

**Comm 8970:  
Seminar in Persuasion and Social Influence**

**Instructor**

Nancy Rhodes

Office: 3045A Derby Hall

Email: rhodes.296@osu.edu

Office Hours: 10am-Noon Weds. and by appointment

**Class Time and Location**

Tues & Thurs 12:45 – 2:05 pm

3116 Derby Hall

**Course Overview:**

From the catalogue: Advanced seminar on current research cutting across sub-fields of communication.

From the instructor: In this course we will review the major theories of persuasion and social influence, focusing on both the historical development of these theories as well as contemporary research and innovations.

**Readings:**

All readings will be available on Carmen.

**Course Objectives:**

At the end of this course, students should:

1. Understand and be able to explain the major theories of persuasion and social influence.
2. Understand and be able to implement the main research paradigms in persuasion research.
3. Understand and apply theory and research findings in persuasion to practical problems.

**Course Requirements:**

1. Attendance and Participation: This is a seminar. You are required to read the material and actively participate in the discussion during class time.
2. Reaction Papers (25% of final grade): The reaction papers are intended to structure your thoughts about the readings for the week. To facilitate your thinking about the material, and to give me time to look at your papers prior to class, the reaction paper will be due each week on Monday at noon (see exceptions in the course schedule). I will provide comments and feedback by Tuesday morning, and the questions and comments you have will form the discussion starters for class during the week.

To get the most out of the readings, I ask that you structure the paper in the following way. The first paragraph is to be a brief summary of the articles. Focus in particular on what was done in each study (the method), and what the main findings were (the results). The second paragraph is to be an integration of all articles that are due for that day. In your integration paragraph, I want you to talk about what generalizations or conclusions can be made across the readings. How would you succinctly summarize this group of articles? Are there important areas of discrepancy among the articles? If so, can you succinctly identify these? The third paragraph is to be your reaction. In your view, what is the most important contribution from these readings, either to theory and basic knowledge, or to applications of knowledge? What limitations do you see in these readings? The final part of the paper is in

many ways the most important. I want you write at least two questions for discussion. These can focus in general on what questions remain to be answered in this area, or the questions can focus on any questions you have about the readings – what remains unclear to you about these studies?

Reaction papers should be typed, double spaced, with one inch margins. Papers should be approximately one to one and a half pages in length and should never exceed 2 pages in length. Papers MUST be submitted through the dropbox tab in Carmen.

Each reaction paper is worth a maximum of 10 points. Points are broken down as follows: Summary – 2 pts; Integration – 3 pts; Reaction – 2 pts, Questions – 3 . Maximum points will be earned by presenting a thoughtful, thorough, and concise treatment of the topic. The lowest grade will be dropped.

3. Article Presentations. Each student will present TWO research articles during the semester. These presentations will cover an article chosen by the student from the list of supplementary readings for each topic. This presentation will be approximately 15-20 minutes in length, will provide a summary of the article, as well as a discussion of the relevance of the article to the other readings for the week. The student presenter will serve as the “resident expert” in the reading, and formulate discussion questions to lead the group through the important issues raised in the readings.
4. Research Proposal. A research paper will be due on the date of the scheduled final exam. In this writing project the student will choose either a practical problem or theoretical issue related to persuasion, conduct a review of the research literature related to that problem or issue, and propose a research study that will advance knowledge in this area. Proposing to study the effectiveness of a persuasive intervention, or a study to test a theoretical model would both be appropriate.
5. Paper Presentation. Students will make an oral presentation of their papers to the class during the scheduled presentation days. This presentation should be accompanied by a PowerPoint or other visual aid and should be of the quality of a conference presentation. The presentation should give a justification for the proposed research, a description of the methodology, and a discussion of how this study will advance knowledge in the field.
6. Student feedback (-5% for not completing): For each of the days in which students present their research papers, students in class will submit the following: identify the presentation you thought was best and explain what you liked about the presentation (self-nominations are acceptable, but justify it). Make a suggestion to at least one of the presenters that you hope will help them improve their project. The feedback will be supplied to the students but your name will not be identified with the feedback. These are due by the end of the following day. The combined feedback should be no less than 1 page.

## Grade assignment

Final grades will be computed thusly:

Attendance and participation	10%
Reaction Papers (Lowest grade dropped)	25%
Article presentations (1 @ 15% ea.)	15%
Research Proposal	40%
Paper Presentation	10%

Grades will be assigned using the following percentage system.

