

Communication 8970: Human-Computer Interaction Fall 2016

Instructor: Jesse Fox, Ph.D.
Email: fox.775@osu.edu
Office hours: T 1-3 & by appt.

Office: 3084 Derby Hall
Office phone: 614.247.2348

Class Information: Tues/Thurs 3:55-5:15, Derby 3116

Course Description: This course is one of two seminars offered as part of the communication technology focus area of the School of Communication graduate program. The focus of this course is on experiences with technology, including technological adoption and use; affordances across digital platforms; usability; and elements of interface design and their psychological, interpersonal, social, and cultural implications.

Course Objectives:

1. To explain the concepts and theories behind HCI research and their relevance to communication
2. To identify and elaborate elements of HCI design and their effects on users
3. To critically evaluate and synthesize interdisciplinary HCI research
4. To develop study ideas based on HCI theory and research

Required text:

American Psychological Association (2010). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (6th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.

All other readings can be found on Carmen.

Recommended:

Strunk, W., & White, E. B. (2000). *The elements of style* (4th ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon. (Or any later edition)

Assignments

Study journal. (5%) After reading an article, you should be left with as many questions as you found answers. As a researcher, it is essential to get into the habit of collecting your ideas, even if you don't have time to develop them into actual studies just yet. Your journal doesn't have to be neat or have a Hello Kitty cover or anything like that—it is for your benefit. Simply reference the article or topic at the top and sketch out approximately 1 page of your lingering questions, hypotheses, and/or future study ideas. The goal is to develop a collection of the kernels of executable studies. You don't have to do this for every topic, but you should do this for at least 10 dates/classes. Be sure that for these 10 dates, it is clear what you are deriving from the associated readings and concepts. *Midterm journal check* (at least 5 entries): **Tuesday, October 18.** *Journal due:* **Tuesday, December 6.**

Mid-dish-term exam. (20%) This exam will be an in-class, closed-book, short essay exam. The purpose of this format is twofold: first, to prepare you for the demands of your comprehensive exams; second, it is designed to prepare you for the demands of teaching and presenting your work. Although we are in an era of having information at our fingertips, you should have the ability to clearly, accurately, and spontaneously answer questions without having to consult other sources. Midterm date: **Tuesday, November 8.**

Usability testing. (15%) At some point this semester, we will engage in some hands-on activities for you to get experience with evaluating the usability of computer interfaces. With your collaborator/s, you will produce a brief usability report and recommendation based on your testing (4-5 pages). The timing of this project is pending.

Research project. (40%) Your final project for the course will be either a) a literature review and conceptual or theoretical synthesis of an HCI topic, or b) an executable research proposal (introduction, literature review with hypotheses, method, limitations, and appendices with all items and stimuli) and accompanying IRB. The goal of either of these projects is to dig very deeply into a topic to broaden your knowledge base and also to yield what I hope will be a publishable paper.

Your project needs to be an original idea. I will not accept proposals that align too closely with your existing body of work. If you have written several papers on topic X, don't propose a literature review on topic X. Use this opportunity to explore something that interests you that you have not had the time or license to delve into yet.

The end product will be a journal-worthy paper. "Journal-worthy" means your paper should not only be well-written and insightful, but also professional in its presentation: clean 6th edition APA formatting and style; references and in-text citations cross-checked and appropriately formatted; and paper free of grammatical and typographical errors. Failure to follow directions and other sloppiness will result in considerable points taken off of your grade to reflect the potential consequences of unprofessional work in academia (e.g., rejected manuscripts, failed conference submissions, and a reputation among colleagues for being careless.)

All measures should be submitted as appendices. The paper should be approximately 14-16 pages without references or appendices.

- *Topic approval:* You must meet with me before **October 20** to get preliminary approval on your topic.
- *Initial proposal:* Your initial proposal will include 2-3 pages (plus any references). In a synthesis paper, this would outline the scope of your literature review, argue for its need, and elaborate your goals. For a research proposal, this should include basic theoretical argumentation, rationale, and preliminary hypotheses. You will submit a hard copy of your proposal in class on **Tuesday, October 25.**
- *Paper progress check-in:* You are expected to make progress on your paper throughout the semester. At this point, I will request to see evidence of your literature review (draft) and reference gathering. Check-in: **Thursday, November 17.**

- *Final paper due: **Friday, December 9 by 3 pm.*** You must submit a copy via Carmen AND a hard copy or you will be penalized.

