

# MMC 6476 – Understanding Audiences:

## *Message Design*

Course Syllabus • Class #26814 • Spring 2026

---

### Professor

**Bob Ivanov**

Weimer Hall 2022  
bobiivanov@ufl.edu  
phone number:  
352.392.0943

**Office Hours:**

T 11:00 am – 12:50 pm

**Virtual Hours:**

by appointment  
<https://ufl.zoom.us/my/bobiivanov>

---

---

### Course Information

**Where**

WEIM 1092

**When**

T 12:50 – 3:50 PM

**Prerequisites****Course Description**

While in the daily world of “on the fly” interpersonal communication, we have only so much ability to craft what we say and how we say it, when we craft persuasive messages for promotions, interventions, and campaigns, we have much, much, much more control. This seminar will consider approaches to constructing persuasive messages through an intensive examination of the literature investigating the structure, format, content, and function/effect of messages.

**Student Learning Outcomes**

*After completing this course, more specifically, the student will be able to:*

1. Students will become familiar with the conceptual definitions of message “elements” (structure, format, content).
2. Students will become familiar with the outcome variables of interest (function/effect) in message design research.
3. Students will be aware of other communication elements (source, channel, receiver, noise) operative in message design research and how they are considered in research designs.
4. Students will be introduced to the theoretical and methodological approaches used to study message design, processing, and effects.
5. Students will become familiar with the major issues in message design research and develop a good sense of how various approaches either advance or impede scholarly work in this area.
6. Students will learn to recognize effective messages and areas for correction.
7. Students will practice developing effective persuasive messages.

---

## Course Tools, Materials, Supplies Fees, and Communication

### Required Readings

- No required textbook for the class.

### Other Required Materials and Supplies Fees

- Supplemental readings: Will be provided on Canvas to students
- There are no additional fees for this course.

### Communication

- Most communication will occur via Canvas Announcements and/or e-mail. Please use school-designated e-mail as the faculty cannot share sensitive information to a non-student-issued university e-mail. Students can also call the faculty member(s) to talk directly or leave a message.

---

## Grading & Assignments

### ***Persuasive Message Selection and Evaluation (Six [6] Bi-Weekly Assignments Starting Week 2)***

After completing the readings for the upcoming week, each student will be responsible for selecting a promotional message that features **at least one message element** consistent with our course discussion for the upcoming week. This message can take: (1) any form (e.g., visual, textual, etc.), (2) be transmitted via traditional (e.g., print, video, audio) or contemporary (e.g., social media platforms such as Instagram, X, etc.) means, (3) and appear in the context of the student's interest (e.g., political advertisement, product commercial, organizational press release, campaign speech, health promotion flyer, etc.). The promotional message should not be longer than 1,000 words. If a speech or a long press release is selected, for example, please reduce the message to no more than the prescribed length by removing less relevant portions of the message.

After the message is selected, the student will provide an accompanying word document that will describe what message element(s) is/are featured in the message and whether, based on the readings for that week, this/these element(s) was/were appropriately executed. The discussion will focus on why the student believes that, based on the readings, the message element(s) was/were used appropriately, thus maximizing the message effectiveness. Conversely, if the student does not believe that the message used the message element(s) appropriately or did not maximize its (or some of their) efficacy, the student should discuss why that is the case and how can the message be augmented to maximize the efficacy of the aforementioned element(s) in the message.

For these bi-weekly assignments, half of the students will be assigned to have their assignments completed for the readings to take place in Weeks 2, 4, 6, 8, 11, and 13. The other half will be assigned to complete their work for the readings to take place in Weeks 3, 5, 7, 9, 12, 14. All submission will take place in Canvas and will be labeled as *(Persuasive Message Selection and Evaluation Assignment)* **Selection 1-6**.

### ***Message Design (Five [5] Bi-Weekly Assignments Starting with Week 4)***

Students will design a promotional message in the context of their choosing for the topic, brand, issue, etc. for which they are most passionate. They may choose to write a persuasive message to promote a product, service, social cause, health behavior, political candidate, organizational stewardship (i.e., as in corporate advertising), etc. The message should be between 500 and 1,000 words as demonstrated in the persuasive message exemplar (664 words) contained in the **Message Appendix** placed at the end of this syllabus.

The first assignment should provide a baseline message the student will use to work on in the rest of the assignments. More specifically, each week the next assignment is due, the student will **improve the original baseline message** by incorporating some of the message elements (or relevant information) **covered in the previous week** and/or about to be **covered in the upcoming week**.

