

**JOMC 705.001 – Theories of Mass Communication**  
**Course Syllabus**  
**Fall 2014**

Professor: Dr. Francesca Carpentier

Office: Room 326

E-mail: francesca@unc.edu

Office Hours: M-Th 10:30a-11:30a

Class Hours: 2:00p-3:15p TR

Classroom: Rm 340A

### **Overview and Objectives**

JOMC 705 is an introduction to mass communication theories and conceptual frameworks. The course opens with a brief discussion of theory building, provides an overview of the history of mass communication theory, and then surveys some of the major social science theories and models used in the field. We'll end the course with visits from JOMC faculty who will explain how they incorporate theory into their research activities. This class should mesh with what you are learning in JOMC 701 so that you can understand how theory and research methods work together. This class is designed to lay the foundation for taking topic-specific seminars and for producing a theoretically grounded thesis or dissertation in mass communication.

By the end of this course, you should be able to:

- Articulate the components of social science theory and the steps in theory building;
- Trace the historical development of mass communication theory;
- Critique the major theories that have guided mass communication research;
- Develop a theoretically-based argument in relation to a specific research question; and
- Contribute to knowledge appropriate to the communications professions in which you work.

With the exception of the first day of class, you are expected to do all of the assigned readings ahead of time to be able to participate in class. You are not expected to fully understand every word that you read prior to class, but if you do not do the readings beforehand, you will not be prepared to ask questions that might help you understand them, nor will you benefit from classmates' questions.

Missing class is strongly discouraged. You will be responsible for getting notes and other materials if you miss class.

### **Recommended but not Required Textbook:**

Bryant, J., & Oliver, M. B. (Eds.) (2008). *Media effects: Advances in theory and research (3rd ed.)*. New York: Routledge.

**Additional Readings (see course site for links):**

Philosophy of Science and Mass Communication Theory History:

Kuhn, T. S. (1962). *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago, The University of Chicago Press.

Craig, R. T. (1999). *Communication theory as a field*. *Communication Theory*, 9(2), 199-161.

Shannon, C. E. (1948, July). *A mathematical theory of communication*. *Bell System Technical Journal*.

Baran, S. J., & Davis, D. K. (2012). *Mass communication theory: Foundations, ferment, and future (6<sup>th</sup> edition)*. Boston, MA: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.

Concept Explication:

Shoemaker, P.J., Tankard, J.W., & Lasorsa, D.L. (2004). Theoretical Concepts. In *How to Build Social Science Theories* (pp. 15-35). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Chaffee, S. H. (1991). *Communication concepts I: Explication*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Kiousis, S. (2002). Interactivity: a concept explication. *New Media & Society*, 4(3), 355–383.

Sundar, S. S., Kalyanaraman, S., & Brown, J. (2003). Explicating website interactivity: Impression-formation effects in political campaign sites. *Communication Research*, 30(1), 30-59.

Agenda-Setting:

McCombs, M., & Shaw, D. (1972). The agenda-setting function of mass media. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 36, 176-187.

McCombs, M. E., & Shaw, D. L. (1993). The evolution of agenda-setting research: Twenty-five years in the marketplace of ideas. *Journal of Communication*, 43(2), 58-67.

Framing:

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

Scheufele, D. A. (1999). Framing as a theory of media effects. *Journal of Communication*, 49(1), 103-122.

Priming:

Tulving, E. (1972). Episodic and semantic memory. In Tulving, E. & Donaldson, W. (Eds.), *Organization and Memory* (pp. 381–403). New York: Academic Press.

Collins, A. M., & Loftus, E. F. (1975). A spreading-activation theory of semantic processing. *Psychological Review*, 82, 407–428.

Scheufele, D. A., & Tewksbury, D. (2007). Framing, agenda setting, and priming: The evolution of three media effects models. *Journal of Communication*, 57(1), 9-20.

