 **COMM 302:**

**PERSUASION**

**Number of Units:** 4

**Spring 2022 –**Tuesdays – 2pm to 4pm PST

**Section:** Section 21718D

**Location: ASC G34**

**Instructor:** Dr. Sheila Murphy

**Office:** Online or phone by appointment

**Office Hours:** By appointment

**Contact Info:** Email at smurphy@usc.edu to set up in-person, ZOOM or phone meeting

**I. Course Description**

We will examine persuasion from a variety of perspectives and consider how the target, the techniques, the source, the message, and the channel of communication all interplay in persuasion.

*Target audience*: A successful persuasion attempt directed at one subgroup of the population may fail when applied to a different subgroup.

*Theories and techniques*: There are a variety of theories and techniques available for any persuasion attempt. Knowing when and how to use these techniques effectively is central to any persuasion attempt.

*Source*: Persuasion attempts can originate from a variety of sources (e.g., parents, friends, government and businesses). What characteristics of a source are typical within successful persuasion attempts?

*Message*: Although the content conveyed in different persuasion attempts differ there are features that can be utilized within a message to improve the effectiveness of persuasion attempts.

*Channel*: There are multiple methods with which to reach a persuasion target (e.g., print, word of mouth, the internet). We will examine the strengths and weaknesses of different channels.

**Course format**

Class will meet weekly for up to 2 hours and 30 minutes. Class meetings will consist of lectures, student presentations and discussions. Currently we are scheduled to meet in person but you can participate synchronously online if necessary due to health issues and the class will be taped in case you missed a class.

**II. Student Learning Outcomes**

Persuasion is a dynamic and developing discipline. Persuasion techniques of one hundred or even five years ago are different in many ways from effective persuasion techniques utilized today. This is due to a variety of reasons but primarily our understanding of persuasion has evolved, the target of persuasion techniques (us) has changed over the years, and new channels for persuasion (e.g., social media) are available. However, there are still many important lessons and effective techniques to be learned from past studies. This course will therefore examine past and current persuasion techniques. The objective of this course is to educate you regarding a variety of persuasion attempts many of you are exposed to daily.

When you have completed this course you should be able to

1. Identify persuasion attempts by individuals and organizations.
2. Increase your ability to resist persuasive appeals.
3. Understand how persuasion differs across subgroups (e.g., gender and cultures).
4. Understand the relationship between behavior and attitudes.
5. Utilize persuasion more effectively in your own day-to-day life.
6. Employ persuasion techniques to improve the effectiveness of campaigns.

**III. Required Readings and Supplementary Materials**

**Required Materials**

Perloff, R. (2020). The Dynamics of Persuasion: Communication and Attitudes in the 21st Century, 7th Edition (Routledge Communication Series). New York: Routledge Press.

ISBN-13: 978-0367185794 ISBN-10: 0367185792 available in ebook or paperback or rental

Cialdini, R. B. (2008). *Influence: Science and Practice* (5th edition or higher). Boston, MA: Pearson Press.

 ISBN10 # 0-205-60999-6 or ISBN13: 978-0-205-60999-4

**Required journal articles are available organized by weekly topic on Blackboard.**

**Optional Materials**

***Additional recommended but not required texts for further reading are italics throughout the syllabi:***

***For those who would like to delve further into theories of persuasion I recommend***

*Dillard, J. P. & Shen, L. (2012). Sage Handbook of Persuasion: Developments in Theory and Practice. Thousand Oaks, Sage Publishers. ISBN-13: 000-1412983134*

 *Relevant chapters from this book are included under Further Reading*

**IV. Description and Assessment of Assignments & Assignment Submission Policy**

**Description and Assessment of Assignments**

**1. Attendance** **and participation** **in class activities** — As we only meet once a week, and much of the material from lecture does not overlap with that of the text, attendance is crucial. Everyone is allowed one unexplained absence (meaning not present either in-person or online) per term but must view the video of the lecture and complete any activities required such as quizzes or short assignments. If you already know that you need to be absent for more than one lecture, you may want to take an alternate class that can be taken asynchronously. **10%**

**2. Reading assignments** — The lectures presume you have done the assigned reading prior to coming to class. The lectures will make more sense if you have done the background reading ahead of time.

**3.** **Quizzes** – At the end of most lectures (but not the first or the last) there will be a 10 item quiz on the concepts covered in that day’s lecture. Together these quizzes will count for **60%** of your grade.

**4. Final paper —** You will design an attitude change campaign from a list of possible topics integrating theories from the entire semester (10-15 pages of text without references and appendices). **20%**

**5. Final presentation** — This course attempts to enable you not just to design a persuasive campaign but to impart information to others in a coherent and professional manner. Consequently, in the final class period you will prepare and present an 8-10-minute PowerPoint presentation describing the key components of your persuasive campaign to the class. **10%**

**Course-specific Policies (Assignment Submission, Grading Timeline, Late work, and Technology)**

**Assignment Submission**

The final paper will be submitted via email directly to smurphy@usc.edu in a Word doc non-pdf format so Dr. Murphy can edit and comment in track changes.

**Paper and submission guidelines:**

1. Papers must be word-processed, double-spaced, in 12-point Times New Roman font with 1-inch margins on all sides of the page.
2. Before you turn in your paper make sure you keep both a hard copy and a Word file.
3. Please ensure that each paper is written in American Psychological Association style by referring to the APA manual.
4. Typos and spelling errors are unforgivable at this level and reflect poorly on you. This is a professional program and *a paper with multiple grammar, typo or spelling errors will receive substantial deductions.*
5. If you are not a native English speaker it is recommended that you have a native English speaker or someone from the Learning Lab look over your paper for grammar. The content of the paper, however, must be yours alone.

