [instructions on setting up Google accounts here]
- Access to the Canvas online learning management system

Technical Support

For account help, contact UK's Information Technology Customer Services online, by email, or by phone at 859-218-HELP (4357).

Course Assignments

Below is a brief description of each assignment in CJT 616. More detailed information will be provided in Canvas. All assignments should also be submitted in Canvas unless otherwise stated. Assignments will be discussed in class as they become relevant:

Weekly Engagement:

(1) Independent Assignments: Weekly Reaction Papers (11 @ 15 points each)

Reaction papers are exactly what they sound like – a reaction to the readings for the week. You can choose to focus on what was most surprising or interesting about the readings (e.g., how they support or contradict other research or theoretical perspectives, what methodological choices they made, critiquing the articles, making connections to other readings and other courses, or ideas for future research). We will not formally discuss everything in your reaction in discussion boards, but they should guide your contributions. Mainly, *each reaction paper should contain 3 burning questions that you would like answered after doing the readings*. Our discussions will seek to answer these questions as they are presented. You will be responsible for turning in 11 reaction papers between Weeks 2-16 for a total of 150 points – your lowest score will be dropped. Your reaction paper should a maximum of 1 single-spaced page with references included on separate page as needed. In addition, please note that because reaction papers guide your thoughts for the week, they should be turned in by the end of the prior week. That is, Week 2's reaction paper is due at the end of Week 1.

(2) Collective Assignments: Discussion Board Participation (100 total points)

You will need to participate in all the discussion board posts, as most of the class will occur in this space (*there will be 15 total – one for each week of readings). Thus, you are responsible for keeping up with the various conversations that will be taking place through your burning questions from the weekly reflections, your knowledge of the reading, and your personal experience(s).

There will be three active discussion boards present each week, running from 8:00 am Monday morning until 11:59 pm on the following Sunday. The three discussion boards will be related to *(1) Your burning questions/comments/critiques based on the week's readings; (2) Practical application of the week's concept to pedagogy; (3) Scholarly origins / Personal connections*. You are expected to contribute to each board in some capacity, though the amount of your contribution between them does not need to be equivalent.

(3) Independent Assignment: Discussion Board Management (50 total points)

Starting in Week 3, one student will be assigned to "manage" each discussion board alongside the instructor. This student will be in charge of *(1) posting an introductory video for the week's content and (2) ensuring that active conversation surrounding the content is taking place*. The introductory video should introduce/define the week's concept and its importance, comment on the nature of the research that has taken place surrounding that concept, briefly critique the concept, and provide 1-2 areas for future research. Essentially, the assigned student will serve as a leader for the discussion boards; their role is basically to make sure the discussion doesn't come to a halt.

Midterm Assignment (Choose 1):

(1) Concept Book Chapter

The first option for your midterm assignment is the *book chapter*. For this assignment, students are asked to write a book chapter synthesizing the research surrounding a specific instructional

communication variable (e.g., self-disclosure, credibility, rapport) they find interesting from class so far (Weeks 3-8). Your Handbook should serve as an excellent example of similar manuscripts, though your work will need to be original. The manuscript should not exceed 20 pages in length, including APA references and any tables/figures you choose to include. It should, at a minimum, include:

- A biographical note (a brief description of yourself; approximately 40 words);
- The construct's conceptualization and operationalization and the researcher(s) primarily responsible for the construct;
- A brief rationale for why the construct remains important to our study of instructional communication;
- A discussion (either as separate sections of the chapter or embedded within) of the key methods and key questions used to investigate the topic;
- Where possible, include traditional classroom contexts and other training/learning environments (e.g., out of class meetings, organizational training) to showcase how the construct is at work in multiple contexts (i.e., not just face-to-face classrooms);
- 4-5 general knowledge claims based around the construct.

(2) Pragmatic Training Manual

The second option for your midterm assignment is the ***pragmatic training manual***. The training manual should synthesize research on an instructional communication variable you find interesting from class so far (Weeks 3-8) and explain how to apply the concept in an instructional context (e.g., online course, library, K-12 classroom, health session). Students must apply the literature review and synthesis to create an original and professional 1-hour training session. Contents of the training program may vary, and much can be left to student design and creativity. However, there are several items that must be included: an agenda of the training program, explanations of the training program activities, instructional materials (e.g., case studies, synopses of relevant articles, role play situations) and an annotated bibliography of related reference materials.

(3) Extended Forum Essay

The third option for your midterm assignment is the ***extended forum essay***. *Communication Education* – the flagship journal for instructional communication research – publishes a series of quarterly forum articles that address relevant problems within the field. For this assignment, you will write an extended version of the forum essay in response to the current call from the journal. While forum essays are generally around 1,000 words, your extended essay addressing the problem should not exceed 15 pages, including references. Your forum essay should, at a minimum, (1) directly address the call and establish that a problem exists; (2) present a unique solution to the problem based on your knowledge and interpretation of instructional communication; (3) offer a roadmap for future research and scholarship related to your solution. As part of the assignment, you will also submit a shortened version of the larger essay that meets the requirements of the *Communication Education* call (1,000 words including references) and can be submitted for publication if desired. Note – your instructor will not ask for authorship on the publication but will help prepare it for submission.

Final Project

(1) Research Prospectus

The first option for your final project is the **research prospectus**. You will write a report that extends a current program of research or proposes a new program of research and focuses on more contemporary conceptualizations of communication, teaching, and learning. You should develop a research study that is grounded in theory and incorporates a concept discussed at some

point during the semester. The final paper should include (1) a literature review / rationale / theoretical framework including hypotheses and/or research questions, (2) proposed method, and (3) a data analysis plan. See the handout in Canvas for additional guidance regarding the research prospectus.

(2) Build-Your-Own-Instructional Model

The second option for the final project is the ***build-an-instructional-model paper.*** For this assignment, students will be asked to create their own model of instructional communication based on the variables and concepts discussed throughout the semester. In other words, you should explicate how you believe instructional communication works to influence student outcomes/achievement based on your knowledge of the variables discussed throughout the semester. You may draw on any of the existing models within the literature as examples (e.g., McCroskey's et al's (2004) General Model of Instructional Communication; Weber et al's (2011) Instructional Beliefs Model; Sellnow et al.'s IDEA model; Keller's (1987) ARCS Model). You do not have to incorporate every concept from class, but you should articulate why the variables you select are important to analyze and how they are connected. At a minimum, your final paper will include:

– A visual representation of your proposed model;
– A literature review/rationale including hypotheses/propositions representing the different connections within the proposed model (i.e., a rationale for why X leads to Y);
– An outline of future instructional communication research projects related to the model;
– References

