

CJT 780: Inoculation Theory

Professor: Bobi Ivanov Office: 137 Grehan Telephone: 7-9467 Cell: (405) 923-9053
E-Mail: bobi.ivanov@uky.edu Hours: R – 4:00 – 5:45 PM or by arrangement.

This syllabus denotes subject areas, class activities, readings, and written assignments which are scheduled during this semester. **Keep your syllabus handy and refer to it regularly!** The reading and written assignments are listed on the day when they are due to be completed.

This course addresses an important **functional question** in the persuasion/campaigns literature: how to promote resistance to influence. It thus cuts across--and is of relevance to--scholars with interests in such contexts as: public relations, commercial advertising, health communication, mass media, political campaign communication, and other areas (such as interpersonal communication, instructional communication, and cross-cultural communication, etc.). Since the 1920s, academics and practitioners in these areas have single-mindedly pursued new and better methods of persuading people but, for the most part, have ignored what might be done to protect people against influence. This course will stress inoculation, what Eagly and Chaiken term "the grandparent theory of resistance to attitude change." It is an area in which I have been actively involved in as my main active program of research.

The course will focus on the following area. We will examine inoculation theory: resistance generally; the original inoculation model; key elements of the model; complementary and competing explanations for resistance; nuances in the use of inoculation; and application of the theory. We will thoroughly probe assigned readings.

In addition, as a part of your assignment (a prospectus), we will discuss and try to enrich the inoculation construct, reformulating its basic logic in light of progress that has been made in extant knowledge of social influence since the initial formulation of inoculation theory in the 1960s. In approaching this area, you and your team will examine the theory and research which is relevant to a particular facet of the inoculation construct and produce a paper which offers propositions supported by a strong rationale and evidence. The teams will present their papers to the class for discussion. On the basis of these papers (or additional ideas), we will synthesize core propositions, and design a study to test them. **Those students who wish to participate in** the study will qualify as co-authors on all subsequent papers which are based on the results of the study. Students interested to participate in the project will stay after class each week to discuss the progress of the study and be assigned specific tasks.

Finally, we will explore applications of inoculation theory in a variety of specific contexts. You will select a single context of interest, probe the extant research in that area, and prepare a research prospectus, including literature review and method's section. The prospectus will be an amalgamation of theory and context. Ideally, it will test new theoretical questions (or hypothesis) in the context of your choosing; but at the minimum it will apply the theory in a new context. Each student will present his or her prospectus to the class.

I expect you to prepare carefully for, and play the leading role during each meeting session. Read and reflect on what you have read so that you will be able to actively participate in discussions. Your substantive contributions, which presuppose attendance, is a criterion for final grades.

The reading from R. Dubin, *Theory Building*, is not a requirement for this class, but is recommended. You will be provided with the inoculation articles you need for this course; however, it is your responsibility to collect the support materials for the theory and context. You are encouraged to contact the instructor for potential ideas.

<u>Session</u>	<u>Subject Area and Assignments</u>
Week 1: August 23	INTRODUCTION AND THEORY BUILDING Introductions and procedural READING: Dubin, R. <i>Theory Building</i> (Not assigned, a reference. Should be read if not familiar with theory and theory building)

<p>Week 2: August 30</p>	<p>RESISTANCE AND INOCULATION Discussion: Resistance and the origin and nature of the original inoculation model.</p> <p>READING:</p> <p><i>Resistance General and Introduction to Inoculation:</i></p> <p>Knowles, E. S., & Linn, J. A. (2004). <i>Resistance and Persuasion</i>. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum. Read Chapters 1 & 2. (Rest of chapters not assigned, but should be read at some point in time FYI)</p> <p>Bizer, Larsen, & Petty. (2011). Exploring the valance-framing effect: Negative framing enhances attitude strength. <i>Political Psychology</i>.</p> <p>Jenkins, M., & Dragojevic, M. (2011). Explaining the process of resistance to persuasion: A politeness theory based approach. <i>Communication Research</i>.</p> <p>Ford, Ford, & D'Amelio (2008). Resistance to change: The rest of the story. <i>Academy of Management Review</i></p> <p>Lumsdaine & Janis (1953). "Resistance to 'counterpropaganda'...." <i>Public Opinion Quarterly</i></p> <p>McGuire (1964). "Inducing resistance to persuasion." In Berkowitz, <i>Advances in experimental social psychology</i>.</p> <p>Wyer (1974). <i>Cognitive organization and change</i> (particularly pp. 204-215).</p> <p>Nelson, C. E. (1968). Anchoring to accepted values as a technique for immunizing beliefs against persuasion. <i>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</i>, 9(4), 329-334.</p> <p>Compton & Pfau (2005). "Inoculation theory of resistance to influence at maturity". <i>Communication yearbook</i> 29.</p> <p>Ivanov, B. (2011). Designing inoculation messages for health communication campaigns. In H. Cho (Ed.), <i>Health communication message design: Theory and practice</i> (pp. 73-93). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.</p>
------------------------------	--