Class participation and discussion questions. (20%) On three occasions, you will be responsible for submitting two discussion questions no later than midnight Friday for the subsequent week's topics. You will be graded for the relevance, thoughtfulness, and timeliness of your questions. Active and thoughtful class participation will account for the remaining part of your grade. Active doesn't mean nodding, breathing, and/or not falling asleep; it means making meaningful and relevant contributions to the discussion, asking challenging or interesting questions, knowing when to listen, and being a supportive participant *every* class.

Policies & Legalese

Academic Integrity: I take academic dishonesty very seriously. All students are subject to the student code of conduct (see http://studentaffairs.osu.edu/resource_csc.asp), including the student code of academic integrity.

One important consideration for graduate students is the fine line between re-using segments of one's work and re-submitting one's work. When you are writing multiple papers on the same topic across courses, it can be difficult to determine the difference. For this class, I want to see original ideas and original work that are relevant to the substance of the course. I do not want to see the same paper you've submitted multiple times with just a new population, a new treatment, or a few different variables to make it fit the class topic. Any and all segments of work that has been submitted previously or concurrently (whether in another course, a conference paper, a journal submission, or any other format) must be clearly indicated if included or heavily paraphrased in any materials submitted for this course. Failure to do so will be considered academic dishonesty and will have severe repercussions, such as a zero on the assignment.

Disruptions: Disruptions and distractions (including talking during lecture; text messaging or other phone use; or nonclass computer activity), threatening behavior, and negative participation (e.g., use of inappropriate language or derogatory speech) will not be tolerated. Any student who engages in such behavior may be asked to leave class, suffer grade penalties, and be reported to the Dean of Students and/or University Police. Cell phones are considered a disruption. **Turn your cell phone and other devices off completely and put them away before the start of class.** Any student who is observed consulting or using their device or whose device rings, beeps, or audibly vibrates during class will suffer grade penalties (1% of the overall class grade for the first offense, 5% for the second offense, etc.) and may be asked to leave class.

Device Policy: Computers will be used for in-class activities only. Laptops, tablets, phones, wearables, and other mobile device use is otherwise prohibited. If you require a computer for notetaking due to a disability, please see the disability portion below and make an appointment with me to discuss arrangements.

Disability Accommodations: If you anticipate the need for accommodations to meet the requirements of this course, please contact the Office for Disability Services, Baker Hall, Room 098, or phone (614) 292-3307. Students with documented disabilities making requests must meet with me privately within the first three weeks of class to discuss reasonable accommodations.

Diversity Statement: The School of Communication at The Ohio State University embraces and maintains an environment that respects diverse traditions, heritages, experiences, and people. Our commitment to diversity moves beyond mere tolerance to recognizing, understanding, and welcoming the contributions of diverse groups and the value group members possess as individuals. In our School, the faculty, students, and staff are dedicated to building a tradition of diversity with principles of equal opportunity, personal respect, and the intellectual interests of those who comprise diverse cultures.

Title IX Statement: Title IX makes it clear that violence and harassment based on sex and gender are Civil Rights offenses subject to the same kinds of accountability and the same kinds of support applied to offenses against other protected categories. If you or someone you know has been sexually harassed or assaulted, subject to domestic or dating violence, or stalked or otherwise threatened, you may find the appropriate resources at <http://titleix.osu.edu> or by contacting the Ohio State Title IX Coordinator, Kellie Brennan, at titleix@osu.edu. Information about confidential counseling through the Counseling and Consultation Service can be found at <http://www.ccs.osu.edu/> or (614) 292-5766.

