COM 604: Theory Construction in Communication
Wednesday 3-5:45 PM – Fall Semester 2016
The Hugh Downs School of Human Communication
Arizona State University - Tempe

Teaching Team Information:

Professors:	Dr. Sarah J. Tracy	Dr. Daniel Brouwer	Dr. Bradley Adame
Office:	STA 424	STA 428	STA 458
Office Hours:	Tu: 2:15-4:15pm & by appointment	Tu & Th: 9:30-11am & by appointment	M: 1:00-3:00pm & by appointment
Email:	Sarah.Tracy@asu.edu	brouwer@asu.edu	badame@asu.edu
Phone	480.965.7709	480.965.5976	480.727.6563

Course Assistant: Melissa Framer   Melissa.Framer@asu.edu
Office: Stauffer A111   Office Hours: Mon 2:15-4:15pm

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

Required Books:
Bochner, A. P. (2014). *Coming to narrative: A personal history of paradigm change in the human sciences*. Walnut Creek: CA: Left Coast Press.
Shoemaker, P. J., Tankard Jr., J. W., & Lasorsa, D. L. (2004). *How to build social science theories.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

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

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

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

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

Academic honesty:
In December 2013, the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee and Faculty Senate approved the following Academic Integrity Statement to be included on all new course syllabi: "Academic honesty is expected of all students in all examinations, papers, laboratory work, academic transactions, and records. The possible sanctions include, but are not limited to, appropriate grade penalties, course failure (indicated on the transcript as a grade of E), course failure due to academic dishonesty (indicated on the transcript as a grade of XE), loss of registration privileges, disqualification, and dismissal. Forms of academic dishonesty are varied but include plagiarism. In the *Student Academic Integrity Policy* manual, ASU defines plagiarism as 'using another's words, ideas, materials, or work without properly acknowledging and documenting the source.' For more information, see https://provost.asu.edu/academic-integrity."

With regard to graduate students, a salient concern about academic honesty involves "double-dipping," or turning in the same or very similar work for credit in different courses. We support your efforts to extend previous work that you have conducted on materials pertaining to this course; however, please notify us if you choose to extend previous work, and please indicate how you intend to craft a unique project for this course.

Grading:

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

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

Assignments:

*1.0 Course Participation / Discussion Boards - **100 pts**:*

*1.1 Course Participation - **50 pts**:*
As in most graduate seminars, it is our hope that engaged and lively discussion by all members of the collective will be the engine that drives our seminar. Thus, the primary form of your participation should be engaged and lively discussion. Students should complete assigned readings, read other students' discussion board posts, and make notes about all these before class so they can participate in an enthusiastic and informed manner. Other components of active, in-class participation include thoughtful and appropriate verbal participation (more does not always = better), concentrating on course material rather than distractions (do not text or message during class), and providing support to class members (fostering collective focus on the course material). Notes about participation will be recorded for each student after every course session.

Recognizing the fact of multiple learning styles, we also note the following as supplementary forms of participation: listening alertly and taking notes during the seminar, focused attention for the full class period, online contributions such as posted responses to discussion questions or other issues related to readings and course topics on Blackboard, and course-related but non-assignment-related office visits.

*1.2   Discussion Board Posts - **50 pts** (10 @ 5 points). Part one is due the Monday before class, 11:59pm. Part two is due the next day (Tuesday) 11:59 p.m.*

The purpose of this assignment is threefold:
1. to jump-start your critical examination of the week's readings, providing a foundation for the week's in-class discussion
2. to facilitate the practice of expressing complex ideas in a limited space
3. to facilitate a group conversation among course members.

For each unit, there is a part one and part two.

Part One (Original Post) - You will respond to *one* question/statement crafted by the teaching team and post *one thought provoking* discussion question/statement of your own. Your post for each week should be 400-500 words (please note that Blackboard will cap at 600 words) – you are free to decide how to distribute this allotment. This will be due by 11:59 p.m. on Monday evenings.

Part Two (Peer Feedback) - For each unit, you will also provide peer feedback to a peer's discussion board post. Your feedback to your peer should be about 250 words (Blackboard will cap at 300). You can provide feedback on whichever post you choose. This will be due by 11:59 p.m. on Tuesday evenings.

You will be responsible for posting both part one and part two for 10 of the 13 units between weeks 2 and 15 (you are welcome to post more). Everyone will post for week two, and will then post for at least 3 out of 4 sessions for each instructor.