<p>Week 3: September 6</p>	<p>RESISTANCE AND INOCULATION Discussion: Resistance and the origin and nature of the original inoculation model.</p> <p>READING:</p> <p><i>The Original Inoculation Model:</i></p> <p>McGuire (1961). "The effectiveness of supportive and refutational defenses...." <i>Sociometry</i>.</p> <p>McGuire & Papageorgis (1961). "The relative efficacy of various types of prior belief-defense in producing immunity against persuasion." <i>Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology</i>.</p> <p>McGuire (1962). "Resistance to persuasion conferred by active and passive prior refutation of the same and alternative counterarguments." <i>Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology</i>.</p> <p>McGuire & Papageorgis (1962). "Effectiveness of forewarning in developing resistance to persuasion." <i>Public Opinion Quarterly</i>.</p> <p>McGuire (1970, February). "A vaccine for brainwash." <i>Psychology Today</i>.</p> <p>Anderson & McGuire (1965). "Prior reassurance of group consensus as a factor in producing resistance to persuasion." <i>Sociometry</i>.</p> <p><i>Threat, Refutational Preemption and Counterarguing:</i></p> <p>Compton & Pfau (2005). "Inoculation theory of resistance to influence at maturity" (pages 97-105, 121-129). <i>Communication yearbook 29</i>. (Previously Covered. Not a new reading.)</p> <p>Benoit (1991). "Two tests of the mechanism of inoculation theory." <i>Southern Communication Journal</i>.</p> <p>Pryor & Steinfatt (1978). "The effects of initial belief level on inoculation theory and its proposed mechanisms." <i>Human Communication Research</i>.</p> <p>Farkas & Anderson (1976). "Integration theory and inoculation theory as explanations of the 'paper tiger' effect." <i>Journal of Social Psychology</i>.</p> <p>Papageorgis & McGuire (1961). "The generality of immunity to persuasion produced by pre-exposure to weakened counterarguments." <i>Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology</i>.</p>
--------------------------------	---

<p>Week 4: September 13</p>	<p>INOCULATION THEORY</p> <p>Discussion: Key elements and boundaries of the inoculation model: Threat, Refutational Preemption, and Counterarguing.</p> <p>READING:</p> <p><i>Threat:</i></p> <p>Compton & Pfau (2005). "Inoculation theory of resistance to influence at maturity" (pages 97-105, 121-129). <i>Communication yearbook 29</i>. (Previously Covered. Not a new reading.)</p> <p>Compton, J. (2009). Threat explication. <i>STAM Journal</i>, 39, 1-18.</p> <p>Compton, J., & Ivanov, B. (2012). Untangling threat during inoculation-conferred resistance to influence. <i>Communication Reports</i>, 25(1), 1-13.</p> <p>Miller, C. H., Ivanov, B., Sims, J. D., Compton, J., Harrison, K. J., Parker, K. A., Parker, J. L., & Averbeck, J. A. (in press). Boosting the potency of resistance: Combining the motivational forces of inoculation and psychological reactance. <i>Human Communication Research</i>.</p> <p><i>Threat and Boundaries:</i></p> <p>Pfau, Tusing, Koerner, Lee, Godbold, Penaloza, Yang, & Hong (1997). "Enriching the inoculation construct..." <i>Human Communication Research</i>.</p> <p>Pfau, Banas, Semmler, et al. (2010). Role and impact of involvement and enhanced threat in resistance. <i>Communication Quarterly</i>, 58, 1-18.</p> <p>Pfau, Compton, Parker, An, Wittenberg, Ferguson, Horton & Malyshev (2006). "The conundrum of the timing of counterarguing effects in resistance." <i>Communication Quarterly</i>.</p> <p>Parker, K. A., Ivanov, B., & Compton, C., (2012). Inoculation's efficacy with young adults' risky behaviors: Can inoculation confer cross-protection over related but untreated issues? <i>Health Communication</i>.</p> <p><i>Counterarguing:</i></p> <p>Miller & Baron (1973). "On measuring counterarguing." <i>Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior</i>.</p> <p>Ivanov, B. Parker, K. Dillingham (in press). Measuring counterargument: A review and critique of the most popular techniques. <i>The International Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies in Communication</i>.</p> <p>Banas, J. A., & Bessarabova, E. (2009). "The influence of counterarguing on the inoculation process." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Communication Conference, Chicago, Illinois.</p>
---------------------------------	--

<p>Week 5: September 20</p>	<p>INOCULATION THEORY</p> <p>Discussion: Key elements and boundaries of the inoculation model: Threat, Refutational Preemption, and Counterarguing.</p> <p>READING:</p> <p>Complementary and competing explanations for resistance.</p> <p>READING:</p> <p><i>Complementary and Competing Explanations:</i></p> <p>Tannenbaum (1966). "Mediated generalization of attitude change...." <i>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</i>.</p> <p>Tannenbaum, Macaulay, & Norris (1966). "Principle of congruity and reduction of persuasion." <i>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</i>.</p> <p>Tannenbaum & Norris (1965). "Effects of combining congruity principle strategies...." <i>Sociometry</i>.</p> <p>Petty & Cacioppo (1986). <i>Communication and persuasion</i>.</p> <p>Zuwerink & Devine (1996). "Attitude importance and resistance to persuasion." <i>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</i>.</p> <p>Pfau, Tusing et al (1997). "Enriching the inoculation construct." (Previously Covered. Not a new reading.)</p> <p>Burgoon & Miller (1990). "Overcoming resistance to persuasion via contiguous reinforcement and repetition of message." <i>Psychological Reports</i>.</p> <p>Cronen & LaFleur (1977). "Inoculation against attacks: A test of alternative explanations." <i>Journal of Social Psychology</i>.</p> <p>Roskos-Ewoldsen & Fazio (1997). "The role of belief accessibility in attitude formation." <i>Southern Communication Journal</i>.</p> <p>Compton & Pfau (2005). "Inoculation theory at maturity" (pages 109-112, 114-115, & 124-132). (Previously Covered. Not a new reading.)</p> <p>Pfau, Roskos-Ewoldsen, Wood, Yin, Cho, Lu, & Shen (2003). "Attitude accessibility as an alternative explanation for how inoculation confers resistance." <i>Communication Monographs</i>.</p> <p>Pfau, Compton, Parker, Wittenberg, An, Ferguson, Horton, & Malyshev (2004). "The traditional explanation for resistance...and an alternative rationale based on attitude accessibility." <i>Human Communication Research</i>.</p> <p>Pfau, Ivanov, Houston, Haigh, Sims, Gilchrist, Russell, Wigley, Eckstein, & Richert (2005). "Inoculation and mental processing: The instrumental role of associative networks in the process of resistance to counterattitudinal influence." <i>Communication Monographs</i>.</p>
---------------------------------	--