(3) Online Teaching Portfolio

The third option for the final project is the ***online teaching portfolio.*** You will use an online service (e.g., Squarespace; Wordpress; Github; Wix) or your own knowledge of coding to create a portfolio showcasing your teaching accomplishments and philosophy. The online portfolio should have tabs/links for each of the following sections:

– *About Me/Personal*: Provide a brief description of who you are as a person and what experience you bring to the profession.
– *Teaching Philosophy*: Your teaching philosophy should reflect your approach to the classroom. Depending on your personal beliefs, areas to address could include pedagogy, evaluation, classroom management, diversity/inclusion, or feedback. You should include 3-5 "I believe" statements that reflect your philosophy. In addition, the philosophy should be grounded in research. Although you do not need to include explicit citations in your philosophy, you should include the relevant, impactful readings or citations that inspired it.
– *Curriculum Vita or Resume*
– *Class Syllabus*: You should create a syllabus for a class that you will likely teach in the future (but aren't teaching yet) or a class you would like to teach sometime soon. You may create a fictional office address and office hours to include on the syllabus. I suggest that you consult the [Center for the Enhancement of Learning and Teaching website](#) to make sure that your syllabus includes the required and recommended components and that you look at several example syllabi written by a variety of instructors.

While your syllabus will undoubtedly have similarities to a syllabus that you might obtain from a faculty member who teaches the same course, you SHOULD NOT merely copy their syllabus and put your name at the top. Instead, you should carefully consider how your classroom policies might differ and how you can best structure your class and syllabus to best accomplish the course objectives and meet the needs of your students.

- *Annotated Lesson Plan*: You should compile lesson plans for two class periods. For each class period, you should include (1) Your teaching notes for the course, which should contain notations about which learning objectives are being addressed and which part of Bloom's (or Anderson & Krathwohl's) taxonomy is being emphasized in each class segment and (2) Board notes, PowerPoint slides, handouts, or any other materials that you plan to use.
- *One Assignment*: This assignment should be appropriate for the course that you are teaching. It might be a lab, a group project, an individual project, a homework assignment, a final project, or any other assignment of your choosing. Along with the assignment, you should include a brief (~ 1 paragraph) explanation of when the assignment would be used and what objectives it is intended to accomplish.
- *Additional Resources*: If applicable, your portfolio should also including other relevant information include evidence of teaching effectiveness, evaluations from a superior, student kudos and praise, additional teaching activities, or selected teaching publications.

Grading and Grading Scale

I hope grades will not be emphasized in this course as the major reinforcement for which students are to strive. At the same time, I realize that grades do hold contingencies for you and, therefore, I will make every effort to be as objective, impartial, and fair as possible. In keeping with this goal, I welcome your involvement in the assessment process and general feedback. The following guidelines will be used to establish the final grade for the course:

Assignment	Points
Weekly Reaction Papers	150
Discussion Board Participation	100
Discussion Board Management	50
Midterm Project	300
Final Project	400
Total Points	1000

Grades will be administered using the standard 90% = A, 80% = B, 70% = C, 60% = D, <60% = E.

Please NOTE: I absolutely **CANNOT** legally discuss grades via email or Canvas. If you have questions or issues related to a grade, you MUST set up a meeting with me or visit office hours.

Course Policies and Expectations

Completion of Assignments

As students pursuant of an advanced degree, it is assumed that you will turn your assignments in on time. All assignments are on the date listed in the course schedule below. Late assignments will receive a 0. You are expected to devote enough time out of every day to working on this class and to stay on top of the content, assignments, and deadlines.

Part of my personal teaching philosophy is grounded in the belief that you are humans first and students second. I do not believe in separating the classroom from the "real world"; things that happen outside of class directly influence your performance and ability to give your best effort towards meeting learning goals. If you encounter problems, please let me know right away. Like most instructors, I am more understanding if you keep me informed.

Also, all written assignments (first/rough and final drafts) must be submitted in a .doc, .docx, or .pdf format to Canvas. If you have submitted correctly, you will see a screen that confirms your submission, and you can check the gradebook to see that the assignment has been submitted. Any file that is attached, but unable to be opened, will be treated as if it were not submitted and will result in a zero. Emailed assignments will not be accepted.

Attendance

You are required to log-in to our Canvas shell at least two times a week, though more engagement is encouraged to facilitate a robust and comprehensive discussion. You are responsible for any information shared by the instructor through the in-Canvas announcements or Syllabus.

For any emergency situation that arises, please e-mail me as soon as you know about the situation.

Written Work

As graduate students, you are expected to have developed a strong foundation in writing at this point in your academic career. Further, as graduate students, you are expected to demonstrate continued improvement of your writing skills. All papers must follow APA 7th edition. The writing style, mechanics, and content are equally important.

Participation

You are expected to read all of the *assigned* readings. You may choose from the *optional* readings at your discretion – though I do believe they are helpful. Class discussions will happen on discussion boards. These discussions will extend the information covered in the assigned readings. You are responsible for knowing this information to the extent that you are able to fully discuss it. You will engage fully in every discussion demonstrating knowledge and critical thought about readings, lecture materials, and your own classroom experiences (or research experiences)

Student Behavior

You are expected to log-in and engage in our online course several times throughout the week. We will maintain an open, respectful, and engaged classroom environment. The respect should extend to those who are in the classroom (e.g., myself, other students). Respect is being able to challenge a difference of opinions without attacking or belittling another person. Your interactions online should remain professional and focused on learning without resorting to personal attacks, unsupported claims, or irrelevant conversations. This will not be tolerated. Students who engage in disrespectful or disruptive behavior will be asked to see me to discuss their communication and behaviors. See the UKY's Code of Student Conduct for further information on prohibited conduct.

If things happen in the course that upset you or make you uncomfortable, e-mail me as soon possible.

Academic Integrity - Prohibition on Plagiarism (Senate Rules 6.3.1)

Per University policy, students shall not plagiarize, cheat, or falsify or misuse academic records. Students are expected to adhere to University policy on cheating and plagiarism in all courses. The minimum penalty for a first offense is a zero on the assignment on which the offense occurred. If the offense is considered severe or the student has other academic offenses on their record, more serious penalties, up to suspension from the University may be imposed.

Plagiarism and cheating are serious breaches of academic conduct. Each student is advised to become familiar with the various forms of academic dishonesty as explained in the Code of Student Rights and Responsibilities. Complete information can be found at the following website: http://www.uky.edu/Ombud. A plea of ignorance is not acceptable as a defense against the charge of academic dishonesty. It is important that you review this information as all ideas borrowed from others need to be properly credited.

Senate Rules 6.3.1 (see http://www.uky.edu/Faculty/Senate/ for the current set of *Senate Rules*) states that all academic work, written or otherwise, submitted by students to their instructors or other academic supervisors, is expected to be the result of their own thought, research, or self-expression. In cases where students feel unsure about a question of plagiarism involving their work, they are obliged to consult their instructors on the matter before submission.