(humbly) Dillman Carpentier, F. R. (2014). Agenda setting and priming effects based on information presentation: Revisiting accessibility as a mechanism explaining agenda setting and priming. *Mass Communication and Society*, 17(4), 531-552.

#### Social Cognition:

Bandura, A. A., Ross, D., & Ross, S. A. (1961). Transmission of aggression through imitation of aggressive models. *The Journal Of Abnormal And Social Psychology*, 63(3), 575-582.

#### Cultivation:

Gerbner, G. (1969). Toward "Cultural Indicators": The analysis of mass mediated public message systems. *AV Communication Review*, 17(2), 137-148.

Shrum, L. J. (1996). Psychological processes underlying cultivation effects: Further tests of construct accessibility. *Human Communication Research*, 22(4), 482-509.

#### Elaboration Likelihood Model:

Cacioppo, J. T., Petty, R. E., Kao, C., & Rodriguez, R. (1986). Central and peripheral routes to persuasion: An individual difference perspective. *Journal Of Personality & Social Psychology*, 51(5), 1032-1043.

#### Functional Theories:

Katz, E., Blumler, J. G., & Gurevitch, M. (1973). Uses and gratifications research. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 37(4), 509-516.

Zillmann, D. (1988). Mood management through communication choices. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 31(3), 327-340.

#### Theory of Planned Behavior:

Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50, 179-211.

Griffin, R. J., Neuwirth, K., Giese, J., & Dunwoody, S. (2002). Linking the Heuristic-Systematic Model and depth of processing. *Communication Research*, 29(6), 705-732.

Nabi, R. L., & Sullivan, J. L. (2001). Does television viewing relate to engagement in protective action against crime? A cultivation analysis from a theory of reasoned action perspective. *Communication Research*, 28(6), 802-825.

#### Media Dependency:

Ball-Rokeach, S. J., & DeFleur, M. L. (1976). A dependency model of mass-media effects. *Communication Research*, 3(1), 3-21.

Ball-Rokeach, S. J. (1985). The origins of individual media-system dependency: A sociological framework. *Communication Research*, 4, 485-510.

Third-Person Effect:

Davison, W. (1983). The Third-Person Effect in Communication. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 47(1), 1-15.

Social Comparison:

Festinger, L. (1954). A theory of social comparison processes. *Human Relations*, 7, 117-140.

Krayer, A. A., Ingledew, D. K., & Iphofen, R. R. (2008). Social comparison and body image in adolescence: A grounded theory approach. *Health Education Research*, 23(5), 892-903.

Social Identity:

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behaviour. In S. Worchel & W. G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (2nd ed., pp. 7-24). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

Symbolic Interactionism:

Tuchman, G., & Jensen, K. (2002). Part II: Systematics: Chapter 5: The production of news. *Handbook Of Media & Communication Research*, 78-90.

Davis, J. (2010). Architecture of the personal interactive homepage: Constructing the self through MySpace. *New Media & Society*, 12(7), 1103-1119.

Entertainment:

Vorderer, P., Klimmt, C., & Ritterfeld, U. (2004). Enjoyment: At the heart of media entertainment. *Communication Theory*, 14(4), 388-408.

Gatekeeping:

Shoemaker, P. J. & Vos, T. P. (2008). Media gatekeeping. In M. B. Salwen & D.W. Stacks (Eds.), *An integrated approach to communication theory and research* (2nd ed.) (pp. 75-89). New York: Routledge.

Roberts, C. (2005, August). *Gatekeeping theory: An evolution*. Paper presented to the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, San Antonio, Texas.

Barzilai-Nahon, K. (2008). Toward a theory of network gatekeeping: A framework for exploring information control. *Journal of the American Information Science and Technology*, 59(9), 1-20.

## **Assignments:**

### Annotated Bibliography (15% of course grade)

Due Oct 7 beginning of class

This assignment is designed to encourage you to locate quality sources that will provide information for your concept explication, theory development paper and final paper.