<p>Week 6: September 27</p>	<p>INOCULATION THEORY Nuances in the use of inoculation.</p> <p>READING:</p> <p><i>Delay and Decay:</i></p> <p>Manis (1965). "Immunization, delay, and the interpretation of persuasive messages." <i>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</i>.</p> <p>Manis & Blake (1963). "Interpreting of persuasive messages as a function of prior immunization." <i>Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology</i>.</p> <p>McGuire (1962). "Persistence of the resistance to persuasion induced by various types of prior belief defenses." <i>Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology</i>.</p> <p>Pryor & Steinfatt (1978). "The effects of initial belief level on inoculation theory and its proposed mechanisms." <i>Human Communication Research</i>. (Previously Covered. Not a new reading.)</p> <p>Rogers & Thistlethwaite (1969). "An analysis of active and passive defenses...." <i>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</i>.</p> <p>Compton & Pfau (2005). "Inoculation theory at maturity (pages 105-109 & 130-132). (Previously Covered. Not a new reading.)</p> <p>Pfau, Compton, Parker, An, Wittenberg, Ferguson, Horton, & Malyshev (2006). "The conundrum of the timing of counterarguing effects in resistance." (Previously Covered. Not a new reading.)</p> <p>Banas, J. A., & Rains, S. A. (2010). A meta-analysis of research on inoculation theory. <i>Communication Monographs</i>, 77, 281-311.</p> <p>Ivanov, B., Pfau, M., & Parker, K. A. (2009). Can inoculation withstand multiple attacks? An examination of the effectiveness of the inoculation strategy compared to the supportive and restoration strategies. <i>Communication Research</i>, 36, 655-676.</p> <p>Receiver/Media Variables:</p> <p>Stone (1969). "Individual differences and inoculation against persuasion." <i>Journalism Quarterly</i>.</p> <p>Ivanov, B., Parker K. A., Miller, C. H., & Pfau, M. (in press). Culture as a moderator of inoculation success: The effectiveness of a mainstream inoculation message on a subculture population. <i>The Global Studies Journal</i>.</p> <p>Pfau, M., Van Bockern, S., & Kang, J. G. (1992). Use of inoculation to promote resistance to smoking initiation among adolescents. <i>Communication Monographs</i>, 59, 213-230.</p> <p>Compton & Pfau (2005). "Inoculation theory at maturity" (pages 109-112). (Previously Covered. Not a new reading.)</p> <p>Pfau, Holbert, Zubric, Pasha, & Lin (2000). "Role and Influence of Communication Modality in the Process of Resistance to Persuasion." <i>Media Psychology</i>.</p>
---------------------------------	---

Week 7: October 4	INOCULATION THEORY Enriching the Construct Presentations and Discussion: Theory construction papers. Theory construction papers Due.
----------------------	--

<p>Week 8 October 11</p>	<p>INOCULATION THEORY</p> <p>Discussion: Affect and the process of resistance.</p> <p>READING:</p> <p><i>Affect and Resistance (Message Variables):</i></p> <p>Mayer, N. D., & Tormala, Z. L. (2010). “Think” versus “feel” framing effects in persuasion. <i>Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin</i>, 36(4). 443-454.</p> <p>Jacks, J., Z., & Devine, P. G. (2000). Attitude importance, forewarning of message content, and resistance to persuasion. <i>Basic and Applied Social Psychology</i>, 22, 19-29.</p> <p>Zuwerink, J. R., & Devine, P. G. (1996). Attitude importance and resistance to persuasion: It’s not just the thought that counts. <i>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</i>, 70, 931-944. (Previously Covered. Not a new reading.)</p> <p><i>Affect and Inoculation (Message Variables):</i></p> <p>Lee, W., & Pfau, M. (1998). <i>The effectiveness of cognitive and affective inoculation appeals in conferring resistance against cognitive and affective attacks</i>. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, Jerusalem, Israel.</p> <p>Nabi, R. L. (2003). “Feeling” resistance: Exploring the role of emotionally evocative visuals in inducing inoculation. <i>Media Psychology</i>, 5, 199-223.</p> <p>Pfau, M., Szabo, E. A., Anderson, J., Morrill, J., Zubric, J., & Wan, H. H. (2001). The role and impact of affect in the process of resistance to persuasion. <i>Human Communication Research</i>, 27, 216-252.</p> <p>Ivanov, B., Pfau, M., & Parker, K. A. (2009). The attitude base as a moderator of the effectiveness of inoculation strategy. <i>Communication Monographs</i>, 76, 47-72.</p> <p>Pfau, M., Semmler, S. M., Deatrick., L., Ason, A., Nisbett, G., Lane, L., Craig, E., Underhill, J., & Banas, J. (2009). Nuances about the role and impact of affect in inoculation. <i>Communication Monographs</i>, 76, 73-98.</p> <p>Wigley, S., & Pfau, M. (2010). Arguing with emotion: A closer look at affect and the inoculation process. <i>Communication Research Reports</i>, 27, 217-229.</p>
------------------------------	--

