SYLLABUS AND OUTLINE
COMMUNICATION 735
SEMINAR IN RELATIONAL COMMUNICATION
Fall 2014

Instructor: Peter A. Andersen   Email: peterand@mail.sdsu.edu
Office: Comm 203   Mobile Phone: 619-857-4233
Office Hours: Tuesday 1:00-2:00, Wednesday 3:00-4:00, Thursday 1:00-2:00

Assignments	Due Dates	% of Grade
Research Proposal	October 5	10%
Research Study	December 3	30%
Class Participation	Ongoing	5 %
Expert Presentations	Two to be arranged	20%
Peer Evaluation	Dec.17	10%
Final Exam	Dec.17	25 %

Because this is a class in relational communication, several of the assignments will be done in dyads. You must participate in **different dyads** for the two interviews and for the empirical study (if you chose to do an empirical study).

Objectives:
1. Articulate and describe the history of interpersonal and relational communication.
2. Conduct a complete "state of the art" or empirical study on relational communication that is of conference paper quality.
3. Present supplemental material on two units of the relational communication.
4. Describe various types of interpersonal relationships and their similarities and differences.
5. Articulate and critique major theories of relational communication.
6. Express current knowledge of the development and maintenance of close relationships.
7. Articulate the importance of human evolution as the basis of contemporary interpersonal relationships.
8. Describe the importance of infant attachment and attachment theory on childhood and adult relationships.
9. Elucidate the role of affection, immediacy, intimacy, power, and attraction on the development, maintenance, and termination of close relationships.

Papers:
All papers should be type written, double-spaced, employ APA style, and be stapled together. It is particularly important to accurately and meticulously footnote (in APA style) all studies, ideas, and findings in order to avoid charges of plagiarism (i.e. copying a portion of another scholar's or student's work and submitting it as your own). ***Plagiarism, like receiving or giving aid during an exam, will result in failure in this course***. Please familiarize yourself with the dept. plagiarism policy at the end of this syllabus.

Readings:
Two sets of readings are required for the class. Your preparation for in class presentations and your final paper should incorporate additional materials. Please do the readings *prior* to the class session.

Guerrero, L. K., Andersen, P. A. Afifi, W. A. (2014). Close Encounters: Communication in Relationships. (4th Edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. (GAA).

Reading Packet available at Cal Copy by mid-August. Cal Copy is on the east side of College Avenue just North of Montezuma (next to KB Books)

Expert Presentations:

All presentations will be done in dyads. **Remember, you must select 2 different partners for your 2 expert presentations.**

Presentations will follow a 30-minute format. During the first part of the presentation each week, the dyad will do a 20-minute *entertaining and content-laden* introduction to the topic. This presentation may involve visual aids, skits, PowerPoint presentations, exercises, quizzes, or audio/video material but these media are not a requirement. This presentation should evoke interest in the topic, and briefly summarize *some* important findings. *I will stop you at 20 minutes!*
- *Go beyond* the readings by summarizing and presenting current research. *Do not summarize our readings for this week (we already read those)*.
- Provide a one page bibliography of your top 10 recent articles on the topic.
- Please provide a copy the class with your favorite recent article on this topic.

The presentation will be followed with a ten-minute question/answer period from seminar participants that will provide a general transition into a class discussion of the topic readings. I will call on people randomly during this phase.
- Class members should keep questions short and participants should keep answers short. Long answers destroy that lively interview format. Each seminar student should prepare a question.
- All class members should do the readings and prepare questions *in writing* that can be asked following the presentation.

For the research study you have two choices: an empirical study or a state of the art paper.

The Empirical Study:

During the first weeks of class (no later than Sept. 10) please select a *partner* with whom to conduct an empirical study in relational communication and report your choice to me. The empirical study should comprehensively investigate (including data collection) a problem of importance in relational communication. The paper may be qualitative and/or quantitative. The paper should demonstrate your ability to: a) select a

problem of importance in relational communication research, b) exhaustively review and summarize research relevant to that problem, c) incorporate any theory or theories that may help to make predictions as to the outcome of the problem, and d) derive hypothesis or questions which provide an empirical test of the problem. In short, an "A" paper should be a completed study like a convention paper or journal article. The paper is due in two segments: On Oct 1., you should submit a complete rationale for your study including research questions, problems or hypotheses, a complete review of *relevant* literature and theory, and a sketchy idea of how you might conduct the study (the methods section). This means the study is 30% finished at this time.