Please love your reader by proofreading your posts for grammar, spelling, and style. You will receive points for completion by the due date. If you complete the post and feedback by their due date within the word-counts specified, you will earn full credit (3 points for post, 2 points for response).

The Blackboard discussion portals are structured so that you must create your post before you are able to read your peers' responses. We do this to facilitate and encourage your originality and freedom in crafting a post that reflects your thoughts, instincts, and impressions related to the week's materials, while avoiding any potential priming effects. We strongly encourage you to read through your peers' responses and reference your and others' posts during class.

2.0   *Uses, functions, and consequences of theory and paradigms in one scholar's trajectory. – Supervising Instructor: Sarah J. Tracy – Due Friday, 9/30, by 5pm.* **100 pts.**

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

3.0   *Theorize a communication issue/phenomenon/variable from two perspectives. – Supervising Instructor: Dan Brouwer – Due Friday, Oct. 28, by 5pm.* **100 pts.**

This paper calls upon you to select one meso- or micro-level topic of communication inquiry (e.g., identity, agency, voice, body, conflict, relationships, audience, affection, social support, socialization, leadership, health disparities, etc.) and discuss how it would be defined, conceptualized, and studied by two of the theoretical traditions we have addressed this semester. Both the choice of topic and the choice of which two theoretical traditions to feature are up to you. In your discussion, be sure to attend to the ontological, epistemological, axiological, and methodological assumptions that undergird the theoretical traditions you are featuring. Additionally, you should articulate both the advantages and the limitations of your featured traditions in relation to the topic you have chosen: What can each tradition distinctly or uniquely illuminate about the topic, and what is each tradition unable or less able to illuminate about the topic? This paper should make appropriate use of class readings and should be constituted by about 10 pages, not including cover page, abstract, endnotes, and references.

4.0   *Self-Reflection Paper. – Supervising Instructor: Bradley J. Adame – Due Friday, Dec. 2, by 5pm.* **100 pts.**

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

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

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

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

COM 604 Course Schedule (changes may be made via course announcement):
Fall 2016 – Wednesdays – 3-5.45pm – Stauffer 431

Week	Date	Topic	Assignment Due (see schedule below for readings due)
1	8/24/16	Foundations One: Introductions and Philosophies	
2	8/31/16	Foundations Two: Frameworks, Traditions & Paradigms of Communication	First discussion board entries 8/29/16 by 11:59pm (and Mondays thereafter)
3	9/7/16	A Personal Narrative of Paradigm Change	
4	9/14/16	Theories of Discourse and Interaction & A Grand Tour of Org Com Theory	
5	9/21/16	A Sampling from Phenomenology, Critical, and Post-Modern Approaches	
6	9/28/16	Building Interpretive Theories that Matter & A Case Study of SJT Theory Building	Scholarly trajectory/theory use paper 9/30/16 by 5pm
7	10/5/16	The Social Scientific Approach to Communication	
8	10/12/16	Theory Building in Persuasion and Social Influence	
9	10/19/16	Theory Building and Debate in Interpersonal Communication: Deception	
10	10/26/16	Theory Building in Risk & Fear Communication	Theorizing from two perspectives 10/28/16 by 5pm
11	11/2/16	Rhetorical Theories—Classical through Modern Variations on Enduring Themes	
12	11/9/16	NCA Annual Convention – No Class	
13	11/16/16	Rhetorical Theories—Postmodern, Poststructural,	

		and Critical/Cultural Variations on Enduring Themes	
14	11/23/16	Theory Construction of "the Public Sphere"—A "Case Study"	
15	11/30/16	Intersections Among Rhetorical, Performance, Critical/Cultural, and Social-Scientific Theories	Self-Reflection Paper 12/2/16 by 5pm
16	Final	Where Have we Come, and Where are we Going: Student Self-Reflection Presentations	Ungraded Presentations of Self-Reflection Paper

1 - Foundations One: Introductions and Philosophies

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

Tracy, S. J. (2010). Qualitative quality: Eight "big-tent" criteria for excellent qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry, 16*, 837-851.

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

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

2 - Foundations Two: Frameworks, Traditions, and Paradigms of Communication

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

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

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

2-page paradigm grid (excerpted from Tracy, S. J. (2013). *Qualitative research methods: Collecting evidence, crafting analysis, communicating impact.* Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.