<p>Week 9 October 18</p>	<p>INOCULATION THEORY Nuances in the use of inoculation.</p> <p>READING:</p> <p>Message Variables:</p> <p>Burgoon & Miller (1971). "Prior attitude and language intensity...." <i>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</i>.</p> <p>Burgoon & King (1974). "The mediation of resistance to persuasion strategies...." <i>Human Communication Research</i>.</p> <p>Burgoon et al. (1976). "Propensity of persuasive attack and intensity of pretreatment messages...." <i>Journal of Psychology</i>.</p> <p>Burgoon, Cohen, Miller, & Montgomery (1978). "An empirical test of a model of resistance to persuasion." <i>Human Communication Research</i>.</p> <p>Miller & Burgoon (1979). "The relationship between violations of expectations...." <i>Human Communication Research</i>.</p> <p>Miller, C. H., Ivanov, B., Sims, J. D., Compton, J., Harrison, K. J., Parker, K. A., Parker, J. L., & Averbek, J. A. (in press). Boosting the potency of resistance: Combining the motivational forces of inoculation and psychological reactance. <i>Human Communication Research</i>. (Previously Covered. Not a new reading.)</p> <p>Ivanov, B., Pfau, M., & Parker, K. A. (2009). The attitude base as a moderator of the effectiveness of inoculation strategy. <i>Communication Monographs</i>, 76, 47-72. (Previously Covered. Not a new reading.)</p> <p>Ivanov, B., Pfau, M., & Parker, K. A. (2009). Can inoculation withstand multiple attacks? An examination of the effectiveness of the inoculation strategy compared to the supportive and restoration strategies. <i>Communication Research</i>, 36, 655-676. (Previously Covered. Not a new reading.)</p> <p>Ivanov, B., Parker, K. A., & Pfau, M. (2012). The interaction effect of attitude base and multiple attacks on the effectiveness of inoculation. <i>Communication Research Reports</i>.</p> <p>Pfau, Tusing, Lee, Godbold, Koerner, Penaloza, Hong, & Yang (1997). "Nuances in inoculation: The role of inoculation approach, ego-involvement, and message processing disposition in resistance." <i>Communication Quarterly</i>.</p> <p>Lee & Pfau (1998). "The effectiveness of cognitive and affective appeals in conferring resistance against cognitive and affective attacks." Paper presented at ICA. (Previously Covered. Not a new reading.)</p> <p>Pfau, Szabo, Anderson, Morrill, Zubric, & Wan (2001). "The Role and Impact of Affect in the Process of Resistance." <i>Human Communication Research</i>. (Previously Covered. Not a new reading.)</p> <p>Jacks & Devine (2000). "Attitude importance, forewarning of message content, and resistance to persuasion." <i>Basic and Applied Social Psychology</i>. (Previously Covered. Not a new reading.)</p> <p>Compton & Pfau (2005). "Inoculation theory at maturity" (pages 107-109, 112-115, & 129-132). (Previously Covered. Not a new reading.)</p>
------------------------------	--

<p>Week 10 October 25</p>	<p>APPLICATIONS OF INOCULATION Discussion: Political Campaigns / Intercultural / Interpersonal / Instructional.</p> <p>READING:</p> <p>Political Campaigns</p> <p>Compton, J., & Ivanov, B. (in press). Vaccinating voters: Surveying political campaign inoculation scholarship. In E. L. Cohen (Ed.), <i>Communication yearbook 37</i>. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.</p> <p>Pfau & Burgoon (1988). "Inoculation in political campaign communication." <i>Human Communication Research</i>.</p> <p>Pfau, Kenski, Nitz, & Sorenson (1990). "Efficacy of inoculation strategies in promoting resistance to political attack messages." <i>Communication Quarterly</i>.</p> <p>Pfau, Park, Holbert, & Cho (2001). "The effects of party- and PAC-sponsored issue advertising and the potential of inoculation to combat its impact on the democratic process." <i>American Behavioral Scientist</i>.</p> <p>An & Pfau (2004). "Efficacy of inoculation in televised political debates." <i>Journal of Communication</i>.</p> <p>Lin, W.-K. (2005). "Inoculation to resist attacks." <i>Asian Journal of Communication</i>.</p> <p>Pfau, Haigh et al. (2006). "The effects of print news photographs of the casualties of war." <i>Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly</i>.</p> <p>Intercultural</p> <p>Ivanov, B., Parker, K. A., Miller, C. H., & Pfau, M. (in press). Culture as a moderator of inoculation success: The effectiveness of a mainstream inoculation message on a subculture population. <i>The Global Studies Journal</i>. (Previously Covered. Not a new reading.)</p> <p>Interpersonal</p> <p>Sutton, C. H. (2011). <i>Inoculating against jealousy: Attempting to preemptively reduce the jealousy experience and improve jealousy expression</i>. (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Georgia, Athens, GA. (Read abstract. The rest is NOT assigned due to length, but should be read at some point especially is interpersonal communication is the area of interest)</p> <p>Instructional</p> <p>Compton, J. & Pfau, M. (2008). Inoculation against pro-plagiarism justifications: Rational and affective strategies. <i>Journal of Applied Communication Research</i>, 36, 98-119.</p>
-------------------------------	--

<p>Week 11 November 1</p>	<p>APPLICATIONS OF INOCULATION Discussion: Commercial – Promotions/Marketing.</p> <p>READING:</p> <p>Promotions/Marketing</p> <p>Compton & Pfau (2004). “Inoculation theory at maturity” (pages 115-117 & 134-135). Located in section on “Key Elements.”</p> <p>Ivanov, B., & Parker, K. A. (2011). Protecting images with inoculation: A look at brand, country, and corporate images. <i>The International Journal of the Image</i>.</p> <p>Szybillo, G. J., & Heslin, R. (1973). Resistance to persuasion: Inoculation theory in a marketing context. <i>Journal of Marketing Research</i>, 10, 396-403.</p> <p>Pfau (1992). "The potential of inoculation in promoting resistance to the effectiveness of comparative advertising messages." <i>Communication Quarterly</i>.</p> <p>Bechwati & Siegal (2005). “The impact of the prechoice process on product returns.” <i>Journal of Marketing Research</i>.</p> <p>Ivanov, B., Parker, K. A., & Compton, J. (2011). The potential of inoculation in reducing post-purchase dissonance: Reinforcement of purchase behavior. <i>Central Business Review</i>, 30, 10-16.</p> <p>Compton & Pfau (2004). “Use of inoculation to foster resistance to credit card marketing targeting college students. <i>Journal of Applied Communication Research</i>.</p> <p>Ivanov, B., Pfau, M., & Parker, K. A. (2009). The potential of inoculation in protecting the country of origin image. <i>Central Business Review</i>, 28, 9-16.</p> <p>Ivanov, B., Pfau, M., & Parker, K. A. (2009). Can inoculation withstand multiple attacks? An examination of the effectiveness of the inoculation strategy compared to the supportive and restoration strategies. <i>Communication Research</i>, 36, 655-676. (Previously Covered. Not a new reading.)</p>
-------------------------------	--

