

COM 691: HEALTH COMMUNICATION CAMPAIGNS

Spring 2019 –Monday 3:00 p.m. to 5:45 p.m.
Stauffer A431

Instructor: Anthony J. Roberto, Ph.D.

Office: A468 Stauffer Hall

Phone: 602-821-8669 (Cell)

Email: anthony.roberto@asu.edu

Office Hours: Monday 1:30 p.m. to 2:30 p.m.

Wednesday 1:15 pm to 2:15 p.m.

And by appointment

Assistant: Summer Preston, M.A.

Office: Graduate Student Lounge Stauffer Hall

Phone: 303-815-4917 (Cell)

Email: summer.preston@asu.edu

Office Hours: Monday 2:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.

And by appointment

OBJECTIVES

This class is designed to make you a more effective researcher, teacher, and user/practitioner of theory and research in the area of health communication campaigns. After taking this class, students will (1) understand the processes involved in designing and evaluating health campaigns; (2) be able to identify some of the key variables that lead to attitude and behavior change; (3) understand how these variables relate to one another according to multiple theoretical perspectives; and (4) be able to apply all concepts, theories, and research to a variety different contexts and issues.

REQUIRED READINGS

See end of syllabus for list of required readings – this list may be expanded/adjusted as needed based on class discussion.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS

Your grade in this class is a function of four factors: (1) participation, (2) theory application presentation, (3) research application presentation, and (4) a research project.

PARTICIPATION: This portion of your grade consists of active discussion of class material. I expect you to complete the assigned readings ahead of time and to demonstrate that you read them based on (1) answers to questions I ask, (2) questions you ask, and (3) comments you make during class. Obviously if you do not come to class you will not be able to participate and may have points deducted from your participation grade.

THEORY APPLICATION PRESENTATION: Students will be randomly assigned to lead a short discussion (15 minutes including questions and answers) on a study that is guided by and/or tests one of the theories covered in class. These presentations are due on the day the assigned theory is discussed in class (see Tentative Daily Schedule). The study can focus on any topic as one of the goals of this assignment is to allow you to personalize the class to your specific needs and interests. Ideally the study will focus on the creation and/or evaluation of a theory-based message, but I am open to other ideas as well. *Students must get approval from the instructor at least one week before their due date to make sure the study they select will work for this class/assignment (I am happy to review articles either in person or via email).* The discussion should include a short overview of the study that address the following types of questions, and allow time for a few questions from the class:

- 1) What was the purpose of the study? For example, what were the key hypotheses or research questions? (Please quickly summarize rather than quoting them all verbatim.)
- 2) What research method was used in the study?
- 3) What was the role of theory in this study (see theory coding scheme)?**
- 4) How would you describe the message that was being designed or evaluated (if applicable)?
- 5) What were the main findings?
- 6) What were the main strengths/contributions (i.e., why did the study get published)?
- 7) What were the main weaknesses that you see in this article (i.e., what additional information would have been helpful, or what might you have done differently)?
- 8) Do you have any questions about the study?

RESEARCH METHOD APPLICATION PRESENTATION: Students will be randomly assigned to lead a short discussion (15 minutes including questions and answers) on a health communication campaigns related study that uses one of the research methods covered in class. These presentations are due on the day the assigned method is discussed in class (see Tentative Daily Schedule). The study can focus on any topic and represents another way for you to personalize the class to your specific needs and interests. *Students must get approval from the instructor at least one week before their due date to make sure the study they select will work for this class/assignment (I am happy to review articles either in person or via email).* The presentation should include a short overview of the study that address the following types of questions, and allow time for a few questions from the class:

- 1) What was the purpose of the study? For example, what were the key hypotheses or research questions? (Please quickly summarize rather than quoting them all verbatim.)
- 2) What theory was used to guide the research (if applicable)?
- 3) How would you describe the message that was being designed or evaluated (if applicable)?
- 4) How well was the method described? That is, could you replicate the study from the information provided? Why or why not?**
- 5) What were the main findings?
- 6) What are the main strengths/contributions (i.e., why did the study get published)?
- 7) What are the main weaknesses that you see in this article (i.e., what additional information would have been helpful, or what might you have done differently)?
- 8) Do you have any questions about the study?