My Expectations: I expect that as a graduate student, you come to class prepared every day. I expect you to have the time management, research, and writing skills to ensure your success in a graduate level course. Graduate coursework is not merely a series of hoops to jump through; every class represents a body of knowledge you have not yet mastered. Regardless of its relevance to your specific interests, coursework is your opportunity to become a well-read, well-rounded, and wise scholar. Readings and other assignments should be completed before class, and you should have spent sufficient time reading, annotating, rereading, pondering, digging, or otherwise immersing yourself in the material. Your written work should reflect this depth of thought as well as the professionalism expected of someone who is not merely a student, but a scholar in the early stages of your career.

This syllabus is an agreement between the instructor and the student. The instructor reserves the right to make changes to the syllabus as deemed necessary. By staying enrolled in this class, the student agrees to abide by the policies described herein.

Tentative Course Schedule

<u>Date</u>	<u>Assignments</u>	<u>Topic</u>
T 8/23		Course intro
R 8/25		What is human-computer interaction?
T 8/30	DQ topic selection	Considerations for studying HCI in Comm
R 9/1		Evolution of HCI platforms
T 9/6		Affordances
R 9/8		Theoretical approaches to HCI (HCI)
T 9/13		Theoretical approaches to HCI (Comm)
R 9/15		Theoretical approaches to HCI (Comm)

T 9/20		Methods, usability, & HCI research
R 9/22		HCI & identity
T 9/27		Design principles & considerations
R 9/29		Predictors of use & adoption
T 10/4		Predictors of use & adoption
R 10/6		Attention & multitasking
T 10/11		Experiences with HCI
R 10/13	FALL BREAK – NO CLASS	
T 10/18	Midterm journal check-in	Seeking & selecting media & information
R 10/20	Last day for paper topic approval	Evaluating information
T 10/25	Paper proposal due	Psychological effects of HCI
R 10/27		Prevalence, ubiquity, & problematic use
T 11/1		Perceiving computers socially: concepts
R 11/3		Perceiving computers socially
T 11/8	MIDTERM	
R 11/10	NCA – NO CLASS	
T 11/15		Emotional and affective experiences with HCI
R 11/17	Paper progress check-in	Persuasive technology
T 11/22		Persuasive technology
R 11/24	THANKSGIVING – NO CLASS	
T 11/29		HCI & health
R 12/1		Expanding human capacity
T 12/6	Final journal due	Computers as superior humans

Final paper due Friday, December 9 @ 3 pm

Communication 8970: Human-Computer Interaction Course Readings

When in doubt, read articles in chronological (rather than alphabetical) order.

Tuesday, August 23 – Intro, no readings

Thursday, August 25 -- What is HCI? Humans and computers

Lee, E. J., & Sundar, S. S. Human-computer interaction. In C. R. Berger, M. E. Roloff, & D. R. Ewoldsen, *Handbook of communication science* (2nd ed.; pp. 507-523). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Turing, A. (1950). Computing machinery & intelligence. *Mind*, 59, 433-460.

Recommended

Card, S. K., Newell, A., & Moran, T. P. (1983). *The psychology of human-computer interaction*.

Carroll, J. M. (2010). Conceptualizing a possible discipline of human–computer interaction. *Interacting with Computers*, 22, 3-12. doi: 10.1016/j.intcom.2009.11.008

Lanier, J. (2011). *You are not a gadget*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Sears, A., Lazar, J., Ozok, A., & Meiselwitz, G. (2008). Human-centered computing: Defining a research agenda. *International Journal of Human–Computer Interaction*, 24, 2-16. doi: 10.1080/10447310701771456

Shackel, B. (1997). Human-computer interaction—Whence and whither? *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, 48, 970-986. doi: 10.1002/(SICI)1097-4571(199711)48:11<970::AID-ASI2>3.0.CO;2-Z

Tuesday, August 30 – Considerations for studying HCI in Communication

Heinderyckx, F. (2014). Reclaiming the high ground in the age of onlinement. *Journal of Communication*, 64, 999-1014. doi: 10.1111/jcom.12130

Metzger, M. J. (2009). The study of media effects in the era of internet communication. In R. L. Nabi & M. B. Oliver (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of media processes and effects* (pp. 561-576). Washington, DC: Sage.