When students submit work purporting to be their own, but which in any way borrows ideas, organization, wording, or content from another source without appropriate acknowledgment of the fact, the students are guilty of plagiarism.

Plagiarism includes reproducing someone else's work (including, but not limited to a published article, a book, a website, computer code, or a paper from a friend) without clear attribution. Plagiarism also includes the practice of employing or allowing another person to alter or revise the work which a student submits as his/her own, whoever that other person may be, except under specific circumstances (e.g. Writing Center review or peer review) allowed by the Instructor of Record or that person's designee. Plagiarism may also include double submission, self-plagiarism, or unauthorized resubmission of one's own work, as defined by the instructor.

Students may discuss assignments among themselves or with an instructor or tutor, except where prohibited by the Instructor of Record (e.g. individual take-home exams). However, the actual work must be done by the student, and the student alone, unless collaboration is allowed by the Instructor of Record (e.g. group projects).

When a student's assignment involves research in outside sources or information, the student must carefully acknowledge exactly what, where and how he/she has employed them. If the words of someone else are used, the student must put quotation marks around the passage in question and add an appropriate indication of its origin. Making simple changes while leaving the organization, content, and phraseology intact is plagiaristic. However, nothing in these Rules shall apply to those ideas, which are so generally and freely circulated as to be a part of the public domain.

Note: Any assignment you turn in may be submitted to an electronic database to check for plagiarism.

Academic Integrity - Prohibition on Cheating (Senate Rules 6.3.2)

Cheating is defined by its general usage. It includes, but is not limited to, the wrongfully giving, taking, or presenting any information or material by a student with the intent of aiding himself/herself or another on any academic work which is considered in any way in the determination of the final grade. The fact that a student could not have benefited from an action is not by itself proof that the action does not constitute cheating. Any question of definition shall be referred to the University Appeals Board.

Academic Integrity - Prohibition on Falsification/Misuse of Academic Records (SR 6.3.3)

Maintaining the integrity, accuracy, and appropriate privacy of student academic records is an essential administrative function of the University and a basic protection of all students. Accordingly, the actual or attempted falsification, theft, misrepresentation or other alteration or misuse of any official academic record of the University, specifically including knowingly having unauthorized access to such records or the unauthorized disclosure of information contained in such records, is a serious academic offense. As used in this context, "academic record" includes all paper and electronic versions of the partial or complete permanent academic record, all official and unofficial academic transcripts, application documents and admission credentials, and all academic record transaction documents. The minimum sanction for falsification, including the omission of information, or attempted falsification or other misuse of academic records as described in this section is suspension for one semester.

Accommodations Due to Disability

If you have a documented disability that requires academic accommodations, please see me as soon as possible during scheduled office hours. In order to receive accommodations in this course, you must provide me with a Letter of Accommodation from the Disability Resource Center (DRC). The DRC coordinates campus disability services available to students with disabilities. Visit the DRC website, email the DRC, contact them by phone at (859) 257-2754, or visit their office on the corner of Rose Street and Huguelet Drive in the Multidisciplinary Science Building, Suite 407.

Non-Discrimination Statement and Title IX Information

UK is committed to providing a safe learning, living, and working environment for all members of the University community. The University maintains a comprehensive program which protects all members from discrimination, harassment, and sexual misconduct. For complete information about UK's prohibition on discrimination and harassment on aspects such as race, color, ethnic origin, national origin, creed, religion, political belief, sex, and sexual orientation, please see the electronic version of UK's *Administrative Regulation 6:1* ("Policy on Discrimination and Harassment") . In accordance with Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, the University prohibits discrimination and harassment on the basis of sex in academics, employment, and all of its programs and activities. Sexual misconduct is a form of sexual harassment in which one act is severe enough to create a hostile environment based on sex and is prohibited between members of the University community and shall not be tolerated. For more details, please see the electronic version of *Administrative Regulations 6:2* ("Policy and Procedures for Addressing and Resolving Allegations of Sexual Assault, Stalking, Dating Violence, Domestic Violence, and Sexual Exploitation"). Complaints regarding violations of University policies on discrimination, harassment, and sexual misconduct are handled by the Office of Institutional Equity and Equal Opportunity (IEEO), which is located in 13 Main Building and can be reached by phone at (859) 257-8927. You can also visit the IEEO's website.

Faculty members are obligated to forward any report made by a student related to IEEO matters to the Office of Institutional Equity and Equal Opportunity. Students can *confidentially* report alleged incidences through the Violence Intervention and Prevention Center, Counseling Center, or University Health Services.

Statement on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI)

The University of Kentucky is committed to our core values of diversity and inclusion, mutual respect and human dignity, and a sense of community (Governing Regulations XIV). We acknowledge and respect the seen and unseen diverse identities and experiences of all members of the university community (https://www.uky.edu/regs/gr14). These identities include but are not limited to those based on race, ethnicity, gender identity and expressions, ideas and perspectives, religious and cultural beliefs, sexual orientation, national origin, age, ability, and socioeconomic status. We are committed to equity and

justice and providing a learning and engaging community in which every member is engaged, heard, and valued.

We strive to rectify and change behavior that is inconsistent with our principles and commitment to creating a safe, equitable, and anti-racist environment. If students encounter such behavior in a course, they are encouraged to speak with the instructor of record or the [college's diversity officer](#), who is charged with addressing concerns about diversity, equity, and inclusiveness (uky.edu/inclusiveexcellence/college-diversity-inclusion-officers). Students may also contact a faculty member within the department, program director, the director of undergraduate or graduate studies, the department chair, or the dean. To submit an official report of bias, hatred, racism, or identity-based violence, visit the Bias Incident Support Services [website](#).

Authorship

"Authorship credit should reflect the individual's contribution to the study/work conducted. An author is considered anyone involved with initial research design, data collection and analysis, manuscript drafting, and final approval. However, the following do not necessarily qualify for authorship: providing funding or resources, mentorship, or contributing research but not helping with the publication itself. The primary author assumes responsibility for the publication, making sure that the data are accurate, that all deserving authors have been credited, that all authors have given their approval to the final draft; and handles responses to inquiries after the manuscript is published" (APA Guidelines on Authorship, see www.apa.org/research/responsible/publication/).

My primary responsibility is to ensure your learning. To that end, we will produce various documents that have the potential to be submitted for publication. I will not seek authorship on your individual work; however, I will provide you with feedback, guidance, and direction to ensure you manuscript is prepared for publication if you want to submit it. You may choose to include me as an author if you feel it is appropriate, but the expectation will always be for you to take sole responsibility of your work.