RESEARCH PROJECT: The major assignment of this course is an original written research report (20 pages maximum) and conference style presentation (10-15 minutes maximum) on a topic related to health communication campaigns. This project, which may be done either individually or in pairs, requires obtaining IRB approval and collecting original data. The amount of data required will depend on the method used, and on whether you are working individually or in pairs. Here are a few examples based on methods used in previous classes: in-depth individual interviews ($N \approx 10$ -20 thirty to sixty minute interviews), focus groups ($N \approx 2$ -4 sixty to ninety minute focus groups with 6-10 people each), survey research ($N \approx 150$ -200),

experiment (*N* will vary greatly depending on complexity of the study and the number of conditions). Your study must be theory based and contain all the standard sections of a traditional manuscript, including literature review, hypotheses/research questions, method, results, and discussion. *All topics, theories, and methods/research designs must be approved by the instructor (see initial proposal below)*. The paper must be formatted using rules outlined in the 6th edition of the APA publication manual.

In sum, this project will be completed in 5 parts (deadlines for each part are listed in the tentative daily schedule):

- 1) IRB certification (proof of completion may be submitted to the instructor either in person or via email)
- 2) Initial proposal (2-3-page maximum) that address the following:
 - a) The topic you will study
 - b) Brief background and need (i.e., a paragraph describing why is this an important topic)
 - c) Theory (must include at least one of the theories discussed in class, but may also include other theories)
 - d) Tentative hypotheses/research questions
 - e) Research method/design (including how you will measure or manipulate all key variables)
- 3) IRB approval (must be coordinated with the instructor who will be the PI for the project for IRB proposes)
- 4) Paper
- 5) Presentation

If you are not present to hear one or more of your peers' presentations, you will have points deducted from your presentation grade. And, you will have 5% deducted from your final grade for each of the following deadlines you fail to meet: (1) IRB certification, (2) initial proposal, (3) IRB approval.

GRADING CRITERIA

YOUR GRADE IN THIS CLASS IS A FUNCTION OF THE FOLLOWING:

Participation	10%
Theory application presentation	15%
Method application presentation	15%
Research project presentation	20%
Research project paper	40%

We will be using the standard grading scale in this class: A+ = 97-100%, A = 93-96%, A- = 90-92%, B+ = 87-89%, B = 83-86%, B- = 80-82%, C+ = 77-79%, C = 70-76%, D = 60-69%, E = less than 60%.

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

ATTENDANCE: Though there is no formal attendance policy in this class, I will take attendance every day, and you are expected to attend each class meeting. In addition, you may have points deducted from your participation and/or assignment grades if you do not attend class, or if you arrive late or leave early.

MISSED OR LATE WORK: As a general rule, if you do not turn in an assignment or present on a given day, you will receive a zero for a grade. All due dates are noted under the Tentative Daily schedule portion of the syllabus. *All assignments are due at the beginning of class on the due date.* In the rare case when a late

assignment is approved by the instructor, you may still have a minimum of 10% deducted from your grade for *each day* it is late.

APPEALING A GRADE: If you have any questions about your grade for an assignment, you must submit them to me *in writing* (email is fine) within one week (seven days) after it is originally returned. In some instances (for reasons beyond my/your control), it may take more than a week to resolve an issue; but that will not be a problem if you originally raise the issue within one week. You are always welcome to go over questions after this deadline, but grades will not be adjusted after one week.

READINGS AND PARTICIPATION: All readings should be done prior to the assigned class period. You are expected to participate *fully and constructively* in class discussions and activities. See the Course Requirements section of the syllabus for more on readings and participation.

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, reading the newspaper, doing work for other classes, 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 Arizona State University's Code of Student Conduct (<https://eoss.asu.edu/dos/srr/codeofconduct>) and Computer, Internet, and Electronics Communications policies (<http://asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd125.html>).

E-MAIL & COMPUTER WORK: We use email for class updates, so please check your email several times a week.

After careful consideration about the use of cell phones and laptops in class, I have come up with the following policy. **Cell phones** should be turned off or on silent mode and not visible during class time (you should not use cell phones to make or receive calls during class, or to type/send or read emails, text messages, etc. during class). **Laptop computers** are allowed, but internet access (including, but not limited to, reading/checking and writing/sending emails and surfing the web) are expressly prohibited during class unless they are an explicit part of a class activity (the instructor will notify you when this is the case). Exceptions will be made on a case by case basis when there a potential emergency or other issues need to be addressed (please notify and get permission from the instructor ahead of time when you think such a situation exists). I am purposefully not including an explicit penalty for these behaviors at this time since you are graduate students who I hold in the highest regard. However, I reserve the right to change this policy should it become necessary in the future (you will be notified if/when such a policy becomes necessary).