Here are some guidelines that may help you.

A) Once you select your partner, get busy **immediately**.

B) See your instructor during the first two weeks to brainstorm your topic. Remember I am available each week during office hours or via email. I am on campus every Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday for scheduled meetings if my office hours do not work.

C) Select a topic that in compelling and interesting to you. At the beginning of the semester pursue your book of readings and identify articles that are interesting to you and can be extended. Do not be afraid to replicate a study. It may be the easiest way to do this assignment.

D) As you look over the readings also look at their methods. This study may be qualitative or quantitative, and conducted in the field, lab, or by questionnaire.

E) Give me as complete a paper as possible on October 1, if you can. That way I can give you maximum feedback for the final study. I will give you one week or less turnaround.

F) Because most of you will be collecting data on human subjects, you need to contact and obtain approval from the University's Institutional Review Board. Failure to do so is a violation of University policy and state and federal law.

G) Similarly, be sure to obtain approval of the instructor/course director before collecting data in an SDSU course.

The State of the Art:
A "state of the art" paper is a complete, analytic, critical review of our state of knowledge in a given area of personal relationships. Here are some guidelines.

A) This paper must be done *individually*. You can, of course, seek advice from your instructor as well as other students and faculty.

B) Please brainstorm your topic with your instructor.

C) State of the art articles are **comprehensive**. All relevant literature should be summarized. A *major weakness* would be that you failed to include relevant studies.

D) Select a narrow topic: A topic like love, acquaintance, or intimacy could fill volumes.

E) If a prior state-of-the-art article exists in your area, build upon it.

F) The paper should culminate in conclusions about what we know regarding this area.

G) On out line and complete set of reference is due on October 1.

H) Recommendations for future research and knowledge gaps should be provided.

Schedule of Classes and Topics

SESSION 1:   August 27: **INTRODUCTION TO THE COURSE:**
Topic: INITIAL ENCOUNTERS:
UNDERSTANDING THE ACQUAINTANCE
PROCESS

Topics: Syllabus Review
Course Overview
Discussion of Assignments

Content Topics: History of Relational Communication
Key Definitions
Relational Myths
Relational Ideology
Nonverbal and Verbal Communication
Personal and Interpersonal Identity
Generational Identity
Interpersonal Image
Characteristics of Relationships
Initial Interaction
Initiation

Readings: GAA Chapters 1 & 2

SESSION 2:   September 3 **ATTRACTION, SIMILARITY, AND UNCERTAINTY:**
THE BASIS OF INITAIL REALTIONSHIPS

Content Topics: Uncertainty
Uncertainty Reduction Theory
Uncertainty Management
Dimensions of Attraction
Task Attraction
Physical Attraction
Social Attraction
The Biology of Attraction

Readings: GAA: Chapters 3 & 4

2A) Afifi, W. & Matsunaga, M. (2008). Uncertainty management theories. In L. A. Baxter & D. O. Braithwaite (Eds.). *Engaging theories in Interpersonal Communication: Multiple Perspectives* (pp. 117-132). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

2B) Montoya, R. M. & Horton, R. S. (2012). A meta-analytic investigation of the processes underlying the similarity-attraction effect, *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 30*, 64-94.

SESSION 3: Sept 10   RELATIONSHIP INTENSIFICAITON, DISCLOSURE, TRAJECTORIES, TURNING POINTS AND PRIVACY

Topics: Relationship Topoi
              Cognitive Schemas
              Relational Schemas
              Relational Stages
              Relational Dialectics
              Emotions
              Trajectories
              Turning Points
              Inertia
              Proximity and Distance
              Relational Topography
              Relational Change
              Privacy Management
              Self-Disclosure
              Topic Avoidance

Readings: GAA Chapter 5 and 6.