The first step in the assignment is for the students to properly (1) identify the primary target audience for the message, (2) the method of message delivery (e.g., audio, visual, etc.), (3) platform, (4) level of motivation the audience members would have to engage with the message (e.g., how much do they care about the issue/product to engage with the message content), and (5), opportunity/ability to engage with the message (e.g., is there noise that may distract them from the message, do they need prior technical knowledge to comprehend the message, etc.). This should be clearly stated before the message is displayed in the word document.

The second step is the message construction, which should range between 500 and 1,000 words. Please keep the length in mind as the platform you choose, the delivery method, etc., need to be consistent with a message that features such length (e.g., it does not make sense, I suppose, that such a lengthy message would be displayed using TikTok).

The third step is not relevant for the baseline message, but it is with each subsequent message, as the student will need to clearly show the changes from the baseline message. This can be done by using the tracking option in word, using comment boxes to show where and how the wording changes, and/or using yellow highlight that shows the differences between the two messages side by side. Any of these methods are acceptable for as long as they are clear. If a student is unsure about the best approach to take or if there is a concern whether the approach taken is appropriate, the student is encouraged to confer with the instructor ahead of submission.

For these bi-weekly assignments, half of the students will be assigned to have their assignments completed for the readings to take place in Weeks 4, 6, 8, 13, and 15. The other half will be assigned to complete their work for the readings to take place in Weeks 5, 7, 9, 12, 14. The **Message Design** assignments will be due on opposite weeks from the **Persuasive Message Selection and Evaluation** assignments. All submission will take place in Canvas and will be labeled as (Message Design Assignments) **Design 1-5**.

### **Discussion Leading (Two [2] Opportunities Starting with Week 2)**

Whereas all students are required to read and be prepared to discuss all of the reading assignments each week, all students will be assigned to two weeks for which they will act as discussion leaders. Any given week a student will not be assigned to more than one reading, to ensure that no student is overwhelmed by the assignment. The discussion should address the major issues/points made in the assigned reading, should be responsive to questions asked by classmates and instructor, and should attempt to synthesize related ideas across readings (within and between topics, as applicable). Note: the instructor is quite willing to meet with discussion leaders before class to answer questions, provide advice, and otherwise help to work out specific approaches to discussion leading (e.g., to use or not use visual aids [such as PPT], have handouts, etc.).

### **Class Participation (Starting with Week 2)**

Because good discussion is **so important** to the success of this course, the instructor expects everyone to participate wholeheartedly. Participation will be recorded every course period starting with Week 2. A single point of participation during class or within a specific segment of the class (e.g., first 30 minutes of a 150+ minute class) is not sufficient.

### **Grades**

Final grade breakdown:

Participation.....	100 points
Discussion Leading (2X).....	100 points [50 points each]
Persuasive Message Selection and Evolution (6X).....	300 points [50 points each]
Message Design (5X).....	500 points [50 points each]

*Total: 1,000 points*

University of Florida

# MMC 6476 – Understanding Audiences:

## *Message Design*

Course Syllabus • Class #26814 • Spring 2026

Grading Scale	Grade	Grade Points
93.4 – 100.0	A	4.00
90.0 – 93.3	A-	3.67
86.7 – 89.9	B+	3.33
83.4 – 86.6	B	3.00
80.0 – 83.3	B-	2.67
76.7 – 79.9	C+	2.33
73.4 – 76.6	C	2.00
70.0 – 73.3	C-	1.67
66.7 – 66.9	D+	1.33
63.4 – 66.6	D	1.00
60.0 – 63.3	D-	0.67
0.0 – 59.9	E	0.00

More information on grades and grading policies is here:

<https://catalog.ufl.edu/UGRD/academic-regulations/grades-grading-policies/>

---

### Class Attendance, Preparation, Demeanor, Late Work, Make-Up, and AI Policy

It is challenging to do well in this class if one does not attend regularly. Students are expected to arrive for class on time and behave in a manner that is respectful to the instructor and to fellow students. Opinions held by other students should be respected in discussion, and conversations that do not contribute to the discussion should be held to a minimum, if at all.

Should an issue arise, which may conflict with this policy, one should contact the faculty before class as soon as possible. This is a graduate course and attendance is expected. **A more than one (1) unexcused absence will lead to a letter grade deduction.** Absences should be cleared with the instructor of record. Repeated absences, even when excused, can negatively impact course performance, thus it is strongly recommended that a student missing one or multiple classes communicates clearly with the instructor so that alternative solutions may be explored to minimize absences.

