

Communication/Information Science 4450/6450
CMC Seminar
Spring 2015

[As of Mar. 22, 2015. Updated versions will be made available on Blackboard site]

Tues. & Thurs., 1:25-2:40
Room: Kennedy 213

Instructor: Susan Fussell
Office: 332 Kennedy Hall
Office hours: Tuesday & Thursday 12:00-1:15
Phone: 255-1581 (do not leave messages)
E-mail: sfussell@cornell.edu

TA: Stephanie Steinhardt
Office: 209 Kennedy Hall
Office hours: Tuesday & Thursday 2:45-4:00
E-mail: sbg94@cornell.edu

Course Description

In this course, we will examine fundamental aspects of interpersonal communication and consider how different types of computer-mediated communications (CMC) technologies such as e-mail, instant messaging, video conferencing, twitter and social network sites affect communication processes. The goals of the course are to provide students with a basic understanding of the processes of interpersonal communication, an understanding of how features of current CMC technologies affect interpersonal communication, and the knowledge they need to help design new communications technologies.

Objectives:

- Students will gain a theoretical understanding of the field of CMC and become familiar with both common and novel CMC tools, through readings and in-depth class discussion of key articles in the field.
- Students will gain an understanding of how CMC researchers conduct their research, through a series of mini projects that require them to examine CMC phenomena and write short reports on them.
- Students will gain an in-depth understanding of a selected area of CMC, through their team project and class presentation.

Required texts:

Course materials will consist of approximately 50-60 pages of readings per week. All materials are available in pdf format on the course BlackBoard site. Articles are listed in the recommended order of reading. Complete reading of each piece is required prior to class. Lecture notes will also be made available on Blackboard at the end of each week.

Student Responsibilities and Grading:

1. Participation and Attendance (10%): Approximately half of the class time each week will be set aside for group discussion. Students are expected to prepare for each class; they should read and note

the specified texts, and participate actively in class discussions. Students may be called on to summarize the major arguments, strengths, weaknesses, or problems, in any assigned reading. Regular attendance is expected. Failure to attend regularly and be prepared will be grounds for a grade reduction at the instructor's discretion.

2. Blackboard Discussion (15%): Students are expected to post comments on the blackboard forum set up for at least 18 different class days that have readings assigned. Posts can include reactions to ideas in the readings, reflections on the readings based on your own experiences, or ideas or questions for future research. Students can start their own discussion threads or add to those started by other students. Posts should add up to at least 250 words per class. Posts must be completed by 10 AM on the day the readings are discussed (Tuesday or Thursday) to receive credit.

3. Leading Class Discussion of a Reading (5%): For one reading during the semester, students are expected to lead 10-15 minutes of discussion. Students will need to be able to summarize the reading in their own words (research questions/hypotheses, methods, results, conclusions), identify 2-3 interesting discussion topics, and summarize key points from the blackboard discussion of that article.

4. Short Papers (30%): Students are expected to write six short papers over the course of the semester, each worth 5% of the final grade. For some of these papers, you will have the option of working with a partner. Each paper will require analysis and synthesis of a subset of course readings and/or small-scale data collection and analysis. Paper assignments will be given out at least one week in advance of the deadline. Short papers are due in class on the date specified. Late assignments will be downgraded one letter grade per day.

5. Team Research Project (30%): Each student will work with a team with 3-4 other students to conduct a research project on a CMC topic, analyze the results, and write a report of the project using standard report-writing style (e.g., introduction, hypotheses, method, results, discussion). The research report should be 12-15 pages, double spaced, excluding tables and figures. To earn full credit for the research project, students must also submit interim materials at the indicated points in the syllabus, including: brief project summary, IRB training, IRB materials, and all brief class updates.

6. Class Presentation of Research Project (10%): Each research project team will present its research and results to the class via a short oral presentation and a poster. Further details will be provided later in the semester.

Academic Integrity:

Academic integrity is crucial to your personal scholarly identity. Your rights and responsibilities in this area are outlined in the Cornell University Code of Academic Integrity <http://cuinfo.cornell.edu/Academic/AIC.html>.