<p>Week 12: November 8</p>	<p>APPLICATIONS OF INOCULATION Discussion: Commercial - Corporate/PR.</p> <p>READING:</p> <p>Corporate/PR</p> <p>Compton & Pfau (2005). "Inoculation theory at maturity" (pages 115-117 & 134-135). (Previously Covered. Not a new reading.)</p> <p>Ivanov, B., & Parker, K. A. (2011). Protecting images with inoculation: A look at brand, country, and corporate images. <i>The International Journal of the Image</i>. (Previously Covered. Not a new reading.)</p> <p>Pfau, M., & Wan, H. H. (2006). Persuasion: An intrinsic function of public relations. In C. H. Botton and V. Hazelton, Jr. (Eds.), <i>Public Relations Theory II</i> (88-119). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.</p> <p>Pfau, M., Haigh, M., Sims, J., & Wigley, S. (2006). The influence of corporate front-group stealth campaigns. <i>Communication Research</i>, 34, 1-27.</p> <p>Burgoon, Pfau, & Birk (1995). "An inoculation theory explanation for the effects of corporate issue/advocacy advertising campaigns." <i>Communication Research</i>.</p> <p>Wan & Pfau (2004). "The relative effectiveness of inoculation, bolstering, and combined approaches in crisis communication." <i>Journal of Public Relations Research</i>.</p> <p>Wigley, S. & Pfau, M. (2010). Communicating before a crisis: An exploration of bolstering, CSR and inoculation practices. In Timothy Coombs & Sherry Holladay. (Eds.), <i>The handbook of crisis communication</i> (pp. 568-590). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.</p> <p>Sims, J. D., & Pfau, M. (2010). Using inoculation to protect value-in-diversity attitudes: An unsuccessful test and a nuanced antidote. Presented at the annual meeting of the National Communication Association, San Francisco, California.</p>
<p>Week 13-14:</p> <p>November 15 & November 22</p> <p>NO CLASS</p>	<p>Haigh, M. M., & Pfau, M. (2006). Bolstering organizational identity, commitment, and citizenship behaviors through the process of inoculation. <i>International Journal of Organizational Analysis</i>, 14(4), 295-316.</p> <p>Veil, S. R., & Kent, M. L. (2008). Issues management and inoculation: Tylenol's responsible dosing advertising. <i>Public Relations Review</i>, 34, 399-402.</p>

<p>Week 15 November 29</p>	<p>APPLICATIONS OF INOCULATION Discussion: Health.</p> <p>READING:</p> <p>Health</p> <p><i>General</i></p> <p>Compton & Pfau (2004). "Inoculation theory at maturity" (pages 119-121 & 132-134). (Not a new reading. Previously covered).</p> <p>Pfau (1995). "Designing messages for behavioral inoculation." In Maibach & Parrott, <i>Designing health messages</i>.</p> <p>Ivanov, B. (2011). Designing inoculation messages for health communication campaigns. In H. Cho (Ed.), <i>Health communication message design: Theory and practice</i> (pp. 73-93). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. (Not a new reading. Previously covered).</p> <p>Perry (1987). "Results of prevention programs with adolescents." <i>Drug and Alcohol Dependence</i>.</p> <p><i>Smoking Prevention</i></p> <p>Biglan, & Ary (1985). "Methodological issues in research on smoking prevention." In Bell & Battjes, <i>Prevention research</i>.</p> <p>Foon (1986). "Smoking prevention programs for adolescents...." <i>International Journal of the Addictions</i>.</p> <p>Pfau, Van Bockern, & Kang (1992). "Use of inoculation to promote resistance to smoking initiation among adolescents." <i>Communication Monographs</i>.</p> <p>Pfau & Van Bockern (1994). "The persistence of inoculation in conferring resistance to smoking initiation among adolescents: The second year." <i>Human Communication Research</i>.</p> <p>Szabo & Pfau (2001). <i>Reactance as a response to antismoking messages</i>. Paper presented at NCA.</p> <p>Banerjee, S. C., & Greene, K. (2006). Analysis vs. production: Adolescent cognitive and attitudinal responses to antismoking interventions. <i>Journal of Communication</i></p> <p>Banerjee, S. C., & Greene, K. (2007). Antismoking initiatives: Effects of analysis versus production media literacy interventions on smoking-related attitude, norm, and behavioral intention. <i>Health Communication</i>, 22(1), 37-48.</p> <p><i>Drinking/Unprotected Sex Prevention</i></p> <p>Duryea (1982, 1983) and Duryea, et al.(1990) articles</p> <p>Godbold & Pfau (2000). "Conferring resistance to peer pressure among adolescents." <i>Communication Research</i>.</p> <p>Parker, K. A., Ivanov, B., & Compton, C., (2012). Inoculation's efficacy with young adults' risky behaviors: Can inoculation confer cross-protection over related but untreated issues? <i>Health Communication</i>. (Not a new reading. Previously covered).</p> <p><i>Preventing Gang Violence</i></p> <p>Matusitz, J. & Breen, G-M. (2009). Preventing youths from joining gangs: How to apply inoculation theory. <i>Journal of Applied Security Research</i>, 4, 109-128.</p>
--------------------------------	---

