

Arizona State University

Hugh Downs School of Human Communication

Syllabus for:

Communication 691

Seminar: Persuasion and Social Influence

Spring Semester 2020

6:00 – 8:45 p.m. Wednesdays

Stauffer Hall A431

Course Overview

This course will examine the major social scientific theoretical perspectives and concepts related to persuasion and social influence. This course will familiarize you with major theories, areas of research, and points of controversy in the social scientific study of persuasion. The course will begin with definitions of key terms (e.g., what is persuasion?) and the relationships between attitudes and behaviors. The course will then take the oft-trod trip through source, message, context, and receiver effects in persuasion. We will also consider both cognitive models of persuasion and social influence processes.

There are no prerequisite courses for this class, however, a course in statistics and/or empirical research methods will help students understand course material. It is assumed that students will complete assigned readings ahead of time and will be willing and able to discuss them in class.

Requirements and Grading

Completion of *all* assignments is necessary for successful completion of the course. No one may receive a passing grade (i.e., D or better) without completing all assignments.

<u>Assignment</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Each</u>	<u>Total Points</u>
Examinations	2	100	200
Paper Assignment	1	150	150
Group Application Assignment	1	50	50
Attendance/Participation	1	50	<u>50</u>
Total			450

Examinations will be take-home and be in essay format. Each exam will include more questions than you have to answer (e.g., the exam might have seven questions where you need to answer any four). Examination questions will focus on critical thinking skills in addition to ability to articulate course material. The midterm exam will cover material from the first half of the class while the final exam will cover material from the second half of class (i.e., the final exam will *not* be cumulative).

In the **GROUP APPLICATION PRESENTATION**, students will be randomly assigned to groups, and groups will be randomly assigned to develop and present a 30-minute (maximum) presentation of a chapter from the Cialdini (2009) text. The instructor will ask group members to evaluate the quality and quantity of each other's input. Individuals' grades on this assignment will be a function of both the group grade (assigned by the instructor) and peer evaluations. Further, students not present during their group presentation (or who miss another group's presentation) will have up to 25% deducted from their presentation grade. **THE PAPER ASSIGNMENT** will allow students, either individually or in groups, to delve into a topic related to persuasion and/or social influence in great detail (i.e., in 15-30 pages). A complete description of the paper assignment appears on pages 9-10 of this syllabus.

There will be a total of 400 points available in this course. The number of points you accumulate during the semester will determine your final grade. The following scale will determine grades.

445.5 – 450.0	= A+
418.5 – 445.4	= A
405.0 – 418.4	= A-
391.5 – 405.9	= B+
373.5 – 391.4	= B
360.0 – 373.4	= B-
346.5 – 359.9	= C+
315.0 – 346.4	= C
270.0 – 314.9	= D
00 – 269.9	= E

Required and Optional Readings

Readings come in one of four sources. First, readings will come from the second edition of the *SAGE Handbook of Persuasion*. This source provides relatively detailed review of specific areas of research. Second, readings represent a combination of important works (both early and more recent) in an area. These readings (journal articles and book chapters) will typically take a historical perspective. Readings will frequently begin with important original studies (some from quite long ago) and will include recent reviews of the literature (including many meta-analyses). Third, readings will come from Cialdini's *Influence: Science and Practice* book. If you haven't read this book yet, you will really enjoy it. It is a very readable and very interesting discussion of many interesting and relevant topics. Finally, I will make most chapters from the third edition of Stiff and Mongeau's *Persuasive Communication* textbook available on Canvas. This book provides broad coverage of topics discussed, so we won't spend a lot of time on it in class. This reading is optional.

Chapters from *Persuasive Communication* and some of the other readings will be available on the course Canvas site. Other readings will be available online (e.g., through Google Scholar on the ASU library's web site).

- Cialdini, R. B. (2009). *Influence: Science and practice*. Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Dillard, J. P., & Shen, L. (Eds.) (2013). *The SAGE handbook of persuasion: Developments in theory and practice* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Stiff, J. B., & Mongeau, P. A. (2016). *Persuasive communication* (3rd ed.). New York: Guilford.

Policies

Attendance / Participation

Fifty points of your final grade comes directly from your attendance, active discussion of class material, and weekly discussion questions. From my perspective, seminars are *discussion* classes. I expect that every student will attend, and actively participate, in every class session. Thus, I also expect that active participation in discussions will be the class norm. I will come to class with questions I wish to pose, but I will do little lecturing. I expect that students will answer the questions that I pose and ask their own questions in class. Your active participation in class will facilitate all students' understanding of course material. Outside class contributions (e.g., e-mail or FtF conversations) can also count toward the participation grade. . If you cannot make a class, please let me know *ahead of time* (to the extent to which it is possible).