ACADEMIC DISHONESTY: In the *Student Academic Integrity Policy*, ASU defines *plagiarism* as “using another’s words, ideas, materials or work without properly acknowledging and documenting the source. Students are responsible for knowing the rules governing the use of another’s work or materials and for acknowledging and documenting the source appropriately.” You can find this definition, along with other important information and University policies regarding academic integrity, at: http://www.asu.edu/studentaffairs/studentlife/judicial/academic_integrity.htm.

Academic dishonesty, including (but not limited to) plagiarism, inappropriate collaboration, or copying the work/answers of another student, will not be tolerated. There are severe sanctions for academic dishonesty, including failure of the assignment, failure of the class, and expulsion from ASU.

ACCOMMODATION FOR DISABILITIES: Students with disabilities that have been certified by the ASU Disability Resource Center will be appropriately accommodated and should inform the instructor as soon as possible of their needs (and provide documentation no later than the second week of class). The Disability Resource Center is located at: Matthews Center, P.O. Box 873202, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ 85287. Phone (480) 965-1234, TDD (480) 965-9000, Web Page <http://www.asu.edu/studentaffairs/ed/drc/>.

DISCLAIMER: The information provided in this syllabus (including the tentative class schedule) constitutes a list of basic class policies. I reserve the right to modify this information when deemed necessary for any reason. You will be notified in class and/or via email/Blackboard if/when any changes occur.

TENTATIVE DAILY SCHEDULE

WEEK	DATE	TOPIC	READINGS	WHAT'S DUE
1	M 1/7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduction to class 		
2	M 1/14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public health, health communication, and interventions 	USDHHS (2001) USDHHS (2010) Roberto (Chapter 1)	
3	M 1/21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Martin Luther King Jr. Holiday Observed 		IRB Certification (CITI)
4	M 1/28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Social marketing and the health communication program cycle 	Edgar et al. (2011) Roberto (Chapter 2, pp. 1-20)	Initial Proposal
5	M 2/4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The ecological approach and the PRECEDE-PROCEED Model Introduction to theory and meta-analysis 	Roberto (Chapter 2, pp. 20-34) Roberto (Chapter 5) Snyder et al. (2004)	
6	M 2/11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Health belief model 	Champion & Skinner (2008) Carpenter (2010)	*
7	M 2/18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Social cognitive theory 	McAlister et al. (2008) TBA	*
8	M 2/25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extended parallel process model 	Witte (1992) Tannenbaum et al. (2015) Rimal & Real (2003)	*
9	M 3/4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Spring Break 		IRB Approval
10	M 3/11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Theory of reasoned action, theory of planned behavior, and the integrative model 	Montano & Kasprzyk (2008) Alberracin et al. (2001) Downs & Hausenblas (2004)	*
11	M 3/18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transtheoretical model 	Prochaska et al. (2008) Ferrer et al. (2009) de Oliveira et al. (2005)	*
12	M 3/25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduction to Evaluation Research Methods Focus groups and individual interviews 	Krueger & Casey (2015) TBA	**
13	M 4/1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Survey research 	Dillman et al. (2009) Gosling et al. (2004)	**
14	M 4/8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Experimental design 	Campbell & Stanley (1963) Roberto (Chapter 15)	**
15	M 4/15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Diffusion of innovation Computer tailored messages 	Rogers (2003) Krueter et al. (2003) Noar et al. (2009)	
16	M 4/22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research Presentations 		Research presentation
17	M 4/29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research Papers 		Research papers

* Randomly assigned theory application presentation due (ONE presentation per student).

** Randomly assigned method application presentation due (ONE presentation per student).

REQUIRED READINGS (IN ALPHABETICAL ORDER)

