

SPEECH 664 – PERSUASION AND SOCIAL INFLUENCE
Fall 2006 (M 2:00-4:30 p.m., George 335)
Professor: Dr. Hye-ryeon Lee

Office: George Hall 329
Phone: 956-3322
Office hours: Mon. 1:00 – 2:00, and by appointment

E-mail: Hyeryeon@Hawaii.edu
Website: <http://www.hawaii.edu/speech>

COURSE DESCRIPTION

Goals

This course is designed to introduce students to theories, concepts, strategies and processes of persuasion and social influence. The concepts and theories addressed in the course will be applied to both interpersonal persuasion and communication campaigns. The course focuses on competing theoretical accounts of the processes underlying persuasion (the evidence concerning them, the problems they have encountered, etc.) and on research evidence concerning the effects of various factors on persuasive effectiveness.

Through participation in this course, student should (1) understand a range of theoretical and empirical issues in the study and practice of persuasion and (2) be able to critically evaluate persuasion and social influence scholarship in the discipline.

Course format

The course will be conducted in a seminar format where students are expected to discuss issues raised in the readings. Therefore, it is imperative that students complete assigned readings prior to each class meeting. The instructor may provide a basic lecture when appropriate.

In addition, each student will be assigned to a theory to be covered in the course, and will function as a guest speaker for that theory. To prepare for this role, students are expected to find one article that describes a study which empirically tests the theory in an applied context. Then, students will do a 15 minute presentation that includes a brief overview of the theory and the chosen study along with their critique of the study. These presentations will lead into the discussion of the applicability of the theory to “real world” problems.

Required Text & Assigned Readings

Students are required to buy one textbook:

O’Keefe, D.J. (2002). *Persuasion: Theory and research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

There are many additional reading materials for the course. Each student is responsible for obtaining these readings by the date assigned.

Grades

Final grades will be determined based on a final exam (40%), a class presentation (10%), a theory paper (40%), and overall participation in classroom discussions (10%). Those who wish to appeal their grades should do so by submitting an appeal letter to the course instructor within 72 hours from the time of grade distribution. The letter should describe the nature of the dispute, justification for the dispute and proposed actions. Instructor will review individual appeals carefully and respond in writing. However, students should be aware of the fact that a review can result in lowering of the grade as well as improving it.

Paper

Each student will select a theory/theoretical area and develop a paper which discusses the current state of the theory. The student is expected to review all relevant literature on the theory. The paper will contain (a) a review of the theoretical terms, assumptions, and propositions, (b) the historical background of the theory, (c) a discussion of the validity of the theory based on empirical evidence, and (d) identification of areas needing future research. This paper is due **December 7** and constitutes 40% of your grade. To prevent last minute scrambling at the end of the semester and to allow students to get instructor feedback prior to turning in the graded paper, students will be asked to submit this project in a number of phases. Only the final phase of the project (i.e. the paper) will be given a course grade. Thus, students are not required to submit any phase listed below except the final paper. Instructor feedback on each of the phases will only be provided if a student completes the phase on or prior to the date assigned. The phases are described below.

a. Reference paper: The paper will provide a list of all relevant articles with a one to three sentence summary following each citations. **Due: October 9**

b. Outline 1: Students will provide a detailed outline of the first part of their paper (review of the theoretical terms, assumptions, and propositions, and the historical background of the theory). The outline must contain complete sentences and have citations where appropriate. The historical background of the theory may be a separate section or discussed when laying out the theory. Make your organizational choice based on the criteria of conciseness and clarity. **Due: October 23**

c. Outline 2: The second outline will include appropriate revisions made to outline 1 and will detail the last half of the paper. **Due: November 6**

d. Final paper: The final paper should demonstrate expertise in your theoretical area and should be free of typographical and grammatical errors. Paper is **due on December 7**, and must not exceed 20 pages. Papers must follow APA guidelines specified in the following manual. This book provides the writing style for most of the social science journals you will consult as majors. While it is not a required text for the class, it would be a good investment for those who major in Speech or other social sciences areas.

American Psychological Association (2001). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (5th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.

Assignments and examinations

Assignments are due on or before the regularly scheduled class time on the date due. All assignments should be typed and double spaced. ABSOLUTELY NO late assignments will be accepted.

In principle, no make-up or early examinations will be allowed. In case of **an extraordinary and urgent conflict that is verifiable**, instructor may allow a make-up or early exam. However, arrangements have to be made prior to the exam date with the instructor.

A word about honesty

It is students' responsibility to complete their own work as best as they can in the time provided. Cheating, plagiarism and falsification of data are serious offenses. Anyone found guilty of academic misconduct should expect to fail the entire course and have a record of the matter forwarded to the Dean of Students.

A word about cellular phones

Students are expected to observe basic courtesy out of respect for fellow students and the professor. Cellular phones are very disruptive for class. Remember to turn off your cellular phones before coming into the classroom.

COURSE OUTLINE AND READING ASSIGNMENTS

1. Introduction: Persuasion and the concept of attitude -- August 21/28

O'Keefe, D. J. (2002). *Persuasion: Theory and research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. – Chapters 1 and 7

Miller, G. R. (1980). On being persuaded: Some basic distinctions. In M. E. Roloff & G. R. Miller (Eds.), *Persuasion: New directions in theory and research* (pp. 11-27). Beverly Hills: Sage.

Allport, G. W. (1935). Attitudes. In C. Murchison (Ed.), *A handbook of social psychology* (pp.798-844). Worcester, MA: Clark University Press.

Kelman, H. (1961). Processes of opinion change. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 25, 57-78

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

2. The attitude-behavior relationship – September 11

Wicker, A. W. (1969). Attitudes versus actions: The relationships of overt behavioral responses to attitude objects. *Journal of Social Issues*, 25, 41-78.