Unit 1: A Historical Introduction to the Discipline	

Week 1: 1/10-1/16	**Introductions, Course Overview, and Defining Instructional Communication**
	
	1. Handbook Chapter 1 (Farris, Houser, & Hosek)
	2. Myers, S. A., Tindage, M. F., & Atkinson, J. (2016). The evolution of instructional communication research. In P. L. Witt (Ed.), *Communication and learning* (pp. 13-42). De Gruyter
	3. Nyquist, J. L., & Booth, J. L. (1977). Instructional communication: A basic course for teachers. *Communication Education, 26*(1), 13-26. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634527709378195
	4. Friedrich, G. (1987). Instructional communication research. *Journal of Thought, 22*, 4-10.
	5. Sprague, J. (2002). Communication education: The spiral continues. *Communication Education, 51*(4), 337-354. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634520216532
	
	Forum Reading:
	6. Perspectives on the interface of communication and instruction: Contextual and programmatic effects; *Communication Education*, 1989, Issue 4
	    a. Choose **one** article from the following set of authors:
	        i. Friedrich, Burgoon, Andersen, Book, Wolvin & Engleberg, Sorensen, Nussbaum & Prusank, Barker, Pedersen, Richmond, Staton, DeWine & Pearson, Nyquist et al.
	
	OPTIONAL Readings:
	• Conley, N. A., & Ah Yun, K. (2017). A survey of instructional communication: 15 years of research in review. *Communication Education, 66*(4), 451-466. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2017.1348611
	• Staton-Spicer, A. Q., & Wulff, D. H. (1984). Research in communication and instruction: Categorization and synthesis. *Communication Education, 33*(4), 377-391. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634528409384767
	• Nussbaum, J. F., & Friedrich, G. (2005). Instructional/developmental communication: Current theory, research, and future trends. *Journal of Communication*, *55*(3), 578-593. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2005.tb02686.x
	
	Due Before 11:59 PM on Sunday (1/16):
	• Introduction Responses
	• Week 2 Reaction Paper
	• Complete Brief Assessment Survey
	• Weekly Discussion Responses

Week 2: 1/17-1/23	**Theoretical and Methodological Approaches** 1. Handbook Chapter 18 (Fassett & Nainby) 2. Mazer, J. P., & Graham, E. E. (2015). Measurement in instructional communication research: A decade in review. *Communication Education, 64*(2), 208-240. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2014.1002509

3. Sprague, J. (1992). Expanding the research agenda for instructional communication: Raising some unasked questions. *Communication Education, 41*(1), 1-25. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634529209378867.
4. Waldeck, J. H., & LaBelle, S. (2016). Theoretical and methodological approaches to instructional communication. In P. L. Witt (Ed.), *Communication and learning* (pp. 67-101). De Gruyter
5. Lashbrook, V. J., & Wheeless, L. R. (1978). Instructional communication theory and research: An overview of the relationship between learning theory and instructional communication. In B. D. Ruben (Ed.) *Communication yearbook 3* (pp. 439-456). Transaction Books.

Forum Reading:
6. Revisiting the origins of communication education: Foundations in speech communication; *Communication Education*, 2002, Issue 4
    a. Choose **one** article from the following set of authors:
        i. Reid, Dance, Roberts, Brown, Friedrich, Daly, McCroskey et al., Trank, Crandall & Hazel, Rubin.

OPTIONAL Readings:
- Scott, M. D. & Wheeless, L. R. (1977). Instructional communication theory and research: An overview. In B. D. Ruben (Ed.), *Communication yearbook 1* (pp. 495-511). Transaction Books.
- Daly, J. A., & Korinek, J. T. (1980). Instructional communication theory and research: An overview of classroom interaction. In D. Nimmo (Ed.), *Communication yearbook 4* (pp. 515-532). Transaction Books.
- Horan, S. M., & Afifi, T. D. (2014). Advancing instructional communication: Integrating a biosocial approach. *Communication Education, 63*(4), 383-404. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2014.934851

Due Before 11:59 PM on Sunday (1/23):
- Responses to Introduction Videos (Respond to at least 3 peers)
- Week 3 Reaction Paper
- Weekly Discussion Responses

Week 3 1/24-1/30	**Learning Outcomes: The Bottom Line** 1. Handbook Chapters 15 (Hosek, Crawford, & Vogl-Bauer) and 16 (Lane, Frey & Tatum) 2. Clark, R. A. (2002). Learning outcomes: The bottom line. *Communication Education, 51*(4), 396-404. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634520216531 3. Broeckelman-Post, M. A., & Ruiz-Mesa, K. (2018). Measuring college learning in public speaking. https://www.natcom.org/sites/default/files/pages/Measuring_College_Learning_in_Public_Speaking.pdf 4. Anderson, L. W., & Krathwohl, D. R. (Eds.) (2001). *A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing: A revision of Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives: Abridged edition* (pp. 38-62). Addison Wesley Longman. 5. Frisby, B. N., Mansson, D. H., & Kaufmann, R. (2014). The cognitive learning measure: A three-study examination of validity. *Communication Methods and Measures, 8*(3), 163-176. https://doi.org/10.1080/19312458.2014.903389

Forum Reading:
6. Affective learning; *Communication Education*, 2015, Issue 4
   - Choose **one** article from the following set of authors:
     - Myers & Goodboy, Thweatt & Wrench, Housley Gaffney & Dannels, Bolkan, Witt, Mottet, Lane

OPTIONAL Readings:
- Mottet, T. P., & Richmond, V. P. (1998). Newer is not necessarily better: A reexamination of affective learning measurement. *Communication Research Reports, 15*(4), 370-378. https://doi.org/10.1080/08824099809362136
- Brown, P. C., Roediger III, H. L., & McDaniel, M. A. (2014). *Make it stick: The science of successful learning* (pp. 1-22, 200-253). Harvard University Press.
- Frymier, A. B., & Houser, M. L. (1999). The revised learning indicators scale. *Communication Studies, 50*(1), 1-12. https://doi.org/10.1080/10510979909388466

Due Before 11:59 PM on Sunday (1/30):
- Week 4 Reaction Paper
- Weekly Discussion Responses

Unit 2: Instructor Messages & Behavior

Week 4: 1/31-2/6	**Instructors as Sources of Communication**
	
	1. Nussbaum, J. F. (1992). Effective teacher behaviors. *Communication Education*, *41*(2), 167-180. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634529209378878
	2. Worley, D., Titsworth, S., Worley, D. W., & Cornett-DeVito, M. (2007). Instructional communication competence: Lessons learned from award-winning teachers. *Communication Studies*, *58*(2), 207-222. https://doi.org/10.1080/10510970701341170
	3. Dannels, D. P. (2015). Teacher communication concerns revisited: Calling into question the gnawing pull toward equilibrium. *Communication Education, 64*(1), 83-106. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2014.978796
	4. Starnaman, S. M., & Miller, K. I. (1992). A test of a causal model of communication and burnout in the teaching profession. *Communication Education, 41*(1), 40-53. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634529209378869
	5. Comadena, M. E., Semlak, W., & Escott, M. D. (1992). Communicator style and teacher effectiveness: Adult learners versus traditional undergraduate students. *Communication Research Reports, 9*(1), 57-63. https://doi.org/10.1080/08824099209359897
	
