

**SPRING 2012**  
**SEMINAR IN HEALTH COMMUNICATION CAMPAIGNS**  
**CJT 775**  
**THURSDAY, 1:00-3:30**

**Instructor:** Philip Palmgreen  
246 Grehan Building  
257-7801  
[palmgreen@uky.edu](mailto:palmgreen@uky.edu)

**Office Hours:** T&R 9-11 or by appointment.

This seminar will be devoted to the role of the mass media in contemporary public health campaigns, with a focus on the application of theory and research to campaign design. Research indicates that media campaigns can be effective in changing attitudes and behavior regarding smoking, drug use, safer sex, heart disease, nutrition, and other health-related topics.

In this seminar we will review various theories/approaches concerning social marketing, targeting, social modeling, persuasion, message design, and campaign message exposure. We will also conduct an overview of studies of campaign effects, and engage in a detailed examination of specific techniques for modern campaigns. Particular attention will be devoted to a number of successful (and some unsuccessful) campaigns concerned with a great variety of health issues in this and other countries.

One especially noteworthy campaign is the Office of National Drug Control Policy's (ONDCP) National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign, an ongoing \$2 billion effort launched in July, 1998. This campaign represents the largest federally funded health communication campaign in history, and will be examined in some detail. The instructor served on a scientific overview panel for this campaign for several years.

Finally, we will examine the evolving use of new digital communication technologies in health communication interventions and consider the implications of these new technologies for the design of future health communication campaigns.

The instructor has served as principal or co-principal investigator on a number of research projects sponsored by the National Institute on Drug Abuse and the National Institute of Mental Health over the last twenty years. These projects have focused on increasing the effectiveness of televised anti-drug or safer sex messages in health communication campaigns. One project involved a two-city field experiment and time-series evaluation of the impact of televised PSA campaigns on use of marijuana by at-risk adolescents. Another multi-year study examined the impact of particular message platforms of the ONDCP campaign on adolescent use of marijuana. A recent field experiment sponsored by NIMH investigated the effects of safer sex campaigns on at-risk young adults in two matched cities. A current NIMH study involves campaigns to delay sexual initiation among adolescents. These studies will be used to illustrate principles of campaign design and evaluation.

**TEXT:** Hornik, R.C. (Ed.), (2002) *Public Health Communication: Evidence for Behavior Change*, Mahwah, NJ:LEA/Routledge.

## **OTHER READINGS:**

A “packet” of additional readings is available on the course website. Go to: <http://www.uky.edu/~pcpalm1>. Click on “CJT 775 Course Page.” *User name* is CJT775 (no spaces, all caps). *Password* is: campaigns (all lower case). Click on “Course Packet.” Then click on the title of the reading to bring up the appropriate PDF. Six readings are from Rice and Atkin, *Public Communication Campaigns*. These are grouped in a single PDF in the course packet and are indicated in the weekly reading lists as “R&A”.

## **DISCUSSION:**

A seminar format will be followed for the most part in which all are expected to engage in thoughtful and critical discussion of the major ideas, theories, and positions advanced in the readings. Everyone should come to class each week with a number of observations and insights to share. I will have my own observations to make and at times these will need to be lengthy for pedagogical purposes. I will also make a few presentations. There will be plenty of time, however, for you to contribute your own thoughts on the issues. Your contributions to class discussion will account for *15% of your grade*.

## **PAPERS:**

Quality of ideas, reasoning, and writing will be major criteria in grading the writing assignments. Papers should be double-spaced, *one-inch margins all around*, no larger than 12-pt. font. *Use APA or a medical journal style and include appropriate references*. Grades on the two major paper assignments will be reduced one portion of a letter grade (see **GRADING**) for each day the paper is late.

**Critical/Creative Paper (12 pages)** --This paper *will be due on 3-22-12*. In it you are asked to critically discuss **one or a combination** of the following: the application of particular theories or models, targeting strategies, campaign design principles, or evaluation strategies in health communication campaign efforts. You may want to treat campaigns in general, or focus on one particular *type* of campaign (e.g., smoking, breast cancer, heart disease, etc.). Although this is not necessary, you might also choose to present original, creative ideas, concepts, approaches, or theoretical formulations related to the design of effective health campaigns. *Your topic should be approved by me at least 2 weeks in advance of the due date. This paper counts 40% of your course grade.*