**Technology in the classroom:**

Many of you expect to be able to use your computers during class to take notes. To avoid distracting background noises please mute yourself if typing during lecture as it is distracting. When you have your computer in front of you, there is a temptation to IM, email, check sport scores, or watch YouTube videos while your peers are trying to engage in the lecture but please don’t. It is typically obvious to the instructor and classmates when a student is using their laptop or phone for tasks unrelated to the class. **To maintain the classroom atmosphere please use your computer only for Zoom participation and note taking during class.**

**V. Grading**

**Grading Breakdown**

Each student’s final grade will be based on the total number of points earned according to the following scale:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Assignment** | **Points** | **% of Grade** |
| Participation  |  | 10% |
| In-class Quizzes |  | 60% |
| Term Paper |  | 20% |
| Final Presentation |  | 10% |
| **TOTAL** |  | **100%** |

**Grading Scale**

Course final grades will be determined using the following scale.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 94 to 100%: A | 80% to 83%: B- | 67% to 69%: D+ |
| 90% to 93%: A- | 77% to 79%: C+ | 64% to 66%: D |
| 87% to 89%: B+ | 74% to 76%: C | 60% to 63%: D- |
| 84% to 86%: B | 70% to 73%: C- | 0% to 59%: F |

**Grading Standards**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Letter Grade** | **Description** |
| **A**  | **Excellent; demonstrates extraordinarily high achievement; comprehensive knowledge and understanding of subject matter; all expectations met and exceeded.** |
| **B** | **Good; moderately broad knowledge and understanding of subject matter; explicitly or implicitly demonstrates good, if not thorough understanding; only minor substantive shortcomings.** |
| **C** | **Satisfactory/Fair; reasonable knowledge and understanding of subject matter; most expectations are met; despite any shortcomings, demonstrates basic level of understanding.** |
| **D** | **Marginal; minimal knowledge and understanding of subject matter; more than one significant shortcoming; deficiencies indicate only the most rudimentary level of understanding.** |
| **F** | **Failing; unacceptably low level of knowledge and understanding of subject matter; deficiencies indicate lack of understanding.** |

**Grading Timeline**

**Grading Timeframe and Missing or Inaccurate Score Inquiries/Disputes**

For effective learning, students should receive timely feedback on assignments and exams.  Therefore, every attempt will be made to grade assignments/exams and post grades within two weeks.  Scores for all assignments and exams are regularly updated on Blackboard.  You are responsible for notifying the Instructor **within two weeks** of a score posting if you think a score is missing or inaccurate.

**Late work**

Delivering your assignments on time is crucial to your success in this course and in life more generally. The deadlines for each submission are provided with each assignment. Missing deadlines incurs penalties (unless approved by Dr. Murphy or TA). Any late assignment still has to be completed and delivered, or it may prevent you from completing the course.

**The grade of incomplete (IN):**

***The University only allows instructors to assign a grade of incomplete if work is not completed because of documented illness or some other emergency***. Removal of the grade of IN must be instituted by the student and agreed to by myself and the department and reported on the official “Incomplete Completion Form” to the University.

**VI. Course Schedule: A Weekly Breakdown
Changes to syllabus**

The course schedule will be followed as closely as possible but may vary. Any changes will be announced in class or by e-mail as far in advance as possible.

**Weekly Course Schedule for Spring 2022**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Date | Lecture Topic |
| **Week 1**Jan 11 | Cognitive Influences |
| **Week 2**Jan 18 | Emotional and Motivational Influences |
| **Week 3** Jan 25 | Individual Level Influences I: The Self |  |
| **Week 4** Feb 1 | Individual Level II: Gender |  |
| **Week 5**Feb 8 | Social Influences I |
| **Week 6**Feb 15 | Social Influences II |
| **Week 7**Feb 22 | Cross-Cultural Influences |
| **Week 8**March 1 | Media Influences I: Narrative and the Message Learning Approach |
| **Week 9**March 8 | Media Influences II: Priming and Agenda-setting |
| **Week 10**March15 | SPRING BREAK NO CLASS |
| **Week 11**March 22 | Elaboration Likelihood Model (ELM)  |
| **Week 12**March 29 | The Relationship between Attitudes and Behaviors |
| **Week 13**April 5 | No lecture work on paper |
| **Week 14**April 12 | Correction of Misinformation and Resistance to Persuasion |
| **Week 15**April 19 | Student Presentations and Final Paper |

**ATTITUDE FORMATION AND CHANGE**

 **Week 1: COGNITIVE INFLUENCES**

**Perloff Chapters 1 - 6**

**Heuristics and Biases**

Tversky, A. and Kahneman, C. (1974). Judgment under uncertainty: Heuristics and biases. Science, 185, 1124-113.

Langer, E. Mindfulness (Aspen Talk 2014 and 1999 article “The Construct of Mindfulness”)

Loh, K. and Kanai, R. (2015). How has the internet reshaped human cognition?” The Neuroscientist.

Metzger, M. J., & Flanagin, A. J. (2013). Credibility and trust of information in online environments: The use of cognitive heuristics. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 59, 210–220. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2013.07.012>

**Schemata**

Fiske, S.  (2009). "Social Cognition and the Normality of Prejudgment” Chapter 3 from Dovidio, Glick and Rudman (Eds). On the Nature of Prejudice:  Fifty Years After Allport, Blackwell.

Falk, E.B., Morelli, S.A., Welbourn, B.L., Dambacher, K. & Lieberman, M.D. (2013). Creating buzz: The neural correlates of effective message propagation. *Psychological Science, 24*(7), 1234-1242

**Stereotyping**

Seiter, E. (1986). Stereotypes and the media: A re-evaluation. Journal of Communication, 36(2) 14-26.

