Abstract: An Observation Intervention in order to Facilitate Multi-Contextual Learning in an Interpersonal Communication Class

This portfolio documents an intervention I made for C122 (Interpersonal Communication) during the 2009-2010 academic year, during which I was a fellow of the Teagle Collegium for Inquiry in Action. In the fall semester, I noted that numerous students did not utilize Dell Hymes’ SPEAKING model for their projects, and many of the students who did filled it out in an unsophisticated or un-useful way. I also noticed that while students could easily pay “lip service” to the importance and prevalence of course concepts in their everyday lives, few were fluently able to apply them outside of the course context. Therefore, for the spring semester, I designed an in-class observation activity as an intervention, so that students could practice their growing expertise with course concepts outside of the structured classroom context. I found that while there was short-term improvement in terms of how students used the SPEAKING model, as demonstrated by its use in in-class minute papers and the first two observation assignments, the improvement was not sustained over the course of the semester, as demonstrated by performance on the midterm and in later assignments. I believe that the improvement is explained by the fact that my intervention forced students to do ethnography, whereas previous assignments merely asked them to simulate it. I conclude by suggesting that further implementations of multi-contextual learning situations are needed in order to both sustain the SPEAKING model’s use, and, more broadly, to challenge students to apply growing expertise in various contexts. This portfolio documents one attempt to incorporate multi-contextual learning and may serve as a model for others wishing to do the same.

1 Dell Hymes’ SPEAKING model is an acronym for Setting, Participants, Act Sequences, Key, Instrumentalities, Norms, and Genre and is used throughout the course I teach to help students structure their observations (see pp 32 and 459-60 in A Cultural Approach to Interpersonal Communication, edited by Leila Monaghan and Jane E. Goodman)
Introduction

In this course, C122 (A Cultural Approach to Interpersonal Communication), I am the instructor of record. I am responsible for all grading, lesson plans, student communication, and other responsibilities related to the class. The syllabus is not of my own design, so I am under the tutelage of a course director, Jennifer Robinson. The 2009-2010 academic year was my first year teaching C122.

My previous teaching experience included one year as a Fremdsprachenassistentin in various Gymnasien in Brandenburg, Germany\(^2\); the CELTA, done in Berlin, Germany; two semesters as a tutor for the America Reads program in Brooklyn, New York; and one year teaching C121 (Public Speaking) at Indiana University Bloomington. When I began teaching C122, I felt that overall my teaching methods were developing, but that I had more breadth than depth in my teaching experience. I was concerned about developing and maintaining authority in the classroom, as well as using teaching methods suited to college-aged learners: most of my previous experience had involved teaching children and adolescents, and I found that when I taught C121 in 2008 and 2009, I often defaulted to methods of communication, instruction, and classroom management better suited for younger learners, which my students did not always appreciate or find helpful.

While C122 shares the humanistic heritage of my main research area, media studies, I was often learning along with my students, especially in the Fall 2009 semester, as I did not have a strong ethnographic background and many of the texts were new to me. I chose to see this as a strength in my teaching as I feel my unfamiliarity with the course texts allowed me to see the course from both a student and instructor perspective.

Student demographics and diversity

The majority of students in all sections of C122 reflect the demographics of Indiana University – Bloomington as a whole. The majority are freshmen of traditional college age. My first-day introduction activity identified that more than 90% of the students are self-identified as heritage or traditional college students (i.e., students directly out of high school entering college for the first time, who had at least one parent who attended college).\(^3\) Most students identify as Caucasian. A slight majority grew up in Indiana, but many are out-of-state students, mostly from California, New York, or Illinois.

In Fall 2009, Section 1 enrolled 23 students, all of whom were white, heritage college students of traditional age. In Fall 2009, Section 2 enrolled 20 students. Of these, one was a non-

---

\(^2\) Specifically, the Friedrich-Ludwig-Jahn Gymnasium, Forst (Lausitz), Germany and the Einstein Gymnasium Neuenhagen, Neuenhagen bei Berlin, Germany. While working in both schools, I assisted in a variety of classes for English-language learners ranging from age 11-19.

\(^3\) There was some confusion about the terms “non-traditional student” and “first in [their] family to go to college.” Many students interpreted the latter as “I am the first of my siblings to attend college” and the former as a means of identifying students who “did not study, who do [their] own thing.” Because of this unfamiliarity with the terms, exact data are unavailable but I believe it indicates that very few students fit the traditional rubric for either category.
traditional, international student. Two students identified as African-American and one identified as Asian-American. In Section 1, 10 students were male and 13 were female; in Section 2, 9 students were male and 11 were female.

In the Spring 2010 semester, Section 1 enrolled 23 students, including one African-American non-traditional, first-generation student and two international students. In the Spring 2010 semester, Section 2 enrolled 24 students. All were traditional college-aged students, including two international students. Section 1 enrolled 13 males and 10 females while Section 2 enrolled 12 males and 12 females.

In the 2009-2010 academic year, the countries of Pakistan, the United Kingdom, Russia, and Ghana were represented by international students in my sections. In the Spring 2010 semester, 21% of the 47 students (10 students) were student-athletes. In the Fall 2009 semester, 6 of the 43 students (14%) were student-athletes. It may be worth noting that in the 2009-2010 academic year, both of the non-traditional students in my sections had taken my public speaking class the previous spring.

Course level and subject

This is a 100-level course in the Department of Communication and Culture. It is designed as an introduction to ethnography and to provide a critical/cultural approach to the study of communication. It differs from many other 100-level courses at Indiana University in that students design and conduct their own research project throughout the semester, engaging with course concepts as they do so. Unlike other Interpersonal Communication courses, C122 is rooted in humanistic theories that seek to explain principles of communication, and to do so from a cultural approach, rather than a linguistic, business, or psychological approach.

The course content moves from more theoretical articles towards more concrete case studies. It is organized into four units: “Ethnographer’s Toolkit” (foundational ideas and concepts), “Ethnography of Talk: From Language Form to Social Solidarity” (forms of language, gender difference, etc.), “Communication and Social Groups: The Work of Belonging” (how groups form and create identity), and “Interpersonal Communication in Institutional Settings: Structure and the Exercise of Power” (how language is used by groups to circulate power). There is ample opportunity, via student-directed discussions and presentations, for the students to engage with the material and situate it into their own experiences as well as share them with the class.