**Final Paper—Designing Health Communication Campaigns for the Next Decade (15 pages)**-- Taking into account what you will have learned in the course about the characteristics of effective campaigns, and considering the ever-evolving structure and use of traditional and new media in such interventions, discuss your recommendations for the design and implementation of large-scale health communication campaigns over the next decade. As in your critical/creative paper, you may focus on campaigns in general or limit yourself to a particular type of campaign (smoking, drug use, heart disease, etc.). In your paper be sure to discuss your recommendations for the mix of traditional and new media. In other words, this should *not* only be about campaigns which use new communications technology (eHealth). I want you also to consider how *traditional media* should be incorporated (they are not going away soon). Support any recommendations in the paper with appropriate references. *This counts 45% of your course grade and is due 4-30-12.*

## **GRADING:**

All assignments (including class discussions) will receive a letter grade ranging from A+ to E- (hopefully the latter grade will not have to be employed!). The number of points you earn on a particular assignment/portion of the course can be calculated by multiplying the number of points for a particular grade (see table below) by the weighting of that assignment.

<u>Letter Grade</u>	<u>Points</u>	<u>Letter Grade</u>	<u>Points</u>
A+	140	C-	60
A	130	D+	50
A-	120	D	40
B+	110	D-	30
B	100	E+	20
B-	90	E	10
C+	80	E-	0
C	70		

If, for example, you make a “B” on the critical/creative paper (which counts 40% of your grade), you have earned  $(100 \times .40) = 40$  points toward your final total. A total of 120 points is required to earn an “A” in the course, 90 points for a “B”, and 60 points for a “C”. Because “D” grades are not awarded to graduate students as a final grade, below 60 points is an “E”. Please humor me on this grading system. It has worked well in allowing me to blend assignments of different natures and weightings while giving you a letter grade on each assignment. The latter allows you to get an on-going sense of my grading criteria vis-a-vis the kind of final course letter grade you might expect.

## **CLASS POLICIES:**

**Attendance:** Attendance is required, of course, in a seminar which meets only once a week. Each unexcused absence will result in a reduction in your final course grade of one portion of a letter grade (e.g., from A- to B+).

**Cell Phones and Texting:** Please turn off your ringers and please, no texting.

**Cheating and Plagiarism:** Cheating and plagiarism continue to be significant problems on campus. There are serious sanctions for these offenses, which may include an “E” in the course or even suspension. For more detail than you ever wanted, go to:  
<http://www.uky.edu/StudentAffairs/Code/part2.html>. (Section VI, parts 6.3.0 to 6.6.0).

**CJT 775**  
**SPRING 2012**  
**READINGS**

*Background Readings: (Optional)*

1/12/12

1. Montano & Kasprzyk, “The theory of reasoned action and the theory of planned behavior” – packet
2. Janz et al., “The health belief model” – packet
3. Baranowski et al., “How individuals, environments, and health behavior interact: Social cognitive theory” – packet
4. Prochaska et al., “The transtheoretical model and stages of change” – packet
5. Gielen & McDonald, “Using the PRECEDE-PROCEED planning model” – packet
6. Glasgow, “Evaluation of theory-based interventions: The RE-AIM model” – packet

*Overview of Health Communication Campaigns*

1/19/12

1. Hornik, “Preface” to Hornik book, pp xi-xv.
2. Randolph & Viswanath, “Lessons learned from public health mass media campaigns”--packet
3. Hornik, “Public health communication: making sense of contradictory evidence.” – Hornik, pp 1-19
4. Abroms & Maibach, “The effectiveness of mass communication to change public behavior” –packet

*Approaches to Campaign Design and Evaluation*

1/26/12

1. Noar, “A 10-year retrospective of research in health mass media campaigns” – packet
2. Snyder & Hamilton, “A meta-analysis of U.S. health campaign effects on behavior...” – Hornik, pp. 357-383.
3. Atkin & Freimuth, “Formative evaluation research in campaign design” – R&A, pp. 125-145.
4. Hornik, “Exposure: Theory and evidence about all the ways it matters” – packet

2/2/12

1. Grier & Bryant, “Social marketing in public health” –packet
2. Grier & Kumanyika, “Targeted marketing and public health” – packet
3. Noar et al., “Does tailoring matter? Meta-analytic review of tailored print.....interventions” – packet

2/9/12

1. Glanz & Bishop, “Role of behavioral science theory in .....public health interventions” – packet
2. Cappella, “Integrating message effects and behavior change theories” – packet
3. Stephenson & Witte, “Creating fear in a risky world: Generating effective health risk messages.” – R&A, pp. 88-102.
4. Green & Witte, “Can fear arousal in ...campaigns contribute to the decline of HIV prevalence? – packet

2/16/12

1. Valente, “Evaluating communication campaigns” — R&A, pp. 105-111 (skip rest of chapter)
2. Viswanath & Finnegan, “Reflections on community health campaigns: Secular trends and the

- capacity to effect change” – Hornik, pp. 289-313.
3. Evans et al., “Efficacy methods to evaluate health communication and marketing campaigns” – packet .
  4. Salmon & Murray-Johnson, “Communication campaign effectiveness: Critical distinctions” – R&A, pp.168-180.