***Further reading (not required):***

*Meyer K & Damasio A. (2009). Convergence and divergence in a neural architecture for recognition and memory. Trends in Neuroscience. Jul;32(7):376-82.*

 *Chapters 1-5 of R. Nisbett and L. Ross Human Inference.*

*Langer, E. J. (1978). Rethinking the role of thought in social interaction. In J. Harvey, et al. (Eds.), New Directions in Attribution Research.*

*Hamilton, D. and Trolier, T. (1986). Stereotypes and Stereotyping: An overview of the cognitive approach. In J. Dovidio and S. Gaertner, Prejudice, Discrimination and Racism. pp. 127-133.*

*Hogan, J. M. (2012). Persuasion in the Rhetorical Tradition. In The Sage Handbook of Persuasion (Chapter 1). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.*

 *Rhodes, N. & Ewoldsen, D. R. (2012). Outcomes of Persuasion: Behavioral, Cognitive, and Social. In The Sage Handbook of Persuasion (Chapter 4). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.*

 *Miller, G. R. (2012). On Being Persuaded: Some Basic Distinctions. In The Sage Handbook of Persuasion (Chapter 5). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.*

 *Dillard, J. P. (2010). Persuasion. In The Handbook of Communication Science (Chapter 12). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.*

 *Roskos-Ewoldsen, D. R. & Roskos-Ewoldsen, B. (2010). Message Processing. In The Handbook of Communication Science (Chapter 8). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.*

**Week 2: EMOTIONAL AND MOTIVATIONAL INFLUENCES**

**Perloff Chapters 10-11**

**Conditioning and Modeling Approaches**

**Consistency Theories**

 Chapter 3 of Cialdini

**Factors that Influence Liking**

 Chapter 5 and 7 of Cialdini

**The Primacy of Affect**

Zajonc, R. B. (1980). Feeling and thinking: Preferences need no inferences. American Psychologist, 35, 151-175.

**Fear Appeals**

 Mongeau, P. A. (2013). Fear Appeals. In *The Sage Handbook of Persuasion* (Chapter 12). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

 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*(6), 1178–1204. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0039729>

**Guilt**

O’Keefe, D. J. (2002). Guilt as a mechanism of persuasion. In Dillard, J. P. & Pfau, M. W.

 (eds.) *The persuasion handbook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

**Anger**

Walter, N., Tukachinsky, R., Pelled, A., & Nabi, R. (under-review). Meta-analysis of anger and persuasion: An empirical integration of three models.

**Humor**

Walter, N., Cody, M. J., Xu, L. Z., & Murphy, S. T. (2018). A Priest, a Rabbi, and a Minister Walk into a Bar: A Meta-Analysis of Humor Effects on Persuasion. *Human Communication Research,* 1-31.

***Further Reading:***

*Bettinghaus & Cody, Ch. 4*

*Burgoon, M., Alvaro, E.2&, Grandpre, J. & Greene, K.L. (2002). Revisiting the Theory of Psychological Reactance: Communicating Threats to Attitudinal Freedom, in Dillard and Pfau’s The Persuasion Handbook: Developments in Theory and Practice, Sage.*

*Festinger, L. (1957). A Theory of cognitive dissonance. Evanston: Row and Peterson.*

*Harmon-Jones, E. (2002). A Cognitive Dissonance Theory Perspective on Persuasion. In Dillard & Pfau’s. The Persuasion Handbook: Developments in Theory and Practice. Thousand Oaks, Sage Publishers*

*Nabi, R. (2002). Discrete Emotions and Persuasion. In Dillard, J. P. & Pfau, M. W. (eds.) The Persuasion Handbook. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.*

*Newcomb, T. (1968). Interpersonal balance. In Theories of Cognitive Consistency. Chicago: Rand McNally.*

*Schacter, S. and Singer, J. E. (1962). Cognitive, social and physiological determinants of emotional state. Psychological Review, 379-399.*

*Witte, K., Meyer, G., Martell, D. (2001). History of Health Risk Messages: Fear Appeal Theories from 1953 to 1991, Chapter 2 of Effective Health Risk Messages: A step by step guide. Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications.*

**Week 3: INDIVIDUAL LEVEL INFLUENCES I: THE SELF**

**Attitudes as Functional**

Katz, D. (1958). The functional approach to the study of attitudes. Public Opinion Quarterly, 20, 163-204.

Carpenter, C., Boster, F.J., & Andrews, K.R. (2012). Functional Attitude Theory. In *The Sage Handbook of Persuasion* (Chapter 7). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

**The Self**

Synder, M., and De Bono, K. G. (1985). Appeals to image and claims about quality: Understanding the psychology of advertising. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 49, 586-597.

Markus, H. and Sentis, K. (1982). The Self in Social Information Processing. In J. Suls (Ed.) Social Psychological Perspectives on the Self. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

**Self-Efficacy**

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change.

Psychological Review, 84, 191-215.

**Self-Affirmation**

Walter, N., Demetriades, S. Z., & Murphy, S. T. (2017). Just a spoonful of sugar helps the messages go down: Using stories and vicarious self-affirmation to reduce e-cigarette use. *Health Communication*, 1-9.

**Product Placement**

Balasubramanian, S. K., Karrh, J. A.; Patwardhan, H. (2006). Audience Response to Product Placements: An Integrative Framework and Future Research Agenda. *Journal of Advertising, 35*, 115-141.