$\geq 93\%$ = A	$\geq 90\%$ = A-
$\geq 87\%$ = B+	$\geq 83\%$ = B
$\geq 80\%$ = B-	$\geq 77\%$ = C+
$\geq 73\%$ = C	$\geq 70\%$ = C-
$\geq 67\%$ = D+	$\geq 63\%$ = D
$> 63\%$ = E	

## Disability Services

This syllabus is available in alternative formats upon request. Students with disabilities are responsible for making their needs known to the instructor and seeking assistance in a timely manner. Any student who feels he/she may need accommodation based on the impact of a disability should contact me privately to discuss your specific needs, or contact the office for disability services at 292-3307 in Room 150 Pomerene Hall to coordinate your documented disabilities.

## Academic Misconduct

Academic misconduct will not be tolerated. The term “academic misconduct” includes all forms of student academic misconduct wherever committed; illustrated by, but not limited to, cases of plagiarism and dishonest practices in connection with examinations. All instances of alleged academic misconduct will be reported to the Committee on Academic Misconduct, which is responsible of investigating or establishing procedures for the investigation of all reported cases of student academic misconduct. For additional information, see the Code of Student Conduct ([http://studentaffairs.osu.edu/info\\_for\\_students/csc.asp](http://studentaffairs.osu.edu/info_for_students/csc.asp)).

## Timeliness

Reaction papers are due at noon most Mondays (but see course schedule for exceptions). Late reaction papers will not be graded. All other assignments will be penalized at a rate of -10% per day it is late. For example, if you received a 92 on your research proposal, but it was turned in on Dec. 17 your grade for the paper will be an 82.

## APA Format

All papers should follow the APA Publication Manual guidelines.

**I reserve the right to modify this syllabus at any point during the semester. Modifications will be posted on Carmen and announced in class.**

Week #	Date	Topic	Readings
0	8/28	Course Intro	
1	9/2 - 9/4	Basic Definitions and Concepts	<p><b>Required:</b></p> <p>Miller, G. R. (2003). On being persuaded: Some basic distinctions. In J. P. Dillard &amp; M. Pfau (Eds.), <i>The persuasion handbook</i> (pp. 3-16). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. (Reprinted from <i>Persuasion: New directions in theory and research</i>, pp. 11-28, by M. Roloff &amp; G. R. Miller, Eds., 1980. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage).</p> <p>Kelman, H. (1961). Processes of opinion change. <i>Public Opinion Quarterly</i>, 25, 57-78.</p> <p>Oskamp, S. &amp; Schultz, P. W. (2005). <i>Attitudes and Opinions</i> (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. (Chapter 5: pp. 88-111).</p> <p>Albarracin, D., Wang, W., Li, H., &amp; Noguchi, K. (2008). Structure of attitudes: Judgments, memory, and implications for change. In W. D. Crano &amp; R. Prislin (Eds.), <i>Attitudes and attitude change</i>.</p> <p><b>Supplemental:</b></p> <p>Katz, D. (1960). The functional approach to the study of attitudes. <i>Public Opinion Quarterly</i>, 24, 163-204.</p> <p>Zanna, M. P., &amp; Rempel, J. K. (1988). Attitudes: A new look at an old concept. In D. Bar-Tal &amp; A. W. Kruglanski (Eds.), <i>The social psychology of knowledge</i> (pp. 315-334). New York: Cambridge University Press.</p> <p>Eagly, A.H., &amp; Chaiken, S. (1993). <i>The psychology of attitudes</i>. Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.</p>
2	9/9-9/11	Explicit vs. implicit attitudes and measures	<p><b>Required:</b></p> <p>Roskos-Ewoldson, D. R., &amp; Fazio, R. H. (1992). On the orienting value of attitudes: Attitude accessibility as a determinant of an object's attraction of visual attention. <i>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</i>, 63, 198-211.</p> <p>Fazio, R. H., &amp; Olson, M. A. (2014). The MODE model: Attitude-Behavior Processes as a Function of Motivation and Opportunity. In Sherman, J. W., Gawronski, B., &amp; Trope, Y. (Eds.), <i>Dual process theories of the social mind</i>. New York: Guilford Press.</p> <p>Rhodes, N. &amp; Ewoldsen, D. R. (2013). Outcomes of persuasion: Results of deliberative and spontaneous processes. In J. Dillard &amp; L. Shen (Eds.), <i>Handbook of persuasion</i> (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.</p> <p>Smith, E. R., &amp; DeCoster, J. (2000). Dual process models in social and cognitive psychology: Conceptual integration and links to underlying memory systems. <i>Personality and Social Psychology Review</i>, 4 108-131.</p> <p><b>Supplemental:</b></p> <p>Schwarz, N. (1998). Accessible content and accessibility experiences: The interplay of declarative and experiential information in judgment. <i>Personality and Social Psychology Review</i>, 2, 87-99.</p> <p>Gawronski, B., &amp; Bodenhausen, G. V. (2006). Associative and propositional processes in evaluation: An integrative review of implicit and explicit attitude change. <i>Psychological Bulletin</i>, 132, 692-731.</p> <p>Fazio, R. H., Jackson, J. R., Dunton, B. C., &amp; Williams, C. J. (1995). Variability in automatic activation as an unobtrusive measure of racial attitudes: A bona fide pipeline? <i>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</i>, 69, 1013-1027.</p>