Typical class format

C122 meets twice a week for seventy-five minutes. In my sections, class typically begins with a brief overview of business items such as upcoming assignments, debriefs from graded assignments, or reminders, and an overview of the plan for the day. The discussion of daily material varies: sometimes students give group-designed presentations on the readings; sometimes I have prepared activities such as games or in-class projects. Often, the class begins with a think/pair/share activity or a set of small-group questions, which move into larger group debriefs. Lectures are rarely given, and are done usually only with articles students find significantly difficult, such as the more theoretical articles early in the course. Class usually ends with reminders about upcoming assignments, office hours, on-campus events, or lead-ins to upcoming readings.
C122 fits into the curriculum of the discipline because it provides students with a basic survey of canonical theories about culture and communication, and equips them to conduct their own research. Because of the centrality of the students’ research design and the discussion-based format, it is an inherently learner-centered course. The course presents students with opportunities to engage with and evaluate many studies and theories related to the topic, ultimately producing a self-designed project that contributes to the field. However, this course differs from the traditional curriculum of the discipline in that most introduction to ethnography or interpersonal communication courses: 1) are aimed at upper-level or graduate students 2) do not incorporate a component of original research, instead focusing on methods and research design and 3) are graded heavily on exams and superficially on observations or inventories. C122 is unique in that it allows students to practice ethnography and, more importantly, to conduct an ethnography on groups of their own choosing. The tests in the course are low-stakes, worth only 10% of the overall course grade each. The onus is on the student to design a study, conduct fieldwork, and analyze it according to course concepts. The major assignments on the course, to which I will refer in this portfolio, are the greetings assignment (students observe a greeting anywhere they wish and provide an analytical write-up), Fieldnotes I (the first observation students conduct for their project; the Fieldnotes I project comprises jottings, a transcript, an audio recording, a permission form, the SPEAKING model and a write-up), Fieldnotes II (identical in format to Fieldnotes I, but the content is of a different observation), and the final ethnography paper. The weighting of the assignments towards original research reflects the objectives of the course.

Learning objectives for the course include:

- By the end of the course, students will be fluent with basic terms and concepts related to the canon of culturally/critically-based research about human communication.
- By the end of the course, students will know how to conduct fieldwork and produce analytical write-ups of observations.
- By the end of the course, students will know how to analyze their data within the framework of course readings.
- By the end of the course, students will have a better understanding of the forces that drive interpersonal communication in their everyday life.
- After successfully completing the course, students will be more sensitive to the cultural construction of communication.


---

4 For examples of syllabi for comparable classes, see Dr. Kenneth C. Petress’ syllabus for Interpersonal Communication at University of Maine at Presque Isle: http://tinyurl.com/296sune (Accessed May 12, 2010) and Marybeth Callison’s syllabus for Interpersonal Communication at the University of Georgia: http://tinyurl.com/2e4p36q (accessed May 12, 2010).
Background

I designed this lesson in response to a learning challenge I identified in the Fall 2009 semester, which was the students’ resistance to, and lack of fluency with, the SPEAKING model. In my previous semester teaching C122, I introduced the model via a class activity that had students fill the SPEAKING model in for a video.

I found that the majority of students did not see the model’s relevance or usefulness as a tool to help focus their attention to useful details during observations. I found that due to the structure of individual work / large group discussion during the SPEAKING model lesson in Fall 2009, students who were unsure of their work either tuned out or relied on more outspoken classmates to ask questions about muddy points. I felt that the lack of meaningful use of the SPEAKING model stemmed from the way it had been addressed and introduced in class. I thought that providing students with an ungraded opportunity to do their own observations in class with the SPEAKING model would enable them to use it more usefully for higher-stakes assignments, such as the greetings assignment and fieldnotes. I believed that rather than relying on an artificial observation experience, such as a video, allowing students to do real fieldwork would drive home the importance of the course early on, and would also represent an intriguing difference from their expectations about this, or other, classes. I predicted that by emphasizing the observations and relevance of the real world early on, students would be able to more fluently apply course concepts to their everyday lives. They had always been good at paying “lip-service” to the importance of the course concepts, but many students had difficulty analyzing their observations within the lens of important course concepts, even though they readily admitted how important everything was.

I felt a large part of this was the boundary perceived between Interpersonal Communication: The Class and interpersonal communication as it was lived in their everyday lives. Therefore, I sought to design activities that would blur the boundary between the class as an event and their lives, in which the course concepts existed constantly and perhaps subconsciously. I wanted students to be able to articulate the ways in which the course concepts existed in their lives as experts, rather than novices, and to be able to do so in a context that was less controlled than the learner-centered classroom, as much of ethnography involves applying academic concepts to different concepts.

Lesson Plan Design and Influences

To address this teaching / learning challenge, I combined several approaches, including the learner-centered approach, the concept of learning contexts, and my knowledge of the signature pedagogy used in C122 and other courses. In re-designing lessons, I made a conscious effort to emphasize the universality of the course concepts. I wanted to provide students with the opportunity to use their growing knowledge of interpersonal communication in their own contexts, and I wanted this opportunity to represent a break with the input/discussion/output model that I feel over-dominates humanist courses.
My major innovation was to include in-class field observations in lessons where I had previously relied upon movie clips; previously, students filled out the SPEAKING model based on what was shown in the clips. These observations were designed 1) to increase student fluency with the SPEAKING model; 2) to help students practice observation skills by conducting an observation attenuated on specific details; 3) to give students a real-life opportunity to see concepts from course readings (related to greetings protocols and symbols of category membership) play out in their “homes” (the class is held in McNutt, a large dorm complex). I felt that 3) would lead to 4), an empirical demonstration of the universality of the course concepts. Students could pay lip service to the application of course concepts to their lives but their written work indicated that when it came to examining it in their own observations, they sometimes floundered. I believed that by providing them with a structured opportunity to examine their own everyday life through the lens of course concepts, a more fruitful way for them to conduct independent observation might emerge.

I felt that a major explanation for the weaker engagement with course concepts was context and learning environment design. While in my classroom, students were in a constructed learner-centered context; however, when they left to do observations, they were not in any space constructed as a learning environment. I was able to see how course concepts existed in these contexts due to my position as an expert; the novice students simply saw it as their own lives and thus had difficulty connecting the two. Therefore, I felt that learning in a less-controlled or more community-centered context would help the students “fluently retrieve” their knowledge about communication and apply it to this different context.

In these observations, the students went in pairs or trios to sites around the classroom building and watched for a greeting between two or more people (the 27 January observation); in the second observation, they watched an interaction for symbols of category membership (the 3 March observation). In both cases they examined the interactions through the rubric of the SPEAKING model and assessed the method.

In both cases, they filled out a worksheet (see Appendix C) with the SPEAKING model, and turned it in to me, along with a “minute paper” about the observation experience. On the day of the second observation, there was very high absenteeism in both sections, I assume because it was the day after the midterm test. Therefore, sample work is only included and discussed for the first observation, as the high absenteeism seemed to contribute to a self-selection of strong students doing the 3 March observation.

Lesson Plan and Objectives

For the lesson plan that incorporate this observation activity, my objectives were as follows:

- 1. Students will gain familiarity and practice with the SPEAKING model.
- 2. Students will engage with the concept of applying observation to human interactions in order to work towards a protocol.
- 3. Students will have the experience of engaging with "world as classroom" by conducting an observation - on class time - in their own environment. Therefore, students will see early on the roots this class has in their everyday lives.