**Brand and Selective Exposure**

Kim, D. (2015). Brand and Selective Exposure**.**

***Further Reading:***

*Coover, G. E. & Murphy, S. T. (1999). The communicated self: Exploring the interaction between self and social context. Human Communication Research, 26(1), 125-147.*

Carpenter, C., Boster, F.J., & Andrews, K.R. (2012). Functional Attitude Theory. In *The Sage Handbook of Persuasion* (Chapter 7). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

*Damasio, A. (2010). Self Comes to Mind: Constructing the Conscious Brain. New York: Random House.*

*Lepper, M. R., Ross, L and Lau, R. R. (1986). Persistence of inaccurate beliefs about the self: Perseverance effects in the classroom. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50, 482-491.*

*Pages 613-651 from Theories of Cognitive Consistency, Chicago: Rand McNally.*

**Week 4: INDIVIDUAL LEVEL INFLUENCES II: GENDER**

Hyde, J. S. (2014). Gender Similarities and Differences. *Annual Review of Psychology,* 65, 373-398.

Eagly, A. H. (1994). On comparing women and men. Feminism and Psychology, 4, 513-522.

Buss, D. M. (1995). Psychological Sex Differences: Origins through sexual selection. American Psychologist, 50, 164-168.

Eccles, J.S., Jacobs, J.E., & Harold, R.D. (1990). Gender role stereotypes, expectancy effects and parent’s socialization of gender differences. Journal of Social Issues, 46, 183-201.

Smith, S. L., Choueiti, M., Pieper, K., Gillig, T., Lee, C. & DeLuca, D. (2015). Inequality in 700 Popular Films: Examining Portrayals of Gender, Race & LGBT Status from 2007 to 2014. A report from the Media Diversity and Social Change Initiative.

Grohmann, B. (2009). Gendered Dimensions of Brand Personality. Journal of Marketing Research, (vol 46. No. 1) 105-119.

Lieven, T., Grohmann, B., Herrmann, A., Landwehr, J. & van Tilburg, M. (2015). The effect of brand design on brand gender perceptions and brand preference, European Journal of Marketing, Vol. 49 Iss 1/2 pp. 146 – 169.

**Week 5: SOCIAL INFLUENCES I**

 **Perloff Chapter 12**

**Compliance**

Chapters 3 and 6 of Cialdini

Milgram film in class

**Reciprocity& Social Comparison**

Chapter 2 of Cialdini

**Scarcity**

Chapter 7 of Cialdini

**Bystander Apathy**

Chapter 4 of Cialdini

**Week 6: SOCIAL INFLUENCES II**

 **Perloff Chapter 13**

**Group Norms**

Rimal, R. N. & Lapinski, M. K. (2015). A Re-Explication of Social Norms, Ten Years Later. *Communication Theory, 25*, 393-409.

Smith, S. W., Atkin, C.K., Martell, D. Allen, R., & Hembroff, L. (2006). A social Judgment Theory Approach to Conducting Formative Research in a Social Norms Campaign. *Communication Theory*, *16*, 141-152.

**Social Identity**

Hogg, M. A. & Reid, S. A. (2006). Social Identity, Self-Categorization, and the Communication of Group Norms. Communication Theory, 16, 7-30.

**Social Networks and Social Capital**

Ichiro, I., Subramanian, S.V. & Kim, D. (2008). Chapters 1 and 12 in *Social Capital and Health.* Springer.

Walter, N., Murphy, S. T., Frank, L. B., & Ball-Rokeach, S. J. (2017). The power of brokerage: Case study of normative behavior, Latinas and cervical cancer. *Communication Research*, 1-24.

***Further reading:***

*Asch, S. Effects of group pressure upon the modification and distortion of judgments. In Maccoby, E. Newcomb, T., and Hartley, E. Readings in Social Psychology, 3rd Edition MNH, pp. 174-183.*

*Boer, H. & Westhoff, Y. (2006). The Role of Positive and Negative Signaling Communication by Strong and Weak Ties in the Shaping of Safe Sex Subjective Norms of Adolescents in South Africa. Communication Theory. 16, 75-90.*

*Campbell, D. T. and Levine, R. A. (1968). Ethnocentrism and intergroup relations. In Theories of Cognitive Consistency, Chicago: Rand McNally. pp. 551-564.*

*Deutsch, M. and Gerard, H. (1955). A study of normative and informational influences on individual judgment. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 51, 629-636.*

*Lapinski, M. K. & Rimal, R. N. (2005). An Explication of Social Norms. Communication Theory, 15(2), 127-147.*

*Maccoby, E., Newcomb, T. and Hartley, E. Readings in Social Psychology, 3rd Edition (MNH), pp. 265-275.*

*Milgram, S. (1963). Behavioral study of obedience. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 67, 371-378.*

*Newcomb, T., Attitude development as a function of reference groups: The Bennington Study. In Nemuth, C. J. (1986). Differential contributions of majority and minority influence. Psychological Review, 93, 23-32.*

*Poortinga, W. (2012). Community resilence and health: The role of bridging, bonding and linking aspects of social capital. Health & Place (18), 268-295.*

*Price, V., Nir, L. & Capella, J. N. (2006). Normative and Informational Influences in Online Political Discussions. Communication Theory, 16, 47-74.*

*Sherif, M. Group influences upon the formation of norms and attitudes. In Maccoby, E. Newcomb, T. and Hartley, E. (Eds.) Readings in Social Psychology, 3rd Edition (MNH), pp. 219-232.*

*Smith, S. W., Atkin, C.K., Martell, D. Allen, R., & Hembroff, L. (2006). A social Judgment Theory Approach to Conducting Formative Research in a Social Norms Campaign. Communication Theory, 16, 141-152.*

*Yanovitzky, I. & Rimal, R. (2006). Communication and Normative Influence: An Introduction to the Special Issue. Communication Theory, 16, 1-6.*

 **Week 7: MIDTERM DUE CROSS-CULTURAL INFLUENCES**

Markus, H., & Kitiyama, S. (1990). Cultural variation in the self concept. Culture and self: Implications for cognition, emotion and motivation. *Psychological Review, 98*, 224-253.