As part of their class participation, students are **required** to submit three open-ended questions designed to generate class discussion. These questions must focus on at least two different course readings for that week. These questions must be posted to the appropriate discussion board on the class Canvas site by noon of each class day (starting 22 January).

Late Work

Due dates for all assignments are provided in the semester schedule. Any modification of these deadlines will be announced in class (and on Canvas) ahead of time. For the midterm and paper assignments, a one-week period grace period is provided, beyond which late work will be penalized. One week following the posted due date, a 10% penalty will be deducted for each week that the assignment is late. So, for example, the midterm exam is due on Wednesday, March 18th. Up until the beginning of the next class period (i.e., March 25th) there will no penalty for late submissions. At the beginning of that class period, however, a 10% deduction will be taken from the assigned score for that assignment. An additional 10% deduction will be taken for each subsequent week the assignment is late. The paper is due on Wednesday, April 22nd and the grace period ends at class time on Wednesday, April 29th. For the final examination, the grace period ends at the end of finals week (i.e., 11:59 p.m., Friday, May 8th) and late penalties will begin to accrue at that point.

Student Conduct

I want to build a classroom climate that is comfortable for all. In a communication class, it is *especially* important that we (1) display respect for all members of the classroom – including the instructor and students, (2) pay attention to and participate in all class sessions and activities; (3) avoid unnecessary disruption during class time (e.g., having private conversations, performing non-class related work on the Internet, receiving cell phone calls, etc.); and (4) avoid racist, sexist, homophobic or other negative language that may unnecessarily exclude members of our campus and classroom. This is not an exhaustive list of behaviors; rather, they represent the minimal standards that help make the classroom a productive place for all concerned.

Students are required to adhere to the behavior standards listed in the ASU's student code of conduct (<https://students.asu.edu/srr/students>). Students are entitled to receive instruction free from interference by other members of the class. An instructor may withdraw a student from a course when the student's behavior disrupts the educational process under USI 201-10 (<http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/usi/usi201-10.html>).

Electronic Mail & Computer Work

I will use electronic mail and the course Canvas site for class updates, so please frequently check your email. All discussion questions must be submitted to the appropriate discussion boards on the course Canvas site by noon of each class day.

Cell phones should be turned off (ideally) or placed in silent mode (silent...really silent...not vibrate...that still makes noise) and not visible during class time. You should not use cell phones to make or receive calls or send e-mails or text messages during class that are not class related. Laptop computers are allowed, but internet access (including, but not limited to, sending and/or receiving e-mail, surfing the web, streaming sporting events, and/or playing solitaire) is prohibited during class unless it is an explicit and direct part of class activity. Exceptions will be made on a case-by-case basis (e.g., personal emergency or other exigencies). Please let me know ahead of time in such circumstances. There is no explicit penalty stated for violating this policy because I hold graduate students in very high regard. I reserve the right to institute such a penalty, however, if it becomes necessary. I will announce/discuss such penalties before they are instituted.

Incomplete

The instructor gives a mark of "I" (incomplete) only when a student who is otherwise doing acceptable work is unable to complete a course because of illness or other conditions beyond the student's control. The mark of "I" should be granted only when the student can complete the unfinished work with the same instructor. However, an incomplete ("I") may be completed with an instructor designated by the school director if the original instructor later becomes incapacitated or is otherwise not on campus. Students must arrange with the instructor to receive an incomplete (and agreeing on the nature of the work to be completed *in writing* on the appropriate form) *before the end of the semester*. Please note that filing paperwork for an incomplete immediately stops the 'late penalty' clock.

Canvas and Technology Help – We will be using Canvas as our Learning Management system this semester. Students can navigate directly to the course Canvas website via *myASU* or <http://canvas.asu.edu>. If you need technical assistance, it is available via the Canvas "Help" icon located on the left-hand navigation menu and phone and live chat support are available 24/7 at <http://contact.asu.edu>. ASU Tech Studios provide a variety of walk-in support services on all ASU campuses: <https://uto.asu.edu/services/campus-it-resources/techstudio>. To learn the basics, refer to the Student Guide: <https://community.canvaslms.com/docs/DOC-10701> and the Canvas Glossary: <http://links.asu.edu/student-canvas-glossary>.