<p>Week 16 December 6</p>	<p>INOCULATION: PRESENT AND FUTURE Discussion: Pushing the Boundaries</p> <p>READING:</p> <p>Compton & Pfau (2005). "Inoculation theory at maturity" (pages 121-136). (Previously Covered. Not a new reading.)</p> <p><i>Umbrella/Cross-Protection:</i></p> <p>Parker, K. A., Ivanov, B., & Compton, C., (in press). Inoculation's efficacy with young adults' risky behaviors: Can inoculation confer cross-protection over related but untreated issues? <i>Health Communication</i>. (Previously Covered. Not a new reading.)</p> <p><i>Boosting Resistance:</i></p> <p>Miller, C. H., Ivanov, B., Sims, J. D., Compton, J., Harrison, K. J., Parker, K. A., Parker, J. L., & Averbeck, J. A. (in press). Boosting the potency of resistance: Combining the motivational forces of inoculation and psychological reactance. <i>Human Communication Research</i>. (Previously Covered. Not a new reading.)</p> <p><i>WOMC/Post Inoculation Talk (PIT):</i></p> <p>Compton, J. & Pfau, M. (2009). Spreading inoculation: Inoculation, resistance to Influence, and word-of-mouth communication. <i>Communication Theory</i>, 19, 9-28.</p> <p>Mason, A. (2010). Advancing inoculation theory: Treatment impact on content and motivation of subsequent diffusion. Presented at the annual meeting of the National Communication Association, San Francisco, California.</p> <p>Ivanov, B., Miller, C. H., Compton, J., Averbeck, J. M., Harrison, K. J., Sims, J. D., Parker, K. A., & Parker, J. L. (2012). Effects of post-inoculation talk on resistance to influence. <i>Journal of Communication</i>, 62(4), 701-718.</p> <p><i>Resistance and Attitude Change:</i></p> <p>Wood, M. L. M. (2007). Rethinking the inoculation analogy: Effects on subjects with differing preexisting attitudes. <i>Human Communication Research</i>, 33, 357-378.</p> <p>Blervacq, J. (2010). <i>The promotion of physical activity through a psychological inoculation</i>. Unpublished master's thesis, Hogeschool-Universiteit Brussel, Brussels, Belgium. (Not assigned reading, only FYI)</p> <p><i>Attitude Function and Multiple Attacks:</i></p> <p>Ivanov, B., Pfau, M., & Parker, K. A. (2009). Can inoculation withstand multiple attacks? An examination of the effectiveness of the inoculation strategy compared to the supportive and restoration strategies. <i>Communication Research</i>, 36, 655-676. (Previously Covered. Not a new reading.)</p> <p>Ivanov, B., Parker, K. A., & Pfau, M. (in press). The interaction effect of attitude base and multiple attacks on the effectiveness of inoculation. <i>Communication Research Reports</i>. (Previously Covered. Not a new reading.)</p> <p><i>Associative Networks:</i></p> <p>Pfau, Ivanov, Houston, Haigh, Sims, Gilchrist, Russell, Wigley, Eckstein, & Richert (2005). "Inoculation and mental processing: The instrumental role of associative networks in the process of resistance to counterattitudinal influence." <i>Communication Monographs</i>. (Previously Covered. Not a new reading.)</p> <p>Pfau, M., Semmler, S. M., Deatrck., L., Ason, A., Nisbett, G., Lane, L., Craig, E., Underhill, J., & Banas, J. (2009). Nuances about the role and impact of affect in inoculation. <i>Communication Monographs</i>, 76, 73-98. (Previously Covered. Not a new reading.)</p>
-------------------------------	---

Week 17	INOCULATION THEORY
Tuesday	Applications of Inoculation
December 11	Presentations and Discussion: Research prospectus
6:00 PM	Prospects DUE.
Final	

GRADING CRITERIA

<u>Item to be Evaluated</u>	<u>Maximum Points</u>
Theory Construction (paper and presentation)	100
Prospectus (paper and presentation)	150
Class Contributions	50
TOTAL POINTS	300

Grades are determined using a straight percentage computation, as follows.

Points	Percentage	Grade
270-300	90-100	A
240-269	80-89+	B
210-239	70-79+	C
000-209	00-69+	E

DESCRIPTION OF WRITTEN ASSIGNMENTS

Theory Construction Paper

Students will work in teams of two or three. Each team will take on one area which, based on developments in theory and research, it should be possible to enrich inoculation theory. You could focus on one of a variety of areas. Some unanswered theoretical issues are discussed below. This list is intended as suggestive, as many more questions may arise from our discussions.

(A) Threat triggers receiver motivation to bolster attitudes, but there is much that we don't know about threat. (1) What level of threat is optimal? Early research intimated that refutational preemption, by itself, is sufficient to unleash resistance (that threat is implicit and does not need to be explicit). Burgoon et al. (1976) found certainty to be key to elicited threat, finding that a 50:50 chance of encountering a counterattitudinal attack was optimal. Since then, this question has been somewhat ignored. Because threat is the motivational trigger for resistance, it is assumed that it should precede refutational preemption in a form of an explicit forewarning. However, one could make the case that no explicit threat is required (that learning of an impending attack is sufficient), or that explicit threat in the form of forewarning could either precede or follow refutational preemption. Compton and Ivanov (2012) examined the relationship between explicit forewarning and refutational preemption in creating threat, but their design had a weakness as no condition was included in the study that featured only the refutational preemption component. (2) What is the nature of threat? Is it cognitive, affective, or both? It has been assumed that the threat mechanism itself is cognitive, consisting of a verbal warning of impending attack, but that it unleashes something that is partly affective, the motivation to defend attitudes. These assumptions have never been tested. (3) How much elicited threat is optimal? Pfau, Tusing et al. (*HCR*, 1997) found inoculation to be less effective with low-involving issues, like gambling, and high-involving issues, like handguns. The reason for ineffectiveness was inability to generate further threat: with low-involving issues, it was difficult to get people to care much whether they might encounter a counterattitudinal attack; by contrast, with high-involving issues, people already cared and were aware that they would encounter counterattitudinal attacks. No studies to date have elicited more than low- to mid-level threat levels. (4) Is there a better instrument to measure elicited threat levels? It may be that weak threat manipulations in research to date are a function of poor measurement as opposed to inadequate operationalization. (5) Are there other means of eliciting threat other than the classic verbal technique? Nabi (2003) found that visual inoculation treatments were effective in eliciting threat. However, Pfau, Haigh, et al. (2006) found that print and print-plus-photograph inoculation treatments did not differ significantly either in the amount of threat elicited or in effectiveness in fostering resistance. (6) Could anger play a role of threat or is it a product of threat. Recent studies have shown that threat generates anger which enhances the process of resistance. Some have recently argued that measuring threat has found weak result of this property because what the messages really generate is anger rather than threat.