Violations of the code of conduct include but are not limited to:

- Submitting work in this class that has also been submitted for a grade in another course without prior permission of both instructors.
- Using, obtaining, or providing unauthorized assistance on examinations, papers, or any other academic work.
- Misrepresenting another person's work as your own. You are responsible for obeying the Code of Academic Integrity. Ignorance of the code is not an excuse.

You are responsible for obeying the Code of Academic Integrity. Ignorance of the code is not an excuse.

The most common problem for many students is plagiarism, which will not be tolerated and will be sanctioned by failure of the course. Students from other cultures should be especially aware that

American standards of acknowledgement and use of material prepared by others (especially one's professors) can be much different than those in other cultures. **All students MUST complete the tutorial at <<http://plagiarism.arts.cornell.edu/tutorial/index.cfm>>.**

Misrepresenting another's work as your own means presenting somebody else's words or ideas without proper attribution. Proper attribution includes quotation marks and page numbers for *any* words taken directly from any piece of another author's work, and/or a citation when you have paraphrased or summarized somebody else's work. Sources need not be published to be cited; any document that you use as a source that you are not the sole author of must be cited or attributed in this way. If you have any questions or concerns about how to attribute or whether a source must be cited, please ask for clarification in advance. Academic integrity is a serious matter and will be treated as such.

Students agree that by taking this course all required papers may be subject to submission for textual similarity review to Turnitin.com for the detection of plagiarism. All submitted papers will be included as source documents in the Turnitin.com reference database solely for the purpose of detecting plagiarism of such papers. Use of Turnitin.com service is subject to the Usage Policy posted on the Turnitin.com site.

Note: Course materials posted on Blackboard or distributed in class are intellectual property belonging to the author(s). Students are not permitted to buy or sell any course materials, including but not limited to syllabi, PowerPoint presentations, teaching materials, or class exercises without the express permission of the instructor. Such unauthorized behavior constitutes academic misconduct.”

Accommodations

It is Cornell policy to provide reasonable accommodations to students who have a documented disability (e.g., physical, learning, psychiatric, vision, hearing, or systemic) that may affect their ability to participate in course activities or to meet course requirements. Students with disabilities are encouraged to contact Student Disability Services and their instructors for a confidential discussion of their individual need for academic accommodations. Student Disability Services is located in 420 CCC. Staff can be reached by calling 607-254-4545. **Students are advised to meet with me early in the semester to make arrangements for accommodations.**