	Forum Reading:
	6. When teaching works; *Communication Education*, 1993, Issue 4
	   a. Choose **one** article from the following set of authors:
	      i. Conquergood; Sprague; Strine; Wulff
	
	OPTIONAL Readings:
	- Morris, T. L., Gorham, J., Cohen, S. H., & Huffman, D. (1996). Fashion in the classroom: Effects of attire on student perceptions of instructors in college classrooms. *Communication Education, 45*(2), 135-148. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634529609379043

	• Rubin, R. B., & Feezel, J. D. (1986). Elements of teacher communication competence. *Communication Education, 35*(3), 254-268. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634528609388348 • Martin, F., Ritzhaupt, A., Kumar, S., & Budhrani, K. (2019). Award-winning faculty online teaching practices: Course design, assessment and evaluation, and facilitation. *The Internet and Higher Education, 42*, 34-43. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ihedec.2019.04.001. Due Before 11:59 PM on Sunday (2/6): • Week 5 Reaction Paper • Weekly Discussion Responses

Week 5:
2/7-2/13
	Instructor Messages (Clarity, Humor, Self-Disclosure)
	
	1. Handbook Chapter 2 (Mazer)
	2. Titsworth, S., Mazer, J. P., Goodboy, A. K., Bolkan, S., & Myers, S. A. (2015). Two meta-analyses exploring the relationship between teacher clarity and student learning. *Communication Education*, *64*(4), 385-418. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2015.1041998
	3. Banas, J. A., Dunbar, N., Rodriguez, D., & Liu, S. J. (2011). A review of humor in educational settings: Four decades of research. *Communication Education*, *60*(1), 115-144. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2010.496867
	4. Kromka, S. M., & Goodboy, A. K. (2021). The effects of relevant instructor self-disclosure on student affect and cognitive learning: A live lecture experiment. *Communication Education, 70*(3), 266-287. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2021.1900583\\
	5. Kaufmann, R., & Frisby, B. N. (2017). Dimensions of instructor disclosure: Implications for rhetorical and relational goals of instruction. *Communication Research Reports, 34*(3), 221-229. https://doi.org/10.1080/08824096.2017.1286469
	
	Forum Reading:
	6. The Lecture and Student Learning; *Communication Education*, 2017, Issue 2.
	   o Choose **one** article from the following set of authors:
	      ▪ Sciullo, Meyer & Hunt, Mallin, Stearns, Kramer, Waldeck & Weimer, Buzzanell, Darling
	
	OPTIONAL Readings:
	• Hosek, A. M., & Thompson, J. (2009). Communication privacy management and college instruction: Exploring the rules and boundaries that frame instructor private disclosures. *Communication Education*, *58*(3), 327-349. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634520902777585
	• Bolkan, S. (2017). Development and validation of the clarity indicators scale. *Communication Education, 66*(1), 19-36. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2016.1202994
	• Banas, J. A., Bisel, R. S., Kramer, M. W., & Massey, Z. (2019). The serious business of instructional humor outside the classroom: A study of elite gymnastic coaches' uses of humor during training. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 47*(6), 628-647. https://doi.org/10.1080/00909882.2019.1693052
	
	Due Before 11:59 PM on Sunday (2/13):

Week 6
2/14-2/20
	Instructor Messages (Misbehaviors, Feedback, Confirmation, Credibility)
	
	1. Goodboy, A. K., & Myers, S. A. (2015). Revisiting instructor misbehaviors: A revised typology and development of a measure. *Communication Education*, *64*(2), 133-153. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2014.978798
	2. Trees, A. R., Kerssen-Griep, J., & Hess, J. A. (2009). Earning influence by communicating respect: Facework's contributions to effective instructional feedback. *Communication Education*, *58*(3), 397-416. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634520802613419
	3. Finn, A. N., Schrodt, P., Witt, P. L., Elledge, N., Jernberg, K. A., & Larson, L. M. (2009). A meta-analytical review of teacher credibility and its associations with teacher behaviors and student outcomes. *Communication Education*, *58*(4), 516-537. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634520903131154
	4. Goldman, Z. W., Claus, C. J., & Goodboy, A. K. (2018). A conditional process analysis of the teacher confirmation–student learning relationship. *Communication Quarterly*, *66*(3), 245-264. https://doi.org/10.1080/01463373.2017.1356339
	5. Wang, T. R. (2012). Understanding the memorable messages first-generation college students receive from on-campus mentors. *Communication Education, 61*(4), 335-357. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2012.691978
	
	Forum Reading:
	6. Instructional Communication in Organizational Contexts: Innovations in Training and Consulting; *Communication Education*, 2008, Issue 4
	    o Choose **one** article from the following set of authors:
	        ▪ Plax et al., Scott et al., Hart et al., Chandler & Wallace, Waldeck, Cragan, Meyers & Johnson, Lucier
	
	OPTIONAL Readings:
	• Goldman, Z. W., Cramer, G. A., Sollitto, M., Labelle, S., & Lancaster, A. L. (2016). What do college students want? A prioritization of instructional behaviors and characteristics. *Communication Education, 66*(3), 280-298. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2016.1265135
	• Vallade, J. I., & Kaufmann, R. (2018). Investigating instructor misbehaviors in the online classroom. *Communication Education*, *67*(3), 363-381. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2018.1467027
	• Teven, J.J., & McCroskey, J.C. (1997). The relationship of perceived teacher caring with student learning and teacher evaluation. *Communication Education, 46*(1), 1-9. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634529709379069
	
	Due Before 11:59 PM on Sunday (2/20):
	• Week 7 Reaction Paper
	• Weekly Discussion Responses

Week 7: 2/21-2/27	**Compliance Gaining (Power, Syllabi, Fairness, Justice)** 1. Handbook Chapter 8 (Chory & Horan)