3	9/16-9/18	Attitude-Behavior 1	<p><b>Required:</b>  Wicker, A. W. (1969). Attitudes versus actions: The relationships of overt behavioral responses to attitude objects. <i>Journal of Social Issues</i>, 25, 41-78.  Ajzen, I., &amp; Fishbein, M. (1973). Attitudinal and normative variables as predictors of specific behaviors. <i>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</i>, 27, 41-57.  Kim, M. S., &amp; Hunter, J. E. (1993). Relationships among attitudes, behavioral intentions, and behaviors: A meta-analysis of past research, part 2. <i>Communication Research</i>, 20, 331-384.</p> <p><b>Supplemental:</b>  LaPiere, R. T. (1934). Attitudes vs. actions. <i>Social Forces</i>, 13, 230-237.  Fazio, R. H. (1986). How do attitudes guide behavior? In R. M. Sorrentino &amp; E. T. Higgins (Eds.), <i>Handbook of motivation and cognition</i> (Vol. 1, pp. 204-243). New York: Guilford.  Kim, M. S., &amp; Hunter, J. E. (1993). Attitude-behavior relations: A meta-analysis of attitudinal relevance and topic. <i>Journal of Communication</i>, 43, 101-142.  Lord, C. G., Lepper, M. R., &amp; Mackie, D. (1984). Attitude prototypes as determinants of attitude-behavior consistency. <i>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</i>, 46, 1254-1266.  Ajzen, I. and Fishbein, M. (1977). Attitude-behavior relations: A theoretical analysis and review of empirical research. <i>Psychological Bulletin</i>, 84, 888-918.</p>
4	9/23-9/25	Attitude-Behavior 2: Theory of Reasoned action/Theory of Planned Behavior	<p><b>Required:</b>  Ajzen, I. (1991). The Theory of Planned Behavior. <i>Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes</i>, 50, 179-211.  Silk, K. J., Weiner, J., &amp; Parrott, R. L. (2005). Gene Cuisine or Frankenfood? The Theory of Reasoned Action as an Audience Segmentation Strategy for Messages About Genetically Modified Foods. <i>Journal Of Health Communication</i>, 10(8), 751-767. doi:10.1080/10810730500326740  Fishbein, M., &amp; Yzer, M. C. (2003). Using Theory to Design Effective Health Behavior Interventions. <i>Communication Theory</i>, 13(2), 164.</p> <p><b>Supplemental:</b>  Madden, T. J., Ellen, P. S., &amp; Ajzen, I. (1992). A comparison of the theory of planned behavior and the theory of reasoned action. <i>Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin</i>, 18, 3-9.  Stone, T. H., Jawahar, I. M., &amp; Kisamore, J. L. (2010). Predicting academic misconduct intentions and behavior using the theory of planned behavior and personality. <i>Basic and Applied Social Psychology</i>, 32, 35-45.  Roberto, A. J., Krieger, J. L., Katz, M. L., Goei, R., &amp; Jain, P. (2011). Predicting Pediatricians' Communication With Parents About the Human Papillomavirus (HPV) Vaccine: An Application of the Theory of Reasoned Action. <i>Health Communication</i>, 26(4), 303-312. doi:10.1080/10410236.2010.550021  Fishbein, M., &amp; Ajzen, I. (2010). <i>Predicting and changing behavior: The reasoned action approach</i>. New York: Psychology Press (Taylor &amp; Francis).</p>