Accommodation for Disabilities – Arizona State University encourages qualified persons with disabilities to participate in its programs and activities. Students who may need disability accommodation(s) for this class should obtain necessary information from the campus Disability Resource Center (DRC) [<http://www.asu.edu/studentaffairs/ed/drc/>]. Students must make the first contact with the DRC. *An instructor may provide accommodations only as specified by DRC documentation.*

Course/Instructor Evaluation – The online course/instructor evaluation will open 7-10 days before the last official day of classes. Watch for e-mails concerning with *ASU Course/Instructor Evaluation* sent to your official ASU e-mail address. Make sure this mail forwards to an account you actually check. You can check this online by going to My ASU, choose Self Support and then E-mail Update (UPO).

Response(s) to the course/instructor evaluation are anonymous and will not be returned until (long) after grades have been submitted. (Non)completion of the evaluation is not required and will not affect your grade. Your responses are important as they are used to improve instruction and help administrators evaluate instructional quality.

Title IX Statement. Title IX is a federal law that provides that no person be excluded on the basis of sex from participation in, be denied benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity. Both Title IX and university policy make clear that sexual violence and harassment based on sex is prohibited. An individual who believes they have been subjected to sexual violence or harassed on the basis of sex can seek support, including counseling and academic support, from the university. If you or someone you know has been harassed on the basis of sex or sexually assaulted, you can find information and resources at <http://sexualviolenceprevention.asu.edu/faqs/students>.

As a mandated reporter, I am obligated to report any information I become aware of regarding alleged acts of sexual discrimination, including sexual violence and dating violence. ASU Counseling Services, <https://eoss.asu.edu/counseling>, is available if you wish discuss any concerns confidentially and privately.

Academic Dishonesty

I presume that all students will act in a responsible and honest manner. I expect both students and the instructor will to act in a manner consistent with ASU's student academic integrity policy. Descriptions of this policy's highlights are at the following location:

<https://provost.asu.edu/index.php?q=academicintegrity>
<https://clas.asu.edu/students/ai>
<http://graduate.asu.edu/beintheknow>

This statement describes academic dishonesty and does not contradict ASU, The College of Liberal Arts and Science, or Hugh Downs School policy. Academic dishonesty could take any of several forms, however, in this class, the most common form is plagiarism. *Plagiarism* includes

using someone else's words or ideas without giving proper credit to that source. The instructor assumes that a paper or examination submitted by a student represents the student's own words and to represent his or her own ideas, unless certain words and ideas are specifically credited to a proper authority. A paper bearing a student's name that does not do this represents plagiarism and reflects misrepresentation and dishonesty.

Plagiarism can occur in many forms. Word-for-word copying of another work without the use of quotation marks or citing that source, paraphrasing another person's ideas without proper citation of that work, providing a misleading citation, and handing in one's own (or another student's) work (e.g., a paper from a previous class) would all be considered plagiarism.

It is important to note that the original format and location of the original material is irrelevant in determining plagiarism. Copying material from the Internet is the same form of plagiarism as copying material from a book or journal article found online or in the library. Copying an article from a journal is functionally equivalent to copying a friend's paper from a previous semester. By placing this statement into my syllabus, I do not want to eliminate study groups or several individuals working together. What I do *not* want is for one person to do the work and more than one person to hand it in. In short, it's fine to work together, but when it comes time to write up your word, it is important that you do so individually.

Definitions of, procedures for reporting, and penalties for academic dishonesty are outlined in the sites listed above. Your instructor will follow these guidelines when academic dishonesty is suspected. Your instructor strongly recommended that you become familiar with these sections of these policies.

COMMUNICATION 691 – PERSUASION AND SOCIAL INFLUENCE
SPRING 2020 TENTATIVE SEMESTER SCHEDULE

WEEK	DATE	TOPIC(S)	READINGS
1	13 <i>January</i>	Introduction to the Course	OL: Noar
2	1-20	What is Persuasion?	HB: Miller HB: Rhodes & Ewaldsen OL: Leet-Pelligrini & Rubin SM 1, 2
3	1-27	What are Attitudes? Attitudes → Behaviors	HB: Carpenter et al. Riemer et al. OL: LaPiere OL: Sivacek & Crano OL: Fazio & Williams SM 3

NOTE: SM = Stiff & Mongeau CR = Course Reserves OL = Available Online HB = Handbook

COMMUNICATION 691 – PERSUASION AND SOCIAL INFLUENCE
SPRING 2020 TENTATIVE SEMESTER SCHEDULE (cont.)

