

Arizona State University
Hugh Downs School of Human Communication

Syllabus for:
Communication 691
Seminar: Persuasion and Social Influence

Spring Semester 2016
3:00 – 5:45 p.m. Thursdays
Stauffer Hall A431

Instructor

Instructor: Dr. Paul A. Mongeau
Office: Stauffer Hall A410C [Hugh Downs School Office]
Mailbox: Stauffer Hall A412
Phone: 480.965.3773
E-Mail: Mongeau@ASU.edu
Office Hours: 1:30 – 2:30 Mondays
2:30-3:30 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. The course will begin with definitions of key terms (e.g., what is persuasion?). 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 also 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. It is assumed that students will complete 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 Points</u>
Examinations	2	100	200
Paper	1	100	100
Group Application Assignment	1	50	50
Attendance/Participation	1	50	<u>50</u>
Total			400

Examinations will be take-home and be in essay format. Each exam will include more questions than you have to answer (e.g., the exam might have seven questions where you need to answer any four). Examination questions will focus on critical thinking skills in addition to mastery of course material. 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).

In the GROUP APPLICATION PRESENTATION, students will be randomly assigned to groups, and groups will be randomly assigned to develop and present a 25 minute (maximum) presentation of a chapter from the Cialdini (2009) text. The instructor will ask group members to evaluate the quality and quantity of each other's input. Individual grades will be a function of both the group grade (assigned by the instructor) and peer evaluations. Further, students not present during their group presentation (or who miss another group's presentation) will have up to 25% deducted from their presentation grade. The paper assignment will allow students, either individually or in groups, to delve into a topic related to persuasion and/or social influence in great detail. A description of the paper assignment appears on pages 9-10 of this syllabus.

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-
349.0 – 359.9	= B+
332.0 – 348.9	= B
320.0 – 331.9	= B-
308.0 – 319.9	= C+
280.0 – 307.9	= C
240.0 – 279.9	= D
00 – 239.9	= E

Required Readings

Readings come in one of three forms. First, readings will come from the (yet unpublished) third edition of Stiff and Mongeau's *Persuasive Communication* textbook. We have recently (and finally) finished the revisions and we expect the page proofs to be received within the next few weeks. I do not anticipate spending a great deal of time discussing these chapters in class as they provide broad coverage of the topics discussed in class. The opening of most classes will likely include a brief focus on the key concepts from those chapters. Second, readings will come from the second edition of the *Handbook of Persuasion*. Third, readings will be a combination of seminal works in an area, original studies, or reviews of the literature (including many meta-analyses).

Chapters from *Persuasive Communication* will be available on the course Blackboard site. Other readings will be available either online (e.g., through Google Scholar) or through the electronic reserves through ASU's library site.

- Cialdini, R. B. (2009). *Influence: Science and practice*. Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Dillard, J. P., & Shen, L. (Eds.) (2013). *The SAGE handbook of persuasion: Developments in theory and practice* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Stiff, J. B., & Mongeau, P. A. (in press). *Persuasive communication* (3rd ed.). New York: Guilford.

Policies

Attendance / Participation

Fifty points of your final grade comes directly from your attendance, active discussion of class material, and weekly discussion questions. From my perspective, seminars are *discussion* classes (even with as many students as we have). I expect that every student will attend every class and that active participation in discussions will be the class norm. I expect that students will ask questions in class and will answer the questions that I pose.

As part of the participation grade, students are required to submit three open-ended questions designed to generate discussion of two or more readings. Outside class contributions (e.g., e-mail or FtF conversations) can also count toward the participation grade. These questions must be posted onto the appropriate discussion board on the class Blackboard site by noon of each class day. Your active participation in class will facilitate all students' understanding of course material.

Late Work

Due dates for all assignments are provided in the semester schedule. For the midterm and paper assignments, a one-week period grace period is provided, beyond which late work will be penalized. One week 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 17th. Up until the beginning of the next class period (i.e., March 24th) there will no penalty for late submissions. At the beginning of that class period, however, a 10% deduction will be taken from the assigned score for that assignment. An additional 10% deduction will be taken for each subsequent week the assignment is late. The paper is due on Thursday, April 21st and the grace period ends at class time on Thursday, April 28th. For the final examination, the grace period ends at the end of finals week (i.e., 11:59 p.m., Thursday, May 5th) and late penalties will begin to accrue at that point.

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 ASU's student code of conduct (<https://students.asu.edu/srr/students>). 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>).