2. Horan, S. M., Martin, M. M., & Weber, K. (2012). Understanding emotional response theory: The role of instructor power and justice messages. *Communication Quarterly, 60*(2), 210-233. https://doi.org/10.1080/01463373.2012.669323
3. Chory-Assad, R. M., & Paulsel, M. L. (2004). Classroom justice: Student aggression and resistance as reactions to perceived unfairness. *Communication Education, 53*(3), 253-273. https://doi.org/10.1080/0363452042000265189
4. Frey, T. K., Moore, K., & Dragojevic, M. (2021). Syllabus sanctions: Controlling language and fairness as antecedents to students' psychological reactance and intent to comply. *Communication Studies, 72*(3), 456-473. https://doi.org/10.1080/10510974.2021.1876130
5. Pytlak, M. A., & Houser, M. L. (2014). Because I'm the teacher and I said so: GTA use of behavior alteration techniques to establish power and credibility in the college classroom. *Western Journal of Communication, 78*(3), 287-309. https://doi.org/10.1080/10570314.2014.893010

Forum Reading:
6. Communication Instruction Around the World; *Communication Education*, 1998, Issue 3.
    - Choose **one** article from the following set of authors:
        i. Beebe et al., Irwin, Valo, Rolls

OPTIONAL Readings:
- Tatum, N. T., Olson, M. K., & Frey, T. K. (2018). Noncompliance and dissent with cell phone policies: a psychological reactance theoretical perspective. *Communication Education*, *67*(2), 226-244. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2017.1417615
- Goodboy, A. K., & Goldman, Z. W. (2016). Teacher power and compliance-gaining. In P. L. Witt (Ed.), *Communication and learning* (pp. 129-156). De Gruyter.
- Thompson, B. (2007). The syllabus as a communication document: Constructing and presenting the syllabus. *Communication Education*, *56*(1), 54-71. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634520601011575

Due Before 11:59 PM on Sunday (2/27):
- Week 8 Reaction Paper
- Weekly Discussion Responses

Week 8: 2/28-3/6	**Relationships (Rapport, Immediacy)** 1. Handbook Chapters 7 (Richmond, Houser, & Hosek) & 9 (Frisby & Buckner) 2. Zhang, Q., & Witt, P. (2016). Instructor immediacy. In P. L. Witt (Ed.), *Communication and learning* (pp. 157-182). De Gruyter. 3. Frisby, B. N., Berger, E., Burchett, M., Herovic, E., & Strawser, M. G. (2014). Participation apprehensive students: The influence of face support and instructor–student rapport on classroom participation. *Communication Education*, *63*(2), 105-123. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2014.881516 4. Knoster, K., Goodboy, A., Martin, M., & Thomay, A. (2021). What matters most? A prioritization of medical students' preferences for effective teaching. *Communication Education*, *70*(2), 183-200. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2020.1841254

5. Frisby, B. N., & Housley Gaffney, A. L. (2015). Understanding the role of instructor rapport in the college classroom. *Communication Research Reports*, *32*(4), 340-346. https://doi.org/10.1080/08824096.2015.1089847

Forum Reading:

6. Interpersonal Communication in Instructional Settings; *Communication Education*, 2017, Issue 1.
   - Choose **one** article from the following set of authors:
     i. Myers, Goodboy & Kashy, Johnson et al., Punyanunt-Carter & Arias, Lane, Titsworth, Sellnow

OPTIONAL Readings:

- Smythe, M. J., & Hess, J. A. (2005). Are student self-reports a valid method for measuring teacher nonverbal immediacy?. *Communication Education*, *54*(2), 170-179. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634520500213389
- Comstock, J., Rowell, E., & Bowers, J. W. (1995). Food for thought: Teacher nonverbal immediacy, student learning, and curvilinearity. *Communication Education*, *44*(3), 251-266. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634529509379015
- Christensen, L. J., & Menzel, K. E. (1998). The linear relationship between student reports of teacher immediacy behaviors and perceptions of state motivation, and of cognitive, affective, and behavioral learning. *Communication Education, 47*(1), 82-90. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634529809379112

Due Before 11:59 PM on Sunday (3/6):

- Week 9 Reaction Paper
- Weekly Discussion Responses

	Unit 3: Student Perceptions and Behavior

Week 9: 3/7-3/13	**Student Behavior (Dissent, Challenge Behavior, Incivility)**
	1. Handbook Chapter 5 (Goodboy & Bolkan)
	2. Goodboy, A. K., Bolkan, S., Kromka, S. M., & Knoster, K. C. (2021). Instructional dissent over the course of the semester. *Communication Education*, *70*(4), 347-364. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2021.1925718
	3. Chory, R. M., & Offstein, E. H. (2018). Too close for comfort? Faculty–student multiple relationships and their impact on student classroom conduct. *Ethics & Behavior*, *28*(1), 23-44. https://doi.org/10.1080/10508422.2016.1206475
	4. Hayes, J. G. (2005). Problematic student behaviors in the college communication classroom: Reviewing and re-envisioning instructional communication research. *Basic Communication Course Annual, 17*(1), 43-93. http://ecommons.udayton.edu/bcca/vol17/iss1/7.
	5. Vallade, J. I., Martin, M. M., & Vela, L. E. (2015). An investigation of students' forgiveness, instructional dissent, and learning in the college classroom. *Western Journal of Communication, 79*(4), 389-412. https://doi.org/10.1080/10570314.2015.1068368
	Forum Reading:
	6. Wicked Problems Forum: Freedom of Speech at Colleges and Universities; *Communication Education*, 2018, Issue 2.
	- Choose **one** article from the following set of authors:

	i. Herbeck, Mazer, Waltman, Rudick & Dannels
	OPTIONAL Readings:
	• Hooker, J. (2019). 'I have a student who...': Systematically addressing student misbehaviors in the basic course. *Basic Communication Course Annual, 31*(1), 186-189. https://ecommons.udayton.edu/bcca/vol31/iss1/15.
	• Burroughs, N. F. (2007). A reinvestigation of the relationship of teacher nonverbal immediacy and student compliance-resistance with learning. *Communication Education, 56*(4), 453-475. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634520701530896
	• Zhang, Q., & Sapp, D. A. (2013). Psychological reactance and resistance intention in the classroom: Effects of perceived request politeness and legitimacy, relationship distance, and teacher credibility. *Communication Education, 62*(1), 1-25. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2012.727008
	Due Before 11:59 PM on Sunday (3/13):
	• Week 11 Reaction Paper
	• Weekly Discussion Responses
	• Midterm Assignment
Week 10: 3/14-3/20	**Spring Break! Enjoy Your Time Away**