<u>WEEK DATE</u>	<u>TOPIC(S)</u>	<u>READINGS</u>
4 5 February	Reasoned Action Theories <i>Special Guest: Dr. Tony Roberto</i>	HB: Yzer CR: Roberto To Be Announced
5 2-12	Cognitive Response Models I	HB: O'Keefe CR: Petty & Cacioppo OL: Petty, Cacioppo, & Goldman CR: Mongeau & Stiff CR: Petty et al. OL: Allison et al. SM 5

NO CLASS: FEBRUARY 19TH – WESTERN STATES COMMUNICATION ASSOCIATION

6 2-26	Cognitive Response Models II	OL: Chaiken & Ledgerwood OL: Slater & Router OL: Kruglanski et al. OL: Yang et al.
7 4 March	Group Application Presentations	Cialdini

NO CLASS: 11 MARCH: SPRING BREAK

8 3-18	Source Characteristics	OL: Pornpitakpan OL: Allen & Stiff OL: O'Keefe OL: Dilbeck et al. SM 6
-------------	------------------------	--

MIDTERM EXAMINATION DUE 17 MARCH

9 3-25	Message Characteristics: Rational Appeals	HB: Shen & Bigsby OL: Allen et al. OL: Zebregs et al. OL: Fitch SM 7
-------------	---	--

NOTE: SM = Stiff & Mongeau CR = Course Reserves OL = Available Online HB = Handbook
COMMUNICATION 691 – PERSUASION AND SOCIAL INFLUENCE
SPRING 2020 TENTATIVE SEMESTER SCHEDULE (cont.)

<u>WEEK DATE</u>	<u>TOPIC(S)</u>	<u>READINGS</u>
10 1 April	Message Characteristics: Fear Appeals	HB: Mongeau OL: Witte & Allen OL: Dillard et al. OL: Kang & Lin OL: Kim & Shin SM 8
11 4-8	Receiver Characteristics	OL: Johnson & Eagly OL: Eagly & Carli CR: Burgoon & Klingle HB: Fink & Cai SM 9
12 4-15	Setting Characteristics	HB: Sundar et al. OL: Oh & Sundar HB: Andrews et al. OL: Buller SM 10
13 4-22	Social Influence Processes	OL: Feeley et al. OL: Burger OL: Boster et al. OL: Cialdini & Schroeder SM 11, 12

PAPER DUE – WEDNESDAY, APRIL 22ND

14 4-29	Social Influence: Conformity	OL: Milgram OL: Doliński et al. OL: Latane & Darley OL: Asch
---------	------------------------------	---

FINAL EXAMINATION DUE 11:59 P.M. FRIDAY, MAY 8TH

NOTE: SM = Stiff & Mongeau HB = Handbook CR = Course Reserves OL = Available Online

COMMUNICATION 691 [P&SI] - PAPER ASSIGNMENT
DUE: WEDNESDAY, APRIL 22

This purpose of this paper is to allow students to investigate some aspect of persuasion and/or social influence in depth and detail. The topic and nature of the paper up to the student(s) to decide; however, because it represents a detailed investigation, the paper's topic should be of some interest to the student. Students may choose a topic discussed in class (e.g., the Unimodel) or a topic not discussed in class (e.g., Language Expectancy Theory).

Nature of the Paper

This paper can be done individually or in groups of up to three and can come in any of several formats. It could be a literature review, research proposal, development of a theoretical position, research report, meta-analysis, methodological and/or theoretical critique of an article or area of research, application of the material discussed, or another format pending the instructor's approval. Given any of the formats, the paper should review the relevant literature (i.e., theory development and/or research) relevant to your topic. Using any format, one of your primary tasks in writing this paper is to describe what we know (and what we do not know) about the topic that you have chosen. You should use the appropriate data sources, find the appropriate books, book chapters, and/or journal articles, and synthesize what they have to say into a paper (or part of your paper, depending on the format).

If you choose to write a research proposal, research report, or meta-analysis, the literature review and predictions should provide the proper context for your (proposed) study. In addition to the review of the literature (described above) you will need to explain the methods used to test the prediction(s) you made or the question(s) you posed. Follow the standard format for a social science method's section (e.g., participants, design, instrumentation, procedures). Be explicit. Develop your methods to the extent that you (or someone else) could actually perform the study using your methods. Depending on your paper's format, you may or may not actually carry out the study.