Students are expected to **complete reading assignments prior to class** so that a robust discussion of the topics, clarifications, and exercises can take place during classes.

Make-up assignment opportunities will be provided for excused absences, where warranted. Students who miss assignments are encouraged to get in touch with the instructor to schedule the assignment make up work. Late, unexcused work will receive a 20% deduction for each day [including holiday and weekends days] the assignment is late, unless alternative prior arrangements have been made with the instructor (or if not possible to make prior to the exam/assignment, as soon as possible).

Requirements for class attendance and make-up exams, assignments, and other work in this course are consistent with university policies that can be found at:

<https://catalog.ufl.edu/UGRD/academic-regulations/attendance-policies/>

**Enlisting the help of Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools to assist with any assignment in this course is strictly prohibited and such usage will be considered as a violation of the University Honesty Policy. A failure to adhere to this policy will result in course sanctions ranging from a failing grade on the assignment for a first offence to failing the course for repeated offenses.** This course is focused on

learning and practicing critical thinking and writing skills, which can only be accomplished when students are fully responsible for their own work.

---

## Student Accommodations

Students with disabilities who experience learning barriers and would like to request academic accommodation are encouraged to connect the [Disability Resource Center](#). It is important for students to share their accommodation letter with their instructor and discuss their access needs as early as possible in the semester.

---

## Course Evaluation

Students are expected to provide professional and respectful feedback on the quality of instruction in this course by completing course evaluations online via GatorEvals. Guidance on giving feedback professionally and respectfully is available at <https://gatorevals.aa.ufl.edu/students/>. Students will be notified when the evaluation period opens and can complete evaluations through the email they receive from GatorEvals, in their Canvas course menu under GatorEvals, or via <https://ufl.bluera.com/ufl/>. Summaries of course evaluation results are available to students at <https://gatorevals.aa.ufl.edu/public-results/>.

---

## University Honesty Policy

University of Florida students are bound by The Honor Pledge, which states, “We, the members of the University of Florida community, pledge to hold ourselves and our peers to the highest standards of honor and integrity by abiding by the Honor Code. On all work submitted for credit by students at the University of Florida, the following pledge is either required or implied: “On my honor, I have neither given nor received unauthorized aid in doing this assignment.” The Honor Code (<https://sccr.dso.ufl.edu/process/student-conductcode/>) specifies a number of behaviors that violate this code and the possible sanctions. Furthermore, students are obligated to report any condition that facilitates academic misconduct to appropriate personnel. If any questions or concerns remain, students are encouraged to contact their course instructors.

---

## In-Class Recording

Students are allowed to record video or audio of class lectures. However, the purposes for which these recordings may be used are strictly controlled. The only allowable purposes are (1) for personal educational use, (2) in connection with a complaint to the university, or (3) as evidence in, or in preparation for, a criminal or civil proceeding. All other purposes are prohibited. Specifically, students may not publish recorded lectures without the written consent of the instructor.

A “class lecture” is an educational presentation intended to inform or teach enrolled students about a particular subject, including any instructor-led discussions that form part of the presentation and delivered by any instructor hired or appointed by the University, or by a guest instructor, as part of a University of Florida course. A class lecture does not include lab sessions, student presentations, clinical presentations such as patient history, academic exercises involving solely student participation, assessments (quizzes, tests, exams), field trips, private conversations between students in the class, or between a student and the faculty or guest lecturer during a class session.

Publication without permission from the instructor is prohibited. To “publish” means to share, transmit, circulate, distribute, or provide access to a recording, regardless of format or medium, to another person (or persons), including but not limited to another student within the same class section. Additionally, a recording, or transcript of a recording, is considered published if it is posted on or uploaded to, in whole or in part, any media platform, including but not limited to social media, book, magazine, newspaper, leaflet, or third-party note/tutoring services. A student who publishes a recording without written consent may be

subject to a civil cause of action instituted by a person injured by the publication and/or discipline under UF Regulation 4.040 Student Honor Code and Student Conduct Code.

---

## Campus Resources

### Health and Wellness

*U Matter, We Care:* If you or someone you know is in distress, please contact [umatter@ufl.edu](mailto:umatter@ufl.edu), 352-392-1575, or visit U Matter, We Care [website](#) to refer or report a concern and a team member will reach out to the student in distress.

*Counseling and Wellness Center:* Visit the Counseling and Wellness Center [website](#) or call 352-392-1575 for information on crisis services as well as non-crisis services.

*Student Health Care Center:* Call 352-392-1161 for 24/7 information to help you find the care you need, or visit the Student Health Care Center [website](#).