### Examining Selected Campaigns and Programs

2/23/12

1. Worden & Flynn, “Using mass media to prevent cigarette smoking” – Hornik, pp. 23-34.
2. Pierce et al., “Long-term effectiveness of the early mass media led antismoking campaigns in Australia” – Hornik, pp. 57-72.
3. Pierce et al., “The California tobacco control program: A long-term health communication project” – Hornik, pp. 97-114.

3/1/12

1. Hersey et al., “The theory of ‘Truth’: How counterindustry media campaigns affect smoking behavior among teens” – packet
2. Ibrahim & Stanton, “The rise and fall of tobacco-control media campaigns, 1967-2006”—packet
3. Rocella, “The contributions of public health education toward the reduction of cardiovascular disease mortality: The National High Blood Pressure Education Program” – Hornik, pp. 73-84.

3/8/12

1. Kincaid et al., “Impact of a mass media vasectomy promotion campaign in Brazil” – Hornik, pp. 179-196.
2. Hornik et al., “Communication in support of child survival...” – Hornik, pp. 219-248.
3. Hill et al., “Changes in sun-related attitudes and behaviors, and reduced sunburn prevalence...” – Hornik, pp. 163-178.
4. Hornik, “Evaluation design for public health communication programs”—Hornik, pp. 385-405

**3/12—3/16 Spring Break**

**3/22/12—Critical/Creative Paper Due**

3/22/12 – Sensation Seeking Targeting (SENTAR)

1. Palmgreen, Donohew & Harrington, “Sensation seeking in anti-drug campaign message design” – R&A, pp. 300-304.
2. Palmgreen et al., “Television campaigns and sensation seeking targeting of adolescent marijuana use: A controlled time series approach” – Hornik, pp. 35-56.
3. Noar, Palmgreen et al., “Assessing the relationship between perceived message sensation value and perceived message effectiveness” – packet
4. Palmgreen & Donohew, “Impact of SENTAR on prevention campaign policy and practice” – packet

\* Zimmerman et al., “Effects of a televised two-city safer sex mass media campaign targeting high-sensation-seeking and impulsive-decision-making young adults” –packet

### 3/29/12 –ONDCP Campaign

1. Kelder et al., "Planning and initiation of the ONDCP *National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign*" – packet
  2. Palmgreen et al., "Effects of ONDCP's *Marijuana initiative* campaign on high-sensation-seeking adolescents"—packet
  3. Hornik et al., "Effects of the *National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign* on youths" – packet
- \* Hornik & Yanovitzky, "Using theory to design evaluations of communication campaigns: The case of the *National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign*" –packet
- \* Westat-Annenberg Final Report on *NYADMC*: Executive Summary --packet
- \* "*National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign*: Campaign fact sheets" – packet

### 4/5/12--eHealth

1. Kreps & Neuhauser, "New directions in eHealth communication: Opportunities and challenges" - packet
2. Bull, "Internet and other computer technology-based interventions for STD/HIV prevention"--packet
3. Abrams et al., "New media cases in *Cases in Public Health Communication & Marketing*" – packet
4. Hanson et al., "Integrating web 2.0 in health education preparation and practice" – packet

### 4/12/12--eHealth

1. Lefebvre, "Integrating cell phones & mobile technologies into public health practice" – packet
  2. Fjeldsoe, "Behavior change interventions delivered by mobile telephone short message service (texting)", - packet
  3. Long, "Using social media to reach women with *The Heart Truth – 2009 Update*" – packet
  4. Noar et al., "Can computer-mediated interventions change theoretical mediators of safer sex?" – packet
- \* Noar, "The utility of "old" and "new" media as tools for HIV prevention" – packet

### 4/19/12—KCHC (no class)

#### 4/26/12 –Entertainment-Education

1. Singhal & Rogers, "The entertainment-education strategy in communication campaigns" – R&A, pp. 343-356.
2. Hether et al., "Entertainment-education in a media-saturated environment ....." –packet
3. Kaiser Report – handout

#### 4. *Course evaluations*

### 4/30/12—Final Paper Due

\* ***Recommended Reading***

## **REFERENCES IN READING PACKET\***

\* Several of these references are not on this semester's list of required readings, but you may find some of the extra ones useful.