The paper should follow the instructions described above. While the length of the paper can vary depending on the topic and format you have chosen, it is not likely that you can adequately complete all parts of the assignment in fewer than 15 pages. I expect most papers to be in the 20-25 page range with a maximum of 30 pages (of text, i.e., not counting title page, abstract, references, tables, figures, appendixes, etc.). The instructor will return any papers substantially longer than the upper limit for pruning before evaluation can occur. Source citations and reference list should be consistent with the sixth edition of the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (i.e., APA style).

Evaluation Criteria

Evaluation will occur on each major part of the paper and might vary somewhat depending on the particular format you use. Evaluation of the literature review depends upon the extent to which it is complete and the quality of your synthesis and analysis of the literature. Evaluation of the hypotheses and methods (if any) section(s) depend upon the extent to which they are

compelling, appropriate given the literature review, and ask (and potentially attempt to answer) interesting questions.

The primary criteria used to evaluate all formats will include completeness, organization, and clarity. (In addition, see *Mongeau's General Criteria for Evaluating Papers*, for a detailed discussion of these criteria.) Completeness refers to the extent to which the student provides an adequate description of the literature and methods (if applicable). Organization refers to the extent to which various ideas flow together. Sentences should blend effectively into paragraphs, while paragraphs should blend well in the major sections of your paper. Clarity refers to the extent to which ideas are presented in an understandable manner. This would include the extent to which ideas (the students', well as other researchers and theorists) are presented clearly. Mechanics refers to the technical (or stylistic) aspects of the paper. Your final draft should be a manuscript devoid of typographical errors, misspellings, punctuation errors, sentence fragments, and so on. Moreover, this criterion also includes evaluation of the extent to which references and citations are complete and consistent with APA style. In this respect, it would be helpful to develop the habit of completing rough drafts of your work and then spending time cleaning and polishing. If you try to write the entire paper the last day or two before it is due, you will almost certainly encounter stylistic problems, not to mention substantive ones.

I will be available to discuss possible topics and, within reason, to examine your preliminary written drafts of your paper. I will not be available to review drafts on the evening before the papers are due. You should set some reasonable period for the submission and return of rough drafts. You should generally count on a one week turn-around time in returning a variety of drafts (i.e., not only this paper, but drafts of other papers as well).

MONGEAU'S GENERAL CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING PAPERS

Across the various classes that I teach and papers that I evaluate, some of the criteria that I use in evaluating papers are specific to the case at hand. Specifically, I will focus on the quality with which students fulfill each of the tasks outlined in that particular assignment. On the other hand, while the specific content of the various papers differ, some of the general criteria that I use to evaluate them remain pretty much the same. I want to spend a bit of time here discussing these general criteria. These criteria are not mutually exclusive (e.g., a lack of organization influences perceptions of clarity); however, I hope that this gives you a good idea of what yardsticks I use when I grade papers. I generally use five general criteria in evaluating student papers.

CRITERION 1: CLARITY

The primary criterion that I use when I evaluate a paper (a draft of my own work, a manuscript that I receive as a reviewer for a professional journal, or a [undergraduate or graduate] student's paper) is clarity. Simply put, are you communicating whatever it is that you are trying to say clearly? It does not matter if you are trying to describe a relationship that you've been part of, a reaction to a lecture, or reviewing the theoretical literature on relationship development, you must do so clearly. Saying something simply is better than saying something using complex, convoluted, language. Don't feel as though you have to use a lot of technical jargon because the research you've read does it. If I consistently cannot understand what you are trying to say, your grade is going to suffer as a result.

CRITERION 2: COMPLETENESS

I evaluate completeness on two levels. First, I evaluate completeness on a *macro* level. Each paper assignment includes multiple parts. For example, the reaction/application paper requires that you first describe course material and then either apply that material to your life experiences or describe how and why you reacted the way that you did. When I evaluate completeness on the macro level, I am looking for the extent to which you actually perform each of the tasks that I require. Failure to complete a major part of a paper is a serious error that will result in substantial point deductions. Therefore, it is important that I know what you are doing as you work your way through your paper. It is in your best interest to inform me where you are and what you are doing in your paper. Signposting and transitions between parts helps immensely in keeping me informed as to what you are doing in your paper.

