

Arizona State University
Hugh Downs School of Human Communication

Syllabus for:
Communication 691
Seminar: Persuasion and Social Influence

Fall Semester 2012
6:00 – 8:45 p.m. Thursdays
Stauffer Hall A13

Instructor

Instructor: Dr. Paul A. Mongeau
Office: Stauffer Hall A335A
Mailbox: Stauffer Hall A412
Phone: 480.965.3773
E-Mail: Mongeau@ASU.edu
Office Hours: 10:30 – 11:30 Tuesday
11:00 – 12:00 Wednesdays
AND BY APPOINTMENT

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. We will discuss applications of course material (e.g., advertising or political campaigns), but will not entail a major course focus. The course will begin with material on what is persuasion, definition of key variables, and the research methods frequently used to study it. Following a discussion of 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 then consider both cognitive models of persuasion and the literatures focusing on 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. We assume that students will read 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</u>	<u>Points</u>
Examinations	2	100		200
Paper	1	100		100
Discussion Leadership	1		50	50
Attendance/Participation	1	50		<u>50</u>
Total				400

Examinations will be take-home and be in essay format. You will receive more questions than you have to answer (e.g., the exam might be five questions where you need to answer any three). 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 but course material *will* build upon itself).

Each student will lead a class discussion of one reading from the course packet (i.e., not one of the chapters from Stiff and Mongeau). Evaluation is based on the extent to which the important points in your reading are brought out in the course of the discussion. Your task is to ensure that the reading's important points are brought out.

On the class sessions that you do lead discussion, you must provide me with a list of your discussion questions *before class begins*. While you may start your discussion leadership off with a brief overview of the reading, your task is to lead discussion, not to lecture. A subsequent handout provides advice for this assignment.

On the class sessions that you do not lead discussion, you are required to hand in three open-ended questions suitable for generating discussion of the readings. Evaluation of these discussion questions will count toward your class participation grade.

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

396.0 – 400.0 = A+
372.0 – 395.9 = A
360.0 – 371.9 = A-
348.0 – 359.9 = B+
332.0 – 347.9 = B
320.0 – 331.9 = B-
308 – 319.9 = C+
280.0 – 307.9 = C
240 – 279.9 = D
0 0 – 239.9 = E

Required Text

There is one required text for this course.

Stiff, J. B., & Mongeau, P. A. (2003). *Persuasive communication* (2nd ed.). New York: Guilford Press.

We require the Stiff and Mongeau text to provide a broad overview of course topics. We do not anticipate spending a great deal of class time discussing the textbook. Most class time will focus on the packet readings.

In addition to this text, there is a **required** packet of readings available at the Alternative Copy Shop (715 S. Forest, conveniently located right behind the Chuckbox).

Policies

Attendance

Attendance - Fifty points of your final grade (just over 10%) comes directly from your attendance, active discussion of class material, and discussion questions (submitted when students do not lead discussion). From our perspective, seminars are *discussion* classes. We expect that every student will attend class every night and that active participation in discussions will be the class norm. Class attendance is also important because seminars are discussion classes. Moreover, examinations will cover class discussion and readings. Your active participation in class will facilitate all students' understanding of course material.

Late Work Penalty

Due dates for all assignments are provided in the semester schedule. For the midterm and paper assignments, we will institute a one-class period grace period beyond which we will penalize late work. At the beginning of the class period 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 Thursday, March 8 (i.e., the Thursday before Spring Break). Up until the beginning of the next class period (i.e., March 22) there will no penalty for late submissions. At the beginning of that class period, however, we will take a 10% deduction of the assigned score for that assignment. An additional 10% deduction will accrue for each subsequent week the assignment is late. The paper is due on Thursday, April 12 and the grace period ends at the beginning of class on Thursday, April 19. For the final examination, the grace period ends at the end of finals week (i.e., 5:00 p.m., Wednesday, May 9) and late penalties will begin to accrue at that point.

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 department chair if the original instructor later becomes incapacitated or is otherwise not on campus. Students must arrange with the instructor to receive an incomplete (including signing the appropriate form and agreeing on the nature of the work to be completed) *before the end of the semester*.

Academic Dishonesty

We presume that all students will act in a responsible and honest manner. We 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:

http://www.asu.edu/studentaffairs/studentlife/judicial/academic_integrity.htm

We will deal with instances of academic dishonesty in a means consistent with these guidelines.