Recommended

Lievrouw, L. A., Bucy, E. P., Finn, T. A., Frindte, W., Gershon, R. A., Haythornthwaite, C., ... & Sundar, S. S. (2001). Bridging the subdisciplines: An overview of communication and technology research. *Annals of the International Communication Association*, 24, 271-296. doi: 10.1080/23808985.2001.11678990

Morris, M., & Ogan, C. (1996). The Internet as mass medium. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 1*(4). doi: 10.1111/j.1083-6101.1996.tb00174.x Available at: <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1083-6101.1996.tb00174.x/full>

Newhagen, J. E., & Rafaeli, S. (1996). Why communication researchers should study the Internet: A dialogue. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 1*(4).

Newell, A., & Card, S. K. (1985). The prospects for psychological science in human-computer interaction. *Human-Computer Interaction, 1*, 209-242. doi: 10.1207/s15327051hci0103_1

Papsdorf, C. (2015). How the Internet automates communication. *Information, Communication & Society, 18*, 991-1005. doi: 10.1080/1369118X.2015.1008539

Walther, J. B., Gay, G., & Hancock, J. T. (2005). How do communication and technology researchers study the internet? *Journal of Communication, 55*, 632-657. doi: 10.1111/j.1460-2466.2005.tb02688.x

Williams, F., & Rice, R. E. (1983). Communication research and the new media technologies. In R. N. Bostrom (Ed.), *Communication yearbook* (Vol. 7, pp. 200-224). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Thursday, September 1 -- Evolution of HCI platforms

Grudin, J. (2008). A moving target: The evolution of HCI. In A. Sears & J. A. Jacko (Eds.), *The human-computer interaction handbook: Fundamentals, evolving technologies, and emerging applications* (2nd ed.; pp. 1-24). New York, NY: CRC Press.

Lal, R. (2013). *Digital design essentials: 100 ways to design better desktop, web, and mobile interfaces*. Beverly, MA: Rockport. [Just skim the selections and read through anything unknown to you.]

Olson, G. M., & Olson, J. S. (2003). Human-computer interaction: Psychological aspects of the human use of computing. *Annual Review of Psychology, 54*, 491-516. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.54.101601.145044

Recommended

Daft, R. L., Lengel, R. H. & Trevino, L. K. (1987). Message equivocality, media selection, and manager performance: Implications for information systems. *MIS Quarterly, 11*, 355-366. doi: 10.2307/248682

Fox, J., Arena, D., & Bailenson, J. N. (2009). Virtual reality: A survival guide for the social scientist. *Journal of Media Psychology, 21*(3), 95-113. doi: 10.1027/1864-1105.21.3.95

Isbouts, J.-P., & Ohler, J. (2013). Storytelling and media: Narrative models from Aristotle to augmented reality. In K. E. Dill (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of media psychology* (pp. 13-42). New York, NY: Oxford.

Iwata, H. (2008). Haptic interface. In A. Sears & J. A. Jacko (Eds.), *The human-computer interaction handbook: Fundamentals, evolving technologies, and emerging applications* (2nd ed.; pp. 229-245). New York, NY: CRC Press.

Rice, R. E. (Ed.) (1984). *The new media: Communication, research, and technology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Rogers, E. (1986). *Communication technology: The new media in society*. New York, NY: The Free Press.

Tuesday, September 6 – Affordances

Culnan, M. J., & Markus, M. L. (1987). Information technologies. In F. M. Jablin, L. L. Putnam, K. H. Roberts, & L. W. Porter (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational communication* (pp. 420-443). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Gaver, W. W. (1991). Technology affordances. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors*, 79-84. ACM. doi: 10.1145/108844.108856

Tao, C. C., & Bucy, E. P. (2007). Conceptualizing media stimuli in experimental research: Psychological versus attribute-based definitions. *Human Communication Research*, 33, 397-426. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2958.2007.00305.x

Recommended

Bucy, E. P., & Tao, C. C. (2007). The mediated moderation model of interactivity. *Media Psychology*, 9, 647-672. doi: 10.1080/15213260701283269

Eveland, W. P. (2003). A “mix of attributes” approach to the study of media effects and new communication technologies. *Journal of Communication*, 53, 395-410. doi: 10.1111/j.1460-2466.2003.tb02598.x

Gibson, J. J. (1979). *The ecological approach to visual perception*. Boston: Houghlin Mifflin.