To do this assignment, you'll first need to fully develop your research question (RQ). Then you'll need to identify a concept within that RQ that is deep enough to make it usable for a concept explication (CE). Then, you'll need to select a theoretical framework (or two) that will allow you to investigate your RQ. Finally, you will compile and annotate a list of sources for each of these items (plus any other relevant topics), using appropriate subheads to organize the bibliography.

Open your annotated bibliography with a statement of your research question and a brief explanation of the concepts and theoretical approaches you plan to pursue.

Limit yourself to reputable academic, trade and media sources. You need a good mix of books and journal articles, with trade journals and popular press pieces included as appropriate. Use online sources only if you can verify the reputation and veracity of the source.

Include only those sources that you have actually read.

For each entry, make it clear how that source relates to your topic. If you have a book with chapters on multiple topics, be sure to note which chapter relates to your RQ. If it's not clear from the title of a journal article how it relates to your RQ, please make this clear in the annotation.

For journal articles that are research studies, please describe the methodology and summarize the findings in the annotation.

There's no absolute number of sources to include, but a good ballpark figure is 25-35. Use American Psychological Association style for your bibliography.

See the example provided on the course site. You can also look at any of the free portions of the entries in the Communication portion of Oxford Bibliographies Online ([http://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/browse?module\\_0=obo-9780199756841](http://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/browse?module_0=obo-9780199756841)). If you enter "Oxford Bibliographies Online" into a Google search, the search results should present you with a list of subheadings under the main Oxford Bibliographies heading. One of these subheadings should be "Communication."

## Concept Explication (20% of course grade)

Due Oct 21 beginning of class

A concept explication is a “meaning analysis.” It is a good place to start to answer a research question, and much of it will end up being used in a literature review.

In this paper you will define THE (or a single) key concept that is integral in your research question. To do so, you will identify as many theoretical and operational definitions as possible for that one concept. Use the literature you have identified in the annotated bibliography to develop your thinking about the key concepts. How have others defined the concepts in which you’re interested? What are the commonalities? Differences? Which of these definitions best fits your project? Your analysis may take the form of a typology in which you further specify how your concept is related to or different from other similar concepts (e.g., interpersonal vs. mass vs. computer mediated communication), or a conceptual map of the components or dimensions of the concepts. Use both written definitions and pictorial models. If you’re especially ambitious, you may add to existing literature by developing your own definition of the concept.

Some examples of concepts that have been used (and thus explicated) in mass communication theory: source credibility, attitude toward the ad, media, bias, interactivity, arousal, presence, enjoyment.

Specific order of information for this assignment: At the beginning of your concept explication paper, please state your research question in terms of relationships between or among variables. Then review the literature related to verbal/conceptual/theoretical definitions of the concept(s). Then review the literature related to operationalization of the concept(s). In both of these parts focus on both the commonalities and differences in the various definitions. End with a statement of how you will choose to define and operationalize your concept(s) for your project.

Length expectation: 7 to 10 pages, including references.

See the example provided on the course site.

## Theory Critiques (25% of course grade)

Due as listed on syllabus at beginning of class (there are three of these)

In these assignments, you will apply the six scientific criteria for judging theory we covered in the first week of the semester to a theory of your choice. These criteria are explanatory power, predictive capability, falsifiability (testability), parsimony (simplicity), internal consistency, and heuristic potential (for generating new research).

Ideally, the theory you choose of the possible listed (see syllabus) will be relevant in some way to your area of interest. You must choose one of the listed theories, corresponding to the frameworks covered most recently in class.

You are also welcome to use additional criteria as you see fit (for example, there are aesthetic criteria for judging theories that you can learn about online—these criteria include things like societal value, agreement among the community of scholars, aesthetic appeal, and fresh insight).

In this paper, you should thoroughly evaluate the propositions of the theory according to the criteria, in addition to discussing the overall worth of the theory as a whole. This includes arguing whether or not you feel this “theory” is, in fact, a bona fide theory. Strengths and weaknesses of the theory should be addressed. This would include a brief discussion of any critiques of the theory that already exist in published work.