5 Bransford et. al., 134-154;
6 Bransfor et. al., 44.
By the end of the class, students will:
  - Be familiar with the SPEAKING model and have practiced using it for their own observation
  - Have conducted their own observation using the situations around them and described the experience in a minute paper.
  - Know the requirements for the Greetings assignment and where to see an example of the assignment.
  - This lesson occurred during the 5th meeting of the class this semester, so I felt it was important to begin emphasizing these tools and concepts early on. Ideally I would have conducted this earlier, but due to the Martin Luther King holiday and myriad drop/adds, I felt it was best to incorporate this observation at this time.

Lesson Plan Document
This is the document for the lesson plan from which I taught on 27 January.
Materials: SPEAKING model worksheet, greetings assignment instructions (also on Oncourse)

2 minutes: I. Collect précis assignment if any submitted for today. Take questions about the Greetings assignment, point students to model assignment online and remind them of due date (2/8)

Greetings Assignment / SPEAKING model activity:

20 minutes: Brief discussion of Youssef & Bauman articles:

Take questions & define unfamiliar terms if any. Ask if students have a discussion question that they would like the group to address?

Think / Pair / Share: How can we think about greetings protocols for other cultures, where this event may be less rigidly defined than for the Tuareg? What constitutes "Face-threatening" here? How could we define a greeting protocol for "our" culture (undergraduates at IU)?

Ask students to jot down a few ideas in their notebook and think about them during the rest of class.

1-2 minutes Briefly solicit from students: Where in and around this building do people meet up? (C-store, cafeteria, bus stop? Computer lab? Front door? Lounges?)

15-20 minutes In teams of 2-3, students deploy to public areas for 10-15 minutes and describe a greeting they see. If they don't witness a greeting, they will quietly observe an interaction. They will need a notebook & writing utensil although between 3 of them, observing a quick greeting shouldn't require that many jottings…Remind students to return PRECISELY 20 minutes after & that someone in each group must bring a phone or watch with which to keep time. (I will spend

---

7 See Appendix C
this time walking around to a few of the locations)

Students return to classroom.

10 minutes: PASS OUT SPEAKING MODEL worksheet. Refer to textbook page: briefly outline each letter.

In pairs or small groups, fill out the SPEAKING model for the greeting or interaction you just witnessed! Note: you may not all agree; in that case, write what each of you think is the genre, etc.

10-15 minutes: Group discussion. Align with the Tuareg article: What common "phases" of greetings did we observe, if any? What are the social norms here?

1-2 minutes: IV. **Minute paper**: Describe briefly your experience in doing this observation. What went as expected? What surprised you? What are some advantages and disadvantages to doing this type of observation-based research?

V. If time: Videos of the Tuareg greetings, call on students to identify each stage. If no time, upload videos to Oncourse.

**ANTICIPATED PROBLEMS**: I'm not sure how well this activity will work, particularly in the 8 AM section as I noticed today that many of the public areas I have listed are not open when class begins; my contingency plan - if the building truly is deserted or the weather is awful etc.- is to have students casually mingle and talk for an equivalent amount of time and fill out the SPEAKING model that way, analyzing in detail how they greeted each other & initiated conversations.

Additional issues could be students not observing a greeting, using the time unwisely or wandering back late, the weather (i'd hate to send students out to the bus stop if it's bitterly cold, snowing etc).

To minimize the impact of these potential problems I will:
* Instruct students to dress warmly for 1/27
* Observe the students observing to note any misuse of this time
* Remind students that I will count them as absent if they don't come back promptly from the observation (Suggest that they set timers on cell phones etc)
Assessment of Intervention

This activity produced a great deal of evidence and data of the students’ experience and learning. Evidence included the turned-in worksheets, which showed the students’ ability to work with the SPEAKING model (previously unfamiliar to all of them), as well as the minute papers they produced at the end of class.

The assignments used throughout the semester also required the SPEAKING model and graded the students on its sophisticated use. I saw a trend of great attention being paid to the SPEAKING model on early assignments such as the greetings assignment and Fieldnotes I, but less attention paid for the second set of Fieldnotes.

Samples of Student Work

I used “minute papers” at the end of the class to ask students what they saw, what surprised them, and advantages and disadvantages of this type of observation. Here are samples of student insights to this prompt: I have categorized them based on my interpretation of their experience with this activity as well as my assessment of their use of the SPEAKING model (weak, average, or sophisticated). I have categorized the experiences as “Unproductive site,” or “Fruitful encounter observed” as well as by section. For the purposes of this categorization, “unproductive site” indicates that the students expressed difficulty in observing an encounter; “Fruitful encounter observed” indicates that they observed enough of an encounter to fill out the work sheet. My grading of the worksheets is for the purposes of this portfolio only as it was an ungraded assignment; however, “weak” worksheets were filled out scantily, left some items blank, or misinterpreted the terms. “Average” worksheets were filled out correctly but may have had slight misunderstandings of terms or a deficit of detail. “Sophisticated” worksheets had sufficient detail for analysis or thick description to occur. In a twenty-minute exercise, it may be difficult to capture this level of detail, but “sophisticated” worksheets made attempts at capturing meaningful details and assessing the interactions in terms of norms and social business.

It is also worth noting that I think some of the weaker work was done in response to lack of data; this experiment was carried out very early in the morning due to early class meeting times, and in winter, which reduced the possible observation sites to indoors areas. Therefore, it is hard to correlate weak use of the SPEAKING model with an actual lack of learning. Student minute papers are presented as handed in.

Comments from Students who filled out the SPEAKING model with sophistication:

- “The assignment went 100% well, which surprised me because I wasn’t expecting to find a conversation this easily. A disadvantage to doing this type of research is the lack of context; two people might be ‘frenemies’ pretending to like each other, but secretly disliking each other, and this information could shed a whole new light on the conversation. The fact that this went so well gives me hope for the greetings assignment, it might not be as difficult as I previously thought.” This comment came from a student who witnessed a useful encounter and who was in a section with a later meeting time.
“I expected to see people having interactions in the dining hall. This is exactly what happened. I was a little bit surprised that there were not more people eating together. There were a lot of people eating alone. One advantage of doing this type of work is if people don’t notice you, than [sic] you’re seeing things as they actually are. A disadvantage is if people notice you then they will be freaked out. I will find a place where I know a lot more greetings take place, i.e., Starbucks.” This comment came from a student who witnessed a useful encounter and who was in a section with a later meeting time.

“My observation was one girl waiting for a boy to meet up with. The girl arrived first and was texting the boy. Once the boy arrived, she sarcasticly [sic] greeted him with ‘you’re so slow.’ Then, both proceeded into the dining room. I expected to see more people greeting each other in the lobby. I was surprised by the number of people who don’t even recognize others. They don’t even glance or smile at the others. Disadvantages was [sic] the time of day. College students at 9 AM are not happy campers. For my greetings assignment, I will now have a better idea of what to look for and how to observe their greetings.” This comment came from a student who witnessed a useful encounter and who was in the section with an earlier meeting time.