Kalyanaraman, S., & Wojdynski, B. (2015). Affording control: How customization, interactivity, and navigability affect psychological responses to technology. In S. S. Sundar (Ed.), *The handbook of the psychology of communication technology*. New York: Wiley & Sons.

Kiousis, S. (2002). Interactivity: A concept explication. *New Media & Society*, 4, 355-383. doi: 10.1177/146144480200400303

Schrock, A. R. (2015). Communicative affordances of mobile media: Portability, availability, locatability, and multimediality. *International Journal of Communication*, 9, 1229-1246.

Sundar, S. S., & Bellur, S. (2011). Concept explication in the Internet age: The case of interactivity. In E. P. Bucy & R. L. Holbert (Eds.), *Sourcebook for political communication research: Methods, measures, and analytical techniques* (pp. 485-500). New York: Routledge.

Sundar, S. S. (2009). Media effects 2.0: Social and psychological effects of communication technologies. In R. L. Nabi & M. B. Oliver (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of media processes and effects* (pp. 545-560). Washington, DC: Sage.

Thursday, September 8 -- Theoretical approaches to HCI

Clemmensen, T., Kaptelinin, V., & Nardi, B. (2016). Making HCI theory work: An analysis of the use of activity theory in HCI research. *Behaviour & Information Technology*, 35, 608-627. doi: 10.1080/0144929X.2016.1175507

Payne, S. J. (2008). Mental models in human-computer interaction. In A. Sears & J. A. Jacko (Eds.), *The human-computer interaction handbook: Fundamentals, evolving technologies, and emerging applications* (2nd ed.; pp. 63-76). New York, NY: CRC Press.

Recommended

Barnes, S. B. (2000). Bridging the differences between social theory and technological invention in human-computer interface design. *New Media & Society*, 2, 353-372. doi: 10.1177/14614440022225850

Carroll, J. M. (Ed.). (2003). *HCI models, theories, and frameworks: Toward a multidisciplinary science*. New York, NY: Morgan Kaufmann. [Wiki book available at: https://en.wikibooks.org/wiki/Models_and_Theories_in_Human-Computer_Interaction/Framework:_Computer_as_Human,_Human_as_Computer:_Perception-Input,_Thinking-Processing,_Action-Output]

Nardi, B. A. (1996). *Context and consciousness: Activity theory and human-computer interaction*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Tuesday, September 13 – Theoretical approaches to HCI from Comm

Blascovich, J., Loomis, J., Beall, A., Swinth, K., Hoyt, C., & Bailenson, J. N. (2002). Immersive virtual environment technology as a methodological tool for social psychology. *Psychological Inquiry*, 13, 103-124. [p. 111-124, starting with “A Model of Social Influence Within IVEs]

Nass, C., & Moon, Y. (2000). Machines and mindlessness: Social responses to computers. *Journal of Social Issues*, 56, 81-103.

Sundar, S. S., Jia, H., Waddell, T. F., & Huang, Y. (2015). Toward a theory of interactive media effects (TIME): Four models for explaining how interface features affect user psychology. In S. S. Sundar (Ed.), *The handbook of the psychology of communication technology* (pp. 47-86). New York: Wiley & Sons.

Recommended

Langer, E. (1989). Minding matters: The consequences of mindlessness-mindfulness. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental psychology* (Vol. 22, pp. 137-173). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Meyrowitz, J. (1985). *No sense of place: The impact of electronic media on social behavior*. New York, NY: Oxford.

Reeves, B., & Nass, C. (1996). *The media equation: How people treat computers, television, and new media like real people and places*. New York, NY: Cambridge.

Thursday, September 15-- Theoretical approaches to HCI from Comm

Bailenson, J. N., Yee, N., Blascovich, J., & Guadagno, R. E. (2008). Transformed social interaction in mediated interpersonal communication. In E. A. Konijn, S. Utz., M. Tanis, & S. B. Barnes (Eds.) *Mediated interpersonal communication* (pp. 77-99). New York: Taylor & Francis.