Abroms, L.C., & Maibach, E. (2008). The effectiveness of mass communication to change public behavior. *Annual Review of Public Health, 29*, 219-234.

Abroms, L.C., Schiavo, R., & Levebvre, R.C. (2008). New media cases in *Cases in Public Health Communication & Marketing: The promise and potential. Cases in Public Health Communication & Marketing, 2*, 3-10.

Baranowski, T., Perry, C., & Parcel, G. (2002). How individuals, environments, and health behavior interact: Social cognitive theory. In K. Glanz, B. Rimer, & F. M. Lewis (Eds.), *Health behavior and health education* (3rd ed., pp. 67-98). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bull, S. (2008). Internet and other computer technology-based interventions for STD/HIV prevention. In T. Edgar, S. M. Noar & V. S. Freimuth (Eds.), *Communication perspectives on HIV/AIDS for the 21st century* (pp. 351-376). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates/Taylor & Francis Group.

Capella, J.M. (2006). Integrating message effects and behavior change theories: Organizing comments and unanswered questions. *Journal of Communication, 56*, S265-S279.

Evans, D.W., Uhrig, J., Davis, K., & McCormack, L. (2009). Efficacy methods to evaluate health communication and marketing campaigns. *Journal of Health Communication, 14*, 315-330.

Fjeldsoe, B.S., Marsall, A., & Miller, Y. (2009). Behavior change interventions delivered by mobile telephone short-message service. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 36*, 165-173.

Gielen, A.C., & McDonald, E.M. (2002). Using the PRECEDE-PROCEED planning model to apply health behavior theories. In K. Glanz, B.K. Rimer, F.M. Lewis (Eds.) *Health behavior and health education* (3rd ed., pp. 409-436). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Glanz, K., & Bishop, D.B. (2010). The role of behavioral science theory in development and implementation of public health intervention. *Annual Review of Public Health, 31*, 399-418.

Glasgow, R.E. (2002). Evaluation of theory-based interventions: The RE-AIM model. In K. Glanz, B.K. Rimer, F.M. Lewis (Eds.) *Health behavior and health education* (3rd ed., pp. 530-544). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Green, E.C., & Witte, K. (2006). Can fear arousal in public health campaigns contribute to the decline of HIV prevalence? *Journal of Health Communication, 11*, 245-259.

Grier, S., & Bryant, C. (2005). Social marketing in public health. *Annual Review of Public Health, 26*, 319-339.

- Grier, S.A., & Kumanyika, S. (2010). Targeted marketing and public health. *Annual Review of Public Health, 31*, 349-369.
- Hanson, C., Thakeray, R., Barnes, M., Neiger, B., & McIntyre, E. (2008). Integrating web 2.0 in health education preparation and practice. *American Journal of Health Education, 39*, 157-166.
- Hersey, J.C., Niederdeppe, J., Evans, D.W., Nonnemaker, J., Blahut, S., Holden, D., Messeri, P., & Haviland, M.L. (2005). The theory of “truth”: How counterindustry media campaigns affect smoking behavior among teens. *Health Psychology, 24*, 22-31.
- Hether, H., Huang, G.C., Beck, V., Murphy, S., & Valente, T. (2008). Entertainment-education in a media-saturated environment: Examining the impact of single and multiple exposures to breast cancer storylines on two popular medical dramas. *Journal of Health Communication, 13*, 808-823.
- Hornik, R.C. (2002). Exposure: Theory and evidence about all the ways it matters. *Social Marketing Quarterly, 8*, 31-37.
- Hornik, R., Jacobsohn, L., Orwin, R., Piesse, A., & Kalton, G. (2008). Effects of the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign on youths. *American Journal of Public Health, 98*, 2229-2236.
- Hornik, R., & Yanovitzky, I. (2003). Using theory to design evaluations of communication campaigns: The case of the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign. *Communication Theory, 13*(2), 204-224.
- Ibrahim, J., & Stanton, G. (2007). The rise and fall of tobacco control media campaigns, 1967-2006. *American Journal of Public Health, 97*(8), 1383-1396.
- Janz, N., Champion, V., & Strecher, V. (2002). The health belief model. In K. Glanz, B. Rimer, & F. M. Lewis (Eds.), *Health behavior and health education* (3rd ed., pp. 67-98). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kelder, S., Maibach, E., Worden, J., Biglan, A., & Levitt, A. (2000). Planning and initiation of the ONDCP National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign. *Journal of Public Health Management Practice, 6*(3), 14-26.
- Kreps, G.L., & Neuhauser, L. (2010). New directions in eHealth communication: Opportunities and challenges. *Patient Education and Counseling, 78*, 329-336.
- Lefebvre, C. (2009). Integrating cell phones and mobile technologies into public health practice: A social marketing perspective. *Health Promotion and Practice, 10*, 490-494.
- Long, T., Taubenheim, A.M, Wayman, J., Temple, S., & Yu, E. (2010). Using social media to reach women with *The Heart Truth* – 2009 update. *Cases in Public Health Communication & Marketing, 4*, 55-68.