3A) Baxter, L. A. & Braithwaite, D. O. (2008). Relational dialectics theory. In . In L. A. Baxter & D. O. Braithwaite (Eds.). *Engaging theories in Interpersonal Communication: Multiple Perspectives* (pp. 349-361). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

SESSION 4: Sept. 17   The Big Two: Social Evolutionary Theory and Attachment Theory: Two leading explanations for Human Relationships

Topics: Social Evolutionary Theories
                                The Biology of Relationships
                                Sexual Fitness
                                Group Fitness
                                Attachment Theory
                                Infant Attachment
                                Secure Attachment
                                Insecure Attachment
                                Partner's attachment

Readings:
4A) Shaver,P. R. & Mikuliner, M. (2010). New directions in attachment theory and research. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 27,* 163-172.

4B) Simpson, J. A. & Rholes, W. S. (2010). Attachment and relationships: Milestones and Future Directions. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 27,* 173-180

4C) Buss, D. M. (2007). The Evolution of Human Mating. *Acta Psychologica Sinica*, 3, 502-512.

4D) Zeifman, D.M. & MA, J. E. (2013) Experimental examination of women's selection criteria for sperm donors versus life partners. *Personal Relationships, 20,* 311-327.

SESSION 5: Sept. 24   COMMUNICATING CLOSENESS: AFFECTION, IMMEDIACY, AND INTIMACY

Topics: Affection
             Intimacy Behaviors
             Immediacy
             Physical Closeness
             Friendship
             Synchronically
             Reciprocity
             Cognitive- Valence Theory
             Self-Disclosure
             Accounts
             Person centered messages
             Sex Differences in Closeness

Readings: GAA Chapter 7

5A)   Andersen, P. A., Guerrero, L.K. & Jones, S.M. Nonverbal intimacy. (2006) In V. Manusov & M. L. Patterson (Eds.) *The Sage Handbook of Nonverbal Communication*: (pp. 259-277). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

5B)   Andersen, P. A. (1998). The cognitive valence theory of intimate communication. In M. T. Palmer & G. A. Barnett (Eds.). *Progress in Communication Sciences, Volume XIV: Mutual Influence in Interpersonal Communication: Theory and Research In Cognition, Affect, and Behavior.* (pp. 39-72). Stamford, CT: Ablex.

5C)   Floyd, K., Judd, J. & Hesse, (2008). Affection exchange theory. In L. A. Baxter & D. O. Braithwaite (Eds.). *Engaging theories in Interpersonal Communication: Multiple Perspectives* (pp. 285-293). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

5D)   Carton, S. T. & Horan, S. M. (2014). A diary examination of romantic and sexual partners withholding affectionate messages. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 31,* 221-246.

SESSION 6: Oct. 1: LOVE -- RESEARCH PROPOSAL DUE!!

Topics: Love
                Commitment
                Intimacy
                Passion
                Bonding

Readings: GAA Chapter 8

6A) Graham, J. M. (2011). Measuring love in romantic relationships: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 28,* 748-771.

6B) Neto, F. (2012). Perceptions of love and sex across the adult life span. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 29,* 760-775.

SESSION 7: Oct. 8:   SEXUAL COMMUNICATION

Topics: Types of Sexual Relationships
                Hookups
                Friends with Benefits
                Heterosexual Behavior
                Homosexual Behavior
                Lust
                Passionate Love
                Sex Differences in Sexual Communication

Readings: GAA Chapter 9

7A) Babin, E. A. (2012). An examination of the predictors of nonverbal and verbal communication of pleasure during sex and sexual satisfaction. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 30,* 270-292.

7B) Byers, E. S. (2011). Beyond the Birds and the Bees and Was It Good for You?: Thirty Years of Research on Sexual Communication. *Current Psychology, 52,* 20-28.

7C) Mongeau, P. A., Knight, K., Williams, J., Eden, J., & Shaw, C. (2013). Identifying and explicating variation among friends with benefits relationships. *Journal of Sex Research, 50*, 37-47.

7D) Ein-Dor, T. & Hirschberger, G. (2012). Sexual healing: Daily diary evidence that sex relieves stress for men and women in satisfying relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 29,* 126-139.