Length will vary, but please aim for between 3 to 5 pages in total, excluding references.

### Research Proposal (40% of course grade)

First literature review/research question draft due Nov 11 beginning of class (reviewed by instructor)  
Final paper due Dec 8 at 10:00am

Your work in this course will culminate in a final paper that will serve as the basis of the theory portion of your thesis or dissertation or a proposal for a paper for presentation at a conference. This paper should include an introduction, a literature review and accompanying argumentation toward one or more propositions, and the propositions themselves in the form of research questions and/or hypotheses.

Typically, your paper will include:

- a. A comprehensive and critical review of relevant academic literature on a mass communication topic and specific research question (based on Annotated Bibliography assignment);
- b. Definitions of key terms and concepts (based on Concept Explication assignment);
- c. A statement of theoretical linkages among concepts, preferably presented as a model and incorporating, applying or modifying an existing relevant theory(ies);
- d. A tentative set of hypotheses or suggestions for research that follow from the conceptual development (in addition to addressing critiques, as noted in the Theory Critique assignment).

We will work through each of the pieces during the semester, and then you will put it all together in a coherent package in the end. Your papers will be graded for both content and form. Strong literature reviews tend to focus on outlining an argument, concentrating on what is known rather than what scholars did what and when. In other words, challenge yourself to avoid starting sentences with “So-and-so (date) examined blah-blah and found...”. Instead, think about what the important lessons of the previous research are, and lead your sentences with concepts and findings rather than names and dates.

You are not expected to gather or analyze data in this course. What you are doing is the theoretical groundwork necessary for subsequent data collection and analysis. However, I encourage each of you to treat this work as the first steps toward a comprehensive research project that ultimately could be published in an academic journal.

See the two examples provided on the course site.

Length expectation: around 7 pages of literature review and up to 7 pages of method, excluding references.

### Other Assignments (0% of course grade)

At the beginning and end of the semester, I will ask you to diagram and write a paragraph about what your research interests are. These are exercises intended to help you explain (and identify) your scholarship. These exercises are not graded.

You will also be asked to make a short five-minute presentation about the research topic you choose for your research proposal (the final paper in this course). This presentation is also not graded, but it is included to help you practice how to concisely explain a paper (in preparation for future academic presentations).

### **Grading:**

As noted above, course grades will be determined on this basis:

Annotated Bibliography (15 percent)  
Concept Explication Paper (20 percent)  
Theory Critique Papers (25 percent total)  
Research Proposal (40 percent)

I reserve the right to deduct from your final course grade up to 10 percent for poor class participation. It is expected that all students in the course will contribute to the in-class discussions, and thus share in the overall learning and discovery that will occur in this course. It is the rare bird, indeed, who does not participate in some way, such that their lack of participation is detrimental to their own and their peers' experience. If this rare case should occur, I will make every effort to alert this rare bird to ensure expectations are met throughout the semester. If, however, no attempt at improvement is made on the part of this rare bird, their course grade will reflect their disinclination to participate.

Here's how the graduate grading scale will be applied in this class:

H – Student reads and critically engages with all of the assigned material. Participation in discussion and written assignments exhibits the ability not only to apply the material, but also to extrapolate ideas, expand into new areas, and contribute to the body of scholarship in the area. Reserved for truly extraordinary work.

P – Student usually reads and engages critically with the assigned material. Able to apply material and extrapolate ideas. Consistently good work done on time.

L – Student reads and engages critically with only some of the assigned material. Able to apply the material and extrapolate ideas in only some instances.

F – Student occasionally misses class, does not always read the material, fails to critically engage with it, and is unable or unwilling to apply the material.

Late papers will not be accepted unless prior arrangements were made with the instructor.