Week 11: 3/21-3/27	**Student Behavior (Emotions, Motivation, Apprehension)**
	
	1. Handbook Chapters 6 (Beebe & Frei) & 10 (Titsworth & Waldbuesser)
	2. Frymier, A. B. (2016). Students' motivation to learn. In P. L. Witt (Ed.), *Communication and learning* (pp. 377-396). De Gruyter.
	3. Bodie, G. D. (2010). A racing heart, rattling knees, and ruminative thoughts: Defining, explaining, and treating public speaking anxiety, *Communication Education, 59*(1)*,* 70-105. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634520903443849
	4. Pekrun, R., Goetz, T., Titz, W., & Perry, R. P. (2002). Academic emotions in students' self-regulated learning and achievement: A program of qualitative and quantitative research. *Educational Psychologist, 37*(2), 91-105. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15326985EP3702_4
	5. Mazer, J. P., McKenna-Buchanan, T. P., Quinlan, M. M., & Titsworth, S. (2014). The dark side of emotion in the classroom: Emotional processes as mediators of teacher communication behaviors and student negative emotions. *Communication Education, 63*(3), 149-168. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2014.904047
	
	Forum Reading:
	6. Wicked Problems: Mental Health Stigma; *Communication Education*, 2018, Issue 3.
	   - Choose **one** article from the following set of authors:
	      i. Smith & Applgeate, Simonds & Hooker, Goldman, Rudick & Dannels
	
	OPTIONAL Readings:

	- Myers, S., Martin, M., & Mottet, T. (2002). Students' motives for communicating with their instructors: Considering instructor socio-communicative style, student socio-communicative orientation, and student gender. *Communication Education, 51*(2), 121-133. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634520216511 - Generous, M. A., & Houser, M. L. (2019). "Oh, S** t! Did I just swear in class?": Using emotional response theory to understand the role of instructor swearing in the college classroom. *Communication Quarterly,* 67(2), 178-198. https://doi.org/10.1080/01463373.2019.1573200 - Goldman, Z. W., Goodboy, A. K., & Weber, K. (2017). College students' psychological needs and intrinsic motivation to learn: An examination of self-determination theory. *Communication Quarterly, 65*(2), 167-191. https://doi.org/10.1080/01463373.2016.1215338 Due Before 11:59 PM on Sunday (3/27): - Week 12 Reaction Paper - Weekly Discussion Responses

Week 12: 3/28-4/3	**Student Behavior (Participation, Engagement, Connectedness)**
	
	1. Handbook Chapter 4 (Frymier & Houser)
	2. Rocca, K. A. (2010). Student participation in the college classroom: An extended multidisciplinary literature review. *Communication Education*, *59*(2), 185-213. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634520903505936
	3. Sidelinger, R. J., Bolen, D. M., Frisby, B. N., & McMullen, A. L. (2012). Instructor compliance to student requests: An examination of student-to-student connectedness as power in the classroom. *Communication Education, 61*(3), 290-308. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2012.666557
	4. Mazer, J. P. (2012). Development and validation of the student interest and engagement scales. *Communication Methods and Measures, 6*(2), 99-125. https://doi.org/10.1080/19312458.2012.679244
	5. Gist-Mackey, A. N., Wiley, M. L., & Erba, J. (2018). "You're doing great. Keep doing what you're doing": Socially supportive communication during first-generation college students' socialization. *Communication Education, 67*(1), 52-72. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2017.1390590.
	
	Forum Reading:
	6. Instructional Communication & Millennial Students; *Communication Education*, 2016, Issue 3.
	   - Choose **one** article from the following set of authors:
	      i. Hosek & Titsworth, Frey & Tatum, Buckner & Strawser, McAllum, Goldman & Martin, Tompkins, Morreale & Staley, Rudick & Ellison
	
	OPTIONAL Readings:
	   - Jorgensen-Earp, C. R., & Staton, A. Q. (1993). Student metaphors for the college freshman experience. *Communication Education, 42*(2), 123-141. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634529309378920 - Frisby, B. N., Hosek, A. M., & Beck, A. C. (2020). The role of classroom relationships as sources of academic resilience and hope. *Communication Quarterly, 68*(3), 289-305. https://doi.org/10.1080/01463373.2020.1779099 - Henningsen, M. L. M., Valde, K. S., & Denbow, J. (2013). Academic misconduct: A goals–plans–action approach to peer confrontation and whistle-blowing.

	Communication Education, 62(2), 148-168. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2012.752509
	Due Before 11:59 PM on Sunday (4/3): • Week 13 Reaction Paper • Weekly Discussion Responses
Unit 4: Everything Else	

Week 13:
4/4-4/10
	Instructional Technologies & Online Learning
	
	1. Handbook Chapters 13 (Edwards & Edwards) & 14 (Sellnow & Kaufmann)
	2. Baker, J. P., Goodboy, A. K., Bowman, N. D., & Wright, A. A. (2018). Does teaching with PowerPoint increase students' learning? A meta-analysis. *Computers & Education, 126*, 376-387. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2018.08.003
	3. Lane, D. R., & Shelton, M. W. (2001). The centrality of communication education in classroom computer-mediated-communication: Toward a practical and evaluative pedagogy. *Communication Education, 50*(3), 241-255. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634520109379251
	4. Kuznekoff, J. H., Munz, S., & Titsworth, S. (2015). Mobile phones in the classroom: Examining the effects of texting, Twitter, and message content on student learning. *Communication Education, 64*(3), 344-365. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2015.1038727
	5. Dixson, M. D., Greenwell, M. R., Rogers-Stacy, C., Weister, T., & Lauer, S. (2017). Nonverbal immediacy behaviors and online student engagement: Bringing past instructional research into the present virtual classroom. *Communication Education, 66*(1), 37-53. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2016.1209222
	
	Forum Reading:
	6. Pandemic Pedagogy and Student Learning; *Communication Education*, 2021, Issue 2.
	    - Choose **one** article from the following set of authors:
	        i. Miller et al., Ashby-King, Hampsten, Swerzinski, Tatum & Frey, Westwick & Morreale
	
	OPTIONAL readings:
	• Bowen, J. A. (2006). Teaching naked: Why removing technology from the classroom will improve student learning. *The National Teaching and Learning Forum, 16*(1). http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/summary?doi=10.1.1.509.36
	• Sherblom, J. C. (2010). The computer-mediated communication (CMC) classroom: A challenge of medium, presence, interaction, identity, and relationship. *Communication Education, 59*(4), 497-523. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2010.486440
	• Lin, X., Kaufmann, R., Spates, S. A., Lachlan, K. A., & Spence, P. R. (2021). Exploring students' perceptions of identity and helper heuristics in the online classroom discussion board. *Communication Education*, 1-17. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2021.1957138
	
	Due Before 11:59 PM on Sunday (4/10):
	• Week 14 Reaction Paper

Week 14: 4/11-4/17	**Critiquing Instructional Research**
	
	1. Simonds, C. J., Meyer, K. R., Hunt, S. K., & Simonds, B. K. (2009). Speech evaluation assessment: An analysis of written speech feedback on instructor evaluation forms in the basic communication course. *Basic Communication Course Annual, 21*, 69-96. http://ecommons.udayton.edu/bcca/vol21/iss1/8
	2. Frey Example Review #1 (posted in Canvas)
	3. Frey Example Review #2 (posted in Canvas)
	4. PLOS: How to Write a Peer Review. https://plos.org/resource/how-to-write-a-peer-review/
	5. McCroskey, J. C., Valencic, K. M., & Richmond, V. P. (2004). Toward a general model of instructional communication. *Communication Quarterly*, *52*(3), 197-210. https://doi.org/10.1080/01463370409370192
	6. Walton, J. (2014). Critical comments on the general model of instructional communication. *Education, 135*(1), 115-125.
	