5	9/30-10/2	Message Learning to ELM	<p><b>Draft bibliography and project abstract due 10/3.</b></p> <p><b>Required:</b>  Carpenter, C. J., &amp; Boster, F. J. (2013). The Relationship Between Message Recall and Persuasion: More Complex Than It Seems. <i>Journal Of Communication, 63</i>(4), 661-681. doi:10.1111/jcom.12042  Petty, R. E., &amp; Cacioppo, J. T. (1984). The effects of involvement on response to argument quantity and quality: Central and peripheral routes to persuasion. <i>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46</i>, 69-81.  Love, R. E., &amp; Greenwald, A. G. (1978). Cognitive responses to persuasion as mediators of opinion change. <i>The Journal Of Social Psychology, 104</i>(2), 231-241. doi:10.1080/00224545.1978.9924065</p> <p><b>Supplemental:</b>  Buller, D. B. (1986). Distraction during persuasive communication: A meta-analytic review. <i>Communication Monographs, 53</i>, 91-114.  Mongeau, P. A., &amp; Stiff, J. B. (1993). Specifying causal relationships in the elaboration likelihood model. <i>Communication Theory, 3</i>, 65-72.  Petty, R. E., Wegener, D. T., Fabrigar, L. R., Priester, J. R., &amp; Cacioppo, J. T. (1994). Conceptual and methodological issues in the elaboration likelihood model of persuasion: A reply to the Michigan State critics. <i>Communication Theory, 3</i>, 336-363.  Petty, R.E. &amp; Cacioppo, J. T. (1979). Issue involvement can increase or decrease persuasion by enhancing message-relevant cognitive responses. <i>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37</i>, 1915-1926.</p>
6	10/7-10/9	Beyond ELM	<p><b>Required:</b>  Kruglanski, A. W., &amp; Thompson, E. P. (1999). Persuasion by a single route: A view from the unimodel. <i>Psychological inquiry, 10</i>, 83-109.  Petty, R. E., Briñol, P., Tormala, Z. L., &amp; Wegener, D. T. (2007). The role of metacognition in social judgment. In A. W. Kruglanski &amp; E. T. Higgins (Eds.), <i>Social psychology: Handbook of basic principles</i> (2th ed., pp. 254-284). New York: Cambridge Press.  Slater, M. D. (2003). Involvement as goal-directed strategic processing: Extending the elaboration likelihood model. In J. P. Dillard &amp; M. Pfau (Eds.), <i>The persuasion handbook</i> (pp. 175-194.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.</p> <p><b>Supplemental:</b>  Petty, R. E., Briñol, P., &amp; Tormala, Z. L. (2002). Thought confidence as a determinant of persuasion: The self-validation hypothesis. <i>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82</i>, 722-741.  Kruglanski, A. W., Xiaoyan, C., Pierro, A., Mannetti, L., Erb, H., &amp; Spiegel, S. (2006). Persuasion According to the Unimodel: Implications for Cancer Communication. <i>Journal Of Communication, 56</i>S105-S122. doi:10.1111/j.1460-2466.2006.00285.x  Chaiken, S., &amp; Maheswaran, D. (1994). Heuristic processing can bias systematic processing: Effects of source credibility, argument ambiguity, and task importance on attitude judgment. <i>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 66</i>, 460-473.</p>