Yee, N., & Bailenson, J. N. (2009). The difference between being and seeing: The relative contribution of self-perception and priming to behavioral changes via digital self-representation. *Media Psychology*, *12*, 195-209. doi: 10.1080/15213260902849943

Recommended

Reeves, B., & Nass, C. (1996). *The media equation: How people treat computers, television, and new media like real people and places*. New York: Cambridge.

Van Der Heide, B., Schumaker, E. M., Peterson, A. M., & Jones, E. B. (2013). The Proteus effect in dyadic communication: Examining the effect of avatar appearance in computer-mediated dyadic interaction. *Communication Research*, *40*, 838-860. doi: 10.1177/0093650212438097

Yee, N., & Bailenson, J. (2007). The Proteus effect: The effect of transformed self-representation on behavior. *Human Communication Research*, *33*, 271-290. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2958.2007.00299.x

Yee, N., Bailenson, J. N., & Ducheneaut, N. (2009). The Proteus effect: Implications of transformed digital self-representation on online and offline behavior. *Communication Research*, *36*, 285-312. doi: 10.1177/0093650208330254

Tuesday, September 20 – Methods, usability, & HCI research

Blascovich, J., Loomis, J., Beall, A., Swinth, K., Hoyt, C., & Bailenson, J. N. (2002). Immersive virtual environment technology as a methodological tool for social psychology. *Psychological Inquiry*, *13*, 103-124. [p. 103-111]

Dumas, J. S., & Fox, J. E. (2008). Usability testing: Current practice and future directions. In A. Sears & J. A. Jacko (Eds.), *The human-computer interaction handbook: Fundamentals, evolving technologies, and emerging applications* (2nd ed.; pp. 1129-1149). New York, NY: CRC Press.

Holz, C., Bentley, F., Church, K., & Patel, M. (2015, June). I'm just on my phone and they're watching TV: Quantifying mobile device use while watching television. In *Proceedings of the ACM International Conference on Interactive Experiences for TV and Online Video* (pp. 93-102). ACM.

Recommended:

Brügger, N. (2009). Website history and the website as an object of study. *New Media & Society*, 11, 115-132. doi: 10.1177/1461444808099574

Cairns, P., & Cox, A. L. (Eds.). (2008). *Research methods for human-computer interaction*. New York, NY: Cambridge.

Hargittai, E., & Sandvig, C. (Eds.). (2015). *Digital research confidential: The secrets of studying behavior online*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Kahn, A. S., Ratan, R., & Williams, D. (2014). Why we distort in self-report: Predictors of self-report errors in video game play. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 19, 1010-1023. doi: 10.1111/jcc4.12056

Taylor, T. L. (1999). Life in virtual worlds: Plural existence, multimodalities, and other online research challenges. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 43, 436-449. doi: 10.1177/00027649921955362

Thursday, September 22 – HCI & identity

[Readings TBD by guest speaker Dr. Roselyn Lee-Won]

Recommended

Bargh, J. A., McKenna, K. Y. A., & Fitzsimmons, G. M. (2002). Can you see the real me? Activation and expression of the “true self” on the Internet. *Journal of Social Issues*, 58, 33-48.

Luppigini, R. (Ed.), *Handbook of research on technoself: Identity in a technological society*. Hershey, PA: IGI Global. doi: 10.4018/978-1-4666-2211-1.ch014

Turkle, S. (1995). *Life on the screen: Identity in the age of the Internet*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Valkenburg, P. M., Schouten, A. P., & Peter, J. (2005). Adolescents’ identity experiments on the Internet. *New Media & Society*, 7, 383-402. doi: 10.1177/1461444805052282

Winner, L. (1996). Who will we be in cyberspace? *The Information Society*, 12, 63-72. doi: 10.1080/019722496129701

Zhao, S., Grasmuck, S., & Martin, J. (2008). Identity construction on Facebook: Digital empowerment in anchored relationships. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 24, 1816-1836.