*University Police Department:* Visit UF Police Department [website](#) or call 352-392-1111 (or 9-1-1 for emergencies).

*UF Health Shands Emergency Room / Trauma Center:* For immediate medical care call 352-733-0111 or go to the emergency room at 1515 SW Archer Road, Gainesville, FL 32608; Visit the UF Health Emergency Room and Trauma Center [website](#).

*GatorWell Health Promotion Services:* For prevention services focused on optimal wellbeing, including Wellness Coaching for Academic Success, visit the GatorWell [website](#) or call 352-273-4450.

### Academic Resources

*E-learning technical support:* Contact the UF Computing Help Desk at 352-392-4357 or via e-mail at [helpdesk@ufl.edu](mailto:helpdesk@ufl.edu).

*Career Connections Center:* Reitz Union Suite 1300, 352-392-1601. Career assistance and counseling services.

*Library Support:* Various ways to receive assistance with respect to using the libraries or finding resources.

*Teaching Center:* Broward Hall, 352-392-2010 or to make an appointment 352-392-6420. General study skills and tutoring.

*Writing Studio:* 2215 Turlington Hall, 352-846-1138. Help brainstorming, formatting, and writing papers.

*Student Complaints On-Campus:* Visit the Student Honor Code and Student Conduct Code [webpage](#) for more information.

*On-Line Students Complaints:* View the Distance Learning Student Complaint Process.

University of Florida

# MMC 6476 – Understanding Audiences:

## *Message Design*

Course Syllabus • Class #26814 • Spring 2026

### Tentative Day-to-Day Schedule

Week	Date	In Class	Due by 10:00 AM on Day of Class
1	01.13 / Tuesday	<b>Introductions: Instructor and Students</b>	
	01.13 / Tuesday	<b>Introductions: Course, Syllabus, Assignments, and Due Dates</b>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Persuasion Handbook (Chapter 2).</i></li> </ul>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Theory &amp; Research (Chapter 11).</i></li> </ul>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Persuasive Comm 3rd Edition (Chapter 10).</i></li> </ul>	
2	01.20 / Tuesday	<b>Communication Process: Sender (encoding) and Source (ethos)</b>	
	01.20 / Tuesday	<b>Communication Process: Channel (delivery/modality) and Noise (distraction)</b>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stiff &amp; Mongeau. <i>Persuasion (Chapter 5)</i></li> </ul>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pfau, M., Diedrich, T., Larson, K. M., &amp; Van Winkle, K. M. (1995). Influence of Communication Modalities on Voters' Perceptions of Candidates During Presidential Primary Campaigns. <i>Journal of Communication</i>, 45(1), 122–133. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1995.tb00718.x">https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1995.tb00718.x</a></li> </ul>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Chaiken, S., &amp; Eagly, A. H. (1983). Communication modality as a determinant of persuasion: The role of communicator salience. <i>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</i>, 45(2), 241–256. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.45.2.241">https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.45.2.241</a></li> </ul>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ivanov, B., Parker, K. A., &amp; Dillingham, L. L. (2018). Inoculation as a risk and health communication strategy in an evolving media environment. In H. D. O'Hair (Ed.), <i>Risk and Health Communication in an Evolving Media Environment</i> (pp. 249-277). New York City, NY: Routledge. <a href="https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315168821-13">https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315168821-13</a>.</li> </ul>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Buller, D. B. (1986). Distraction during persuasive communication: A meta-analytic review. <i>Communication Monographs</i>, 53(2), 91–114. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1080/03637758609376130">https://doi.org/10.1080/03637758609376130</a></li> </ul>	
3	01.27 / Tuesday	<b>Communication Process: Receiver (decoding/tailoring)</b>	
	01.27 / Tuesday	<b>Communication Process: Message Length (full/terse)</b>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stiff &amp; Mongeau. <i>Persuasion (Chapter 8)</i></li> </ul>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noar, S. M., Harrington, N. G., &amp; Aldrich, R. S. (2009). The Role of Message Tailoring in the Development of Persuasive Health Communication Messages. <i>Annals of the International Communication Association</i>, 33(1), 73–133. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1080/23808985.2009.11679085">https://doi.org/10.1080/23808985.2009.11679085</a></li> </ul>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dijkstra, A. (2016). Personalization/computer-tailoring in persuasive technology: Tailoring ingredients target psychological processes. In <i>International Workshop on Personalization in Persuasive Technology</i> (pp. 6-12). (CEUR Workshop Proceedings; Vol. 1582). CEUR Workshop Proceedings.</li> </ul>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sutton J., League C., Sellnow T.L., Sellnow D. D. Terse messaging and public health in the midst of natural disasters: the case of the Boulder floods. <i>Health Commun.</i> 2015;30(2):135-43. doi: 10.1080/10410236.2014.974124. PMID: 25470438.</li> </ul>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Geegan, S. A., Ivanov, B., &amp; Parker, K. A. (2023). Inoculating within character limits: Terse messages to promote Gen Z mental health. <i>The Journal of Communication and Media Studies</i>, 8(2), 65-86. <a href="https://doi.org/10.18848/2470-9247/CGP/v08i02/65-86">https://doi.org/10.18848/2470-9247/CGP/v08i02/65-86</a></li> </ul>	
4	02.03 / Tuesday	<b>Principles of Persuasion and Social Influence</b>	
	02.03 / Tuesday	<b>Message Processing: ELM and HSM</b>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Miller, G. R. (2013). On Being Persuaded. <i>The SAGE Handbook of Persuasion (Chapter 5).</i></li> </ul>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Booth-Butterfield, S., &amp; Welbourne, J. (2002). The Elaboration Likelihood Model. <i>The SAGE Handbook of Persuasion (Chapter 9).</i></li> </ul>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Todorov, A., Chaiken, S., &amp; Henderson, M. D. (2013). The Heuristic-Systematic Model of Social Information Processing. <i>The SAGE Handbook of Persuasion (Chapter 11).</i></li> </ul>	
5	02.10 / Tuesday	<b>Content: Arguments and</b>	
	02.10 / Tuesday	<b>Argument Structure</b>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Areni, C. S. (2003). The effects of structural and grammatical variables on persuasion: An elaboration likelihood model perspective. <i>Psychology &amp; Marketing</i>, 20(4), 349–375. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.10077">https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.10077</a></li> </ul>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>O'Keefe, D.J. (2012). The Argumentative Structure of Some Persuasive Appeal Variations. <i>Topical Themes in Argumentation Theory.</i></li> </ul>	