Griffith, D. A. (2002). The role of communication competencies in international business relationship development. *Journal of World Business, 37*, 256-265.

Gudykunst, W.B. & Lee, C. M. (2002). Cross-cultural communication theories. In Handbook of International and Intercultural Communication. (2nd edition), Gudykunst and Mody, Eds., p.25-50.

Young, Y. K. (2010). Intercultural Communication. In *The Handbook of Communication Science* (Chapter 26). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

 Lu, H. (2015). Burgers or Tofu? Eating Between Two Worlds: Risk Information Seeking and Processing During Dietary Acculturation. *Health Communication*, *30*(8), 758–771. http://doi.org/10.1080/10410236.2014.899658

***Further readings:***

*Murphy, S. T. (1998). A mile away and a world apart: The impact of independent and interdependent views of the self on US-Mexican communications. In J. Power and T.Byrd, (Eds.) Health Care Communication on the US/Mexico Border. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.*

**Week 8: MEDIA INFLUENCES 1: MLA and Narrative**

 **Perloff Chapters 8 & 9**

**Source, Message, Recipient and Channel Factors**

Shen, L. & Bigsby, E. (2012). The Effect of Message Features: Content, Structure and Style. In *The Sage Handbook of Persuasion* (Chapter 2). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

 **Entertainment Education**

 Slater, M.D., Rouner, D. & Long, M. (2006). Television Dramas and Support for Controversial Public Policies: Effects and Mechanisms. Journal of Communication, 56, 235-252.

 Braddock, K., & Dillard, J. P. (2016). Meta-analytic evidence for the persuasive effect of narratives on beliefs, attitudes, intentions, and behaviors. *Communication Monographs*, *77*, 1–24. <http://doi.org/10.1080/03637751.2015.1128555>

 Walter, N., T. Murphy, S., & Gillig, T. K. (2017). To Walk a Mile in Someone Else’s Shoes: How Narratives Can Change Causal Attribution Through Story Exploration and Character Customization. *Human Communication Research, 44*, 31-57.

***Further reading:***

*Bettinghaus & Cody, Chs 3, 5 & 9.*

***Social Learning Theory, Modeling, and Parasocial Interaction in Entertainment Education.***

*Bandura chapter in Singhal, A., Cody, M.J., Rogers, E.M., & Sabido, M. (Eds.)(2004). Entertainment-Education and Social Change: History, Research, and Practice. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.*

*Green, M. C., Garst, J. & Brock, T. (2004). The Power of Fiction: Determinants and Boundaries. In L.J. Shrum, (eds). The Psychology of Entertainment Media, Lawrence Erlbaum: New Jersey.*

***EE, Social Change & Social Capital***

*Singhal, A., Papa, M., Sharma, D., Pant, S., Worrell, T., Muthuswamy, N., Witte, K. (2006). Entertainment Education and Social Change: The Communication Dynamics of Social Capital. Journal of Creative Communications 1:1, 1-18.*

***Domestic EE***

*Murphy, S. T., Frank, L. B., Moran, M., & Woodley, P. (2011). Involved, transported or emotional? Exploring the determinants of change in entertainment education. Journal of Communication.*

*Singhal, A. & Rogers, E. M. (2002). A Theoretical Agenda for Entertainment-Education, Communication Theory, 12(2), 117-135.*

*Singhal, A., Rao, N. & Pant, S. (2006). Entertainment-Education and Possibilities for Second-Order Social Change. Journal of Creative Communications, 1:3.*

 *Slater, M.D. & Rouner, D. (2002). Entertainment-Education and Elaboration Likelihood: Understanding the processing of narrative persuasion. Communication Theory, May 12,2, 173-191*

*Slater, M.D., Rouner, D. & Long, M. (2006). Television Dramas and Support for Controversial Public Policies: Effects and Mechanisms. Journal of Communication,56, 235-252.*

***International EE***

*Chatterjee, J., Murphy, S., Frank, L. and Bhanot, A. (2009). The Importance of Interpersonal Discussion and Self-Efficacy in Knowledge, Attitude, and Practice Models. International Journal of Communication, 3, 607-634. Available at:* [*http://ijoc.org/ojs/index.php/ijoc/article/view/444*](http://ijoc.org/ojs/index.php/ijoc/article/view/444)*.*

*Frank, L. B., Chatterjee, J. S., Chaudhuri, S., Lapsansky, C,. Bhanot, A., & Murphy, S. T. (In press). Talking and Complying: The Role of Interpersonal Discussion and Social Norms in Public Communication Campaigns. Journal of Health Communication.*

*Murphy, S.T., Heather, H.J., Felt, L.J. & de Castro Buffington, S. (2011) Public Diplomacy in Prime Time: Exploring the Potential of Entertainment Education in International Public Diplomacy. Journal of Media Psychology*

**Week 9: MEDIA INFLUENCES** **II**

**Agenda Setting**

 Scheufele, D.A. and Tewksbury, D. (2007). Framing, Agenda-Setting and Priming: The evolution of three media effects models. *Journal of Communication, 57*(1), 9-20.

