

Seminar: Persuasion

COMM 65091/75091

Section 001

Spring, 2001

Instructor: Dr. Janet Meyer

Office: D204C Music and Speech Building (jrmeyer@kent.edu)

Phone: Office: 672-0176, Department office: 672-2659

Office hours: Monday: 1:30 - 2:30 pm
Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday: 1:30 - 3:00 pm

Meeting time: Wednesday, 3:20 - 5:50 pm - D205 Music/Speech Building

Call number: 17999/18000

Course objectives

The purpose of this graduate seminar is to provide an overview of the major theories of persuasion and areas of research in persuasion. The course emphasizes the study of persuasion from a social science perspective. Readings include articles describing the major theories, classic experiments, articles and chapters reporting research stimulated by the theories, meta-analyses, literature reviews, colloquia on controversial issues, and recent studies published in the journals.

Required readings

O'Keefe, D. J. (1990). *Persuasion: Theory and research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Additional course readings are contained in a coursepack available at WordSmiths (402 E. Main St.).

Course requirements

Exams: There will be a midterm exam and a final exam. Both will be essay exams. For each, you will be given a list of study questions prior to the exam. The exams will consist of several questions selected from that list. The final exam will consist only of material covered since the midterm.

Proposal: You will be asked to develop a written proposal for a study that investigates some aspect of a theory of persuasion or area of persuasion research (e.g., source effects). Your proposal should be roughly 15-20 pages in length (double-spaced). It should include a brief

overview of past research in the same or a similar area, a rationale for your study, the hypotheses or research questions you will investigate, a description of the dependent and independent variables, a description of the personality measures, questionnaire, technology (e.g., videotaping), and/or experimental manipulations that you will use to collect data, and a brief explanation of how you plan to analyze the data. You will be expected to describe your proposal in a presentation to the class (roughly 15 minutes) at the end of the term.

Leading discussion: You will be asked to select one of a specified number of articles in the coursepack and lead the class discussion on that article.

Each member of the seminar is expected to participate in class discussions.

Grading

The above requirements will be weighted in the following manner in assigning final grades in the course:

Midterm	35%
Final exam	35%
Leading discussion	5%
Research proposal - presentation	5%
□ □ - paper	20%

Course grades will be assigned according to the following scale:

90 - 100	A
80 - 89	B
70 - 79	C
60 - 69	D
< 60	F

Course Outline and Readings

Unless indicated otherwise in class, all readings should be completed prior to the class session for which they are listed.

1/17: Orientation

1/24: What is an attitude?

O□Keefe, Chapter 3

Katz, D. (1960). The functional approach to the study of attitudes. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 24, 163-204.

Roskos-Ewoldsen, D. R. (1997). Attitude accessibility and persuasion: Review and a

transactive model. In B. Burleson (Ed.), *Communication Yearbook 20* (pp. 185-225). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Roskos-Ewoldsen, D. R., and Fazio, R. H. (1997). The role of belief accessibility in attitude formation. *The Southern Communication Journal*, 62, 107-116.

1/31: The relationship between attitudes and behavior

O'Keefe, Chapter 11

Regan, D. T. & Fazio, R. (1977). On the consistency between attitudes and behavior: Look to the method of attitude formation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 13, 28-45.

Fazio, R. H., Chen, J.-M., McDonel, E. C., & Sherman, S. J. (1982). Attitude accessibility, attitude-behavior consistency, and the strength of the object-evaluation association. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 18, 339-357.

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.

2/7: Cognitive Dissonance Theory / Bem's Self-Perception theory

O'Keefe, Chapter 4

Festinger, L., & Carlsmith, J. M. (1959). Cognitive consequences of forced compliance. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 58, 203-210

Linder, D. E., Cooper, J., & Jones, E. E. (1967). Decision freedom as a determinant of the role of incentive magnitude in attitude change. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 6, 245-254.

Bem, D. J. (1965). An experimental analysis of self-persuasion. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 1, 199-218.

Fazio, R. H., Zanna, M. P., & Cooper, J. (1977). Dissonance and self-perception: An integrative view of each theory's proper domain of application. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 13, 464-479.