## Tentative Course Schedule

	Topic	Readings
Aug 19	Approaching Theory Annotated Bibliographies versus Literature Reviews  (assigned: annotated bibliography due Oct 7)	(none – there is an in-class writing assignment today consisting of a Venn diagram and paragraph explaining your research interests)
Aug 21	Introduction to Communication Theory	Kuhn, T. S. (1962). <i>The structure of scientific revolutions</i> . (173 pages – read throughout the semester)  Craig, R. T. (1999). <i>Communication theory as a field</i> . (38 pages, read all)  Shannon, C. E. (1948, July). <i>A mathematical theory of communication</i> . (pp. 1 and 2 required only)  Baran, S. J., & Davis, D. K. (2012). <i>Mass communication theory: Foundations, ferment, and future</i> . (Read Ch. 1, pp. 5-20, 15 pages)
Aug 26	History of Mass Communication Theory	Baran, S. J., & Davis, D. K. (2012). <i>Mass communication theory: Foundations, ferment, and future</i> . (Read Ch. 2 pp. 22-41, Ch. 4 pp. 73-95, Ch. 6 pp. 135-173, and Ch. 8, 209-215, total of 85 pages)
Aug 28	Building Theory and Concept Explication  (assigned: concept explication due Oct 21)	Shoemaker, P.J., Tankard, J.W., & Lasorsa, D.L. (2004). Theoretical Concepts. In <i>How to Build Social Science Theories</i> (pp. 15-35). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.  Chaffee, S. H. (1991). <i>Communication concepts I: Explication</i> . (73 pages, read all)  Kiouisis, S. (2002). Interactivity: a concept explication. (25 pages, read all)  Sundar, S. S., Kalyanaraman, S., & Brown, J. (2003). Explicating website interactivity: Impression-formation effects in political campaign sites. (Read pp. 30-38, 7 ½ pages)

Sept 2	Agenda-Setting	<p>Baran, S. J., &amp; Davis, D. K. (2012). <i>Mass communication theory: Foundations, ferment, and future</i>. (Read pp. 293-297, total of 5 pages)</p> <p>McCombs, M., &amp; Shaw, D. (1972). The agenda-setting function of mass media. (11 pages, read all)</p> <p>McCombs, M. E., &amp; Shaw, D. L. (1993). The evolution of agenda-setting research: Twenty-five years in the marketplace of ideas. (8 pages, read all)</p> <p>Recommended: <i>Media Effects</i> text, Ch. 1 (16 pages)</p>
Sept 4	Framing	<p>Baran, S. J., &amp; Davis, D. K. (2012). <i>Mass communication theory: Foundations, ferment, and future</i>. (Read pp. 330-339, total of 10 pages)</p> <p>Scheufele, D. A. (1999). Framing as a theory of media effects. (16 pages, read all)</p> <p>Entman, R. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. (8 pages, read all)</p> <p>Recommended: <i>Media Effects</i> text, Ch. 2 (16 pages)</p>
Sept 9	<p>Priming</p> <p>(assigned: theory critique of agenda setting, framing, or priming due Sept 16)</p>	<p>Baran, S. J., &amp; Davis, D. K. (2012). <i>Mass communication theory: Foundations, ferment, and future</i>. (Read pp. 293-297, total of 5 pages)</p> <p>Tulving, E. (1972). Episodic and semantic memory. (22 pages)</p> <p>Collins, A. M., &amp; Loftus, E. F. (1975). A spreading-activation theory of semantic processing. (21 pages)</p> <p>Scheufele, D. A., &amp; Tewksbury, D. (2007). Framing, agenda setting, and priming: The evolution of three media effects models. (10 pages)</p> <p>Dillman Carpentier, F. R. (2014). Agenda setting and priming effects based on information presentation: Revisiting accessibility as a mechanism explaining agenda setting and priming. (22 pages)</p> <p>Recommended: <i>Media Effects</i> text, Ch. 5 (19 pages)</p>