Russell Neuman, W., Guggenheim, L., Mo Jang, S., & Bae, S. Y. (2014). The dynamics of public attention: Agenda-Setting Theory meets big data. *Journal of Communication*, *64*(2), 193–214. <http://doi.org/10.1111/jcom.12088>

Kiousis, S., Strömbäck, J., & McDevitt,, M. (2015). Influence of issue decision salience on vote choice: Linking Agenda Setting , Priming , and issue ownership. *International Journal of Communication ·*, *9*(October), 3347–3368.

**Framing**

Schneider, T. R. (2006). Getting the Biggest Bang for Your Health Education Buck: Message Framing and Reducing Health Disparities. *American Behavioral Scientist, 49,* 812-822.

**Priming**

Power, J., Murphy, S. T., & Coover, G. (1996). Priming prejudice: How stereotypes and counter-stereotypes influence attribution of responsibility and credibility among ingroups and outgroups. Human Communication Research, 23(1), 36-58.

 Peña, J., & Blackburn, K. (2013). The priming effects of virtual environments on interpersonal perceptions and behaviors. *Journal of Communication*, *63*(4), 703–720. <http://doi.org/10.1111/jcom.12043>

 **Intermedia**

 Wang, H., & Singhal, A. (2016). East Los High: Transmedia edutainment to promote the sexual and reproductive health of young Latina/o Americans. *American Journal of Public Health*, 106(6), 1002–1010. <http://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2016.303072>

 Oh, J., & Sundar, S. S. (2015). How does interactivity persuade? An experimental test of interactivity on cognitive absorption, elaboration, and attitudes. *Journal of Communication*, 65(2), 213–236. http://doi.org/10.1111/jcom.12147

 ***Further Reading:***

*Ball-Rokeach, Rokeach and Grube (1984). The Great American Values Test: Influencing belief and behavior through TV.*

*Bandura chapter in Singhal, A., Cody, M.J., Rogers, E.M., & Sabido, M. (Eds.)(2004). Entertainment-Education and Social Change: History, Research, and Practice. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.*

*Berscheid, E. (1966). Opinion change and communicator-communicatee similarity and dissimilarity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 4, 670-680.*

*Berkowitz, L. and Rogers, K. H. (1986). A priming effect analysis of media influences. In J. Bryant and D. Zillman (Eds.) Perspectives on media effects, pp. 57-81. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, Inc.*

*Cacciatore, M. a., Scheufele, D. a., & Iyengar, S. (2016). The end of Framing as we know it … and the future of media effects. Mass Communication and Society, 19(1), 7–23.* [*http://doi.org/10.1080/15205436.2015.1068811*](http://doi.org/10.1080/15205436.2015.1068811)

*Chaiken, S., and Eagley, A. H. (1976). Communication modality as a determinant of message persuasiveness and comprehensibility. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 34, 605-614.*

*Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. Journal of Communication, 43(4), 51-58.*

*Eveland, W. P. (2002). The Impact of News and Entertainment. In Dillard and Pfau*

*Gamson, S. and Modigliani, A. (1987). The changing culture of affirmative action. In Research in Political Sociology , 3, 137-177.*

*Gould, M. S., and Schaffer, D. (1986). The impact of suicide in T.V. movies: Evidence and imitation. New England Journal of Medicine, 315, 690-694.*

*Green, M. C., Garst, J. & Brock, T. (2004). The Power of Fiction: Determinants and Boundaries. In L.J. Shrum, (eds). The Psychology of Entertainment Media, Lawrence Erlbaum: New Jersey.*

*Iyengar, S. and Kinder, D. R. (1987). News That Matters. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.*

*Kinder, D. R. and Sears, D. O. (1985). Public opinion and political behavior. Handbook Iyengar, S. & Simon, A.F. (2000). New Perspectives and Evidence on Political Communication and Campaign Effects. Annual Review of Psychology, 51: 149-169.*

*Klapper, J. (1960). The effects of mass communications. New York: Free Press.*

*Kosicki, G. M. (2002). News Media and Considerations Affecting Political Judgments. In The Persuasion Handbook: Developments in Theory and Practice, Dillard and Pfau (Editors), Chapter 4, 63-82.*

*Lippmann, W. (1922). Public Opinion. New York: MacMillan.*

*Lippmann, W. (1925). The Phantom Public. New York: MacMillan.*

*Mullen, B. et al. (1986). Newscasters' facial expressions and voting behavior of viewers: Can a smile elect a president? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51, 291-295.*

*Patterson, T. and McClure, R. (1976). The unseeing eye: The myth of television power in national elections. New York: G. P. Putnam.*

*Phillips, D. (1980). Airplane accidents, murder and the mass media. Social Forces, 54, 1001-1024.*

*Phillips, D. (1983). The impact of mass media violence on U.S. homicides. American Sociological Review, 48, 560-568.*

*Roeh, I., Katz, E., Cohen, A., and Zeliger, B. (1989). Almost Midnight. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.*

*Rogers, E. (1988). Agenda-setting research: Where has it been? Where is it going? In James A. Anderson (Ed.) Communication Yearbook 11, pp. 555-594. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.S*

*Salovey, P., Schneider, T. R., Apanovitch, A. M. (2002). Message Framing in the Prevention and Early Detection of Illness. In The Persuasion Handbook: Developments in Theory and Practice, (Dillard and Pfau, Editors), Chapter 20, 391- 406.*

*Jenkins, H. (2013). Spreadable Media: Creating Value and Meaning in a Networked Culture. New York, NY: NYU Press*

**Week 10: SPRING BREAK NO CLASS**

**Week 11: ELABORATION LIKELIHOOD MODEL (ELM) AND RESISTANCE TO PERSUASION**

**Perloff Chapter**

**ELM**

 Wagner, B. C. & Petty, R. E. (2011). The elaboration likelihood model of persuasion: Thoughtful and non-thoughtful social influence. *Theories in Social Psychology.* Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Petty, R. E., Cacciopo, J. T., Strathman, A. J., and Priester, J. R. (1994). To think or not to think: Exploring two routes to persuasion. In S. Shavitt and T. C. Brock (Eds.), Persuasion: Psychological insights and perspectives (pp. 113–148). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

**Week 12: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ATTITUDES AND BEHAVIORS**

 **Perloff Chapter 14**

 **The Influence of Attitudes on Behavior**

Ajzen, I. and Fishbein, M. (1977). Attitude-behavior relations: A theoretical analysis and review of empirical research. Psychological Bulletin, 84, 888-918.