Zanna, M. P., & Fazio, R. H. (1981). The attitude-behavior relation: Moving toward a third generation of research. In M. P. Zanna, E. T. Higgins, & C. P. Herman (Eds.), *Consistency in social behavior*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Kim, M-S. & Hunter, J. E. (1993). Relationships among attitudes, behavioral intentions, and behavior: A meta-analysis of past research, Part 2. *Communication Research*, 20, 331-364.

3. Source factors affecting persuasion – September 18

O'Keefe, chapter 8

Hovland, C. I., Janis, I. L., & Kelley, H. H. (1953). *Communication and persuasion*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. Chapter 2.

Andersen, K. E., & Clevenger, T., Jr. (1963). A Summary of Experimental Research in Ethos. *Speech Monographs*, 30, 59-78.

McCroskey, J., C., & Young, T. J. (1981). Ethos and credibility: The construct and its measurement after three decades. *Central States Speech Journal*, 32, 24-34.

4. Message factors affecting persuasion – September 25

O'Keefe, Chapter 9.

Boster, F. J., & Mongeau, P., (1984). Fear-arousing persuasive messages. *Communication yearbook*, 8, 330-375.

Leventhal, H., Singer, R., & Jones, S. (1965). Effects of fear and specificity of recommendation upon attitudes and behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 2, 20-29.

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

5. Receiver factors affecting persuasion -- October 2

O'Keefe, Chapter 10.

McGuire, W. J. (1964). Inducing resistance to persuasion: Some contemporary approaches. In L Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol 1, pp. 191-229).

Pfau, M., & Burgoon, M. (1988). Inoculation in political campaign communication. *Human Communication Research*, 15, 91-111.

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.

6. Consistency theories – October 9

O'Keefe, Chapter 4.

Insko, C. A. (1967). Heider and Newcomb's balance theories. *Theories of attitude change* (pp. 161-176). New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Festinger, L. (1957). *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. Selected readings

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.

7. Learning theories -- October 16

Burgoon, J. K., Burgoon, M., & Miller, G. R., & Sunnafrank, M. (1981). Learning theory approaches to persuasion. *Human Communication Research*, 7, 161-179.

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory* (pp. 1-46). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

8. Theory of Reasoned Action/Planned Behavior – October 23

O'Keefe, Chapter 5.

Fishbein, M. (1979). A theory of reasoned action: Some applications and implications. In H. Howe & M. Page (Eds.), *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation* (Vol 27, pp. 65-116). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Ajzen, I. (1991). The Theory of Planned Behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50, 179-211.

9. Social Judgment Theory – October 30

Sherif, C. W., Sherif, M., & Nebergall, R. E. (1965). *Attitude and attitude change: The Social Judgment-Involvement approach* (pp. 225-244), New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Granberg, D. (1982). Social Judgment theory. *Communication yearbook* 6, 304-329.

10. Elaboration Likelihood Model – November 6

O'Keefe, Chapter 6.

Petty, R. E., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1981). *Attitudes and persuasion: Classic and contemporary approaches* (pp. 255-269). Dubuque, IA: Wm. C Brown.

Chaiken, S. (1987). The heuristic model of persuasion. In M. P. Zanna, J.M. Olson, & C. P. Herman (Eds.), *Social influence: The Ontario Symposium* (Vol. 5, pp. 3-39). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

11. Persuasion in political context – November 13

Page, B. I., Sharpiro, R. Y., & Dempsey, G. R. (1990). What moves public opinion? In D. A. Graber (Ed.), *Media power in politics* (2nd ed.). Washington D.C.: Congressional Quarterly Inc.

Jonston, A., & Kaid, L. L. (2002). Image ads and issue ads in the U.S. presidential advertising: Using video style to explore stylistic differences in televised political ads from 1952 to 2000. *Journal of Communication*, 52, 281-300.

West, D. M. (2001). Television advertising in the presidential campaign. *Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics*, 6, 74-81.

Pfau, M., Holbert, R. L., Szabo, E. A., & Kaminski, K. (2002). Issue-advocacy versus candidate advertising: Effects on candidate preferences and democratic process. *Journal of Communication*, 52, 301-315.

McGraw, K. M., & Hubbard, C. (1996). Some of the people some of the time: individual differences in acceptance of political accounts. In D. C. Mutz, P. M. Sniderman, & R. A. Brody (Eds.), *Political persuasion and attitude change*. Ann Arbor, MA: University of Michigan Press.

12. Persuasion in health context – November 20& 27

Paisley, W. J. (2000). Public communication campaigns: The American experience. In R. E. Rice & C. K. Atkin (Eds.), *Public communication campaigns* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Atkin, C.K. (2000). Theory and principles of media health campaigns. In R. E. Rice & C. K. Atkin (Eds.), *Public communication campaigns* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Finnegan, J. & Viswanath, K. (2002). Communication theory and health behavior change: The media studies framework. In K. Glanz, B. Rimer, & F. Lewis (Eds.), *Health behavior and health education* (3rd ed.). NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Capella, J., Fishben, M., Hornik, R., Ahern, R. K., & Sayeed, S. (2000). Using theory to select messages in antidrug media campaigns: reasoned action and media priming. In R. E. Rice & C. K. Atkin (Eds.), *Public communication campaigns* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Wallack, L., & Dorfman, L. (2000). Putting policy into health communication. In R. E. Rice & C. K. Atkin (Eds.), *Public communication campaigns* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Turner, D. C. (1996). The role of culture in chronic illness. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 39, 717-728.

FINAL EXAMINATION – December 4

PAPER DUE ON December 7