7	10/14-10/16	Message and Source Effects	<p><b>Required:</b>  Tormala, Z.L., Clarkson, J.J. (2007). Assimilation and contrast in persuasion: The effects of source credibility in multiple message situations. <i>Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin</i>, 33, 559-571.  Rimer, B.K., &amp; Kreuter, M.W. (2006). Advancing tailored health communication: A persuasion and message effects perspective. <i>Journal of Communication</i>, 56, S184-S201.  Moyer-Gusé, E. (2008), Toward a Theory of Entertainment Persuasion: Explaining the Persuasive Effects of Entertainment-Education Messages. <i>Communication Theory</i>, 18: 407–425. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2885.2008.00328.x</p> <p><b>Supplemental:</b>  Slater, M.D., &amp; Rouner, D. (2002). Entertainment-Education and Elaboration-Likelihood: Understanding the Processing of Narrative Persuasion. <i>Communication Theory</i>, 12 (2), 173-191.  Smith, M.M., &amp; Smith, B.P. (2009). Race and gender as peripheral cues on political campaign web sites. <i>Communication Research Reports</i>, 26(4), 347-360.  Tormala, Z.L., Brinol, P., &amp; Petty, R.E. (2006). When credibility attacks: The reverse of source credibility on persuasion. <i>Journal of Experimental Social Psychology</i>, 42, 684-691.  Roskos-Ewoldsen, D. R., Bichsel, J., &amp; Hoffman, K. (2002). The Influence of Accessibility of Source Likability on Persuasion. <i>Journal of Experimental Social Psychology</i>, 38(2), 137-143. doi: 10.1006/jesp.2001.1492</p>
8	10/21-10/23	Fear appeals and persuasion	<p><b>Required:</b>  Witte, K., &amp; Allen, M. (2000). A meta-analysis of fear appeals: Implications for public health campaigns. <i>Health Education and Behavior</i>, 27, 591-615.  Muthusamy, N., Levine, T. R., &amp; Weber, R. (2009). Scaring the Already Scared: Some Problems With HIV/AIDS Fear Appeals in Namibia. <i>Journal Of Communication</i>, 59(2), 317-344. doi:10.1111/j.1460-2466.2009.01418.x  Shehryar, O., &amp; Hunt, D. M. (2005). A Terror Management Perspective on the Persuasiveness of Fear Appeals. <i>Journal of Consumer Psychology</i>, 15(4), 275-287. doi: 10.1207/s15327663jcp1504_2</p> <p><b>Supplemental:</b>  Roskos-Ewoldsen, D. R., Yu, H. J., &amp; Rhodes, N. (2004). Fear appeal messages affect accessibility of attitudes toward the threat and adaptive behaviors. <i>Communication Monographs</i>, 71, 49-69.  Nabi, R. L., Roskos-Ewoldsen, D., &amp; Carpentier, F. (2008). Subjective Knowledge and Fear Appeal Effectiveness: Implications for Message Design. <i>Health Communication</i>, 23(2), 191-201. doi:10.1080/10410230701808327  Cho, H., &amp; Witte, K. (2005). Managing fear in public health campaigns: A theory-based formative evaluation process. <i>Health Promotion Practice</i>, 6, 482-490  Lang, A., Chung, Y., Lee, S., Schwartz, N., &amp; Shin, M. (2005). It's an arousing, fast-paced kind of world: The effects of age and sensation seeking on the information processing of substance-abuse PSAs. <i>Media Psychology</i>, 7(4), 421-454. doi: 10.1207/s1532785xmep0704_6</p>

9	10/28-10/30	Resistance to persuasion	<p><b>Required:</b>  Tormala, Z.L. &amp; Petty, R.E. (2002). What Doesn't Kill Me Makes Me Stronger: The effects of resisting persuasion on attitude certainty. <i>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</i>, Vol. 83, No. 6, 1298-1313.  Rains, S. A. (2013). The Nature of Psychological Reactance Revisited: A Meta-Analytic Review. <i>Human Communication Research</i>, 39(1), 47-73. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2958.2012.01443.x  Compton, J., &amp; Ivanov, B. (2012). Untangling threat during inoculation-conferred resistance to influence. <i>Communication Reports</i>, 25(1), 1-13.</p> <p><b>Supplemental:</b>  Jenkins, M., &amp; Dragojevic, M. (2011). Explaining the process of resistance to persuasion: A politeness theory based approach. <i>Communication Research</i>.  Wheeler, S.C., Brinol, P., Hermann, A.D. (2007). Resistance to persuasion as self-regulation: Ego-depletion and its effects on attitude change process. <i>Journal of Experimental Social Psychology</i>, 43, 150-156.  Pfau, Compton, Parker, Wittenberg, An, Ferguson, Horton, &amp; Malyshev (2004). "The traditional explanation for resistance...and an alternative rationale based on attitude accessibility." <i>Human Communication Research</i>.</p>
10	11/4-11/6	Social Influence	<p><b>Required:</b>  Schultz, P. Wesley, Nolan, Jessica M., Cialdini, Robert B., Goldstein, Noah J., &amp; Giskevicius, Vladas. (2007). The Constructive, Destructive, and Reconstructive Power of Social Norms. <i>Psychological Science</i>, 18(5), 429-434. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9280.2007.01917.x  Park, H., Klein, K. A., Smith, S., &amp; Martell, D. (2009). Separating Subjective Norms, University Descriptive and Injunctive Norms, and U.S. Descriptive and Injunctive Norms for Drinking Behavior Intentions. <i>Health Communication</i>, 24(8), 746-751. doi:10.1080/10410230903265912  Hogg, M. A., &amp; Reid, S. A. (2006). Social identity, self-categorization, and the communication of group norms. <i>Communication Theory</i>, 16, 7-30.  Lecat, B., Hilton, D. J., &amp; Crano, W. D. (2009). Group status and reciprocity norms: Can the door-in-the-face effect be obtained in an out-group context? <i>Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice</i>, 13, 178-189.</p> <p><b>Supplemental:</b>  Cialdini, R. B. (2009). <i>Influence: Science and practice (5<sup>th</sup> edition)</i>. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn &amp; Bacon.  Simons-Morton, B. G., &amp; Farhat, T. (2010). Recent findings on peer group influences on adolescent smoking. <i>The Journal of Primary Prevention</i>, 31, 191-208.  Strohmetz, D.B., Rind, B., Fisher, R., &amp; Lynn, M. (2002). Sweetening the till: The use of candy to increase restaurant tipping. <i>Journal of Applied Social Psychology</i>, 32, 300-309.  Boster, F. J. &amp; Mitchell, M. M. (1999). The impact of guilt and type of compliance-gaining message on compliance. <i>Communication Monographs</i>, 66, 168-178.</p>