- Montano, D., & Kasprzyk, D. (2002). The theory of reasoned action and the theory of planned behavior. In K. Glanz, B. Rimer, & F. M. Lewis (Eds.), *Health behavior and health education* (3rd ed., pp. 67-98). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- “National youth anti-drug media campaign: Fact sheets”
- Neuhauser, L., & Kreps, G.L. (2003). Rethinking communication in the E-health era. *Journal of Health Psychology*, 8, 7-23.
- Noar, S.M. (2006). A 10-year retrospective of research in health mass media campaigns: Where do we go from here? *Journal of Health Communication*, 11, 21-42.
- Noar, S.M. (2009). The utility of “old” and “new” media as tools for HIV prevention. In C. Pope, R.T. White, R. Malow (Eds.), *HIV/AIDS: Global frontiers in prevention/intervention* (pp. 343-353). New York: Routledge.
- Noar, S.M., Benac, C.N., & Harris, M.S. (2007). Does tailoring matter? Meta-analytic review of tailored print health behavior change interventions. *Psychological Bulletin*, 133, 673-693.
- Noar, S.M., Pierce, L B., & Black, H.G. (2010). Can computer-mediated interventions change theoretical mediators of safer sex? A meta-analysis. *Human Communication Research*, 36, 261-297.
- Noar, S., Palmgreen, P., Chabot, M., Dobransky, N., & Zimmerman, R. (2009). A 10-year systematic review of HIV/AIDS mass communication campaigns: Have we made progress? *Journal of Health Communication*, 14, 15-42.
- Noar, S.M., Palmgreen, P., Zimmerman, R.S., Lustria, M.L.A., & Lu, H. (2010). Assessing the relationship between perceived message sensation value and perceived message effectiveness: Analysis of PSAs from an effective campaign. *Communication Studies*, 61, 21-45.
- Palmgreen, P., & Donohew, L. (2010). Impact of SENTAR on prevention campaign policy and practice. *Health Communication*, 25, 609-610.
- Palmgreen, P., Lorch, E.P., Stephenson, M., Hoyle, R.H., & Donohew, L. (2007). Effects of the Office of National Drug Control Policy’s marijuana initiative campaign on high-sensation-seeking adolescents. *American Journal of Public Health*, 97(9), 1644-1649.
- Prochaska, J O., Redding, C.A., & Evers, K.E. (2002). The transtheoretical model and stages of change. In K.Glanz, B.K. Rimer, F.M. Lewis (Eds.), *Health behavior and health education* (3rd ed., pp. 99-120). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Randolph, W., & Viswanath, K. (2004). Lessons learned from public health mass media campaigns: Marketing health in a crowded media world. *Annual Review of Public Health*, 25, 419-437.
- Rice, R.E., & Atkin, C.K. (Eds.) (2001). *Public communication campaigns*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage – Seven Selected Chapters.

Slater, M. (1996). Theory and method in health audience segmentation. *Journal of health communication*, 1, 267-283.

Slater, M. (2006). Specification and misspecification of theoretical foundations and logic models for health communication campaigns. *Health Communication*, 20(2), 149-157.

“Westat-Annenberg final report—Executive Summary—“Evaluation of the national youth anti-drug media campaign: 2004 report of findings”

Zimmerman, R., Palmgreen, P., Noar, S., Lustria, M., Lu, H., & Horosewski, M. (2007). Effects of a televised two-city safer sex media campaign targeting high-sensation-seeking and impulsive-decision-making young adults. *Health Education & Behavior*, 34, 810-826.