SESSION 8: Oct. 15 RELATIONAL CHALLENGES: CONFLICT and It's Management

Topics: Conflict
                       Conflict Escalation
                       Conflict Pattern
                       Conflict Management
                       Demand-Withdrawal
                       Stalking
                       Obsessive Relational Intrusion

Readings: GAA Chapters 11

8A) Afifi, T. D., Joseph, A., & Aldeis, D. (2012). The "standards of openness hypothesis": Why women find (conflict) avoidance more dissatisfying than men. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 29,* 102-125.

8B) Schrodt, P., Witt, P. L. & Shimkowski, J. R. (2014). A meta-analytic review of the demand/withdrawal pattern of interaction and its associations with individual, relational, and communicative outcomes. *Communication Monographs, 81,* 28-58.

8C) Rholes, W. R., Kohn, J. M. & Simpson, J. A. (2014). A longitudinal study of conflict in new parents: The role of attachment. *Personal Relationships, 21,* 1-21.

8D) Spitzberg, B. H. & Cupach, W. R. (2007). The state of the art of stalking: Taking stock of the emerging literature. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 12,* 64-86.

SESSION 9: **October 22** POWER PLAYS, POLITICS, AND PERSUASION

Topics: Power
                       Persuasion
                       Compliance Gaining
                       Verbal Power
                       Nonverbal Power
                       Family Politics
                       Gender and Power
                       Gender Inequities

Readings:
GAA Chapter 12

9A) Andersen, P. A. (2008).Positions of Power: The control, power, and status. In *Nonverbal Communication: Forms and Functions*. Long Grove, Il: Waveland.

9B) Burgoon, J. K., Guerrero, L. K., Floyd, K. (2010). Relational Messages: Power, dominance and Influence, In *Nonverbal Communication*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

9C) Miller-Day, M. & Jackson, A. M. (2012). The convergence communication scale: Development and evaluation of an assessment of interpersonal submission. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 29,* 1036-1057.

SESSION 10: October 29   **THE DARK SIDE OF RELATIONSHIPS, RELATIONAL TRANSGRESSIONS: JEALOUSY, INFIDELITY, DECEPTION and MORE**

Topics: Jealousy
             Infidelity
             Extradyadic Sexual Behavior
             Double standards
             Deception

Readings: GAA Chapter 13

10A) Guerrero, L. K. & Andersen, P. A. (1998). The dark side of jealousy and envy: Delusion, desire, desperation, and destructive communication. In B. H. Spitzberg & W. R. Cupach. *The Dark Side of Close Relationships*. (pp. 33-70). Mahwah NJ: Erlbaum.

10B) Muise, A., Christofides, E., Desmaris, S. (2014). "Creeping" of just information seeking? Gender differences in response to jealousy on facebook. *Personal Relationships, 21,* 35-50.

10C) Roggensack, K. E. & Sillars, A. (2013). Agreement and understanding about honesty and deception rules in romantic relationships. *Journal of Social and personal relationships, 31,* 178-199.

SESSION 11: November 5   **SEX DIFFERENCES AND SIMILARITIES**

Topics: **Gender differences**
                Sex difference
                Evolution of sex differences
                Sexual selection strategies
                Differences in Friendship and Intimacy

11A) Andersen, P. A, (2006). The Evolution of Biological Sex Differences in Communication. In D. Canary & K. Dindia. *Sex Differences and Similarities in Communication* (2nd Edition, pp. 117-135). Mahwah, N.J., Lawrence Erlbaum.

11B) Andersen, P. A. (2008) Gender, Sex, and Nonverbal Communication. Chapter 5 in *Nonverbal Communication: Forms and Functions.* Long Grove, Il: Waveland.

11C) Hall, J. A. (2011), Sex differences in friendship expectations: *A meta-analysis. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 6, 723-747.

11D) Haselton, M. G., Mortezai, M., Pillsworth, E.G., Bleske-Rechek, A. & Frederick, D. A. (2006). Ovulatory shifts in human female ornamentation: Near ovulation: Women dress to impress. *Hormones and Behavior, 51,* 40-45.