Semester Schedule

| Class | Week and Topic(s) | Reading |
|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| 1/22 | 1. Intro and Overview | Whittaker, S. (2003). Theories and methods in mediated communication. In Graesser, A., Gernsbacher, M., and Goldman, S. (Eds.) <i>The Handbook of Discourse Processes</i> (pp. 243-286). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. |
| 1/27 | 2. Theories and Methods Assignment 1 Distributed | McCarthy, J. C., & Monk, A. F. (1994). Measuring the quality of computer-mediated communication. <i>Behaviour & Information Technology</i> , 13, 311-319. Williams, F., Rice, R. E., & Rogers, E. M. (1988). Choosing among alternative research designs. In F. Williams, R. E. Rice, and E. M. Rogers, <i>Research methods and the new media</i> (pp. 32-51). New York: Free Press. |
| I. Interpersonal Communication | | |
| 1/29 | 3. Conversational Structure and Coherence | Holtgraves, T. M. (2002). Conversational Structure. In T. M. Holtgraves, <i>Language as Social Interaction</i> (pp. 89-120). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. Herring, S. C. (1999). Interactional coherence in CMC. <i>Proceedings of the 32nd Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences</i> . IEEE Press. Smith, M, Cadiz, J. J., & Burkhalter, B. (2000). Conversation trees and threaded chat. <i>Proc. CSCW 2000</i> (pp. 97-105). |
| 2/3 | 4. Conversational Grounding Assignment 1 due Assignment 2 distributed | Clark, H. H. & Brennan, S. E. (1991). Grounding in communication. In L. B. Resnick, R. M. Levine, & S. D. Teasley (Eds.). <i>Perspectives on socially shared cognition</i> (pp. 127-149). Washington, DC: APA. Gergle, D., Kraut, R. E., & Fussell, S. R. (2004). Action as language in a shared visual space. <i>Proc. CSCW 2004</i> (pp. 487-496). |
| 2/5 | 5. Visual spaces In class project team selection. Team leader will email us with team name and a brief project description IRB training certificates due by midnight Feb 8 | Ishii, H., Kobayashi, M., & Grudin, J. (1992). Integration of inter-personal space and shared workspace: ClearBoard design and experiments. <i>Proc. CSCW 1992</i> (pp. 33-42). Fussell, S. R., Setlock, L. D., & Kraut, R. E. (2003). Effects of head-mounted and scene-oriented video systems on remote collaboration on physical tasks. <i>Proc. CHI 2003</i> (pp. 513-520). |
| 2/10 | 6. Gesture Brief updates from project teams, group A | Bekker, M. M., Olson, J. S., & Olson, G. M. (1995). Analysis of gestures in face-to-face design teams provides guidance for how to use groupware in design. <i>Proc. DIS 1995</i> . Fussell, S. R., Setlock, L. D., Yang, J., Ou, J., Mauer, E. M., & Kramer, A. (2004). Gestures over video streams to support remote collaboration on physical tasks. <i>Human-Computer Interaction</i> , 19, 273-309. |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| 2/12 | 7. Emotion and Affect Assignment 2 Due Brief updates from project teams, group B | Bietz, M. J. (2008). Effects of communication media on the interpretation of critical feedback. <i>Proc. CSCW 2008</i> (467-476). Hancock, J. T., Landrigan, C. & Silver, C. (2007). Expressing emotion in text-based communication. <i>Proc. CHI 2007</i> (pp. 929-932). Wang, H., Predinger, H. & Igarashi, T. (2004). Communicating emotions in online chat using physiological sensors and animated text. <i>Proc. CHI 2004</i> (pp. 1171-1174). |
| 2/17 | February Break – No class | |
| 2/19 | 8. Blending Channels Assignment 3 Distributed Draft of IRB materials due by midnight Feb. 22 | Weisz, J. D., Kiesler, S., Zhang, H., Ren, Y., Kraut, R. E., & Konstan, J. A. (2007). Watching together: integrating text chat with video. <i>Proc. CHI 2007</i> (pp. 877-886). Isaacs, E., Szymanski, S., Yamauchi, Y., Glasnapp, J., & Iwamoto, K. (2012). Integrating local and remote worlds through channel blending. <i>Proc. CSCW 2012</i> . |