Unproductive site (Later section): “The experiment didn’t go as expected because other than two people almost running into each other, there was no interaction. There was [sic] never more than two people in the room at a time, they never sat near each other, and no words were spoken. This was the biggest disadvantage. The biggest advantage was that we were able to see an interaction and get practice using the SPEAKING model. This will apply to the greetings project because it gave me an idea of what to look for and will help me use the SPEAKING model again later.” This comment came from a student who did not witness a useful encounter and who was in the section with a later meeting time.

“My experience and observations were that not many people are up at 9:30 in the morning. That was expected when we saw two girls in the lab they were friendly to each other which lead me to believe they knew each other. An advantage to this type of research is that it is easy to do and doesn’t take very much time and effort. A disadvantage is the time in which we have class, not very popular for students that have an option to sleep. I will apply this to the greetings assignment by useing [sic] it as practice of [?] helping me complete it.” This comment came from a student who witnessed a useful encounter and who was in the section with the later meeting time.

Comments from Students who filled out the SPEAKING model in an average way:

“I don’t think this experiment was very successful for my group. We only saw one person and he had no interactions with anyone. I think the main reason for this is because it was so early in the morning. I think later in the day we could have seen a lot more interactions and been much more successful with this experiment.” This comment came from a student who did not witness a useful encounter and who was in the section with the earlier meeting time.
“Although normally I do not observe people greeting, for this assignment I was hoping to see something unique. It did not go as expected as I was hoping to have witnessed more interaction than I did. Advantages were that the subjects were all in very normal and comfortable situations, however; the disadvantages were not being able to ensure that a greeting would take place. For my greetings assignment I will make sure to pick a location with more people and conversation at it.” This comment came from a student who did not witness a useful encounter and who was in the section with the later meeting time.

Comments from Students who filled out the SPEAKING model in a weak way:

“Nothing really happened in the hallway. I expected this because it is early in the morning. I only saw a few people and they were at separate times because of the separation no one was able to greet each other.” This comment came from a student who did not witness a useful encounter and who was in the section with the earlier meeting time.

“We had the classroom entrance and we were at a big disadvantage because the time we were out there wasn’t very close to the beginning of a class and due to the fact that many people who have 9 am classes don’t have a class before that with a break that would cause them to linger there. We saw no interactions untill [sic] we began [sic] walking back one Asian student greeted [sic] another, not in English, but because our time was up we didn’t get to stay and observe their conversation but they looked as if they began to talk about their reading.” This comment came from a student who did not witness a useful encounter and who was in the section with the earlier meeting time.

Personal / Instructor Reflections of Observation Activity Intervention

METHOD:
For the 27 January observation, I made the following observations about my implementation and explanation of the activity: 1) I spent too much time laying out the rules for the observation, when it was quickly evident that the students took the activity quite seriously. 2) In my earlier section, it was simply too early in the morning to do fruitful observation of undergraduates in a college dorm in January. 3) The handout could be adapted to engage student thinking rather than putting them in the position of relying on the book and attempting to regurgitate terms.

SHORT-TERM OUTCOMES:
Based on the data from the minute papers and unsolicited student comments, I make the following observations about the activity’s outcomes: 1) Some students witnessed interesting encounters, and the ones that did seemed interested and invested in the assignment. 2) Even the students who had unproductive sites acknowledged the activity’s value in modeling what they would do for the greetings assignment. 3) The students seemed interested in the activity and
eager to participate. Many noted both face-to-face and in the minute papers that the activity was “cool” and “useful.”

LONG-TERM OUTCOMES:
Based on my observations throughout the duration of the semester, I make the following observations about the long-term effects and impact of this activity: While the students acknowledged the activity’s usefulness I am not sure that it laid the foundations for their use of the SPEAKING model as I would have liked. Many students, particularly for Fieldnotes II, did skimpy or underdeveloped SPEAKING models; it was clear many did not see it as an intermediate step towards writing fieldnotes but rather a busywork aspect of the assignment to get done. Whether this was due to poor time management or a genuine disregard for the model, it concerned me and seemed to show that the effects of this changed context were, as implemented in my section, only short-term. On the mid-term, some students got incorrect the questions about the SPEAKING model basics (e.g., “What does the E in SPEAKING model stand for?”), though the majority got that question right. The question was multiple-choice and incorrect choices were “Emotion - the tone of an interaction, such as happy, sad, wistful,” “Ed, the guy you are watching,” and “Eventually, the outcome of the interaction.” Only one student chose “Ed.” The majority of incorrect responses were “Emotion.” This is a concern because “Ends,” or “Social business” is a key concept in C122 and I had hoped that the students would have been able to demonstrate that on the midterm, especially in the relatively easy context of remembering, rather than applying or interpreting these concepts. However, it’s worth noting that the multiple-choice question merely asked students to remember, whereas the test also contained an essay question that forced students to demonstrate knowledge through the rubric of the SPEAKING model.

An essay choice on the midterm was “Using our C122 class as an example, give each part of the SPEAKING model according to Monaghan.” While most of the students who chose this essay did a sufficient or excellent job, the ones who did not demonstrated a lack of knowledge regarding certain aspects of the SPEAKING model, particularly Ends, Key, Instrumentality, and Genre. This demonstrated to me that while students had little problem with the more straightforward aspects of the model (Setting, Participants, etc.) the ones that required applied thinking or interpretation still posed difficulty. However, many of the students who got the terms incorrect demonstrated an understanding of what they conveyed or indicated.
Analysis and Reflection

I believe that the students understood the concepts better because this teaching implementation forced them to do ethnography, rather than my previous lesson, which had merely simulated it. It allowed them to practice as rising experts within an uncontrolled context. Moreover, this implementation allowed them to do ethnography in their own context, rather than by looking at ethnographic videos, as in my previous lesson. I thought that this lesson would allow students to incorporate the SPEAKING model into a setting they know well, and to apply it to interactions that are familiar to them. The learning assessments told me the intervention was somewhat successful in that the students enjoyed it and made a diligent effort to observe using the SPEAKING model; however, more practice with or explanation of the terms would have led to stronger results all around. The assessments showed me that students spent more time trying to look up the correct definitions of each term than observing in their areas, and thus missed lots of details.

Another successful aspect of the learning assessment was that a majority of the students did think critically about this method of observation, noting advantages and disadvantages to both the setting and the method. As the success varied (some sites were basically deserted, others were noisy, etc.) it served as a good example to frame their future observations in that it allowed them to experience first-hand some of the frustrations and foibles involved in direct observation, whereas in the previous semester, students often began observations and got frustrated or worried due to their choice of observation site for various reasons beyond their control: e.g., it was noisy, it was empty, everyone was studying quietly, etc.