3 – Intro to Interpretive & A Personal Narrative of Paradigm Change ~124 pages
Miller Chapter #4 – Interpretive Perspectives on Theory Development – pp. 51-65
Bochner, A. P. (2014). *Coming to narrative: A personal history of paradigm change in the human sciences*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
Some of you may choose to read this book cover to cover. That said, for the purposes of COM 604, please read at minimum the pages noted below. Note: Consider reading pps. 298-301 first if you'd like some context of the book's writing method.
pp. 13-23; 33-48; 79-85; 128-148; 149-156; 171-181; 251-294; 298-301

4 – Theories of Discourse and Interaction & A Grand Tour of Org Com Theory
~70 pages + video
Miller Chapter #10 – Theories of Discourse and Interaction (Speech Act Theory, Coordinated Management of Meaning, Communication Accommodation) pp. 145-158. & Chapter #12 – Theories of Organizational Communication – pp. 208-226
Weick, K. E., Sutcliffe, K. M., & Obstfeld, D. (2005). Organizing and the process of sensemaking. *Organization science*, *16*(4), 409-421.
Tracy, S. J., & Huffman, T. P. (In Press). Compassion in the face of terror: A case study of recognizing suffering, co-creating hope, and developing trust in a would-be school shooting. *Communication Monographs.*
Koschmann's CCO video https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=e5oXygLGMuY "What is Organizational Communication"

5 - A Sampling from Phenomenology, Critical, and Post-Modern Approaches ~75 pages
Craig - Unit V – Phenomenological Tradition – pp. 217-250 (Intro, Husserl, Buber, Gadamer)
Craig – Unit IX – Critical– p. 457-471 (article from Deetz's "Democracy in the Workplace") – Note: the uploaded Blackboard document includes extra pages but just Deetz is required.
Mumby, D. K. (1997) Modernism, postmodernism, and communication studies: A rereading of an ongoing debate. *Communication Theory, 7,* 1–28.

6 - Building Interpretive Theories that Matter & A Case Study of SJT Theory Building
~73 pages
Greenwood, D. J., Whyte, W. F., & Harkavy, I. (1993). Participatory action research as a process and as a goal. *Human Relations, 46,* 175-192. *doi:10.1177/0018726793046000203*
Flyvbjerg, B. (2012). Making social science matter. In G. Papanagnou (Ed.), *Social science and policy challenges: Democracy, values, and capacities* (pp. 25-56). Paris: UNESCO Publishing. Available at SSRN: http://ssrn.com/abstract=2278218
Swedberg, R. (2016). Before theory comes theorizing or how to make social science more interesting. *The British journal of sociology, 67,* 5-22. DOI: 10.1111/1468-4446.12184
Read just the Abstract & Theoretical Implications (pages marked) of the following (~9 pps.)
    Tracy, S. J., & Tracy, K. (1998). Emotion labor at 911: A case study and theoretical critique. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 26*, 390-411. (pp. 406-408)
    Tracy, S. J. (2000). Becoming a character for commerce: Emotion labor, self subordination and discursive construction of identity in a total institution. *Management Communication Quarterly, 14*, 90-128. (pp. 118-120)
    Tracy, S. J. (2005). Locking up emotion: Moving beyond dissonance for understanding emotion labor discomfort. *Communication Monographs*, *72, 261-283*. (pp. 278-280)

Note: For sessions 7-10, please read the articles/chapters in the order in which they are listed.

7 - The Social Scientific Approach to Communication
Chaffee, S., & Berger, C. (1987). The study of communication as a science. In C. Berger & S. Chaffee (Eds.), Handbook of communication science (pp. 15-19). Newbury Park: Sage.
Chaffee, S., & Berger, C. (1987). What communication scientists do. In C. Berger & S. Chaffee (Eds.), Handbook of communication science (pp. 99-122). Newbury Park: Sage.
Shoemaker et al: Chapters 1-4, & 7-9 (pp. 1-65, & 107-181).