SESSION 12: November 12   HEALING, EMOTIONAL SUPPORT, RELATIONAL REPAIR AND RECONCILIATION

SOCIAL SUPPORT, SOCIAL NETWORKS, RELATIONAL MAINTENANCE AND RELATIONAL DIALECTICS

Topics: Social Support
             Comforting
             Psychological Health
             Comforting
             Relational Maintenance
             Maintenance Behaviors
             Equity theory
             Investment Models

Readings: GAA Chapter 14

12A) Burleson, B. R. (2003). The experience and effects of emotional support: What the study of cultural and gender differences can tell us about close relationships, emotion, and interpersonal communication. *Personal Relationships*,*10*,1-23.

12B) Mikulincer, M. & Shaver, P. R. (2009). An attachment and behavioral systems perspective on social support, *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 26*, 7-19.

12C) Burleson, B. R. (2009). Understanding the outcomes of supportive communication: A dual process approach. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 26,* 21-38.

12D) Ogolsky, B. G. & Bowers, J. R. (2013). A meta-analytic review of relationship maintenance and its correlates. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 30,* 343-367

No Class: November 19 NCA Convention in Chicago
No Class: November 26 Thanksgiving Break

SESSION 13:   December 3   UNDERSTUDIED RELATIONSHIPS: INTERRACIAL RELATIONSHIPS, BLENDED FAMILIES, GAY AND LESBIAN RELATIONS, THE HOMELESS, AND RELATIONSHIPS IN AGING
Topics: Gay and Lesbian Relationships
                   Remarriage
                   Blended Families
                   Close Relationships in Old Age

Multicultural Relationships
Relationships of the Homeless and Marginalized People

Readings:

13A) Kurdek, L. A. (2006). Differences between partners from gay, lesbian, and cohabiting relationships. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 68,* 509-528.

13B) Scherer, C. R., Akers, E. G., and Kolbe, K. L. (2013). Bisexuals and the sex difference in jealousy hypothesis. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 30*, 1064-1071.

13C) Chicirelli, V. G. (2010). Attachment relationships in old age. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 27*, 191-199.

13D) Pedersen, P. V., Andersen, P. T., & Curtis, T. (2012). Social relations and experiences of social isolation among socially marginalized people. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships,* 29, 839-858.

13E) Nussbaum, J. E. (2007). Life span communication and quality of life. *Journal of Communication, 57,* 1-7.

SESSION 14: December 10   **COMING APART: RELATIONAL DISENGAGEMENT AND TERMINATION**

Topics: Disengagement Strategies
Growing Apart
De-escalation
Break-ups
Divorce
Dissolution
Unrequited love
Work on Topics

Readings: GAA Chapter 15

14A) Huston, T. L. (2009). What's love got to do with it? Why some marriages success and others fail. *Personal Relationships*, *16*, 301-327.

14B) Frisby, B. N., Booth-Butterfield, M., Dillow, M. R., Martin, M. M., & Weber, K. D. (2012). Face and resilience in divorce: The impact on emotions, stress, and the post-divorce relationship. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 29,* 715-735.

14C) Bevan, J. L., Ang, P., & Fearns, J. B. (2014). Being unfriended on Facebook: An application of expectancy violations theory. Computers in Human Behavior, 33, *171-178. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 30,* 1020-1044.

14D) Dailey, R. M., Brody, N., LeFebre L., & Crook, B. (2013). Charting changes in commitment: Trajectories is on again/off again relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 30,* 1020-1044.

SESSION 15: December 17 The Final
Final Exam: 4:00-6:00
Peer Evaluation   4:00

PLAGIARISM

*Plagiarism is one of the highest forms of academic offense. It represents several ethics violations. It is **theft** of intellectual property. In academe, a scholar's words, ideas, and creative products represent essential intellectual property, which are the primary measures of scholarly identity, status and achievement. It is **fraud**. Students should be assessed on their own ideas and abilities; not the ideas and abilities of others. It is **unfair**. It introduces bias and inequity in the assessment process, producing grades for fellow students based on disadvantaged standards and expectations. It is **corruption**. It undermines the credibility of higher education by misrepresenting the meaning of university grades and degrees to the rest of the public. Whether by ignorance, accident, or intent, theft is still theft, fraud is still fraud, inequity is still inequity, and corruption is still corruption. Therefore, the offense, no matter how minor in quantity, is still serious, and is treated as such.*