	Forum Reading:
	7. Diversity and Scholarship on Instructional Communication – Part I; *Communication Education*, 2016, Issue 1
	   - Choose **one** article from the following set of authors:
	      i. Sciullo, Rudick & Golsan, Spencer & Capuzza, Orbe, Fassett & Nainby, De La Mare, González & Cramer
	
	OPTIONAL Reading:
	• Coppoloa, B. P. (2002). Writing a statement of teaching philosophy: Fashioning a framework for your classroom. *Journal of College Science Teaching, 31*(7), 448-453.
	
	Due Before 11:59 PM on Sunday (4/17):
	• Week 15 Reaction Paper
	• Weekly Discussion Responses

Week 15: 4/18-4/24	**Diversity and Inclusion in Instructional Scholarship** 1. Handbook Chapters 11 (Harris & Murphy) & 12 (Manning, Stern, & Johnson) 2. Hendrix, K. G., & Wilson, C. (2014). Virtual invisibility: Race and communication education. *Communication Education, 63*(4), 405-428. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2014.934852 3. Faulkner, S. L., Watson, W. K., Pollino, M. A., & Shetterly, J. R. (2021). "Treat me like a person, rather than another number": University student perceptions of inclusive classroom practices. *Communication Education, 70*(1), 92-111. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2020.1812680 4. Boren, J. P., & McPherson, M. B. (2018). Is coming out in the classroom still an occupational hazard? A replication of Russ, Simonds, and Hunt (2002). *Communication Studies, 69*(3), 242-250. https://doi.org/10.1080/10510974.2018.1466719 5. Joyce, J. (2018). "I didn't even think of this": Examining the influence of student disability accommodation training on basic course instructors' attitudes and

self-efficacy. *Basic Communication Course Annual, 30*, 109-146.
https://ecommons.udayton.edu/bcca/vol30/iss1/8

6. Simmons, J., Lowery-Hart, R., Wahl, S. T., & McBride, M. C. (2013). Understanding the African-American student experience in higher education through a relational dialectics perspective. *Communication Education, 62*(4), 376-394. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2013.813631

Forum Reading:
7. Diversity and Scholarship on Instructional Communication – Part II; *Communication Education*, 2016, Issue 2.
   - Choose **one** article from the following set of authors:
       i. Hosek & Soliz, Carroll et al., Shlossberg & Cunningham, Simmons & Wahl, Yep, Sprague, Hendrix & Jackson II

OPTIONAL Readings:
- Edwards, C., & Harwood, J. (2003). Social identity in the classroom: An examination of age identification between students and instructors. *Communication Education*, *52*(1), 60-65. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634520302463
- McKenna-Buchanan, T., Munz, S., & Rudnick, J. (2015). To be or not to be out in the classroom: Exploring communication privacy management strategies of lesbian, gay, and queer college teachers. *Communication Education, 64*(3), 280-300. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2015.1014385
- Rudick, C. K. (2017). A critical organizational communication framework for communication and instruction scholarship: Narrative explorations of resistance, racism, and pedagogy. *Communication Education, 66*(2), 148-167. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2016.1265137
- Ruiz-Mesa, K., & Hunter, K. (2019). Best practices for facilitating difficult dialogues in the basic communication course. *Journal of Communication Pedagogy, 2,* 134-141. https://doi.org/10.31446/JCP.2019.23.

Due Before 11:59 PM on Sunday (4/24):
- Week 16 Reaction Paper
- Weekly Discussion Responses

Week 16: 4/25-5/1	**The Future of Instructional Research: Where Do We Go from Here?** - Handbook Chapter 17 (Floyd, Afifi, & Shahnazi) - Sellnow, D. D., Limperos, A., Frisby, B. N., Sellnow, T. L., Spence, P. R., & Downs, E. (2015). Expanding the scope of instructional communication research: Looking beyond classroom contexts. *Communication Studies, 66*(4), 417-432. https://doi.org/10.1080/10510974.2015.1057750 - Witt, P. L., Seidel, T., Schidnler, A., Orbe, M. P., Floyd, K., & Hess, J. A. (2016). The future of communication and learning research: Challenges, opportunities, and predictions. In P. L. Witt (Ed.), *Communication and learning* (pp. 727-744). De Gruyter. - Frey, T. K., & Lane, D. R. (2021). CAT in the classroom: A multilevel analysis of students' experiences with instructor nonaccommodation. *Communication Education, 70*(3), 223-246. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2021.1903521

	• Frisby, B., Tatum, N., Galy-Badenas, F., & Bengu, E. (2021). Testing the applicability of the instructional beliefs model across three countries: The role of culture as a theoretical parameter. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, 1-21. Advance online publication.
	
	Forum Reading:
	6. The Future of Instructional Communication; *Communication Education*, 2017, Issue 4.
	    - Choose **TWO** articles from the following set of authors:
	        i. Goodboy, Meluch, Kaufmann & Tatum, Kahl, Jr., Valenzano III & Wallace, Goldman & Myers, Edwards & Edwards, Horan & Bryant, Donovan et al., Chatham-Carpenter, Witt, Dannels
	
	OPTIONAL Readings:
	• Violanti, M. T., Kelly, S. E., Garland, M. E., & Christen, S. (2018). Instructor clarity, humor, immediacy, and student learning: Replication and extension. *Communication Studies, 69*(3), 251-262. https://doi.org/10.1080/10510974.2018.1466718
	• Klyukovski, A. A., & Medlock-Klyukovski, A. L. (2016). Instructor strategic ambiguity: Delineation of the construct and development of a measure. *Communication Education, 65*(3), 253-271. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2016.1142097
	• Sellnow, D. D., Lane, D. R., Sellnow, T. L., & Littlefield, R. S. (2017). The IDEA model as a best practice for effective instructional risk and crisis communication. *Communication Studies, 68*(5), 552-567. https://doi.org/10.1080/10510974.2017.1375535
	
	Due Before 11:59 PM on Sunday:
	• Weekly Discussion Responses
	• Work on Your Final Project

Finals Week:	Final Projects due May 2, 2021 before 11:59 EST.