COMMUNICATION 691 – PERSUASION AND SOCIAL INFLUENCE
FALL 2012 TENTATIVE SEMESTER SCHEDULE

<u>DATE</u>	<u>TOPIC(S)</u>	<u>READINGS</u>
23 August	Introduction to the Course	OL: Noar
8-30	What is Persuasion?	SM 1, 2 CR: Miller HB: Rhodes & Ewaldsen HB: Carpenter
6 September	Attitudes → Behaviors	SM 3 RP: LaPierre OL: Kim & Hunter II HB: Yzer
\		
9-13	Behaviors → Attitudes	SM 4 OL: KnoX & Sutter OL: Brehm OL: Stone et al. OL: Stone & Fernandez
9-20	Cognitive Response Models	SM 5 RP: Petty & Cacioppo RP: Mongeau & Stiff RP: Petty et al. CR: Petty & Brunol HB: O'Keefe
9-27	Cognitive Response Models	OL: Stiff CR: Chaiken OL: Slater & Router Kruglanski et al. Cancer
4 October	Source Characteristics	SM 6 RP: Allen & Stiff OL: Kumkale et al.
10-11	Message Characteristics: Rational Appeals	SM 7 RP: Allen RP: Allen et al. RP: Reinard

MIDTERM EXAMINATION DISTRIBUTED 11 OCTOBER

NOTE: SM = Stiff & Mongeau

CR = Course Reserves

ONL = Available Online

<u>DATE</u>	<u>TOPIC</u>	<u>READINGS</u>
10-18	Message Characteristics: Emotional Appeals	SM 8 RP: Witte & Allen HB: Mongeau OL: Hibbert et al.
<u>MIDTERM EXAMINATION DUE 18 OCTOBER</u>		
10-25	Receiver Characteristics	SM 9 RP: Johnson & Eagly RP: Eagly & Carli
<i>1 November</i>	Setting Characteristics	SM 10 RP: Buller HB: Boster HB: Sundar et al.
11 - 8	Compliance Gaining	SM 11, 12 RP: Dillard RP: O'Keefe & Hale
No Class: 15 November – National Communication Association		
No Class: 22 November - Thanksgiving		
11-29	Health Campaigns	SM 13 OL: Prochaska OL: Noar et al. HB: Atkin OR Crano
12-6	Political Campaigns	SM 14 HB: Perloff TBA

FINAL EXAMINATION DISTRIBUTED TUESDAY, 8 NOVEMBER

FINAL EXAMINATION DUE 5:00 P.M. WEDNESDAY 14 DECEMBER

NOTE: SM = Stiff & Mongeau

CR = Course Reserves

ONL = Available Online

COMMUNICATION 691 - PAPER ASSIGNMENT: DUE: THURSDAY APRIL 12

This purpose of this paper is to allow you 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 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 come in any of several formats. It could be a literature review, a research proposal, a development of a theoretical position, a research report, a meta-analysis, a methodological and/or theoretical critique of an article or area of research, or an application of the material discussed. 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 fifth 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). This will include the extent to which you describe the existing research and theory development relevant to the topic.
- 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).

DISCUSSION LEADERSHIP ASSIGNMENT

As one of the assignments for this course, you will lead the class discussion of one reading during the semester. Evaluation depends on the extent to which you bring out the important points in the reading in the course of the discussion. There is no single best way of doing this. Based on past feedback I have given to students for this assignment, here are some issues to consider.

1. Know your article or chapter. The better you know what your article or chapter says, the better you will be able to do the things you need to best complete this assignment.
2. Manage your time well. You have approximately 75 minutes or so to lead discussion. Make sure that you do not spend too much time on a single issue (particularly if that issue is tangential to the reading) that might cause you to go over other issues in less detail later in the discussion. Make sure that the class adequately discusses the important points in the article.
3. I tend to come into class with more questions than I can possibly pose in the time that I have. I realize that I have more questions than I need, but I do make sure that the most important questions are covered.
3. Provide a brief introduction to your reading. Provide class with an idea of what the article is about, but do not include too much information that might work better as discussion questions. Remember that your task is to lead discussion, not to lecture.
4. Follow up on student comments (sometimes this can be as simple as asking someone “why?” or “how so?”). Following up on student's comments forces you to *listen* to what students are trying to say and turn their contribution into a question, even if it means bringing a topic up “out of order.”
5. Do not answer your own question. If the class does not respond, wait. They might have to think about your question. If the class does not understand your question, they will ask you to rephrase it.
6. Handouts might (and might not) be helpful. Handouts should facilitate, rather than restrict discussion. You should not spend time reading of the handout's content.
7. Be innovative. Try something new. Have fun.
8. Ask good questions.

GOOD DISCUSSION QUESTIONS...