Electronic Mail & Computer Work

I will use electronic mail and the course Blackboard site for class updates, so please check your email several times a week. All discussion questions must be submitted to the discussion boards on the course Blackboard site by noon of each class day.

In discussions with colleagues, I have developed the following policy concerning the use of cell phones and laptops in class. Cell phones should be turned off (ideally) or placed in silent mode (silent...really silent...not vibrate...that still makes noise) and not visible during class time. You should not use cell phones to make or receive calls or send e-mails or text messages during class. Laptop computers are allowed, but internet access (including, but not limited to, sending and/or receiving e-mail, surfing the web, streaming sporting events, and/or playing solitaire) is prohibited during class unless it is an explicit and direct part of class activity. Exceptions will be made on a case-by-case basis (e.g., personal emergency or other exigencies). Please let me know ahead of time in such circumstances. There is no explicit penalty stated for violating this policy because I hold graduate students in very high regard. I reserve the right to institute such a penalty, however, if it becomes necessary. I will announce/discuss such penalties before they are instituted.

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 (and agreeing on the nature of the work to be completed *in writing* on the appropriate form) *before the end of the semester*. Please note that filing paperwork for an incomplete immediately stops the ‘late penalty’ clock.

Academic Dishonesty

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

<https://provost.asu.edu/index.php?q=academicintegrity>

<https://clas.asu.edu/students/ai>

<http://graduate.asu.edu/beintheknow>

This statement describes different forms of academic dishonesty and does not contradict ASU, College of Liberal Arts and Science, or Hugh Downs School policy. Academic dishonesty could

take any of several forms in this class. Perhaps the three most common forms of academic dishonesty are collusion, cheating on an exam, and plagiarism.

Collusion on a homework or computer project includes one student copying answers from another student's work. Collusion on an exam would include (although this is not a comprehensive list) copying another student's answers, exchanging information during an exam, and other similar activities. Collusion generally occurs when two students handing in homework assignments or exams with identical sets of answers. By placing this statement into my syllabus, I do not want to eliminate study groups or several individuals working together on assignments. What I do *not* want is for one person to do the work and more than one person to hand it in. In short, it's fine to work together, but when it comes time to write up your homework or computer assignment, it is important that you work individually.

Cheating on an exam (see also collusion on an exam, above) would include a sidelong glance at a fellow student's work, the preparation and use of a "crib sheet," stealing a copy of the exam, arranging for a substitute to take an exam, using unauthorized material (e.g., a textbook, cell phone, I-Pod) as information sources, and talking during an exam.

Plagiarism is using someone else's words or ideas without giving proper credit to that source. The instructor assumes that a paper submitted by a student represents the student's own words and to represent his or her own ideas, unless certain words and ideas are specifically credited to a proper authority. A paper bearing a student's name that does not do this represents plagiarism and reflects misrepresentation and dishonesty.

Plagiarism can also occur in many forms. Word-for-word copying of another work without the use of quotation marks or citing that source, paraphrasing another person's ideas without proper citation of that work, providing a misleading citation, and handing in another student's work (e.g., a paper from a previous year) would all be considered plagiarism.

It is important to note that the original format and location of the original material is irrelevant in determining plagiarism. Copying material from the World Wide Web is the same form of plagiarism as copying material from a book or journal article found in the library. Copying an article from a journal is functionally equivalent to copying a friend's paper from a previous semester.

Definitions of, procedures for reporting, and penalties for academic dishonesty are outlined in the sites listed above. Your instructor will follow these guidelines when academic dishonesty is suspected. Your instructor strongly recommended that you become familiar with these sections of these policies.

COMMUNICATION 691 – PERSUASION AND SOCIAL INFLUENCE
SPRING 2016 TENTATIVE SEMESTER SCHEDULE

<u>DATE</u>	<u>TOPIC(S)</u>	<u>READINGS</u>
14 <i>January</i>	Introduction to the Course	OL: Noar
1-21	What is Persuasion?	SM 1, 2 HB: Miller HB: Rhodes & Ewaldsen HB: Carpenter et al.
1-28	Attitudes → Behaviors	SM 3 OL: LaPierre OL: Kim & Hunter II HB: Yzer
4 <i>February</i>	Behaviors → Attitudes	SM 4 OL: Knox & Inkster OL: Brehm OL: Bem OL: Stone & Fernandez
2-11	Cognitive Response Models	SM 5 CR: Petty & Cacioppo CR: Mongeau & Stiff CR: Petty et al. OL: Petty & Brunol HB: O'Keefe
2-18	Cognitive Response Models	OL: Chaiken & Ledgerwood OL: Stiff OL: Slater & Router OL: Kruglanski et al.