The 2008-2009 SDSU Graduate Bulletin policy[1] states:

> Plagiarism is formal work publicly misrepresented as original; …. Work shall be deemed plagiarism: (1) when prior work of another has been demonstrated as the accessible source; (2) when substantial or material parts of the source have been literally or evasively appropriated (substance denoting quantity; matter denoting qualitative format or style); and (3) when the work lacks sufficient or unequivocal citation so as to indicate or imply that the work was neither a copy nor an imitation. This definition comprises oral, written, and crafted pieces. In short, if one purports to present an original piece but copies ideas word for word or by paraphrase, those ideas should be duly noted. (Lindey, 1952, *Plagiarism and Originality*)

The 2008-2009 Graduate Bulletin continues by stating:

> San Diego State University is a publicly assisted institution legislatively empowered to certify competence and accomplishment in general and

---

[1] San Diego State University *Graduate Bulletin*, 2008-2009, p. 35.

discrete categories of knowledge. The president and faculty of this university are therefore obligated not only to society at large but to the citizenry of the State of California to guarantee honest and substantive knowledge in those to whom they assign grades and whom they recommend for degrees. Wittingly or willfully to ignore or to allow students' ascription of others' work to themselves is to condone dishonesty, to deny the purpose of formal education, and to fail the public trust.

One of the primary objectives of higher education is to advance humanity by increasing and refining knowledge. Such an objective is therefore threatened by students who commit plagiarism, in which the evidence of the student's knowledge is not genuine. Given the gravity of the offense, students suspected or accused of disregarding, concealing, aiding, or committing plagiarism must be assured of thorough, impartial and conclusive investigation of any such accusation. Likewise, students guilty of such an offense must be liable for an appropriate penalty, even severance from the University and in some cases revocation of an advanced degree, should the demonstrated plagiarism clearly call into question a student's academic ethics, competence or accomplishments.

**THE ACADEMIC DISHONESTY POLICY OF
THE SCHOOL OF COMMUNICATION**

In any case in which an instructor identifies evidence for charging a student with violation of academic conduct standards or plagiarism, the presumption will be with that instructor's determination. The instructor(s) will confer with the School Director to confirm the evidence. Once confirmed, the student will be informed and presented with the evidence. Some conditions and terms below clarify the School policy and procedure.

Proper source attribution: Proper attribution occurs by specifying the source of content or ideas. This is done by (a) providing quotation marks around text, when directly quoted, and (b) clearly designating the source of the text or information relied upon in an assignment.

Intellectual contents: Intellectual contents include all forms of 'text' produced by another person or persons. It includes: writings, course syllabi, course lectures and recordings of lectures, visual information such as models, videos, lyrics, software, etc.

Secondary citations: Secondary citation is not strictly a form of plagiarism, but in blatant forms, it can present similar ethical challenges. A secondary citation is citing source A, which in turn cites source B, but it is source B's ideas or content that provide the basis for the claims the student intends to make in the assignment. For example, assume that there is an article by Jones (2006) in the student's hands, in which there is a discussion or quotation of an article by Smith (1998). Assume further that what Smith seems to be saying is very important to the student's analysis. In such a situation, the student should always try to locate the original Smith source. *In general, if an idea is important enough to discuss in an assignment, it is important enough to locate and cite the original source for that idea.* There are several reasons for these policies: (a) Authors sometimes commit citation errors, which might be replicated without knowing it; (b) Authors sometimes make interpretation errors, which might be ignorantly reinforced (c) Therefore, reliability of scholarly activity is made more difficult to assure and enforce; (d) By relying on only a few sources of review, the learning process is short-circuited, and the student's own research competencies are diminished, which are integral to any liberal education; (e) By masking the actual sources of ideas, readers must second guess which sources come from which citations, making the readers' own research more difficult; (f) By masking the origin of the information, the actual source of ideas is misrepresented. Some suggestions that assist with this principle:

- When the ideas Jones discusses are clearly attributed to, or unique to, Smith, then find the Smith source and citation.
- When the ideas Jones is discussing are historically associated more with Smith than with Jones, then find the Smith source and citation.
- In contrast, Jones is sometimes merely using Smith to back up what Jones is saying and believes, and is independently qualified to claim, whether or not Smith would have also said it; in such a case, citing Jones is sufficient.
- Never simply copy a series of citations at the end of a statement by Jones, and reproduce the reference list without actually going to look up what those

references report—the only guarantee that claims are valid is for a student to read the original sources of those claims.

Self-plagiarism: Students often practice some form of 'double-dipping,' in which they write on a given topic across more than one course assignment. In general, there is nothing wrong with double-dipping *topics or sources*, but there is a problem with double-dipping *exact and redundant text*. It is common for scholars to write on the same topic across many publication outlets; this is part of developing expertise and the reputation of being a scholar on a topic. Scholars, however, are not permitted to *repeat exact text* across papers or publications except when noted and attributed, as this wastes precious intellectual space with repetition and does a disservice to the particular source of original presentation by 'diluting' the value of the original presentation. Any time that a writer simply 'cuts-and-pastes' exact text from former papers into a new paper without proper attribution, it is a form of *self-plagiarism*. Consequently, a given paper should never be turned in to multiple classes. Entire paragraphs, or even sentences, should not be repeated word-for-word across course assignments. Each new writing assignment is precisely that, a new writing assignment, requiring new composition on the student's part.

Specific exemplary infractions and consequences:
- **Course failure:** Reproducing a whole paper, paragraph, or large portions of unattributed materials without proper attribution, whether represented by: (a) multiple sentences, images, or portions of images; or (b) by percentage of assignment length, will result in assignment of an "F" in the course in which the infraction occurred, and a report to the Center for Student Rights and Responsibilities (CSRR[2]).
- **Assignment failure:** Reproducing a sentence or sentence fragment with no quotation marks, but with source citation, or subsets of visual images without source attribution, will *minimally* result in an "F" on the assignment, and may result in greater penalty, including a report to the CSRR, depending factors noted below.
- **Exacerbating conditions--Amount:** Evidence of infraction, even if fragmentary, is increased with a greater: (a) number of infractions; (b) distribution of infractions across an assignment; or (c) proportion of the assignment consisting of infractions.
- **Exacerbating conditions--Intent:** Evidence of foreknowledge and intent to deceive magnifies the seriousness of the offense and the grounds for official response. Plagiarism, whether 'by accident' or 'by ignorance,' still qualifies as plagiarism—it is all students' responsibility to make sure their assignments are not committing the offense.
- **Exceptions:** Any exceptions to these policies will be considered on a case-by-case basis, and only under exceptional circumstances.

Additional Stipulations for Graduate Students & GTAs: If, following a review with a Communication graduate student, a faculty member and School Director determine academic dishonesty has occurred, the evidence will be submitted to the Center of Student Rights and Responsibilities (CSRR). The report "identifies the student who was found responsible, the general nature of the offense, the action taken, and a recommendation as to whether or not additional action should be considered by the

campus judicial affairs office" (CSRR Website[2]). The student will be permitted to continue as a student in the Communication graduate program and as a Teaching Associate (if so assigned), until such time as CSRR due process has taken its course. If CSRR rules in favor of the student, the student's status in the program will continue. If due process rules against the student, then the student will immediately be dropped from all classes in the Communication graduate program and any Teaching Associate position in the School will be terminated. Graduate students may voluntarily withdraw from classes and Teaching Associate duties when charges are brought forward. The School's Director must be notified in writing. Students who voluntarily withdraw, notify the director in a timely manner, and who are subsequently found not guilty of plagiarism may be reinstated without prejudice at the start of the next semester.

SafeAssign: In most classes, major writing assignments will be turned in to *Turnitin,com on* Blackboard. Faculty may use additional methods to detect plagiarism.

---

[2] http://csrr.sdsu.edu/academics1.html