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Hoeken, H. (2017, January 25). Argument Quality and Strength in Health and Risk Messaging. <i>Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Communication</i>. Retrieved 10 Nov. 2025, from <a href="https://oxfordre.com/communication/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228613.001.0001/acrefore-9780190228613-e-298">https://oxfordre.com/communication/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228613.001.0001/acrefore-9780190228613-e-298</a>.</li></ul>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Obermaier, M., Koch, T. The paradox of argument strength: how weak arguments undermine the persuasive effects of strong arguments. <i>Sci Rep</i> 14, 22244 (2024). <a href="https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-024-73348-1">https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-024-73348-1</a></li></ul>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>*Siegel, H. Argument Quality and Cultural Difference. <i>Argumentation</i> 13, 183–201 (1999). <a href="https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1026466310894">https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1026466310894</a></li></ul>	
6	02.17 / Tuesday	Content: Message Sidedness	
	02.17 / Tuesday	Content: Matching/Mismatching Literature	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Allen, M. (1991). Meta-analysis comparing the persuasiveness of one-sided and two-sided messages. <i>Western Journal of Speech Communication</i>, 55(4), 390–404. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1080/10570319109374395">https://doi.org/10.1080/10570319109374395</a></li></ul>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Ivanov, B., Rains, S. A., Geegan, S. A., Vos, S. C., Haarstad, N. D., &amp; Parker, K. A. (2017). Beyond simple inoculation: Examining the persuasive value of inoculation for audiences with initially neutral or opposing attitudes. <i>Western Journal of Communication</i>, 81(1), 105–126. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1080/10570314.2016.1224917">https://doi.org/10.1080/10570314.2016.1224917</a></li></ul>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Kao DT. (2011) Message sidedness in advertising: the moderating roles of need for cognition and time pressure in persuasion. <i>Scand J Psychol</i>, 52(4): 329–340. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9450.2011.00882.x.</li></ul>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Edwards, K. (1990). The interplay of affect and cognition in attitude formation and change. <i>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</i>, 59(2), 202–216. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.59.2.202">https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.59.2.202</a></li></ul>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Petty, R. E., &amp; Wegener, D. T. (1998). Matching Versus Mismatching Attitude Functions: Implications for Scrutiny of Persuasive Messages. <i>Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin</i>, 24(3), 227–240. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167298243001">https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167298243001</a></li></ul>	
7	02.24 / Tuesday	Content: Evidence (logos)	
	02.24 / Tuesday	Content: Narratives	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><i>Persuasive Communication (Chapter 7).</i></li></ul>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><i>Persuasion Handbook (Chapter 22).</i></li></ul>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Hoeken, H. (2001). Anecdotal, statistical, and causal evidence. Their perceived and actual persuasiveness. <i>Argumentation</i>, 15(4), 425–437.</li></ul>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><i>Persuasion Handbook (Chapter 13).</i></li></ul>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Allen, M., Bruflat, R., Fucilla, R., Kramer, M., McKellips, S., Ryan, D. J., &amp; Spiegelhoff, M. (2000). Testing the persuasiveness of evidence: Combining narrative and statistical forms. <i>Communication Research Reports</i>, 17(4), 331–336. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1080/08824090009388781">https://doi.org/10.1080/08824090009388781</a></li></ul>	
8	03.03 / Tuesday	Content: Emotion (pathos) – Fear and the EPPM	
	03.03 / Tuesday	Content: Emotion (pathos) – Anger, Guilt, and other emotions	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><i>Persuasion Handbook (Chapter 15).</i></li></ul>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><i>Persuasion Handbook (Chapter 12).</i></li></ul>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><i>Persuasion Handbook (Chapter 17).</i></li></ul>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Leshner, G., Bolls, P., &amp; Wise, K. (2011). Motivating processing of fear appeal and disgust images in televised anti-tobacco ads. <i>Journal of Media Psychology</i>, 23(2), 77–89.</li></ul>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Turner, M. M., Richards, A. S., Bessarabova, E., Magid, Y. (2020). The effects of anger appeals on systematic processing and intentions: The moderating role of efficacy. <i>Communication Reports</i>, 33(1), 14–26.</li></ul>	
9	03.10 / Tuesday	Structure: Introduction and body paragraph (order, expectancy violation, lexical, and syntactic complexity)	
	03.10 / Tuesday	Structure: Conclusion (explicitness, call to action, restoration postscript)	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Averbeck, J. M., &amp; Miller, C. (2013). Expanding Language Expectancy Theory: The Suasory Effects of Lexical Complexity and Syntactic Complexity on Effective Message Design. <i>Communication Studies</i>, 65(1), 72–95. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1080/10510974.2013.775955">https://doi.org/10.1080/10510974.2013.775955</a></li></ul>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Sponberg, H. (1946). A study of the relative effectiveness of climax and anti-climax order in an argumentative speech*. <i>Speech Monographs</i>, 13(1), 35–44. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1080/03637754609374898">https://doi.org/10.1080/03637754609374898</a></li></ul>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>O’Keefe, D. J. (1997) Standpoint explicitness and persuasive effect: A meta-Analytic review of the effects of varying conclusion articulation in persuasive messages. <i>Argumentation and Advocacy</i>, 34(1), 1-12 DOI: 10.1080/00028533.1997.11978023</li></ul>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Chang, C. (2016). Behavioral Recommendations in Health Research News as Cues to Action: Self-Relevancy and Self-Efficacy Processes. <i>Journal of Health Communication</i>, 21(8), 954–968. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1080/10810730.2016.1204377">https://doi.org/10.1080/10810730.2016.1204377</a></li></ul>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Bessarabova, E., Miller, C. H., &amp; Russell, J. (2016). A Further Exploration of the Effects of Restoration Postscripts on Reactance. <i>Western Journal of Communication</i>, 81(3), 385–403. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1080/10570314.2016.1254815">https://doi.org/10.1080/10570314.2016.1254815</a></li></ul>	