NO CLASS: FEBRUARY 25TH – WESTERN STATES COMMUNICATION ASSOCIATION

MIDTERM EXAMINATION DISTRIBUTED 25 FEBRUARY

3 March	Group Application Presentations	Cialdini
---------	---------------------------------	----------

NO CLASS: 10 MARCH: SPRING BREAK

NOTE: SM = Stiff & Mongeau CR = Course Reserves OL = Available Online HB = Handbook

<u>DATE</u>	<u>TOPIC</u>	<u>READINGS</u>
3-17	Source Characteristics	SM 6 OL: Allen & Stiff OL: Pornpitakpan OL: O'Keefe
<u>MIDTERM EXAMINATION DUE 17 MARCH</u>		
3-24	Message Characteristics: Rational Appeals	SM 7 OL: Allen et al. CR: Reinard HB: Shen & Bigsby
3-31	Message Characteristics: Emotional Appeals	SM 8 OL: Witte & Allen HB: Mongeau CR: O'Keefe
<i>7 April</i>	Receiver Characteristics	SM 9 OL: Johnson & Eagly OL: Eagly & Carli HB: Fink & Cai
4-14	Setting Characteristics	SM 10 OL: Buller HB: Boster HB: Sundar et al.
4-21	Social Influence Processes	SM 11, 12 OL: Feeley et al. OL: Cialdini & Schroeder OL: Boster et al. OL: Burger

PAPER DUE – THURSDAY, APRIL 21ST

FINAL EXAMINATION DISTRIBUTED THURSDAY, APRIL 21ST

4-28	Social Influence: Conformity	OL: Milgram OL: Latane & Darley OL: Asch OL: Cialdini & Goldstein
------	------------------------------	--

FINAL EXAMINATION DUE 11:59 P.M. THURSDAY, MAY 5TH

NOTE: SM = Stiff & Mongeau CR = Course Reserves OL = Available Online HB = Handbook

COMMUNICATION 691 [P&SI] - PAPER ASSIGNMENT
DUE: MONDAY, NOVEMBER 12

This purpose of this paper is to allow students 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(s) 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 be done individually or in groups of up to three and can come in any of several formats. It could be a literature review, research proposal, development of a theoretical position, research report, meta-analysis, methodological and/or theoretical critique of an article or area of research, application of the material discussed, or another format pending the instructor's approval. 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 sixth 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). 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).

MONGEAU’S GENERAL CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING PAPERS

Across the various classes that I teach and papers that I evaluate, some of the criteria that I use in evaluating papers are specific to the case at hand. 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 sixth edition of the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association*.

READING REFERENCES [IN ORDER OF APPEARANCE]

- Noar, S. M. (2006). In pursuit of cumulative knowledge in health communication: The role of meta-analysis. *Health Communication, 20*, 169-175. DOI: 10.1207/s15327027hc2002_8

- Miller, G. R. (2013). On being persuaded: Some basic distinctions. In J. P. Dillard & L. Shen (Eds.), *The Persuasion Handbook* (2nd ed.). 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).

- Rhodes, N., & Ewoldsen, D. R. (2013). Outcomes of persuasion: Behavioral, cognitive, and social. In J. P. Dillard & L. Shen (Eds.), *The Persuasion Handbook* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.

- Carpenter, C. J. (2013). Functional attitude theory. In J. P. Dillard & L. Shen (Eds.), *The Persuasion Handbook* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.

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

- 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. DOI: 10.1177/009365093020003001

- Yzer, M. (2013). Reasoned action theory: Persuasion as belief-based behavior change. In J. P. Dillard & L. Shen (Eds.), *The Persuasion Handbook* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.

- Knox, R. E., & Inkster, J. A. (1968). Post-decisional dissonance at post-time. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 8*, 319-323

- Brehm, J. W. (2007). A brief history of cognitive dissonance theory. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 1*, 381–391. DOI: 10.1111/j.1751-9004.2007.00035.x

- Bem, D. J. (1967). Self-perception: An alternative interpretation of cognitive dissonance phenomena. *Psychological Review, 74*, 183-200. DOI: 10.1037/h0024835

- Stone, J., & Fernandez, N. C. To practice what we preach: The use of hypocrisy and cognitive dissonance to motivate behavior change. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 2*, 1024–1051. DOI: 10.1111/j.1751-9004.2008.00088.x

- Petty, R. E., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1981). *Attitudes and persuasion--classic and contemporary approaches*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