 **The Influence of Behavior on Attitudes**

Bem, D. S. (1972). Self-perception theory. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.) Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, Vol. 6.

Bandura chapter in Singhal, A., Cody, M.J., Rogers, E.M., & Sabido, M. (Eds.)(2004). Entertainment-Education and Social Change: History, Research, and Practice. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates

***Further reading:***

*Aronson, E. and Mills, J. (1959). The effect of severity of initiation on liking for a group, Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 59, 177-181.*

*Bandura chapter in Singhal, A., Cody, M.J., Rogers, E.M., & Sabido, M. (Eds.)(2004). Entertainment-Education and Social Change: History, Research, and Practice. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates*

*Cialdini, et al. (1976). Elastic shifts of opinion. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 34, 663-672.*

*Festinger, L. and Carlsmith, J. (1959). Cognitive consequences of forced-compliance. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 58, 203-210.*

*Freedman J, L, and Sears, D. O. (1965). Warning, distraction and resistance to influence. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1, 262-266.*

*Lord, C. G., Ross, L. and Lepper, M. R. (1979). Biased assimilation and attitude polarization: The effects of prior theories on subsequently considered evidence. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37, 2098-2109.*

*Lord, C., Lepper, M. and Preston, E. (1984). Considering the opposite: A corrective strategy for social judgment. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50, 482-491.*

*McGuire, W. J. (1964). Inducing resistance to change in persuasion: Some contemporary approaches. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in Experimental Social Psychology. New York: Academic Press.*

*Newcomb, T., Koenig, K., Flacks, R. and Warwick, D. (1967). Persistence and Change: Bennington College and its students after 25 years. New York: Wiley.*

*Petty, R. E. and Cacioppo, J. T. (1979). Issue involvement can increase or decrease persuasion. Journal of Personality, 37, 1915-1926.*

*Rokeach, M. (1985). Inducing change and stability in belief systems and personality structures. Journal of Social Issues, 41, 153-171.*

*Ross, L., Lepper, M. R. and Hubbard, M. (1975). Perseverance in self-perception and social perception. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 32, 880-892.*

**Week 13: NO Class**

**Week 14: Resistance to Persuasion and Correcting Misinformation**

 Wilson, S. R. (2010). Seeking and Resisting Compliance. In *The Handbook of Communication Science* (Chapter 13), Berger, Roloff, & Roskos-Ewoldsen, Eds. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Tormala, Z.L. & Petty, R.E. (2002). What Doesn’t Kill Me Makes Me Stronger: The effects of resisting persuasion on attitude certainty. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Vol. 83, No. 6, 1298-1313.

 **Reactance**

Quick, B.L., Shen, L. & Dillard, J. P. (2012). Reactance Theory and Persuasion. In *The Sage Handbook of Persuasion* (Chapter 11). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

**Innoculation**

 Compton, J. (2012). Inoculation Theory. In *The Sage Handbook of Persuasion* (Chapter 14). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

**Misinformation**

 Walter, N., & Murphy, S. T. (2018). How to unring the bell: A meta-analytic approach to correction of misinformation. *Communication Monographs*

 ***Further Readings****:*

*Cialdini, et al. (1976). Elastic shifts of opinion. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 34, 663-672.*

*Fink, E.L., Kaplowitz, S. A., & McGreevy Hubbard, S. (2002). Oscillation in Belief and Decisions.*

*Knowles, E. S. & Linn, J. A. (2004). Resistance and Persuasion. Lawrence Erlbaum, New Jersey.*

 *O’Keefe, D. J. (2012). The Elaboration Likelihood Model. In The Sage Handbook of Persuasion (Chapter 9). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.*

 *Petty, R. E. & Wegener, D. T. (1999). The Elaboration Likelihood: Current Status and Controversies. In S. Chaiken and Y. Trope (Eds.), Dual process theories in social psychology, New York: Guilford Press.*

 *Petty, R. E., Priester, J. R., & Brinol, P. (2002). Mass media attitude change: Implications of the elaboration likelihood model of persuasion. Media effects: Advances in theory and research, 2, 155-198.*

*Petty, R. E. & Brinol, P. (2014). The elaboration likelihood and Metacognitive Models of attitudes. Dual-Process Theories of the Social Mind, 172.*

*Petty, R. E. & Cacioppo, J. T. (1986). The elaboration likelihood model of persuasion. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 19, New York: Academic Press.*

*Rokeach, M. (1985). Inducing change and stability in belief systems and personality structures. Journal of Social Issues, 41, 153-171.*

**Week 15: Student Presentations and Final Papers Due**

**Statement on Academic Conduct and Support Systems**

**Academic Conduct:**

Plagiarism – presenting someone else’s ideas as your own, either verbatim or recast in your own words – is a serious academic offense with serious consequences. Please familiarize yourself with the discussion of plagiarism in SCampus in Part B, Section 11, “Behavior Violating University Standards” [policy.usc.edu/scampus-part-b](https://policy.usc.edu/scampus-part-b/). Other forms of academic dishonesty are equally unacceptable. See additional information in SCampus and university policies on scientific misconduct, [policy.usc.edu/scientific-misconduct](http://policy.usc.edu/scientific-misconduct).