10	03.17 / Tuesday	Spring Break	
	03.17 / Tuesday	***NO CLASS***	
11	03.24 / Tuesday	Style: Language (intensity, controllingness, powerful/powerless)	
	03.24 / Tuesday	Style: Figurative Language (metaphors, rhetoric, irony, and sarcasm)	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Persuasion Handbook (Chapter 19).</i></li> </ul>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Claude H. Miller, Lindsay T. Lane, Leslie M. Deatrck, Alice M. Young, Kimberly A. Potts, Psychological Reactance and Promotional Health Messages: The Effects of Controlling Language, Lexical Concreteness, and the Restoration of Freedom, <i>Human Communication Research</i>, Volume 33, Issue 2, 1 April 2007, Pages 219–240, <a href="https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.2007.00297.x">https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.2007.00297.x</a></li> </ul>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Persuasion Handbook (Chapter 21).</i></li> </ul>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The Role of Rhetorical Questions in Persuasion – Roskos-Ewoldsen (2003)</i></li> </ul>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lugerwerf, L. (2007). Irony and sarcasm in advertising: Effects of relevant inappropriateness. <i>Journal of Pragmatics</i>, 39(10). 1702-1721. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2007.05.002">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2007.05.002</a></li> </ul>	
12	03.31 / Tuesday	Style: Visual Messages (message sensation value)	
	03.31 / Tuesday	Style: Textual Messages and Style (coherence markers)	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Zhang J, Wang Y, Wanta W, Zheng Q, Wang X. Reactions to geographic data visualization of infectious disease outbreaks: an experiment on the effectiveness of data presentation format and past occurrence information. <i>Public Health</i>. 2022;106-112. doi: 10.1016/j.puhe.2021.11.011.</li> </ul>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noar, S. M., Hall, M. G., Francis, D. B., Ribisl, K. M., Pepper, J. K., &amp; Brewer, N. T. (2016). Pictorial cigarette pack warnings: A meta-analysis of experimental studies. <i>Tobacco Control</i>, 25(3), 341-354.</li> </ul>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Morgan, S.E., Palmgreen, P., Stephenson, M.T., Hoyle, R.H. and Lorch, E.P. (2003), Associations Between Message Features and Subjective Evaluations of the Sensation Value of Antidrug Public Service Announcements. <i>Journal of Communication</i>, 53: 512-526. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2003.tb02605.x">https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2003.tb02605.x</a></li> </ul>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wang, Z., Vang, M., Lookadoo, K., Tchernev, J. M., &amp; Cooper, C. (2015). engaging high-sensation seekers: The dynamic interplay of sensation seeking, message visual-auditory complexity and arousing content. <i>Journal of Communication</i>, 65(1), 101-124.</li> </ul>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Kamalski, J., Lentz, L., Sanders, T., &amp; Zwaan, R. A. (2008). The forewarning effect of coherence markers in persuasive discourse: Evidence from persuasion and processing. <i>Discourse Processes</i>, 45(6), 545–579. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1080/01638530802069983">https://doi.org/10.1080/01638530802069983</a></li> </ul>	
13	04.07 / Tuesday	Style: Framing (prospect theory)	