1. Are open-ended. Closed-ended (e.g., yes-no) questions do not give the class any room to discuss ideas (e.g., “do you agree?”). Closed-ended questions can be useful if you have an open-ended question (or two) as a follow-up (e.g., asking “why?” after “do you agree?”).
2. Are clear. Do not use vague terms. Do not use terms from outside class that other students will not know (unless you spend the time to explain them).
3. Are simple. Short questions tend to be clearer than long questions. Complex questions frequently ask two things at once. Make sure that you are asking only one thing at a time.
4. Do not have objective, verifiable, answer (particularly from the reading). Do not ask questions that will end up with someone reading from the packet (unless you have a good follow-up). Good questions are those that give the class a number of directions that they could go.
5. Attempt to identify (and/or challenge) implicit assumptions in a particular piece. These questions force students to look beyond what the authors have to say.
6. Relate back to earlier readings from class. Again, this forces students to go beyond what the authors have to say and to start making connections between concepts and theories. Do not be afraid to bring in concepts from other classes or from your own experience (but be prepared to explain that material or experience).
7. Keeps the discussion on track. There will be times when the focus of discussion meanders from the reading. A good question takes the class from the tangential topic back to the reading (though sometimes you have to bring the class’ attention to the reading more abruptly).
8. Assumes that students have read and understood the reading. Be prepared, however, to discuss basic issues (e.g., definitions).
9. Ask for applications of theoretical positions (or theoretical explanations for applied issues).
10. Are questions. Do not make a statement, state an opinion, or read a passage without an accompanying question. The class may not know how to respond if you do not ask a question.
11. Can be answered by more than one person and in more than one way. Try not to fall into the pattern of: question, answer, question, answer...
12. Are either specific or general. Neither type of question is always preferred. All of one kind (especially specific) gets tedious. Make sure that there is some combination of specific and general questions (e.g., a specific definitional question followed up by a general application).

MONGEAU’S GENERAL CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING PAPERS

Across the various classes that I teach, some of the criteria that I use in evaluating papers are specific to the particular assignment. 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 fifth edition of the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association*.

READING PACKET REFERENCES [IN ORDER OF APPEARANCE]

Miller, G. R. (2003). On being persuaded: Some basic distinctions. In J. P. Dillard & M. Pfau (Eds.), *The persuasion handbook* (pp. 3-16). 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).

LaPiere, R. T. (1934). Attitudes vs. actions. *Social Forces*, *13*, 230-237.

Kim, M. S., & Hunter, J. E. (1993). Attitude-behavior relations: A meta-analysis of attitudinal relevance and topic. *Journal of Communication*, *43*, 101-142.

Kim, M. S., & Hunter, J. E. (1993). Relationships among attitudes, behavioral intentions, and behaviors: A meta-analysis of past research, part 2. *Communication Research*, *20*, 331-384.

Stone, J., Aronson, E., Crain, A. L., Winslow, M. P., & Fried, C. B. (1994). Inducing hypocrisy as a means of encouraging young adults to use condoms. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *20*, 116-128.

Allen, M. A., & Stiff, J. B. (1989). Testing three models for the sleeper effect. *Western Journal of Communication*, *53*, 411-426.

Burgoon, J. K., Birk, T., & Pfau, M. (1990). Nonverbal behaviors, persuasion, and credibility. *Human Communication Research*, *17*, 140-169.

Buller, D. B., & Aune, R. K. (1988). The effects of vocalics and nonverbal sensitivity on compliance: A speech accommodation explanation. *Human Communication Research*, *14*, 301-332.

Cialdini, R. B. (2001). *Influence: Science and practice*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon. [pp. 143-177 only.]

Milgram, S. (1974). *Obedience to Authority*. New York: Harper Colophon Books. [pp. 1-43 only.]

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.

Reinard, J. C. (1988). The empirical study of persuasive evidence: The status after fifty years of research. *Human Communication Research*, *15*, 3-59.

Witte, K., & Allen, M. (2000). A meta-analysis of fear appeals: Implications for public health campaigns. *Health Education and Behavior*, *27*, 591-615.

O'Keefe, D. J. (2000). Guilt and social influence. In M. Roloff (Ed.), *Communication yearbook 23* (pp. 67-101). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

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.

Meyers, R. A., Brashers, D. E., & Hanner, J. (2000). Majority-minority influence: Identifying argumentative patterns and predicting argument outcome links. *Journal of Communication*, *50*, 3-30.

Buller, D. B. (1986). Distraction during persuasive communication: A meta-analytic review. *Communication Monographs*, *53*, 91-114.

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

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

Petty, R. E., Wegener, D. T., Fabrigar, L. R., Priester, J. R., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1994). Conceptual and methodological issues in the elaboration likelihood model of persuasion: A reply to the Michigan State critics. *Communication Theory*, *3*, 336-363. [pp. 344-351 only]

Slater, M. D. (2003). Involvement as goal-directed strategic processing: Extending the elaboration likelihood model. In J. P. Dillard & M. Pfau (Eds.), *The persuasion handbook* (pp. 175-194). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kruglanski, A. W., & Thompson, E. P. (1999). Persuasion by a single route: A view from the unimodel. *Psychological inquiry*, *10*, 83-109.

Dillard, J. P. (1990). A goal-driven model of interpersonal influence. In J. P. Dillard (Ed.), *Seeking compliance: The production of interpersonal influence messages* (pp. 41-56). Scottsdale, AZ: Gorsuch-Scarbrick.

O'Keefe, D. J., & Hale, S. L. (1998). The door-in-the-face influence strategy: A random effects meta-analytic review. In M. Roloff (Ed.), *Communication yearbook 21* (pp. 1-33). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ifert, D. E. (2000). Resistance to interpersonal requests: A summary and critique of recent research. In M. Roloff (Ed.), *Communication yearbook 23* (pp. 125-161). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.