Sept 11	Social Cognitive Theory	<p>Baran, S. J., &amp; Davis, D. K. (2012). <i>Mass communication theory: Foundations, ferment, and future</i>. (Read pp. 193-196, 4 pages total)</p> <p>Bandura, A. A., Ross, D., &amp; Ross, S. A. (1961). Transmission of aggression through imitation of aggressive models. (7 pages)</p> <p>Recommended: <i>Media Effects</i> text, Ch. 6 (30 pages)</p>
Sept 16	Cultivation	<p>Baran, S. J., &amp; Davis, D. K. (2012). <i>Mass communication theory: Foundations, ferment, and future</i>. (Read pp. 340-346, 7 pages total)</p> <p>Gerbner, G. (1969). Toward “Cultural Indicators”: The analysis of mass mediated public message systems. (12 pages)</p> <p>Shrum, L. J. (1996). Psychological processes underlying cultivation effects: Further tests of construct accessibility. (22 pages)</p> <p>Recommended: <i>Media Effects</i> text, Ch. 3 (15 pages), Ch. 4 (23 pages)</p>
Sept 18	Symbolic Interactionism	<p>Baran, S. J., &amp; Davis, D. K. (2012). <i>Mass communication theory: Foundations, ferment, and future</i>. (Read pp. 313-323, 10 pages total)</p> <p>Tuchman, G., &amp; Jensen, K. (2002). Part II: Systematics: Chapter 5: The production of news. (12 pages)</p> <p>Davis, J. (2010). Architecture of the personal interactive homepage: Constructing the self through MySpace. (16 pages)</p>
Sept 23	Social Identity Spiral of Silence Discrimination  (assigned: theory critique of social cognitive theory, cultivation, cognitive process model, symbolic interactionism, or social identity due Sept 30)	<p>Tajfel, H., &amp; Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behaviour. (17 pages)</p> <p>Baran, S. J., &amp; Davis, D. K. (2012). <i>Mass communication theory: Foundations, ferment, and future</i>. (Read pp. 298-302, 10 pages total)</p> <p>Fiske, S. T. (1998). Stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination. In Gilbert, D. T., Fiske, S. T., &amp;</p>

Lindzey, G. (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology*, Vol. 2, 4<sup>th</sup> ed. (pp. 357-411). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill. Available at <http://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=w27pSuHLnLYC&oi=fnd&pg=PA357&ots=gKGjsUBJIO&sig=5-H6O1rrYNxjhQUtOro67wgXWkI#v=onepage&q&f=false> or by searching for “Stereotype and Outgroup” in Google Scholar.

Recommended: *Media Effects* text, Read Ch. 16 (17 pages)

Sept 25

Elaboration Likelihood Model/  
Dual Process Models

Baran, S. J., & Davis, D. K. (2012). *Mass communication theory: Foundations, ferment, and future*. (Read pp. 268-269, 2 pages total)

Cacioppo, J. T., Petty, R. E., Kao, C., & Rodriguez, R. (1986). Central and peripheral routes to persuasion: An individual difference perspective. (12 pages)

Petty, R. E., & Wegener, D. T. (1999). The elaboration likelihood model: Current status and controversies. (pp. 41-72)

And Chen, S., & Chaiken, S. (1999). The heuristic-systematic model in its broader context. (pp. 73-96)  
In Chaiken, S., & Trope, Y. (Eds.), *Dual-process theories in social psychology*. Guilford Press.

Available at

[http://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=5X\\_aulBx99EC&oi=fnd&pg=PA73&dq=Heuristic+Systematic+Model+&ots=OIMX-O7lpi&sig=L1FEekcwaQzH60hzgiIoNY3QhY0#v=onepage&q&f=false](http://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=5X_aulBx99EC&oi=fnd&pg=PA73&dq=Heuristic+Systematic+Model+&ots=OIMX-O7lpi&sig=L1FEekcwaQzH60hzgiIoNY3QhY0#v=onepage&q&f=false) or by searching for “dual process theories in social psychology” in Google Scholar.