	04.07 / Tuesday	Style: Framing (gain/loss, positive/negative, promotion/prevention)	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Salovey, P., Schneider, T. R., &amp; Apanovitch, A. M. (2002). Message framing in the prevention and early detection of illness. In J. P. Dillard &amp; M. Pfau (Eds.), <i>The persuasion handbook: Developments in theory and practice</i> (pp. 391-406). SAGE.</li> </ul>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detweiler, J. B., Bedell, B. T., Salovey, P., Pronin, E., &amp; Rothman, A. J. (1999). Message framing and sunscreen use: Gain-framed messages motivate beach-goers. <i>Health Psychology</i>, 18(2), 189-196.</li> </ul>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>de Bruijn, G-J., Spaans, P., Jansen, B., &amp; van 't Riet, J. (2016). Testing the effects of a message framing intervention on intentions towards hearing loss prevention in adolescents. <i>Health Education Research</i>, 31(2), 161-170.</li> </ul>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Van 't Riet, J., Cox, A. D., Cox, D., Zimet, G. D., De Bruijn, G-J., Van den Putte, B., De Vries, H., Werrij, M. Q., &amp; Ruiter, R. A. C. (2014). Does perceived risk influence the effects of message framing? A new investigation of a widely held notion. <i>Psychology and Health</i>, 29(8), 933-949.</li> </ul>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Harrington, N. G., &amp; Kerr, A. M. (2017). Rethinking risk: Prospect theory application in health message design. <i>Health Communication</i>, 32(2), 131-141.</li> </ul>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nan, X., Daily, K., &amp; Qin, Y. (2018). Relative persuasiveness of gain- vs. loss-framed messages: A review of theoretical perspectives and developing an integrative framework. <i>Review of Communication</i>, 18(4), 370-390.</li> </ul>	
14	04.14 / Tuesday	Resistance (maintenance) vs. Persuasion (change, initiation)	
	04.14 / Tuesday	Revisiting message effects from resistance perspective (forewarning, refutational preemption, source derogation, reactance)	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Handbook of Inoculation Theory and Practice (Chapter 16).</i></li> </ul>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Handbook of Inoculation Theory and Practice (Chapter 8).</i></li> </ul>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Handbook of Inoculation Theory and Practice (Chapter 9).</i></li> </ul>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Handbook of Inoculation Theory and Practice (Chapter 10).</i></li> </ul>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Persuasion Handbook (Chapter 11).</i></li> </ul>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Miller, C. H., Ivanov, B., Sims, J. D., Compton, J., Harrison, K. J., Parker, K. A., Parker, J. L., &amp; Averbeck, J. A. (2013). Boosting the potency of resistance: Combining the motivational forces of inoculation and psychological reactance. <i>Human Communication Research</i>, 39(1), 127-155. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.2012.01438.x">https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.2012.01438.x</a></li> </ul>	
15	04.21 / Tuesday	Reflections	
	04.21 / Tuesday	Conclusion	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>O'Keefe, D. J., &amp; Hoeken, H. (2021). Message Design Choices Don't Make Much Difference to Persuasiveness and Can't Be Counted On—Not Even When Moderating Conditions Are Specified. <i>Frontiers in Psychology</i>, 12, Article 664160. <a href="https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.664160">https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.664160</a></li> </ul>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cappella, Joseph &amp; Li, Yue. (2023). Principles of Effective Message Design: A Review and Model of Content and Format Features. <i>Asian Communication Research</i>. 20. 1-1. 10.20879/acr.2023.20.023.</li> </ul>	
16	04.29/ Wed.	<b>**FINALS WEEK**</b>	
	04.29 / Wed.	<b>NO CLASS</b>	
<p><i>Note:</i> This timeline is subject to change. Meaning, <u>this is all tentative</u>. If changes are made, you will be notified and given an appropriate amount of time to complete any assignments.</p>			