- Mongeau, P. A., & Stiff, J. B. (1993). Specifying causal relationships in the elaboration likelihood model. *Communication Theory, 3*, 65-72. DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-2885.1993.tb00057.x

- 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, 336-342. DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-2885.1993.tb00078.x
- Petty, R. E., & Briñol, P. (2008). Persuasion: From single to multiple to metacognitive processes. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 3, 137-147. DOI: 10.1111/j.1745-6916.2008.00071.x
- O’Keefe, D. J. The elaboration likelihood model. In J. P. Dillard & L. Shen (Eds.), *The Persuasion Handbook* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.
- Chaiken, S., & Ledgerwood, A. (2012). A theory of heuristic and systematic message processing. In P. A. M. Van Lange, A. W. Kruglanski, & T. E. Higgins (Eds.), *Handbook of theories in social psychology* (pp. 246-266). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- 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. DOI: 10.1080/03637758609376128
- Slater, M. D., & Rouner, D. (2002). Entertainment-education and elaboration likelihood: Understanding the processing of narrative persuasion. *Communication Theory*, 12, 173–191
- Kruglanski, A. W., Chen, C., Pierro, A., Mannetti, L., Erb, H.-P., & Spiegel, S. (2006). Persuasion according to the unimodel: Implications for cancer communication. *Journal of Communication*, 56, S105-S122.
- Allen, M. A., & Stiff, J. B. (1989). Testing three models for the sleeper effect. *Western Journal of Communication*, 53, 411-426.
- Pornpitakpan, C. (2004). The persuasiveness of source credibility: A critical review of five decades. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 34, 243-281. DOI: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.2004.tb02547.x
- O’Keefe, D. J. (1987). The persuasive effects of delaying identification of high- and low-credibility communicators: A meta-analytic review. *Central States Speech Journal*, 38, 63-72.
- 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.

- Shen, L., & Bigsby, E. (2013). The effects of message features: Content, structure, and style. In J. P. Dillard & L. Shen (Eds.), *The Persuasion Handbook* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.
- Witte, K., & Allen, M. (2000). A meta-analysis of fear appeals: Implications for public health campaigns. *Health Education and Behavior*, 27, 591-615.
- Mongeau, P. A. (2013). Fear appeals. In J. P. Dillard & L. Shen (Eds.), *The Persuasion Handbook* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.
- O’Keefe, D. J. (2000). Guilt and social influence. In M. E. 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.
- Fink, E. L., & Cai, D. A. (2013). Discrepancy models of belief change. In J. P. Dillard & L. Shen (Eds.), *The Persuasion Handbook* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.
- Buller, D. B. (1986). Distraction during persuasive communication: A meta-analytic review. *Communication Monographs*, 53, 91-114.
- Boster, F. J. (2013). Persuading in the small group context. In J. P. Dillard & L. Shen (Eds.), *The Persuasion Handbook* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.
- Sundar, S. S., Oh, J., Kang, H., & Sreenivasan, A. (2013). How does technology persuade? Theoretical mechanisms for persuasive technologies. In J. P. Dillard & L. Shen (Eds.), *The Persuasion Handbook* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.
- Feeley, T. H., Anker, A. E., & Aloe, A. M. (2012). The door-in-the-face persuasive message strategy: A meta-analysis of the first 35 years. *Communication Monographs*, 79, 316-343. DOI: 10.1080/10510970902955976
 - Cialdini, R. B., & Schroeder, D. A. (1976). Increasing compliance by legitimizing paltry contributions: When even a penny helps. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 34, No. 4, 599-604. DOI: [10.1037/0022-3514.34.4.599](https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.34.4.599)
 - Boster, F. J., Shaw, A. S., Hughes, M., Kotowski, M. R., Strom, R. E., & Deatrck, L. M. (2009). Dump-and-chase: The effectiveness of persistence as a sequential request compliance-gaining strategy. *Communication Studies*, 60, 219–234. DOI: 10.1080/10510970902955976

- Burger, J. M. (1999). The foot-in-the-door compliance procedure: A multiple-process analysis and review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 3, 303-325. DOI: 10.1207/s15327957pspr0304_2
- Milgram, S. (1965). Some conditions of obedience and disobedience to authority. *Human Relations*, 18, 57-76.
- Latane, B., & Darley, J. M. (1968). Group inhibition of bystander intervention in emergencies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 10, 215-221.
- Asch, S. E. (1955). Opinions and social pressure. *Scientific American*, 193, 31-35.
- Cialdini, R. B., & Goldstein, N. J. (2004). Social influence: Compliance and conformity. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 55, 591-621.