Moving Forward

In the future, when conducting this activity and others, I will spend less time laying out consequences for leaving class, as I think my taking the time to do so was unnecessary and set up a dynamic in which it appeared that I expected students to not take the assignment seriously. I will decide on locations for observations before class so that students don’t gang up in nearby areas or feel slighted if sent to less desirable locales. In future semesters, I may conduct this class off-campus, so that we meet in an accessible location, such as on Kirkwood Avenue or the Indiana Memorial Union, and students can disperse to public locales where they may see a variety of interactions. That way, they will observe a variety of people in a downtown area, rather than a population of underclassmen in a dorm.

While I circulate among the groups, I will seek to engage the students in more fruitful conversation. When I circulated, I asked “How’s it going?” and “Do you have any questions?” I thought some of them waited for me to arrive so they could ask me about the SPEAKING model, rather than asking their peers for help, making their best guesses, or observing consistently at their sites, which subverted the intent of the activity. I think a better method would be to ask more carefully-worded questions such as, “What are you observing?” and leading the conversation so they give me their perception of each aspect of the SPEAKING model, and I can correct without telling them flat-out that they are wrong (i.e., Socratic questioning). I think my method of approach / conversation initiation led to most of them assuring me everything was fine. Finally, I would incorporate a simple rating mechanism so students can evaluate each site in terms of its usefulness for this type of observation. I think having student-generated numerical
data on how useful they found each site in terms of its potential for observation will help students better structure the ethnography assignment. For instance, I would have the last question on the worksheet be, “Where 1=awful and 5=great, rate your evaluation site in terms of how useful it was for you to observe and how easy it was to find an interaction. Consider the potential for observation as well as logistics such as how easy it was to see and hear others.” This will help the class generate data in order to draw conclusions about good sites to observe, or even generate discussion as to where people greet / interact with each other on campus, how, and why. I believe that this revised approach will help align the assignment outcomes with its goals in that it will keep the focus on student learning and observation, rather than putting students into a position where they feel they should regurgitate answers.

Overall, I intend to keep this activity but tweak it so that it becomes less about a scavenger hunt to fill in ideas on a sheet and more about using this as a framework to focus observations, and a model for future assignments. I may do the worksheet myself along with them in order to provide a model. Finally, I will provide follow-up in terms of returning the students’ work to them with comments (due to this activity being used for the Teagle Collegium, I kept their worksheets).

In general, I will implement more “field lessons” and in-class observations into the course because I think students feel more invested in class sessions that allow them to get outside and conduct their own observations, or otherwise apply their knowledge to different learning contexts. The data indicate that utilizing a different context for learning can provide an immediate short-term benefit, but perhaps more follow-up is needed for the benefit to last longer.

Overall, I will seek to incorporate more “doing” into the class, because I have found that with all activities, the ones that provoke the most discussion are the ones that force students to do something, rather than open with their opinions about ideas they may not fully be able to articulate. “Doing” things provides students with low-stakes opportunities to see principles in action and will help the move from describing their experience of the activity towards articulating their own ideas and observations about interpersonal communication. I also believe that lessons that incorporate doing inherently change the signature pedagogy of the humanities, and that this unexpected difference leads to more interest and engagement from the students.

While it is sometimes difficult to construct activities that are meaningful, original, and useful without pandering, I do think this approach is important to incorporate into a class like C122.

The Collegium, Outside Sources, and Final Reflections

The Teagle Collegium has influenced my pedagogy and my thinking by illuminating for me what I interpret as the problems in teaching in my field. Too often in the humanities, the burden of proof lies on the interest generated by the object the professor teaches. Sometimes I think “student-centered” becomes a disengaging and confusing muddle for students, who may need more guidance, particularly in the “millennial” generation. Therefore, I seek to engage in a pedagogy that offers a variety of interactional patterns in the classroom and does not resort to offering engaging media objects in place of meaningful ways for the students to engage with objects. I seek to create a student-centered context that can adapt to other contexts and by so doing, illuminate the aspects of the course in the students’ everyday lives.
A number of readings from the Collegium, as well as other works influenced my implementation of this intervention. The discussion in *How People Learn* about novices and experts, as well as contexts, spurred my thinking about course context and how it could affect learning.

I found *Exploring Signature Pedagogies* both fascinating and problematic. The lackluster description of signature pedagogies in the humanities inspired me to incorporate more *doing* into the class and seek to create activities that made the world our classroom, so to speak. The prevalence of the text-input / discussion / output model troubled me almost as much as the lack of a unified signature pedagogy.

The discussion in the course not only led me to implement my course intervention in an attempt to change it, but I also revisited an essay in my discipline that critiques the hegemonic signature pedagogy, Rey Chow’s “A Phantom Discipline.” Although C122 is not a media-based course, I am a media scholar, so these texts influenced my thinking about how media and other humanistic concepts are taught, because improvement is always possible, and re-centering the relevance of media and other communicative concepts in the classroom will lead to more cultural and academic validation for these fields.

I say this not to engage in polemics, but to offer my struggle against a pedagogical model that I feel may serve to hasten the demise of the liberal arts and humanities in the university, particularly in light of the current state of the university. Without pandering to millennials, it may be worth it to engage in pedagogies and lesson structures that represent an unexpected break from what students expect. It has also been well-documented that the cohort of youth currently in college actually *want* direction, so perhaps partially discarding student-centered, free-flowing discussions in favor of structured student-centered activities would be a boon to the humanities. When students learn only within the student-centered context, perhaps they find it more difficult to apply the concepts to other contexts in their lives. Therefore, perhaps it would be opportune for instructors to capitalize on that by providing other contexts from which their students can learn.

---

8 In the Spring 2010 semester, I concurrently took a course about the future of the liberal arts in the university; selected texts that particularly illuminate the struggle for the liberal arts and that discuss pedagogies appear in the Works Cited and Consulted section.