(B) More needs to be done to flesh out the role of associative networks in the process of resistance. Pfau, Ivanov, Houston et al. (2005) theorized that inoculation works, in part, through threat and counterarguing, the explanatory initially posited by McGuire, but also by altering associative networks (altering the structure of existing networks, adding new content to networks, or rendering entire networks more accessible). Pfau, Roskos-Ewoldsen et al. (2003) and Pfau, Compton et al. (2004) proved that inoculation enhances attitude accessibility. However, Pfau, Ivanov, Houston et al. (2005) argued that accessibility is only a part of the mental activity that occurs in resistance. They predicted and proved that inoculation modifies the structure of associative networks (increases the number of nodes and links in existing networks). However, there is no evidence to date that inoculation adds new content to networks. Inoculation should do all three

things: alter the structure of existing networks, add new content to networks, and make whole networks more accessible. The threat/counterarguing explanation and the associative network explanation for how inoculation confers resistance may prove to be complementary or competing rationales. However, one thing is certain. The persistent direct path in SEM results (Pfau et al., 1997, 2001, 2004) from administration of an inoculation treatment to ultimate resistance to a counterattitudinal attack suggests that there is an, as yet, undiscovered mechanism, in addition to the core mechanisms of threat and counterarguing or the added mechanism of changing network structures/attitude accessibility to explain how inoculation confers resistance. Insko (1967, p. 319) argued nearly 40 years ago that “inoculation may simply prove to be part of a larger and more complex picture.” Perhaps the more complete conceptualization of associative networks is the broader explanation that Insko hinted at. Pfau et al., (2009) did not find support for the role of associated networks in the process of resistance. Can the two studies be reconciled? What are potential reasons for the discrepancy and what is the best method to assess the structure of associative networks in order to gauge the impact of inoculation on their structure? In a planned study for Fall 2012, Ivanov has argued that part of the issue rests with the assessment of the associative networks. In the original Pfau et al. (2005), the networks were assessed in a phase (Phase 3) after the inoculation (Phase 2), but before the attack (Phase 4), messages were presented. Hence, little remains known about the impact of the attack messages on the networks. In addition, without assessing the initial pre-inoculation structure of the networks, the actual inoculation-generated change, remains unknown. The second study (Phau et al., 2009) on associative networks, assessed the associative networks in the same phase that the inoculation message was presented (Phase 2), but again not in the final one after the attack was rendered. The difference between the two studies is that in the first one there was a time period between the presentation of inoculation and the assessment of the networks, which was congruent with inoculation theory notion that time is necessary for defenses to accumulate, and, by extension, for the networks to change and/or strengthen. The design of the second study presented the treatment and the assessment of the networks in the same phase, which may account for the differences in the results. A more nuanced design that tests the networks at the inception of the study (Phase 1 – initial pre-inoculation and attack networks), sometime after the inoculation message, but before the attack (Phase 2 or 3) and then after the attack (Phase 3 or 4), would present a better picture of the actual changes within the networks.

(C) Pfau, Szabo et al. (2001) *HCR* indicated that affect plays an important role in resistance (affect-based messages are able to confer resistance and cognitive and affective-anger inoculation messages elicit delayed anger, which contributes to resistance. Investigating resistance, but not inoculation, one of Devine’s doctoral students (Zuwerink & Devine, 1996; Jacks & Devine, (2000) also found an important role for emotion in resistance. We need to know more about emotion’s role in the process of resistance. (1) We need to know the role affect assumes in people’s initial attitudes, and the relationship between initial attitudes and the effectiveness of subsequent inoculation treatments (Edwards’ 1990 notion of matching/mismatching is relevant here as are the Ivanov et al. attitude base studies). Do cognitive and affective inoculation treatments alter the cognitive and affective basis of initial attitudes (in addition to the Ivanov et al, studies, still lot more work remains)? (2) Is part of what people generate in counterarguing affective and how does this relate to the traditional (and entirely cognitive) explanation for the way that inoculation confers resistance? (3) Does inoculation add both cognitive and affective content to associative networks and how does each contribute to resistance (the Fall 2012 study would be used to look at these issues as well)? (4) In addition to anger, which was confirmed by Pfau, Szabo et al. (2001), what range of emotions are elicited in resistance? Also, how does inoculation fair when the messages and/or attacks are presented while individuals are in positive or negative moods? Albeit lot more needs to be done, we have looked at inoculation’s impact when it induces specific emotions; however, how does it fair when participants are experiencing message irrelevant emotion at the time of inoculation and/or attack message presentation?