2/14: The Theory of Reasoned Action / The Theory of Planned Behavior

O'Keefe, Chapter 5

Griffin, R. J., Neuwirth, K., & Dunwoody, S. (1995). Using the Theory of Reasoned Action to examine the impact of health risk message. In B. Burleson (Ed.), *Communication Yearbook 18*, (pp. 201-228). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Sheppard, B. H., Hartwick, J., & Warshaw, P. R. (1988). The Theory of Reasoned Action: A meta-analysis of past research with recommendations for modifications and future research. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *15*, 325-343.

Ajzen, I. (1985). From intentions to actions: A theory of planned behavior. In J. Kuhl & J. Beckmann (Eds.), *Action control: From cognition to behavior* (pp. 11-39). NY: Springer-Verlag.

2/21: Message effects

O'Keefe, Chapter 9

Freedman, J. L. & Fraser, S. C. (1966). Compliance without pressure: The foot-in-the-door technique. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *4*, 195-202.

Dillard, J. P., Hunter, J. E., & Burgoon, M. (1984). Sequential-request persuasive strategies: Meta-analysis of foot-in-the-door and door-in-the-face. *Human Communication Research*, *10*, 461-488.

O'Keefe, D. J., & Figge, M. (1997). A guilt-based explanation of the door-in-the-face influence strategy. *Human Communication Research*, *24*, 64-81.

Allen, M. et al. (1990). Testing a model of message sidedness: Three replications. *Communication Monographs*, *57*, 275-291.

Reeves, R. A., Macolini, R. M., & Martin, R. C. (1987). Legitimizing paltry contributions: On-the-spot vs. Mail-in requests. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *17*, 731-738.

2/28: Fear appeals

O'Keefe, Chapter 9, pp. 165-168).

Leventhal, H. (1971). Fear appeals and persuasion: The differentiation of a motivational construct. *American Journal of Public Health*, *61*, 1208-1224.

Rogers, R. W. (1975). A protection motivation theory of fear appeals and attitude

change. *The Journal of Psychology*, 91, 93-114.

Boster, F. J., & Mongeau, P. (1984). Fear-arousing persuasive messages. In R. N. Bostrom (Ed.), *Communication Yearbook 8*, (pp. 330-375). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Witte, K. (1992). Putting the fear back into fear appeals: The extended parallel process model. *Communication Monographs*, 59, 329-349.

Dillard, J. P. (1994). Rethinking the study of fear appeals: An emotional perspective. *Communication Theory*, 4, 295-323.

3/7: Midterm

3/14: Social judgment theory

O□Keefe, Chapter 2

Hovland, C. I., Harvey, O. J., & Sherif, M. (1957). Assimilation and contrast effects in reactions to communication and attitude change. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 55, 244-252.

Sherif, C. W., Kelly, M., Rodgers, H. L., Jr., Sarup, G. & Tittler, B. I. (1973). Personal involvement, social judgment, and action. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 27, 311-328.

Pallak, M. S., Mueller, M., Dollar, K., & Pallak, J., (1972). Effect of commitment on responsiveness to an extreme consonant communication. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 23, 429-436.

Granberg, D. (1982). Social judgment theory. In M. Burgoon (Ed.), *Communication Yearbook 6* (pp. 304-329). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

3/21: Receiver effects / Inoculation effect

O□Keefe, Chapter 10

Rhodes, N. & Wood, W. (1992). Self-esteem and intelligence affect influenceability: The mediating role of message reception. *Psychological Bulletin*, 111, 156-171.

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.

Pfau, M., et al. (1997). Enriching the inoculation construct: The role of critical components in the process of resistance. *Human Communication Research*, *24*, 187-215.

3/28: Spring Break

4/4: Source effects / Sleeper effect

O'Keefe, Chapter 8

Cronkhite, G., & Liska, J. (1976). A critique of factor analytic approaches to the study of credibility. *Communication Monographs*, *43*, 91-107.

Wachtler, J., & Counselman, E. (1981). When increasing liking for a communicator decreases opinion change: An attribution analysis of attractiveness. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *17*, 386-395.

Chaiken, S. (1980). Heuristic versus systematic information processing and the use of source versus message cues in persuasion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *39*, 752-766.

Petty, R. E., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1990). Involvement and persuasion: Tradition versus integration. *Psychological Bulletin*, *107*, 367-374.