9 For more on millennials and their educational expectations, see Twenge, Jean M. *Generation Me: Why Today’s Young Americans are More Confident, Assertive, Entitled – and More Miserable than Ever Before.*
Works Cited and Consulted
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C122 Interpersonal Communication: A Cultural Approach
Course Syllabus

All readings are in *A Cultural Approach to Interpersonal Communication* (Monaghan and Goodman, eds., Blackwell 2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Readings</th>
<th>Assignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introduction to the Course</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 M 1/11</td>
<td>What Is Interpersonal Communication?</td>
<td>· Course Guidelines for Students (Given out in class)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or T 1/12</td>
<td>Speech communities, speech events, and ways</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of speaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIT I</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnographer’s Toolkit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 W 1/13</td>
<td>Communication and Culture:</td>
<td>· Introduction (1-9)</td>
<td>Due: Course policies worksheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or Th 1/14</td>
<td>The circle around language; the fallacy of</td>
<td>· Miner, “Body Ritual among the Nacirema” (10-12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“normality”</td>
<td>· Agar, “Culture Blends” (13-24)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 1/18</td>
<td>Martin Luther King Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 T 1/19</td>
<td>Toolkit:</td>
<td>· Bauman, “Five Principles” (25-26)</td>
<td>Group projects introduced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or W 1/20</td>
<td>Learning to decode texts</td>
<td>· Monaghan, “How to Read and Present on Complex Texts” (449-455)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is ethnography? The social vs. the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Th 1/21</td>
<td>Toolkit:</td>
<td>· Geertz, “Thick Description” (27-28) (Group 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or M 1/25</td>
<td></td>
<td>· Goodman, “Winking as Social Business” (29-30) (Group 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Key Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5    | T 1/26 or W 1/27 | Practicum: Greetings | · Youssouf et al., "Greetings in the Desert" (50-62)  
· Bauman, "Let Your Words be Few" (63-76)  
Greetings jottings and fieldnotes introduced |
| 6    | Th 1/28 or M 2/1 | Examples of Ethnography: Analyzing interpersonal communication | · Basso, “‘To Give up on Words’” (77-87)  
Ethnography project introduced |
| 7    | T 2/2 or W 2/3  | Examples of Ethnography: Analyzing interpersonal communication | · Katriel & Philipsen, “What We Need is Communication” (88-102)  
Due: Greetings Jottings and Fieldnotes Group Project I introduced |
| 8    | Th 2/4 or M 2/8 | Toolkit: What is a transcript?  
Practicum: Transcription | · Ochs, "Narrative Lessons" (41-49)  
· Ottenheimer, "Writing Cousin Joe" (103-118)  
· Optional: Moerman, "Talking Culture" (119-124)  
Group 1: Project I |
| 9    | T 2/9 | Toolkit: Summary and practice |  
UNIT II  
Ethnography of Talk: From Language Form to Social Solidarity |
| 10   | W 2/10 or | Semantics, syntax, pragmatics and politics | · Lakoff, “The Triangle of Linguistic Structure” (128-133)  
· Wilce, "The Grammar of Politics" (134-144)  
Group 1: Project I |
<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>M 2/15 or T 2/16</td>
<td>Forms of talk and prosody</td>
<td>· Monaghan, &quot;Conversations&quot; (145-149)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Group 2: Project I Due: Ethnography Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>· Tannen, &quot;Conversational Signals and Devices&quot; (150-160)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>W 2/17 or Th 2/18</td>
<td>Male and female communication</td>
<td>· Maltz and Borker, &quot;Male-Female Miscommunication&quot; (161-178)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Group 3: Project I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>· Tannen, Preface, and &quot;Put Down that Paper and Talk to Me!&quot; (179-194)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Group 4: Project I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>M 2/22 or T 2/23</td>
<td>Swearing</td>
<td>· Andersson and Trudgill, &quot;Swearing&quot; (195-199)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Group 5: Project I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>· Murray, &quot;Swearing as a Function of Gender&quot; (200-208)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>W 2/24 or Th 2/25</td>
<td>Exam Review and Analysis of Projects</td>
<td>Transcripts: All bring in copies of short piece of data</td>
<td>Due: Fieldnotes I, Recording, Transcript</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All present focus of ethnography and preliminary data; Exam I Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>M 3/1 or T 3/2</td>
<td>UNITS 1-2 TEST</td>
<td></td>
<td>EXAM I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**UNIT III**

*Communication and Social Groups: The Work of Belonging*

<p>| 16 | W 3/3 or Th 3/4 | Nature of social groups                                        | · Goffman, &quot;Encounters&quot; (218-223)                                |                                                                 |                                                                 |
|    |     |                                                                 | · Eckert, &quot;Symbols of Category Membership&quot; (224-242)             |                                                                 |                                                                 |
|    |     |                                                                 | · Optional: Hudson, &quot;Speech Communities&quot; (212-217)               |                                                                 |                                                                 |
| 17 | M 3/8 or     | Uses of slang                                                   | · Bucholtz, &quot;Word Up: Social Meanings of Slang&quot; (243-267)       |                                                                 |                                                                 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Days</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 18       | W 3/10 or Th 3/11 | Male and female linguistic aggression     | Simmons, "Odd Girl Out" (268-284)  
|          |               |                                            | Kuiper, "Sporting Formulae in New Zealand English" (285-293) |                 |
| M 3/15   | Th 3/19       | Spring Break                               | Classes do not meet.                         | Group Project II introduced |
| 19       | M 3/22 or T 3/23 | Linguistic aggression and facework        | Garot, "Inter-City Teams and Face-Work" (294-317) | Group 1: Project II |
| 20       | W 3/24 or Th 3/25 | “Signifying” as verbal art                | McDowell, "Speech Play" (318-321)  
|          |               |                                            | Smitherman, “If I’m Lyin’, I’m Flyin’”: The Game of Insult in Black Language (322-330) | Group 2: Project II |
| 21       | M 3/29 or T 3/30 | Local networks & the exercise of power    | Kiesling, "Power and the Language of Men" (334-350)  
|          |               |                                            | Optional: Philipsen, "Mayor Daley’s Council Speech" (351-367) | Group 3: Project II |
| 22       | W 3/31 or R 4/1 | Language and identity in school           | Mertz, "Linguistic Ideology and Praxis and US Law School Classrooms (368-377)  
|          |               |                                            | Philips, "Participant Structures and Communicative Competence" (378-395) | Group 4: Project II |
| 23       | M 4/5 or Tu 4/6 | Footing, language use, and the building of social structure | Goffman, "Footing" (396-399)  
<p>|          |               |                                            | Goodman, &quot;An Association for the 21st Century&quot; (400-412) | Group 5: Project II |
| 24       | W 4/7         | Presentations of fieldnotes               |                                             | Due: Fieldnotes II, Recording, and |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Reading Material</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 25           | M 4/12   | Language variation, building of institutions, identity and resistance | Monaghan, "Signing" (413-415)  
LeMaster & Monaghan, "Variation in Sign Languages" (416-420)  
Monaghan, "The Founding of Two Deaf Churches" (421-436) | Groups 1, 2, 3:  
Be prepared to discuss                      |
| or Tu 4/13   |          |                                                                      |                                                                                 |                                             |
| 26           | W4/14    | Socialization and resistance                                         | Shuy, "Attacking the Bureaucratic Language of Car Sales" (437-448)               | Groups 4 and 5:  
Be prepared to discuss                      |
| or Th 4/15   |          |                                                                      |                                                                                 |                                             |
| 27           | M 4/19   |                                                                      |                                                                                 | Exam II Review                             |
| or Tu 4/20   |          |                                                                      |                                                                                 |                                             |
| 28           | W 4/21   |                                                                      |                                                                                 | EXAM II                                    |
| or Th 4/22   |          |                                                                      |                                                                                 |                                             |
| 29           | M 4/26   |                                                                      |                                                                                 | Ethnography groups present                |
| or Tu 4/27   |          |                                                                      |                                                                                 |                                             |
| 30           | W 4/28   |                                                                      |                                                                                 | Ethnography groups present                |
| or Th 4/29   |          |                                                                      | *Due: Portfolio Including Final Ethnography*                                     |                                             |
| M 5/3        |          |                                                                      |                                                                                 | FINALS WEEK                                |
| thru F 5/7   |          |                                                                      |                                                                                 | No C122 Final Exam or Classes This Week    |
Appendix B: Course Policies and Guidelines, C122, Academic Year 2009-2010

C122 INTERPERSONAL COMMUNICATION
Course Guidelines for Students

About these Guidelines
As for all your college courses, you are responsible for understanding all of the policies, assignments, and due dates for C122. If you have any questions, talk with your instructor.