11	11/11-11/13 AND 11/18-11/20	NO CLASS 11/11 (Veteran's Day) Norm Accessibility and the process of normative influence NO CLASS 11/20 (NCA)	Reaction paper due on Wednesday 11/12 No reaction paper due 11/11 or 11/17 <b>Required:</b> Rhodes, N., & Ewoldsen, D. R. (2009). Attitude and norm accessibility and cigarette smoking. <i>Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 39(10)</i> , 2355-2372. (Impact factor: 0.72) Rhodes, N., Roskos-Ewoldsen, D. R., Edison, A., & Bradford, M. B. (2008). Attitude and norm accessibility affect processing of antismoking messages. <i>Health Psychology, 27</i> , S224-S232. Yoshida, E., Peach, J. M., Zanna, M. P., & Spencer, S. J. (2012). Not all automatic associations are created equal: How implicit normative evaluations are distinct from implicit attitudes and uniquely predict meaningful behavior. <i>Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 48</i> , 694-706 <b>Supplemental:</b> Rhodes, N., Ewoldsen, D. R., Shen, L.J., Monahan, J.L. & Eno, C. (2014). The Accessibility of Family and Peer Norms in Young Adolescent Risk Behavior. <i>Communication Research, 41</i> , 3-26. MacDonald, G., & Leary, M. (2005). Why does social exclusion hurt? The relationship between social and physical pain. <i>Psychological Bulletin, 131</i> , 202-233. Krcmar, M., Giles, S., Helme, D. (2008). Understanding the process: How mediated and peer norms affect young women's body esteem. <i>Communication Quarterly, 56(2)</i> , 111-130.
12 and 13	11/25 - 11/27	Ethics, coercion, and obedience NO CLASS 11/27 (Thanksgiving)	<b>No reaction paper this week</b> <b>Required:</b> Sher, S. (2011). A framework for assessing immorally manipulative marketing tactics. <i>Journal of Business Ethics, 102(1)</i> , 97-118. doi: <a href="http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10551-011-0802-4">http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10551-011-0802-4</a> Kassin, S., & Kiechel, K. (1996). The social psychology of false confessions: Compliance, internalization, and confabulation. <i>Psychological Science, 7</i> , 125-128. Baumrind, D. (1964). Some thoughts on ethics of research: After reading Milgram's "behavioral study of obedience." <i>American Psychologist, 19</i> , 421-423. Milgram, S. (1964). Issues in the study of obedience: A reply to Baumrind. <i>American Psychologist, 19</i> , 848-852. <b>Supplemental:</b> Burger, J. (2009). Replicating Milgram: Would people still obey today? <i>American Psychologist, 64</i> , 1-11.
14	12/2 12/4 12/9	Presentations	Upload PowerPoints to Carmen prior to presentation
15	12/16 2:00p m	Scheduled final	Papers due