| 2/24 | 9. Gender | Kapidzic, S., Herring, S. C. (2011). Gender, Communication, and Self-Presentation in Teen Chatrooms Revisited: Have Patterns Changed? <i>Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 17</i> , 39-59. Hemphill, L., & Otterbacher, J. (2012). Learning the lingo? gender, prestige and linguistic adaptation in review communities. <i>Proc. CSCW 2012</i> (pp. 305-314). |
| 2/26 | 10. Culture and Native Language Guest speaker: Ge Gao | Setlock, L. D., Fussell, S. R., & Neuwirth, C. (2004). Taking it out of context: Collaborating within and across cultures in face-to-face settings and via instant messaging. <i>Proc. CSCW 2004</i> (pp. 604-613). Wang, H.-C., Fussell, S. R., & Cosley, D. (2013). Machine translation vs. common language: Effects on idea exchange in cross-lingual groups. <i>Proc CSCW 2013</i> (pp. 935-944).. Gao, G., Xu, B., Cosley, D., & Fussell, S. R. (2014). How beliefs about the presence of machine translation impact multilingual collaborations. <i>Proc. CSCW 2014</i> (pp. 1549-1560). |
| 2. Group Communication and Teamwork | | |
| 3/3 | 11. Collaborating at a Distance Assignment 3 Due Brief updates from project teams, group A | Bos, N., Shami, N. S., Olson, J. S., Cheshin, A., & Nan, N. (2004) In-group/out-group effects in distributed teams: An experimental simulation. <i>Proc. CSCW 2004</i> (pp. 429-436). Yamashita, N., Kuzuoka, K., Hirata, K., Aoyagi, S. & Shirai, Y. (2011). Supporting fluid tabletop collaboration across distances. <i>Proc. CHI 2011</i> (pp. 2827-2836). Venolia, G., Tang, J., Cervantes, R., Bly, S., Robertson, G., Bongshin Lee, B., & Inkpen, K. (2010). Embodied social proxy: Mediating interpersonal connection in hub-and-satellite teams. <i>Proc. CHI 2010</i> (pp. 1049-1058). |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| 3/5 | 12. Awareness Assignment 4 Distributed Brief updates from project teams, group B | Gutwin, C., & Greenberg, S. (2002). A descriptive framework of workspace awareness for real-time groupware. <i>Computer Supported Cooperative Work</i> , 11, 411-446. |
| 3/10 | 13. Informal Communication | Kraut, R. E., Fish, R.S., Root, R.W., & Chalfonte, B.L. (1990). Informal communication in organizations: Form, function, and technology. In S. Oskamp & S. Spacapan (Eds). <i>Human reactions to technology: The Claremont Symposium on applied social psychology</i> (pp. 145-199). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage. |
| 3/12 | 14. Informal Communication, continued | Nardi, B.A., Whittaker, S., & Bradner E. (2000) Interaction and outeraction: instant messaging in action. <i>Proc. CSCW 2000</i> (pp. 79-88). Birnholz, J. P., Gutwin, C., Ramos, G., & Watson, M. (2008). OpenMessenger: gradual initiation of interaction for distributed workgroups. <i>Proc. CHI '08</i> (pp. 1661-1664). Rodenstein, R. & Donath, J. S. (2000). Talking in circles: Designing a spatially-grounded audioconferencing environment. <i>Proc. CHI 2000</i> (pp. 81-88). |
| 3. Communication in Online Communities | | |
| 3/17 | 15. Social Network Sites <i>Guest speaker: Tina Yuan</i> Assignment 4 Due | Ellison, N.B., Steinfield, C. & Lampe, C. (2011). Connection Strategies: Social capital implications of Facebook-enabled communication practices. <i>New Media & Society</i> , 13, 873-892 Yuan, C-Y., Setlock, L. D. & Fussell, S. R. (2014). International students' use of Facebook versus a home country site. <i>CHI 2014 Extended Abstracts</i> (pp. 2101-2106). |
| 3/19 | 16. Virtual Worlds <i>Guest speaker: Dr. Lindsay Reynolds</i> | Ducheneaut, N. & Moore, R. (2004). The social side of gaming A study of interaction patterns in a massively multiplayer online game. <i>Proc. CSCW 2004</i> (pp. 360-369). Nardi, B. & Harris, J. (2006). Strangers and friends: Collaborative play in World of Warcraft. <i>Proc. CSCW 2006</i> (pp. 149-158). |
