

COM 691: HEALTH COMMUNICATION CAMPAIGNS

Fall 2014 –Tuesday 3:00 p.m. to 5:45 p.m.

Instructor: Anthony J. Roberto, Ph.D.

Office: A468 Stauffer Hall

Email: anthony.roberto@asu.edu

Office Hours: Monday 11:30 a.m. to 1:30 p.m.

And by appointment

Assistant: Megan Fisk, M.A.

Office: A308 Stauffer Hall

Email: megan.fisk@asu.edu

Office Hours: 1:30 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 this area of health communication campaigns. After taking this class, students will (1) understand the processes involved in designing, implementing, 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 three factors: (1) participation, (2) theory application presentation, and (3) 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. As a general rule, you will lose 5 points for each missed day or each day you attend but do not participate (if you arrive late or leave early participation points will be adjusted accordingly).

THEORY APPLICATION PRESENTATION: Students will be randomly assigned to lead a short discussion (10-12 minutes maximum) and on a health communication campaigns related *study* that is guided by and/or tests one of the theories covered in class. The discussion should include a short overview of the study, address the following five questions, and also allow time for a few questions:

- 1) What are the research questions addressed in the article? (Just summarize them rather than quoting them verbatim.)
- 2) What method was used for data collection?
- 3) What were the main findings?
- 4) What are the main strengths/contributions (i.e., why did the study get published)?
- 5) What are the weaknesses that you see in this article?

Note: If you are not present to hear one or more of your peers' presentations you will have points deducted from your presentation grade.

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 health communication campaigns related topic. This project will entail obtaining IRB approval for your project and collecting original data using one or more of the following research methods: in-depth individual interviews ($N \approx 15-20$ thirty to sixty minute interviews), focus groups ($N \approx 3-4$ sixty to ninety minute focus groups with 6-10 people each), survey research ($N \approx 200$), or an 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 a literature review and hypotheses/research questions, plus the method, results, and discussion sections. All topics and methods/research designs must be approved by the instructor. 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
- 2) Initial proposal
- 3) IRB approval
- 4) Paper
- 5) Presentation

The written portion of this presentation is worth 100 points, and the conference style presentation is worth 50 points. Further, 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 points deducted from your paper 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	25 points
Application paper & presentation	25 points
Research project presentation	50 points
Research project paper	100 points
Total	200 points

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 will 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 a particular 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 as long as 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 to the behavior standards listed in the Arizona Board of Regents Policy Manual Chapter V – Campus and Student Affairs: Code of Conduct (http://www.abor.asu.edu/1_the_Regents/policymanual/chap5/index.html), and the ACD 125: Computer, Internet, and Electronics Communications (<http://asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd125.html>). 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>).

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 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	TU 8/26	Introduction to class		
2	TU 9/2	What is health communication? What are health communication campaigns? www.healthypeople.gov	Thompson (2006) NCI (2001), pp. 1-13 USDHHS (2000a), pp. 1-20 USDHHS (2000b) USDHHS (2010)	
3	TU 9/9	Planning and strategy development What is a meta-analysis?	Silk et al. (2011) Noar (2006)	
4	TU 9/16	Theories of reasoned action ** Theory of planned behavior **	Alberracian et al. (2001) Downs & Hausenblas (2005) Cialdini (2003)	IRB Certification (CITI)
5	TU 9/23	Fear appeals **	Witte (1992) Witte & Allen (2000) Rimal & Real (2003)	
6	TU 9/30	Social cognitive theory ** Health belief model **	Bandura (2004) Champion & Skinner (2004)	
7	TU 10/7	Transtheoretical model ** Survey research	Prochaska et al. (2004) Dillman et al. (2009)	Initial Proposal
8	TU 10/14	Fall Break – No Classes		
9	TU 10/21	Survey research (Cont.) Experiments	Gosling et al. (2004) Campbell (1957) Campbell & Stanley (1963) Roberto et al. (2007) – just method	
10	TU 10/28	Focus groups & in-depth interviews	Kruger & Casey (2000) Roberto et al. (1998) – just method	
11	TU 11/4	Developing & pretesting Implementing campaigns Assessing effectiveness	Snyder et al. (2004) Webb & Sheeran (2006) Salmon & Murray-Johnson (2001)	IRB Approval
12	TU 11/11	Veteran's Day – No Classes		
13	TU 11/18	Diffusion of innovation Social marketing	Rogers (2003) Kelly et al. (1991) Edgar et al. (2011)	
14	TU 11/25	Targeting & tailoring Entertainment-education	Kreuter et al. (2003) Noar et al. (2009) Singhal & Rogers (2004) Moyer-Guse (2008)	
15	TU 12/2	Individual faculty-student meetings to prepare for research project presentation/paper		Optional rough draft due
16	TU 12/9	Research project presentations		Research Project Presentation & Paper