Required Course Materials
1) Monaghan, Leila, and Jane E. Goodman, eds. A Cultural Approach to Interpersonal Communication. (Blackwell, 2006). This textbook is available at the Indiana Memorial Union (IMU) Bookstore (355-6018) and the TIS Bookstore (3rd and Jordan Streets, 332-3306). Consult the syllabus for the dates on which you will be responsible for reading each chapter.

2) A portable recording device (cassette tape or electronic) and two cassette tapes or CDs. Some tape recorders are available for rental from the Kent Cooper Room of the Wells Library.

3) Other materials as designated by your instructor.

___________________________________________________________

Student Ethics

Academic and Personal Misconduct
Every student will be treated equally according to the policies of this course and Indiana University. All students should review the Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities and Conduct (http://www.dsa.indiana.edu/Code/). It explains the University's expectations about plagiarism, cheating, and appropriate academic and personal conduct. Please seek clarification if you have any questions about any of the course policies.
Although studying and working together are strongly encouraged in C122, you must complete all written assignments and exams by your individual effort. According to the Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities and Conduct (section I.A.3):

A student must not adopt or reproduce ideas, words, or statements of another person without appropriate acknowledgment. A student must give credit to the originality of others and acknowledge an indebtedness whenever he or she does any of the following:

Quotes another person's actual words, either oral or written;
Paraphrases another person's words, either oral or written;
Uses another person's idea, opinion, or theory; or
  d. Borrows facts, statistics, or other illustrative material, unless the information is common knowledge.

Because you will be held responsible for your work, do not hesitate to ask your instructor for clarification about plagiarism before you hand in written work. The instructor and course director are obligated by the University to report academic and/or personal actions which may be deemed misconduct under the provisions of this code. Punishments for cheating and plagiarism can include failing the class.

_________________________________________________________________________

Written Assignments

Written Assignments

Papers, transcriptions, tapes, and signed fieldnotes will not be returned to students but will become the property of CMCL. Exams will also become property of CMCL, and students must return exams to their instructor if they are handed out for viewing.
Format for C122 Written Assignments

In C122, please use the following common writing conventions to guide the format of your assignments. Other requirements may be assigned by your instructor verbally or in writing.

- Typeface and Line Spacing: Use a standard typeface (such as Times or Courier), font size (12 or 10 point font), and double-space your entire paper.
- Margins: One inch on all sides.
- Quotations: Any material that you use verbatim from other sources must be placed between quotation marks and properly cited in MLA style with in-text or parenthetical citations. Please also use proper documentation style when paraphrasing sources. See [http://wwwlibrariesiubedu/indexphp?pageld=337](http://wwwlibrariesiubedu/index.php?pageld=337) for a quick guide to MLA style.
- References: All writing that cites references should include a list of those references at the end of the paper, prepared according to MLA style.
- Page Numbering: Each page should have a page number.
- Title Page: Include your name and e-mail address, the title of your assignment, your C122 instructor's name, the section number, and the date at the top of every paper.

Assignment Due Dates

All written assignments are due during class on the date specified on the syllabus. An assignment turned in any time after the end of class on the due date, or any time the next day, will be considered one day late and will be assessed a 10% penalty. The 10% penalty will continue to be applied for each additional day the assignment is late.

Do not turn in a course assignment by placing it on the instructor's desk, in his/her departmental mailbox, or by giving it to any member of the faculty or staff in the Department of Communication and Culture without specific permission from your instructor to do so. Even then, it is your responsibility to keep a copy of the assignment in case the original is misplaced. Your instructor is not responsible for missing assignments. Any assignment received late or missing will be subject to the late penalty.

________________________________________________________

Assistance
Time Management

C122 has a heavy reading load and many other requirements. The major semester-long ethnography assignment cannot be completed without doing all of the rest of the assignments. Nor can you pass the course without completing the ethnography assignment. That means it is imperative for you to keep up with your work and budget your time carefully in order to succeed in this course. The syllabus indicates when readings and projects are due and when exams will be given. Use the syllabus to plan your weekly schedule.

A good rule of thumb for university-level courses is that students who wish to earn an average grade should plan on devoting about two (2) hours each week outside of class for each credit hour taken. During some weeks, of course, the workload will be heavier than others. Plan on more than six hours a week of your time if you want to earn a grade of B or A.

Tutoring

Writing assistance is available through Writing Tutorial Services (WTS), located in Ballantine Hall 206, the Wells Library, and the Academic Support Centers in Briscoe, Forest, and Teter Residence Halls. WTS staff members have been very helpful to C122 students in the past. You are encouraged to take advantage of their assistance.

To request an appointment with a tutor who will be familiar with C122 assignments, call 855-6738 in advance. You can find out more about Writing Tutorial Services from its web site, http://www.indiana.edu/~wts.

The Academic Support Centers (ASC) also offer tutors and advisers who can assist you with time management, study skills, textbook reading, test preparation, and writing. The ASCs are open daily for study groups, meetings, and advising. Contact any Student Academic Center for hours and availability (855-6931 or http://www.indiana.edu/~acadsupp/ASChome.shtml).

Alternative Arrangements

If you require alternative arrangements for test taking or other class activities due to physical impairment, a learning disability, or other special circumstances, please discuss the matter immediately with your instructor.
If you have not done so already, please contact Student Disability Services (Franklin Hall 006; (812) 855-7578; iubdss@indiana.edu; http://www2.dsa.indiana.edu/dss/). This office offers a wide range of services and can explain what kinds of alternative arrangements are available including notetakers, test accommodations, and counseling on effective learning strategies.

**Office Hours and Availability for Conferences**

You are encouraged to discuss your work and progress in this course with your section instructor throughout the semester. Your instructor will hold office hours at the time and place indicated in class and will be glad to make appointments with students who are unable because of class conflicts to meet during those times. Your instructor may require you to attend office hours as a requirement of the course. E-mail can be a convenient way to ask some questions, but keep in mind that a response may not be immediately forthcoming.