I also evaluate completeness on a *micro* level. Completeness on a micro level represents the extent to which you adequately tackle each of the tasks required in the paper. The question here is how well did you perform each of the tasks required? How completely you should describe something, of course, depends on the nature and length of your paper. If you are describing Predicted Outcome Value Theory in the relationship paper, it does not make sense to spend 5 pages of your seven-page paper describing the theory. You need to complete all parts of the assignment given the page restrictions.

CRITERION 3: ORGANIZATION

The third criterion I use in evaluating papers is organization. Your ideas should develop in a logical manner. Words should fit together to form phrases. Phrases should fit together to form sentences. Sentences should fit together to make paragraphs. Paragraphs should fit together to form the major sections of your paper. What I do not want is a paper that rambles from point to point without any connection between them. The paper assignments suggest a particular organizational scheme for the major parts of your papers and I strongly suggest that you stick to them. Within major sections, the choice of an organizational scheme is up to you.

CRITERION 4: VALIDITY

The fourth major criterion I use in grading papers has to do with the validity of the presented arguments. The arguments that you make in your papers must be valid. This means that the conclusions of your arguments must follow from the premises. Further, the premises and conclusions that you draw should be explicit. I should not have to dig through a paper to identify and understand the arguments you are trying to make.

Part of the validity of an argument has to do with the data supporting a particular conclusion. Specifically, properly document all statements of fact from a reputable primary source. For example, if you are making the claim that men and women communicate differently in some important ways, you need to support that conclusion (or claim) with a reference from a reputable and primary source.

CRITERION 5: MECHANICS

My evaluation also focuses on the technical (or stylistic) aspects of the paper. I expect that submitted drafts should be devoid of grammatical errors, typographical errors, misspellings, punctuation errors, sentence fragments, and so on. In this respect, it would be helpful to develop the habit of completing rough drafts of your work and then spending time cleaning and polishing your writing. If you try to write the entire paper the last day or two before it is due, you will almost certainly encounter stylistic problems, not to mention substantive ones.

I will also evaluate presentational aspects of papers (e.g., spelling, grammar, punctuation, etc.). This mechanics criterion includes evaluating the format of source citations and references provided (if any). The format of the paper, source citations, and reference lists must be consistent with the sixth edition of the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association*.

READING REFERENCES [IN ORDER OF APPEARANCE]

WEEK 1: Introduction to the Course

- Noar, S. M. (2006). In pursuit of cumulative knowledge in health communication: The role of meta-analysis. *Health Communication, 20*, 169-175. DOI: 10.1207/s15327027hc2002_8

WEEK 2: What is Persuasion?

- Miller, G. R. (2013). On being persuaded: Some basic distinctions. In J. P. Dillard & L. Shen (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of persuasion: Developments in theory and practice* (2nd ed., pp. 70-92). Thousand Oaks CA: Sage. (Reprinted from *Persuasion: New directions in theory and research*, pp. 11-28, by M. Roloff & G. R. Miller, Eds., 1980. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage).
- Rhodes, N., & Ewoldsen, D. R. (2013). Outcomes of persuasion: Behavioral, cognitive, and social. In J. P. Dillard & L. Shen (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of persuasion: Developments in theory and practice* (2nd ed., pp. 53-69). Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.
- Leet-Pellegrini, H., & Rubin, J. Z. (1974). The effects of six bases of power upon compliance, identification, and internalization. *Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society, 3*, 68-70.

WEEK 3: Attitudes → Behaviors

- Carpenter, C. J., Boster, F. J., & Andrews, K. R. (2013). Functional attitude theory. In J. P. Dillard & L. Shen (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of persuasion: Developments in theory and practice* (2nd ed., pp. 104-119). Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.
- Riemer, H., Shavitt, S., Koo, M., & Markus, H. R. (2014). Preferences don't have to be personal: Expanding attitude theorizing with a cross-cultural perspective. *Psychological Review, 121*, 619-648.
- LaPiere, R. T. (1934). Attitudes vs. actions. *Social Forces, 13*, 230-237.
- Sivacek, J., & Crano, W. D. (1982). Vested interest as a moderator of attitude-behavior consistency. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 43*, 210-221
- Fazio, R. H., & Williams, C. J. (1986). Attitude accessibility as a moderator of the attitude-perception and attitude-behavior relations: An investigation of the 1984 presidential election. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*, 505-514.

-
-
-
-
-

- = Available Online
- = Available on Canvas

WEEK 4: Reasoned Action Theories

Yzer, M. (2013). Reasoned action theory: Persuasion as belief-based behavior change. In J. P. Dillard & L. Shen (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of persuasion: Developments in theory and practice* (2nd ed., pp. 120-136). Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.