| 3/24 | 17. Tagging and Labeling Brief updates from project teams, group A | Nov, O., Naaman, M., & Ye, C. (2008). What drives content tagging: the case of photos on Flickr. <i>Proc. CHI 2008</i> (pp. 1097-1100). Mamykina, L. Miller, A. D., Grevet, C., Medynskiy, Y., Terry, M. A., Mynatt, E. D., & Davidson, P. R. (2011). Examining the impact of collaborative tagging on sensemaking in nutrition management. <i>Proc. CHI 2011</i> (pp. 657-666). |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| 3/26 | 18. Twitter Brief updates from project teams, group B | Naaman, M., Boase, J., & Chih-Hui Lai, C-H. (2010). Is it really about me? Message content in social awareness streams. <i>Proc. CSCW 2010</i> (pp. 189-192). Morris, M. R., Counts, S., Roseway, A., Hoff, A., & Schwarz, J. (2012). Tweeting is believing?: understanding microblog credibility perceptions. <i>Proc. CSCW 2012</i> (pp. 441-450). Schirra, S., Sun, H., & Bentley, F. (2014). Together alone: motivations for live-tweeting a television series. <i>Proc. CHI 2014</i> (pp. 2441-2450). |
| 4/1, 4/3 | SPRING BREAK -- NO CLASS! | |
| 4/7 | 19. Friendsourcing/Social Q&A Assignment 5 Distributed | Morris, M.R., Teevan, J., & Panovich, K. (2010). What do people ask their social networks, and why?: a survey study of status message q&a behavior. <i>Proc. CHI 2010</i> (pp. 1739-1748). Rzeszotarski, J. M., & Morris, M. R. (2014). Estimating the social costs of friendsourcing. <i>Proc. CHI 2014</i> (pp. 2735-2744). |
| 4/9 | 20. Crowdsourcing | von Ahn, L., & Dabbish, L. (2004). Labeling images with a computer game. <i>Proc. CHI 2004</i> (pp. 319-326). Huang, S.-W., & Fu, W.-T. (2013). Don't hide in the crowd!: Increasing social transparency between peer workers improves crowdsourcing outcomes. <i>Proc. CHI 2013</i> (pp. 621-630). |
| 4. CMC for Specific Application Areas | | |
| 4/14 | 21. Social Media and Social Action | Starbird, S., & Palen, L. (2012). (How) will the revolution be retweeted?: Information diffusion and the 2011 Egyptian uprising. <i>Proc. CSCW 2012</i> (pp. 7-16). Robertson, S. P., Douglas, S., Maruyama, M., & Chen, L-W. (2012). Political dialog evolution in a social network. <i>Proc. Digital Government Research 2012</i> (pp. 40-48). Lee, Y-H., & Hsieh, G. (2013). Does slacktivism hurt activism?: the effects of moral balancing and consistency in online activism. <i>Proc. CHI 2013</i> (811-820). |
| 4/16 | 22. CMC in Home Life <i>Guest speaker: Nanyi Bi</i> Assignment 5 due Assignment 6 distributed | Ames, M. G., Go, J., Kaye, J., & Spasojevic, M. (2010). Making love in the network closet: the benefits and work of family videochat. <i>Proc. CSCW 2010</i> (pp. 145-154). Massimi, M., & Neustaedter, C. (2014). Moving from talking heads to newlyweds: exploring video chat use during major life events. <i>Proc. DIS 2014</i> (pp. 43-52). Yarosh, S., Tang, A., Mokashi, S., & Abowd, G. D. (2013). "Almost touching": parent-child remote communication using the sharetable system. <i>Proc. CSCW 2013</i> (pp. 181-192). |
| 4/21 | Extended updates from project teams | |
| 4/23 | No Class: Work on Project | |
| 4/28 | 23. CMC in Special Populations | Lindley, S. E., Harper, R., & Sellen, A. (2009). Desiring to be in touch in a changing communications landscape: |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | | <p>attitudes of older adults. <i>Proc. CHI 2009</i> (pp. 1693-1702).</p> <p>Piper, A. M. & Hollan, J. D. (2008). Supporting medical conversations between deaf and hearing individuals with tabletop displays. <i>Proc. CSCW 2008</i> (pp. 147-156).</p> |
| 4/30 | <p>24. Human-Agent and Human-Robot Interaction</p> <p>Assignment 6 due</p> | <p>Nass, C. & Lee, K. M. (2000). Does computer-generated speech manifest personality? An experimental test of similarity-attraction. <i>Proc. CHI 2000</i> (pp. 329-336).</p> <p>Mutlu, B., Yamaoka, F., Kanda, T., Ishiguro, H., & Hagita, N. (2009). Nonverbal leakage in robots: Communication of intentions through seemingly unintentional behavior. <i>Proc. HRI 2009</i> (pp. 69-76),</p> <p>Lee, M. K., Kiesler, S., Forlizzi, J. & Rybski, P. (2012). Ripple effects of an embedded social agent: A field study of a social robot in the workplace. <i>Proc. CHI 2012</i> (pp. 695-704).</p> |
| 5/5 | Class Presentations | Project team final presentations (poster session) |
| **Final Reports Due Friday May 15 by Midnight** | | |