Your questions about C122 should be addressed *first* to your section instructor. The course director is available for consultation if you believe that your concerns are not being addressed or if you feel uncomfortable discussing any issue with your instructor. The course director is Dr. Jennifer Robinson. She can be reached at jenmetar@indiana.edu or 855-4607). Raise any questions and/or concerns you have regarding anything contained in these guidelines as soon as possible.

___________________________________________________________

**Attendance and Participation**

**Attendance**

*Attendance in C122 is required. If you anticipate that you will miss more than three classes during the semester for any reason, consider re-enrolling in C122 during another semester. In-class assignments cannot be made up.*

C122 sections are not interchangeable, and you must attend the section for which you are registered. Failure to attend the section listed on your course schedule will mean you are counted as absent from the correct section, and any assignments you complete may not be transferable to another section.
Each student will be allowed **three** absences during the semester. For each absence after three, 20 points will be deducted from your accumulated points. To illustrate, assume that you have 830 points at the end of the semester with five absences. Your grade will be lowered by 40 points to 790 for a final grade of C+. It is your responsibility to be marked present on the class roll/roster at the beginning of each class session. If you are late to class, it is your responsibility -- at the end of the class -- to check in with the instructor. *Leaving class and returning, taking text messages, and repeated lateness will be counted as absences and will also result in a deduction from your accumulated points.*

You are responsible for course content covered on days you are tardy or absent.

The University recognizes some absences as legitimate. You will receive no penalty for work due on a day for which you have a legitimate and documented absence. However, these absences are **NOT in addition to your original allotment of three absences.** (In other words, if a malfunctioning alarm clock causes you to miss class 3 days and then your chess club makes the national finals causing you to miss class a fourth time, you will lose points.) It is your responsibility to provide documentation for a legitimate excuse to the instructor within one week of the missed class period. If you do not meet this deadline, the absence will be unexcused.

If you are involved in University activities approved by the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education that will necessitate missing classes, you should consult the instructor well in advance of the date you will be absent. Students who participate in intercollegiate sports should discuss their semester sports schedule with the instructor during the first week of classes. In either case, you must provide the instructor with a letter from the appropriate University authority verifying your participation.

**Participation**

Each class meeting is an opportunity to **participate** in lecture-discussions examining current theoretical understandings of interpersonal communication and exploring ways these principles apply in our own lives. By being present and on time, reading the assigned material, making study notes, and participating in discussions, you will increase your opportunities to learn and understand the course material.

In C122, we expect participation in every session and see participation as the "practical" part of the course. Just as you are graded on your laboratory skills in a chemistry class, you will be graded on your ability to speak to other members of the class clearly and coherently in C122. You will be expected to be an effective communicator in general discussion and will be graded on your prepared presentations.
Active participation is critical to learning; passive learning is quickly forgotten and does not help you understand the practical applications of interpersonal communication theory. The first step in participating is reading your textbook. By doing the assigned reading, you can use class time to increase your understanding of interpersonal communication concepts. If you have not read the material prior to class discussion, then you will be more likely to be confused. Class discussion should be your second, not your first, exposure to this material.

Examinations

If sufficiently extreme circumstances arise that you must miss a scheduled examination, you must contact your instructor as soon as possible, preferably prior to the scheduled date. Written documentation from an independent source is a condition of make-up examinations. That is, no make-up exam can be given without verification of the legitimate reason the regularly scheduled examination was missed.

Grading

Final course grades are determined on the basis of a cumulative point system. There is a maximum of 1000 points in the course. Note: To pass the course, you must complete the Ethnography Portfolio Project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Percent of Course Total</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warm Up Greetings</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication in Everyday Practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group project I</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group project II</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercises and in-class assignments</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnography Portfolio Project</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>5% (Pass/Redo/Fail)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fieldnotes I (includes recording &amp; transcript)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fieldnotes II (includes recording, transcript, &amp; idea draft)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Ethnography</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Presentation</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Portfolio:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exams</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midterm</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grading Scale**

After any adjustments for unexcused absences, final grades will be assigned according to the following schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Letter Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>970-1000</td>
<td>97-100%</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>940-969.99</td>
<td>94-96.9%</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900-939.99</td>
<td>90-93.9%</td>
<td>A-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>870-899.99</td>
<td>87-89.9%</td>
<td>B+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Grade Appeals

Students may appeal grades received on written work, quizzes, and exams. You must wait at least overnight after receiving the grade to schedule an appointment for a grade appeal. Students are encouraged to use that time to review the instructor's critique and formulate a logical argument for appeal. Your appeal must be written, with the assignment or exam and the instructor's evaluation attached to the written appeal. These materials must be provided to the instructor at least one day before the grade appeal meeting. Grade appeals must be made within one week of receiving the grade. If you are not satisfied with the instructor's response, the formal written appeal may be brought before the course director. This must occur within one week of the grade appeal meeting. Note: You are responsible for following all instructions for assignments, including those provided in paper, electronic, and oral form by your section instructor.

Extra Credit

No extra credit is allowed in this course.

Grade of Incomplete

A grade of incomplete will not be given except under extraordinary circumstances. If such circumstances arise, contact your instructor immediately to discuss the issue and to learn about procedures for requesting an incomplete. Approval of an incomplete is not automatic upon initiating a request. Documentation of the extraordinary circumstances and a plan for completing the course
requirements must be detailed in writing; it will be reviewed and can be approved only by the course director.

Note the University policy regarding absence from class late in the semester (Bulletin/Schedule of Courses, p.28): "Failure to complete a course without an authorized withdrawal will result in the grade of F."

**Posting of Grades**

Indiana University complies with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act, which provides for the protection of your personal records, including the grade information. While some instructors provide grade information in a secure format on the C122 Oncourse web page, grades will not be given out over the phone, mailed early, or distributed to your personal e-mail account. *Do not ask your instructor to do so.*

Access to final grades will be available in OneStart (onestart.iu.edu) as they are submitted by the faculty and posted to students' records.
Appendix C: SPEAKING Model Worksheet for Observation Activity

C122 Interpersonal Communication

Observation Activity: January 27, 2010

**DIRECTIONS:** For this activity, you will conduct a brief group observation in the classroom building. With 2 or 3 of your peers, you will watch other people greeting each other and then practice using the SPEAKING model.

**Note:** If you stay at your site and observe no greetings, fill in the SPEAKING model for another observed interaction (e.g., goodbyes, a conversation, etc). If people ask what you are doing, simply tell them it’s a class activity for C122; if they want more information, direct them to me. If they seem truly uncomfortable, return to the classroom.

My observation site was: ______________

**Setting:**

**Participants:**

**Ends:**

**Act Sequences:**

**Key:**

**Instrumentalities:**

**Norms:**

**Genre:**