Recommended: *Media Effects* text, Ch. 7 (39 pages)

Sept 30

Theory of Planned Behavior  
and combining theories

Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. (32 pages)

Griffin, R. J., Neuwirth, K., Giese, J., & Dunwoody, S. (2002). Linking the Heuristic-Systematic Model and depth of processing. (27 pages)

Nabi, R. L., & Sullivan, J. L. (2001). Does television viewing relate to engagement in protective action

against crime? A cultivation analysis from a theory of reasoned action perspective. (22 pages)

Oct 2 Third-Person Effect

Davison, W. (1983). The Third-Person Effect in Communication. (14 pages)

Recommended: *Media Effects* text, Ch. 12 (17 pages)

Oct 7 Social Comparison

Festinger, L. (1954). A theory of social comparison processes. (23 pages)

(assigned: theory critique of ELM, TPB or TRA, TPE, or social comparison due Oct 14)

Krayer, A. A., Ingledeu, D. K., & Iphofen, R. R. (2008). Social comparison and body image in adolescence: A grounded theory approach. (12 pages)

(annotated bibliography due)

Recommended: *Media Effects* text, Ch. 22 pp. 497-498 (just skim the rest of the 26-page chapter)

Oct 9 Functional Theories:  
Uses-and-gratifications and mood management

Baran, S. J., & Davis, D. K. (2012). *Mass communication theory: Foundations, ferment, and future*. (Read pp. 245-256, 12 pages total)

Katz, E., Blumler, J. G., & Gurevitch, M. (1973). Uses and gratifications research. (14 pages)

Zillmann, D. (1988). Mood management through communication choices. (13 pages)

Recommended: *Media Effects* text, Ch. 8 (19 pages), Ch. 23 (14 pages)

Oct 14 Entertainment Theory

Baran, S. J., & Davis, D. K. (2012). *Mass communication theory: Foundations, ferment, and future*. (Read pp. 270-273, 4 pages total)

Vorderer, P., Klimmt, C., & Ritterfeld, U. (2004). Enjoyment: At the heart of media entertainment. (21 pages)

(Fall Break begins Oct 15 5pm and ends Oct 20 8am – no classes)

Oct 21 Media Dependency  
(concept explication due)

Baran, S. J., & Davis, D. K. (2012). *Mass communication theory: Foundations, ferment, and future*. (Read pp. 183-187 and 288-290, 8 pages total)

Ball-Rokeach, S. J., & DeFleur, M. L. (1976). A dependency model of mass-media effects. (17 pages)

Ball-Rokeach, S. J. (1985). The origins of individual media-system dependency: A sociological framework. (24 pages)

Oct 23 Gatekeeping

Shoemaker, P. J. & Vos, T. P. (2008). Media gatekeeping. (14 pages)

Roberts, C. (2005, August). *Gatekeeping theory: An evolution*. (17 pages)

Barzilai-Nahon, K. (2008). Toward a theory of network gatekeeping: A framework for exploring information control. (20 pages)

Oct 28 Mini Presentations of Research Proposals

(none – each person will have 5 minutes to present his/her research question, theoretical underpinning, general design for addressing the research question, and potential importance of the findings for scholarship and/or society)

Oct 30 Mini Presentations of Research Proposals

(none – each person will have 5 minutes to present his/her research question, theoretical underpinning, general design for addressing the research question, and potential importance of the findings for scholarship and/or society)

Nov 4, 6,  
11, 13,  
18, 20,  
25  
Reserved for faculty  
proseminar visits  
(literature review/RQ drafts are  
due Nov 11 for initial feedback)

(none)

(Thanksgiving Break begins Nov 26 8am and ends Dec 1 8am – no classes)

Dec 2 Looking Back, Moving Forward

(none, but you will need your initial Venn diagram and research interest paragraph from the beginning of the semester – you will be revisiting and revising these)

(Classes end Dec 3; Research proposals due by Dec 8 at 10am)