- Roberto, A. J. (in preparation). *Public health communication: Science and practice*. (**Chapter 10: The Reasoned Action Approach**). Dubuque, IA: Kendall Hunt.

➤

WEEK 5: Cognitive Response Models I [ELM]

O’Keefe, D. J. (2013). The elaboration likelihood model. In J. P. Dillard & L. Shen (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of persuasion: Developments in theory and practice* (2nd ed., 137-149). Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.

- Petty, R. E., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1981). *Attitudes and persuasion--classic and contemporary approaches*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press. [Pages 255-269 only]
- Petty, R. E., Cacioppo, J. T., & Goldman, R. (1981). Personal involvement as a determinant of argument-based persuasion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *41*, 847-855.
- Mongeau, P. A., & Stiff, J. B. (1993). Specifying causal relationships in the elaboration likelihood model. *Communication Theory*, *3*, 65-72. DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-2885.1993.tb00057.x
- Petty, R. E., Wegener, D. T., Fabrigar, L. R., Priester, J. R., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1993). Conceptual and methodological issues in the elaboration likelihood model of persuasion: A reply to the Michigan State critics. *Communication Theory*, *3*, 336-342. DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-2885.1993.tb00078.x
- Allison, T. H., Davis, B. C., Webb, J. W., & Short, J. C. (2017). Persuasion in crowdfunding: An elaboration likelihood model of crowdfunding performance. *Journal of Business Venturing*, *32*, 707-725.

WEEK 6: Cognitive Response Models II [Alternatives]

- Chaiken, S., & Ledgerwood, A. (2012). A theory of heuristic and systematic message processing. In P. A. M. Van Lange, A. W. Kruglanski, & T. E. Higgins (Eds.), *Handbook of theories in social psychology* (pp. 246-266). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Slater, M. D., & Rouner, D. (2002). Entertainment-education and elaboration likelihood: Understanding the processing of narrative persuasion. *Communication Theory*, *12*, 173–191
- Kruglanski, A. W., Chen, C., Pierro, A., Mannetti, L., Erb, H.-P., & Spiegel, S. (2006). Persuasion according to the unimodel: Implications for cancer communication. *Journal of Communication*, *56*, S105-S122.

○ = Available Online

➤ = Available on Canvas

- Yang, Z. J., Aloe, A. M., & Feeley, T. H. (2014). Risk information seeking and processing model: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Communication*, 64(1), 20-41.

WEEK 8: Source Characteristics

- Pornpitakpan, C. (2004). The persuasiveness of source credibility: A critical review of five decades. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 34, 243-281. DOI: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.2004.tb02547.x
- Allen, M. A., & Stiff, J. B. (1989). Testing three models for the sleeper effect. *Western Journal of Communication*, 53, 411-426.
- O'Keefe, D. J. (1987). The persuasive effects of delaying identification of high- and low-credibility communicators: A meta-analytic review. *Central States Speech Journal*, 38, 63-72.
- Dilbeck, K. E., Domínguez, A. S., Ruiz, J. D., & Allen, M. R. (2018). The vicarious and source credibility grid across cultures. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, 28, 83-106.

WEEK 9: Message Characteristics: Rational Appeals

- Shen, L., & Bigsby, E. (2013). The effects of message features: Content, structure, and style. In J. P. Dillard & L. Shen (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of persuasion: Developments in theory and practice* (2nd ed., pp.20-35). Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.
- Allen, M. A., Hale, J. L., Mongeau, P. A., Berkowitz-Stafford, S., Stafford, S., Shanahan, W., et al. (1990). Testing a model of message sidedness: Three replications. *Communication Monographs*, 57, 275-291.
 - Zebregs, S., van den Putte, B., Neijens, P., & de Graaf, A. (2015). The differential impact of statistical and narrative evidence on beliefs, attitude, and intention: A meta-analysis. *Health Communication*, 30, 282-289.
 - Fitch, K. L. (2003). Cultural persuadables. *Communication Theory*, 13, 100-123.

WEEK 10: Message Characteristics: Fear Appeals

- Mongeau, P. A. (2013). Fear appeals. In J. P. Dillard & L. Shen (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of persuasion: Developments in theory and practice* (2nd ed., pp. 184-199). Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.
- Witte, K., & Allen, M. (2000). A meta-analysis of fear appeals: Implications for public health campaigns. *Health Education and Behavior*, 27, 591-615.