** Randomly assigned theory application presentation(s) due.

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.
- Bandura, A. (2004). Health promotion by social cognitive means. *Health Education and Behavior*, *31*, 143-164.
- Campbell, D. T. (1957). Factors relevant to the validity of experiments in social settings. *Psychological Bulletin*, *54*, 297-312.
- Campbell, D. T., & Stanley, J. C. (1963). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research*. Dallas: Houghton Mifflin. (Tables 1, 2, & 3)
- 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.
- Cialdini, R. B. (2003). Crafting normative messages to protect the environment. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *12*, 105-109.
- 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.
- 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.
- Kelly, J. A. et al., (1991). HIV risk behavior reduction following intervention with key opinion leaders of population: An experimental analysis. *American Journal of Public Health*, *81*, 168- 171.
- Krueger, R. A., & Casey, M. A. (2000). *Focus groups: A practical guide for applied research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. (Chapter 1)
- 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.
- Moyer-Gusé, E. (2008). Toward a theory of entertainment persuasion: Explaining the persuasive effects of entertainment-education messages. *Communication Theory*, *18*, 407-425.

- National Cancer Institute (2001). *Making health communication programs work: A planners guide*. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (Chapter 1)
- Noar, S. M. (2006). In pursuit of cumulative knowledge in health communication. The role of meta-analysis. *Health Communication, 20*, 169-175.
- 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., Johnson, A. J., Meyer, G., Robbins, S. L., & Smith, P. K. (1998). The Firearm Injury Reduction Education (FIRE) Program: Formative evaluation insights and implications. *Social Marketing Quarterly, 4* (2), 25-35.
- Roberto, A. J., Zimmerman, R. S., Carlyle, K. E., Abner, E. L., Cupp, P. K., & Hansen, G. L. (2007). The effects of a computer-based pregnancy, STD, and HIV prevention intervention: A nine-school trial. *Health Communication, 21*, 115-124.
- Rogers, E. M. (2003). *Diffusions of Innovation* (5th ed.). New York: Free Press. (Chapter 1)
- Salmon, C. T., & Murray-Johnson, L. (2001). Communication campaign effectiveness: Critical distinctions. In R. E. Rice & C. K. Atkin (Eds.) *Public communication campaigns* (3rd ed.) (pp. 168-180). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Silk, K. J., Atkin, C. K., & Salmon, C. T. (2011). Developing effective media campaigns for health promotion. In T. Thompson, R. Parrott, & J. Nussbaum (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of health communication* (2nd Ed., pp. 203-219). New York: Routledge.
- Singhal, A., & Rogers, E. M. (2004). The status of entertainment-education worldwide. In A. Singhal, M. J. Cody, E. M. Rogers, & M. Sabido (Eds.), *Entertainment-education and social change: History, research, and practice* (pp. 3-20). Mahwah, NJ: Earlbaum.
- 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.
- Thompson, T. L. (2006). Seventy-five (count 'em—75!) issues of health communication: An analysis of emerging themes. *Health Communication, 20*, 117-122.
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (2000a). *Healthy People 2010* (2nd ed.). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office. (Introduction)

- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (2000b). *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.
- Webb, T. L., & Sheeran, P. (2006). Does changing behavioral intentions engender behavior change? A meta-analysis of the experimental evidence. *Psychological Bulletin*, *132*, 249-268.
- Witte, K. (1992). Putting the fear back into fear appeals: The extended parallel process model. *Communication Monographs*, *39*, 329-349.
- Witte, K., & Allen, M. (2000). A meta-analysis of fear appeals: Implications for effective public health campaigns. *Health Education Behavior*, *27*, 591-614.