8 - Theory Building in Persuasion & Social Influence
The Heuristic-Systematic Model:
Chaiken, S. (1980). Heuristic versus systematic information processing and the use of source versus message cues in persuasion. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39(5), 752-766.
Todorov, A., Chaiken, S., & Henderson, M. (2002). The heuristic-systematic model of social information processing. In J. P. Dillard & M. Pfau (Eds.), The persuasion handbook: Developments in theory and practice (pp. 195-213). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
Kopfman, J. E., Smith, S. W., Ah Yun, J. K., & Hodges, A. (1998). Affective and cognitive reactions to narrative versus statistical evidence organ donation messages. Journal of Applied Communication Research, 26(3), 279-300. doi: 10.1080/00909889809365508
Vested Interest Theory:
Crano, W. D. (1983). Assumed consensus of attitudes: The effect of vested interest. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 9(4), 597-608. doi: 10.1177/0146167283094009
Crano, W. D., & Prislin, R. (1995). Components of vested interest and attitude-behavior consistency. Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 17(1 & 2), 1-21. doi:10.1080/01973533.1995.9646129
Adame, B. J., & Miller, C. H. (2014). Vested interest, disaster preparedness, and strategic campaign message design. Health Communication, 1-11. doi: 10.1080/10410236.2013.842527

9 - Theory Building and Debate in Interpersonal Communication: Deception
Buller, D. B., & Burgoon, J. K. (1996). Interpersonal Deception Theory. Communication Theory, 6(3), 203-242.
Levine, T. R., & McCornack, S. A. (1996). A critical analysis of the behavioral adaptation explanation of the probing effect. Human Communication Research, 22(4), 575-588.
Buller, D. B., Stiff, J. B., & Burgoon, J. K. (1996). Behavioral adaptation in deceptive transactions fact or fiction: Reply to Levine and McCornack. Human Communication Research, 22(4), 589-603.
Burgoon, J. K. (2015). Rejoinder to Levine, Clare et al.'s comparison of the Park–Levine probability model versus interpersonal deception theory: Application to deception detection. Human Communication Research, 41(3), 327-349. doi: 10.1111/hcre.12065

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

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

10 - Theory Building in Risk & Fear Communication

McComas, K. A. (2006). Defining moments in risk communication research: 1996–2005. *Journal of Health Communication*, *11*(1), 75–91. doi: 10.1080/10810730500461091

Witte, K. (1992). Putting the fear back into fear appeals: The extended parallel process model. *Communication Monographs*, *59*(4), 329–349. http://doi.org/10.1080/03637759209376276

Witte, K. (1994). Fear control and danger control: A test of the extended parallel process model (EPPM). *Communication Monographs*, *61*(2), 113–134. doi: 10.1080/03637759409376328

Roberto, A. J., Meyer, G., Johnson, A. J., & Atkin, C. K. (2000). Using the extended parallel process model to prevent firearm injury and death: Field experiment results of a video-based intervention. *Journal of Communication*, *50*(4), 157–175. doi: 10.1111/j.1460-2466.2000.tb02867.x

McMahan, S., Witte, K., & Meyer, J. (1998). The perception of risk messages regarding electromagnetic fields: Extending the Extended Parallel Process Model to an unknown risk. *Health Communication*, *10*(3), 247. doi: 10.1207/s15327027hc1003_4

Witte, K., & Allen, M. (2000). A meta-analysis of fear appeals: Implications for effective public health campaigns. *Health Education & Behavior*, *27*(5), 591–615. doi: 10.1177/109019810002700506

Nixon, H. L. (1993). Accepting the Risks of Pain and Injury in Sport: Mediated Culutral Influences on Playing Hurt. *Sociology of Sport*, *Vol.10*, 183–196. doi: 10.1177/101269000035002003

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

15 - Intersections Among Rhetorical, Performance, Critical/Cultural, and Social-Scientific Theories

Gehrke, P. J., & Keith, W. M. (2015). Introduction: A brief history of the National Communication Association. In W. M. Keith & P. J. Gehrke (Eds.), *A century of communication studies: The unfinished conversation* (pp. 1-25). New York, NY: Routledge.

Fenske, M., & Goltz, D. B. (2014). Disciplinary dedications and extradisciplinary experiences: Themes on a relation. *Text and Performance Quarterly, 34(1),* 1-8.

Flores, L. A. (2014). The rhetorical "realness" of race, or why critical race rhetoricians need performance studies. *Text and Performance Quarterly, 34(1),* 94-96.

Madison, D. S. (1999). Performing theory/embodied writing. *Text and Performance Quarterly, 19(2)*, 107-124.

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