(D) More work needs to be done on counterarguing. Inoculation assumes active counterarguing. However, the

process maybe more heuristic/macro than cognitive. Part of this is conceptual and part is operational. At a conceptual level, Pfau, Tusing et al. (1997, *Communication Quarterly*), and Pfau, Holbert et al. (2000) suggested that inoculation may foster resistance via a passive, heuristic process, perhaps in addition to the more conventional active, cognitive process. In other words, it may occur absent active thought. This could be tested by probing the way that people respond to counterarguments, asking whether they reject each counterargument contained in a message outright or whether they reject it with reasons. The process may be more heuristic than previously assumed. At an operationalization level, many of us have been dissatisfied with thought listing as the classic way to assess counterarguing. Miller and Baron (1973) criticized all the available techniques for assessing people's thoughts. Still, over time, thought listing was codified as the only acceptable technique. As an alternative to thought listing, Pfau, Compton et al. (2004) and Pfau, Ivanov et al. (2005) employed a checklist technique. Nabi has worked on what she terms "Message Processing Measure" as an alternative to thought listing. Brandt (1979) has argued that the assessment of thought listing was problematic, instead proposing researchers assess motivation to counterargue. Miller, Ivanov, et al. (in press) used multiple measures to capture this elusive construct, but still lot remains to be done. In addition, as Compton and Pfau (2009) suggested and Mason (2010) and Ivanov et al. (2012) discovered the process of counterarguing may not be exclusively covert or internal, but instead it may be overt as well. Does inoculation spread throu social networks and if so how? Ivanov and colleagues are in the process of analyzing the qualitative responses of this process, but still much remains to be uncovered.

(E) The issue of cross-protection or umbrella protection has been suggested and tested recently with some encouraging results (Parker, Ivanov, & Compton, 2012), but still many questions remain about the size and scope of this umbrella coverage across issue domains. Some additional preliminary has been done, but there are still more questions than answers.

(F) Ivanov, Pfau, and Parker (2009) for the first time exposed the strategy of inoculation to multiple attacks and showed that it is capable of providing protecting against multiple attacks. However, how many can it endure? In their study, the proposed two competing hypotheses (presented in a form of a research question as a result) of whether the additional attack would strengthen or weaken the protection generated by inoculation. Yet, based on design limitations, this question could not be confidently answered. Ivanov et al. have collected additional data to answer these questions, but much more remains unanswered.

(G) Booster sessions or reinforcements are still elusive. Just as some inoculations in the medical field need boosters after a period of time, attitudinal inoculations may potentially be boosted in the same way. However, the research has does far been primarily disappointing (see Compton & Pfau, 2005). So is it that booster do not work in inoculation? Compton and Pfau (2005) seemed to believe that they do and that the issue is proper timing and structure. When is the optimal time to introduce an inoculation booster and in what form? Traditionally Pfau has used the same inoculation message to act as a booster, but would a simple forewarning (see Compton & Ivanov, 2012) be just as effective if not more? Would a reactance-based booster create a stronger reinforcement to the inoculation message (See Miller, Ivanov, et al. in press)? Or would the attack message itself possible act as a booster (see Ivanov et al., 2009; the *CR* study)? Finally, if the attack an potentially act as a booster would it be a weakened form of the attack or a full-fledged one? These are all important questions that remain unanswered.

(H) Wood (2007) and Blervacq (2010) showed that inoculation message can act as persuasion as well. Wood specifically showed that not only inoculation messages work as prescribed, but that they also move individuals with neutral and opposed attitudes in the desired direction as well. This is important as it may improve the utility of this strategy. If inoculation does act as a resistance and persuasion strategy at the same time it may be more useful as strategies can use one strategic message to reach all the target individuals regardless of their

attitudinal position. However, the questions is how does inoculation compare to a supportive strategy? Will inoculation messages be more effective than supportive messages not only in terms of resistance, but also as persuasion? Could we find inoculation messages to be more effective than supportive messages in protecting current attitudes, changing opposing attitudes, and creating new ones?

(I) There are a number of theoretical issues which fall under the broad heading of nuances in inoculation which remain unresolved. These include: timing of pretreatments in relation to subsequent attacks; decay of pretreatments; and the optimal language intensity of inoculation pretreatments in relation to attacks.

The purpose of this paper is to **posit propositions, each backed by sound reasoning and empirical evidence**, which will stem from the extant literature. The ultimate purpose of these collective papers will be to posit a logic of inoculation theory which is much richer in nuance, thereby facilitating greater precision in inoculation predictions in future research. Much more is known today about the process of influence than when McGuire posited inoculation theory in the 1960s. Each team will present its paper for class feedback.

Prospectus

The prospectus for research constitutes a **detailed description of an impending project**, including: (1) a comprehensive review of all relevant literature, which is organized so as to produce a strong rationale for each hypothesis, prediction or question to be examined in the project; and (2) justification and detailed description of the methods which will be employed, including (a) the overall design, (b) data gathering procedures, (c) data analysis procedures, and (4) anticipated schedule.

The prospectus is a blueprint for research which you may follow at a future point in time, possibly even for your dissertation. It will be evaluated rigorously to ensure that, if followed, it will result in a successful effort. The prospectus is intended as a **course-long individual effort**. I recommend that you pick a content area based on your own academic interests as quickly as possible, and then work steadily throughout the semester pulling together all relevant research in your area.

Context (Application)

Possible content domain for the prospectus includes: commercial advertising/marketing; instructional; interpersonal; corporate/public relations (as a tool to protect organization image in crisis situations, as a tool to bolster strong employee morale, or, for non-profit PR, as a strategy to prevent volunteer burnout); political campaign communication; and prevention of many deleterious adolescent behaviors, including: smoking, alcohol use, drinking and driving, gang involvement, youth violence, drug use, sexual activity, obesity, and others.

These are only suggestive. There are more. The only criterion is that the attitudes (beliefs, opinions, behaviors, images, etc.) that you want to protect are already in place, but they are vulnerable to slippage.

Conceptual Nuances (Theory) – *Not a Requirement but a Recommendation*

You are encouraged to take up one area which, based on developments in theory and research, could enrich inoculation theory. You could focus on one of a variety of areas. Some unanswered theoretical issues were discussed earlier. If you consider operationalizing your prospectus in the future whether as a thesis, dissertation or a publication, having a theoretical nuance in the design will significantly enhance the quality and publishability of your work.