## Message Appendix

### "The Dirty Truth About Recycling: Why It's Not the Eco-Friendly Solution You Think It Is"

Op-ed by: Jamie Felton

We are constantly bombarded with messages about how recycling can save the planet and reduce waste. But the truth is, recycling may actually be doing more harm than good. Not only does it consume an enormous amount of energy and resources to process and transport, it does little to actually benefit the environment. Additionally, it can also lead to a false sense of security, allowing us to ignore the bigger, more pressing environmental issues at hand. So, let's take a closer look at why recycling may not be the eco-friendly solution we've been led to believe.

One of the biggest problems with recycling is that it requires a significant amount of energy to process and transport. This means that the environmental benefits of recycling are often outweighed by the energy consumption needed to make it happen. In fact, some studies have shown that recycling can actually have a higher carbon footprint than simply throwing something away.

Many products contain a mix of materials, some of which are recyclable and others that are not. This means that people often end up throwing away items that could have been recycled, or they try to recycle items that are not recyclable, which can lead to contamination in the recycling stream.

Despite the best efforts of consumers to recycle, the reality is that a significant portion of recycled materials are not actually recycled. In fact, it is estimated that only around 9% of all plastic ever produced has been recycled. This is due in part to the fact that the recycling process is complex and often fraught with challenges. For example, different types of plastics require different processes to be recycled, and contaminants such as food residue or incorrect sorting can render a batch of recyclable materials unusable.

Furthermore, the market for recycled materials is highly volatile and dependent on factors such as global supply and demand, the price of oil, and the availability of cheaper virgin materials. This means that even if you diligently sort your recyclables and place them in the bin, there is no guarantee that they will actually be recycled. In fact, many recycling facilities have been forced to stockpile recyclables or even send them to landfill due to a lack of demand or marketability.

Recycling is not only an inefficient use of energy, but it is also an expensive process. Recycling facilities require a significant amount of capital investment and ongoing operational expenses, such as maintenance and labor costs. Additionally, the cost of recycling has only continued to rise as countries, like China, have imposed stricter regulations on the quality of recyclable materials they are willing to accept. This has resulted in a backlog of recyclable materials that are sitting in warehouses, waiting for a buyer or ultimately ending up in the landfill. Municipalities often spend millions of dollars each year on recycling programs, including collection, processing, and transportation. These costs are ultimately passed on to taxpayers or consumers, which means that we are paying more for a service that does little to address our waste problem and benefit the environment.

Recycling can also create a false sense of security. When people believe that they are doing their part for the environment by recycling, they may feel less motivated to make other, more significant changes in their lives. For example, they may continue to drive a gas-guzzling car or consume energy in wasteful ways, believing that they are offsetting their environmental impact by recycling. Recycling can distract us from the larger changes that are necessary to reduce our overall impact on the environment.

While it may seem like a simple solution to the problem of waste, it is actually a complex and energy-intensive process that does little to benefit the environment. So what's the solution? Instead of relying on recycling, we should be focusing on reducing our consumption and investing in more sustainable solutions.