- Albarracin, D., Johnson, B. T., Fishbein, M., & Muellerleile, P. A. (2001). Theories of reasoned action and planned behavior as models of condom use: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *127*, 142-161.
- Campbell, D. T., & Stanley, J. C. (1963). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research*. Dallas: Houghton Mifflin. (Tables 1, 2, & 3)
- Carpenter, C. J. (2010). A meta-analysis of the effectiveness of health belief model variables in predicting behavior. *Health Communication*, *25*, 661-669.
- Champion, V.L., & Skinner, C. S. (2008). The health belief model. In Glanz, K., Rimer, B. K., Viswanath, K. (Eds.) *Health behavior and health education: Theory, research, and practice* (4th ed.; pp. 45-66). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- de Oliveira, M.C.F., Anderson, J., Auld, G., & Kendall, P. (2005). Validation of a tool to measure process of change for fruit and vegetable consumption among male college students. *Journal of Nutrition Education and Behavior*, *37*, 2-11.
- Dillman, D. A., Smyth, J. D., & Christian, L. M. (2009). *Internet, mail, and mixed-mode surveys: The tailored design method* (3rd Ed.). New York: Wiley. (Chapter 2)
- Downs, D. S, & Hausenblas, H. A. (2005). The theories of reasoned action and planned behavior applied to exercise: A meta-analytic update. *Journal of Physical Activity and Health*, *2*, 76-97.
- Edgar, T., Volkman, J. E., & Logan, A. M. B. (2011). Social marketing: Its meaning, use, and application for health communication. In T. Thompson, R. Parrott, & J. Nussbaum (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of health communication* (2nd Ed., pp. 235-251). New York: Routledge.
- Ferrer, R. A., Amico, K. R., Bryan, A. Fisher, W. A., Cornman, D. H., Kiene, S. M., & Fisher, J. D. (2009). Accuracy of the stages of change algorithm: Sexual risk reported in the maintenance stage of change. *Prevention Science*, *10*, 13-21.
- Gosling, S. D., Vazire, S., Srivastava, S., & John, O. P. (2004). Should we trust web-based studies? A comparative analysis of six preconceptions about internet questionnaires. *American Psychologist*, *59*, 93-104.
- Krueger, R. A., & Casey, M. A. (2015). Focus group interviewing. In K. E. Newcomer, H. P. Hatry, & J. S. Wholey (Eds.) *Handbook of program evaluation* (4th ed.; pp. 506-534). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Kreuter, M. W., Lukwago, S. N., Bucholtz, D. C., Clark, E. M., & Sanders-Thompson, V. (2003). Achieving cultural appropriateness in health promotion programs: Targeted and tailored approaches. *Health Education & Behavior*, *30*, 133-146.
- McAlister, A.L., Perry, C.L, & Parcel G. S. (2008). How individuals, environments, and health behavior interact: Social Cognitive Theory. In Glanz, K., Rimer, B. K., Viswanath, K. (Eds.) *Health behavior and health education: Theory, research, and practice* (4th ed.; pp. 169-188). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Montano, D.E., & Kasprzyk, D. (2008). Theory of reasoned action, theory of planned behavior, and the integrated behavior model. In Glanz, K., Rimer, B. K., Viswanath, K. (Eds.) *Health behavior and health education: Theory, research, and practice* (4th ed.; pp. 67-96). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Noar, S. M., Black, H. G., Pierce, L. B. (2009). Efficacy of computer technology-based HIV prevention interventions: A meta-analysis. *AIDS*, 23, 107-115.
- Prochaska, J. O., Redding, C. A., & Evers, K. E. (2008). The transtheoretical model and stages of change. In Glanz, K., Rimer, B. K., Viswanath, K. (Eds.) *Health behavior and health education: Theory, research, and practice* (4th ed.; pp. 97-106). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Rimal, R. N. & Real, K. (2003). Perceived risk and efficacy beliefs as motivators of change: Use of the risk perception attitude (RPA) framework to understand health behaviors. *Human Communication Research*, 29, 370-399.
- Roberto, A. J. (in preparation). *Public health communication interventions: Planning and evaluation*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing. (Chapter 1 – Public Health, Health Communication, and Interventions)
- Roberto, A. J. (in preparation). *Public health communication interventions: Planning and evaluation*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing. (Chapter 2 – Intervention Planning)
- Roberto, A. J. (in preparation). *Public health communication interventions: Planning and evaluation*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing. (Chapter 5 – Introduction to Theory and Meta-Analysis)
- Roberto, A. J. (in preparation). *Public health communication interventions: Planning and evaluation*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing. (Chapter 15 – Practical Experimental Design)
- Rogers, E. M. (2003). *Diffusions of Innovation* (5th ed.). New York: Free Press. (Chapter 1)
- Snyder, L. B., Hamilton, M. A., Mitchell, E. W., Kiwanuka-Tondo, J., & Proctor, D. (2004). A meta-analysis of the effect of mediated health communication campaigns on behavior change in the United States. *Journal of Health Communication*, 11, 71-96.
- Tannenbaum, M. B., Hepler, J., Zimmerman, R. S., Saul, L., Jacobs, S., Wilson, K., & Albarracín, D. (2015). Appealing to fear: A meta-analysis of fear appeal effectiveness and theories. *Psychological Bulletin*, 141, 1178-1204.
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (2000). *Healthy People 2010* (2nd ed.). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office. (Section 11 – Health Communication)
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (2010). *Healthy People 2020* [Brochure]. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Witte, K. (1992). Putting the fear back into fear appeals: The extended parallel process model. *Communication Monographs*, 39, 329-349.