Kelman, H. C., & Hovland, C. I. (1953). Reinstatement of the communicator in delayed measurement of opinion change. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, *48*, 327-335.

4/11: Elaboration Likelihood Model

O'Keefe, Chapter 6

Petty, R. E., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1979). Issue involvement can increase or decrease persuasion by enhancing message-relevant cognitive responses. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *37*, 1915-1926.

Stiff, J. B. (1986). Cognitive processing of persuasive message cues: A meta-analytic review of the effects of supporting information on attitudes. *Communication Monographs*, *53*, 75-89.

Petty, R. E., Kasmer, J. A., Haugtvedt, C. P., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1987). Source and

message factors in persuasion: A reply to Stiff's critique of the Elaboration Likelihood Model. *Communication Monographs*, 54, 233-249.

Stiff, J. B., & Boster, F. J. (1987). Cognitive processing: Additional thoughts and a reply to Petty, Kasmer, Haugtvedt, and Cacioppo. *Communication Monographs*, 54, 250-256.

Petty, R. E., Cacioppo, J. T., Kasmer, J. A., & Haugtvedt, C. P. (1987). A reply to Stiff and Boster. *Communication Monographs*, 54, 257-263.

Hamilton, M. A., Hunter, J. E., & Boster, F. J. (1993). The Elaboration Likelihood Model as a theory of attitude formation: A mathematical analysis. *Communication Theory*, 3, 50-64.

Mongeau, P. A., & Stiff, J. B. (1993). Specifying causal relationships in the Elaboration Likelihood Model. *Communication Theory*, 3, 65-72.

Allen, M., & Reynolds, R. (1993). The Elaboration Likelihood Model and the sleeper effect: An assessment of attitude change over time. *Communication Theory*, 3, 73-82.

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, 336-362.

4/18: Compliance-gaining

O'Keefe, Chapter 12

Miller, G. R., Boster, F. J., Roloff, M. E., & Seibold, D. R. (1987). MBRS Rekindled: Some thoughts on compliance gaining in interpersonal settings. In M. E. Roloff & G. R. Miller (Eds.). *Interpersonal processes: New directions in communication research*. (pp. 89-116). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Wheless, L. R., Barraclough, R., & Stewart, R. (1983). Compliance-gaining and power in persuasion. In R. N. Bostrom & B. H. Westley (Eds.), *Communication Yearbook 7*, (pp. 105-145). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Boster, F. J., & Stiff, J. B. (1984). Compliance-gaining message selection behavior, *Human Communication Research*, 10, 539-556.

Dillard, J. P., & Burgoon, M. (1985). Situational influences on the selection of compliance-gaining messages: Two tests of the predictive utility of the Cody-McLaughlin typology. *Communication Monographs*, 52, 289-304

4/25: Compliance-gaining (continued)

O'Keefe, Chapter 12

Burleson, B. R., Wilson, S. R., Waltman, M. S., Goering, E. M., Ely, T. K., & Whaley, B. B. (1988). Item desirability effects in compliance-gaining research: Seven studies documenting artifacts in the strategy selection procedure. *Human Communication Research, 14*, 429-486.

Seibold, D. R. (1988). A response to "Item Desirability in Compliance-Gaining Research", *Human Communication Research, 15*, 152-161.

Hunter, J. E. (1988). Failure of the social desirability response set hypothesis. *Human Communication Research, 15*, 162-168.

Boster, F. J. (1988). Comments on the utility of compliance-gaining message selection tasks. *Human Communication Research, 15*, 169-177.

Burleson, B. R., & Wilson, S. R. (1988). On the continued undesirability of item desirability: A reply to Boaster, Hunter, and Seibold. *Human Communication Research, 15*, 178-191.

Tracy, K., Craig, R. T., Smith, M., & Spisak, F. (1984). The discourse of requests: Assessment of a compliance-gaining approach. *Human Communication Research, 10*, 513-538.

Wilson, S. R., Aleman, C. G., & Leatham, G. B. (1998). Identity implications of influence goals: A revised analysis of face-threatening acts and application to seeking compliance with same-sex friends. *Human Communication Research, 25*, 64-96.

5/2: Proposal presentations

Final exam: Thursday, May 10, 7:45 - 10:00 am