**Support Systems:**

*Counseling and Mental Health - (213) 740-9355 – 24/7 on call*

[studenthealth.usc.edu/counseling](https://studenthealth.usc.edu/counseling/)

Free and confidential mental health treatment for students, including short-term psychotherapy, group counseling, stress fitness wor

**VII. Policies and Procedures**

**Communication**

Please contact me via email at smurphy@usc.edu with any questions or concerns. I will respond within 24 hours. We can schedule a Zoom or phone meeting if that is preferable please let me know in initial email.

**Statement on Academic Conduct and Support Systems**

**Academic Integrity Policy:**

The School of Communication maintains a commitment to the highest standards of ethical conduct and academic excellence. Any student found responsible for plagiarism, fabrication, cheating on examinations, or purchasing papers or other assignments will be reported to the Office of Student Judicial Affairs and Community Standards and may be dismissed from the School of Communication. There are no exceptions to the school’s policy.

**Academic Conduct:**

**Plagiarism** – presenting someone else’s ideas as your own, either verbatim or recast in your own words – is a serious academic offense with serious consequences. Please familiarize yourself with the discussion of plagiarism in SCampus in Part B, Section 11, “Behavior Violating University Standards” [policy.usc.edu/scampus-part-b](https://policy.usc.edu/scampus-part-b/). Other forms of academic dishonesty are equally unacceptable. See additional information in SCampus and university policies on scientific misconduct, [policy.usc.edu/scientific-misconduct](http://policy.usc.edu/scientific-misconduct).

In addition, it is assumed that the work you submit for this course is work you have produced entirely by yourself, and has not been previously produced by you for submission in another course, without approval of the instructor.

**Emergency Preparedness/Course Continuity in a Crisis**

In case of a declared emergency if travel to campus is not feasible, USC executive leadership will announce an electronic way for instructors to teach students in their residence halls or homes using a combination of Blackboard, teleconferencing, and other technologies. See the university’s site on [**Campus Safety and Emergency Preparedness**](http://safety.usc.edu/).

**Support Systems:**

*Counseling and Mental Health - (213) 740-9355 – 24/7 on call*

[studenthealth.usc.edu/counseling](https://studenthealth.usc.edu/counseling/)

Free and confidential mental health treatment for students, including short-term psychotherapy, group counseling, stress fitness workshops, and crisis intervention.

*National Suicide Prevention Lifeline - 1 (800) 273-8255 – 24/7 on call*

[suicidepreventionlifeline.org](http://www.suicidepreventionlifeline.org/)

Free and confidential emotional support to people in suicidal crisis or emotional distress 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

*Relationship and Sexual Violence Prevention Services (RSVP) - (213) 740-9355(WELL), press “0” after hours – 24/7 on call* [studenthealth.usc.edu/sexual-assault](https://studenthealth.usc.edu/sexual-assault/)

Free and confidential therapy services, workshops, and training for situations related to gender-based harm.

*Office of Equity and Diversity (OED) - (213) 740-5086 | Title IX – (213) 821-8298*

[equity.usc.edu](https://equity.usc.edu/), [titleix.usc.edu](http://titleix.usc.edu/)

Information about how to get help or help someone affected by harassment or discrimination, rights of protected classes, reporting options, and additional resources for students, faculty, staff, visitors, and applicants.

*Reporting Incidents of Bias or Harassment - (213) 740-5086 or (213) 821-8298*

[usc-advocate.symplicity.com/care\_report](https://usc-advocate.symplicity.com/care_report/)

Avenue to report incidents of bias, hate crimes, and microaggressions to the Office of Equity and Diversity |Title IX for appropriate investigation, supportive measures, and response.

*The Office of Disability Services and Programs - (213) 740-0776*

[dsp.usc.edu](http://dsp.usc.edu/)

Support and accommodations for students with disabilities. Services include assistance in providing readers/notetakers/interpreters, special accommodations for test taking needs, assistance with architectural barriers, assistive technology, and support for individual needs.

*USC Campus Support and Intervention - (213) 821-4710*

[campussupport.usc.edu](https://campussupport.usc.edu/)

Assists students and families in resolving complex personal, financial, and academic issues adversely affecting their success as a student.

*Diversity at USC - (213) 740-2101*

[diversity.usc.edu](https://diversity.usc.edu/)

Information on events, programs and training, the Provost’s Diversity and Inclusion Council, Diversity Liaisons for each academic school, chronology, participation, and various resources for students.

*USC Emergency - UPC: (213) 740-4321, HSC: (323) 442-1000 – 24/7 on call*

[dps.usc.edu](http://dps.usc.edu/), [emergency.usc.edu](http://emergency.usc.edu/)

Emergency assistance and avenue to report a crime. Latest updates regarding safety, including ways in which instruction will be continued if an officially declared emergency makes travel to campus infeasible.

*USC Department of Public Safety - UPC: (213) 740-6000, HSC: (323) 442-120 – 24/7 on call*

[dps.usc.edu](http://dps.usc.edu/)

Non-emergency assistance or information.

*Annenberg Student Success Fund*

[https://annenberg.usc.edu/current-students/resources/additional-funding-resources](https://annenberg.usc.edu/current-students/resources/annenberg-scholarships-and-awards)

The Annenberg Student Success Fund is a donor-funded financial aid account available to USC Annenberg undergraduate and graduate students for non-tuition expenses related to extra- and co-curricular programs and opportunities.