- = Available Online
- = Available on Canvas

- Dillard, J. P., Li, R., & Huang, Y. (2017). Threat appeals: the fear–persuasion relationship is linear and curvilinear. *Health Communication, 32*, 1358-1367.
-
- Kang, J., & Lin, C. A. (2015). Effects of message framing and visual-fear appeals on smoker responses to antismoking ads. *Journal of health communication, 20*(6), 647-655.
- Kim, H. J., & Shin, W. (2018). The effects of message source and fear appeal on young adults' response to Sexually Transmitted Disease (STD) messages in Singapore. *Asian Journal of Communication, 28*, 185-204.

WEEK 11: Receiver Characteristics

- Johnson, B. T., & Eagly, A. H. (1989). Effects of involvement on persuasion: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 106*, 290-314.
- Eagly, A. H., & Carli, L. L. (1981). Sex of researchers and sex-typed communications as determinants of sex differences in influenceability: A meta-analysis of social influence studies. *Psychological Bulletin, 90*, 1-20.
- Burgoon, M., & Klingle, R. S. (1998). Gender differences in being influential and/or influenced: A challenge to prior explanations. *Sex differences and similarities in communication: Critical essays and empirical investigations of sex and gender in interaction, 257-285*. [READ ONLY 271-282.]
- Fink, E. L., & Cai, D. A. (2013). Discrepancy models of belief change. In J. P. Dillard & L. Shen (Eds.), *The Persuasion Handbook* (2nd ed., pp. 84-103). Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.

WEEK 12: Setting Characteristics

- Andrews, K. R., Boster, F. J., & Carpenter, C. (2013). Persuading in the small group context. In J. P. Dillard & L. Shen (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of persuasion: Developments in theory and practice* (2nd ed., pp. 354-370). Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.
- Oh, J., & Sundar, S. S. (2015). How does interactivity persuade? An experimental test of interactivity on cognitive absorption, elaboration, and attitudes. *Journal of Communication, 65*, 213-236.
 - Sundar, S. S., Oh, J., Kang, H., & Sreenivasan, A. (2013). How does technology persuade? Theoretical mechanisms for persuasive technologies. In J. P. Dillard & L. Shen (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of persuasion: Developments in theory and practice* (2nd ed., pp. 388-404). Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.
 - Buller, D. B. (1986). Distraction during persuasive communication: A meta-analytic review. *Communication Monographs, 53*, 91-114.

- Available Online
- = Available on Canvas

WEEK 13: Social Influence Processes I

- Feeley, T. H., Anker, A. E., & Aloe, A. M. (2012). The door-in-the-face persuasive message strategy: A meta-analysis of the first 35 years. *Communication Monographs*, 79, 316-343. DOI: 10.1080/10510970902955976
- = Cialdini, R. B., & Schroeder, D. A. (1976). Increasing compliance by legitimizing paltry contributions: When even a penny helps. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 34, 599-604. DOI: 10.1037/0022-3514.34.4.599
- Boster, F. J., Shaw, A. S., Hughes, M., Kotowski, M. R., Strom, R. E., & Deatrck, L. M. (2009). Dump-and-chase: The effectiveness of persistence as a sequential request compliance-gaining strategy. *Communication Studies*, 60, 219–234. DOI: 10.1080/10510970902955976
- Burger, J. M. (1999). The foot-in-the-door compliance procedure: A multiple-process analysis and review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 3, 303-325. DOI: 10.1207/s15327957pspr0304_2

WEEK 14: Social Influence Processes II

- Milgram, S. (1965). Some conditions of obedience and disobedience to authority. *Human Relations*, 18, 57-76.
- Doliński, D., Grzyb, T., Folwarczny, M., Grzybała, P., Krzyszycha, K., Martynowska, K., & Trojanowski, J. (2017). Would you deliver an electric shock in 2015? Obedience in the experimental paradigm developed by Stanley Milgram in the 50 years following the original studies. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 8, 927-933.
- Latane, B., & Darley, J. M. (1968). Group inhibition of bystander intervention in emergencies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 10, 215-221.
- Brody, N., & Vangelisti, A. L. (2016). Bystander intervention in cyberbullying. *Communication Monographs*, 83(1), 94-119.
- Asch, S. E. (1955). Opinions and social pressure. *Scientific American*, 193, 31-35.

- = Available Online
- = Available on Canvas