Tuesday, September 27 – Design principles and considerations

Carroll, J. M. (1997). Human-computer interaction: Psychology as a science of design. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 48, 61-83. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.48.1.61

Lidwell, W., Holden, K., & Butler, J. (2010). *Universal principles of design: 125 ways to enhance usability, influence perception, increase appeal, make better design decisions, and teach through design*. Beverly, MA: Rockport. [selections]

Norman, D. A. (1990). *The design of everyday things*. New York: Basic Books. [selections]

Recommended

Bartle, R. A. (2004). *Designing virtual worlds*. Berkeley, CA: New Riders.

Faiola, A., Davis, S. B., & Edwards, R. L. (2010). Extending knowledge domains for new media education: Integrating interaction design theory and methods. *New Media & Society*, 12, 691-709. doi: 10.1177/1461444809353014

Lal, R. (2013). *Digital design essentials: 100 ways to design better desktop, web, and mobile interfaces*. Beverly, MA: Rockport.

Preece, J., Sharp, H., & Rogers, Y. (2015). *Interaction design: Beyond human-computer interaction* (4th ed.) New York, NY: Wiley & Sons.

Schell, J. (2014). *The art of game design: A book of lenses*. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.

Stanfill, M. (2015). The interface as discourse: The production of norms through web design. *New Media & Society*, 17, 1059-1074. doi: 10.1177/1461444814520873

Thursday, September 29 -- Predictors of use & adoption

Fulk, J., Steinfield, C. W., Schmitz, J., & Power, J. G. (1987). A social information processing model of media use in organizations. *Communication Research*, 14, 529-552. doi: 10.1177/009365087014005005

Rice, R. E. (2009). Diffusion of innovations: Theoretical extensions. In R. L. Nabi & M. B. Oliver (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of media processes and effects* (pp. 489-503). Washington, DC: Sage.

Vishwanath, A., (2006). The effect of the number of opinion seekers and leaders on technology attitudes and choices. *Human Communication Research*, 32, 322-350. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2958.2006.00278.x

Recommended

Chang, B. H., Lee, S. E., & Kim, B. S. (2006). Exploring factors affecting the adoption and continuance of online games among college students in South Korea Integrating uses and gratification and diffusion of innovation approaches. *New Media & Society*, 8, 295-319. doi: 10.1177/1461444806059888

Gonzales, A. (2016). The contemporary US digital divide: From initial access to technology maintenance. *Information, Communication & Society*, 19, 234-248. doi: 10.1080/1369118X.2015.1050438

Sundar, S. S., & Limperos, A. M. (2013). Uses and gratifications 2.0: New gratifications for new media. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 57, 504-525. doi: 10.1080/08838151.2013.845827

Vishwanath, A. (2015). The psychology of the diffusion and acceptance of technology. In S. S. Sundar (Ed.), *The handbook of the psychology of communication technology* (pp. 313-331). New York: Wiley & Sons.

Tuesday, October 4 -- Predictors of use & adoption

Konijn, E. A., Veldhuis, J., Plaisier, X. S., Spekman, M., & den Hamer, A. (2015). Adolescent development and psychological mechanisms in interactive media use. In S. S. Sundar (Ed.), *The handbook of the psychology of communication technology* (pp. 332-364). New York: Wiley & Sons.

Nass, C., & Yen, C. (2010). *The man who lied to his laptop: What we can learn about ourselves from our machines*. New York: Penguin. (ch. 2, Personality)

Springer, N., Engelmann, I., & Pfaffinger, C. (2015). User comments: Motives and inhibitors to write and read. *Information, Communication & Society*, 18, 798-815. doi: 10.1080/1369118X.2014.997268

Recommended

Brandtzaeg, P. B. (2010). Towards a unified Media-User Typology (MUT): A meta-analysis and review of the research literature on media-user typologies. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 26, 940-956. doi: 10.1016/j.chb.2010.02.008

Hargittai, E., & Shaw, A. (2015). Mind the skills gap: The role of Internet know-how and gender in differentiated contributions to Wikipedia. *Information, Communication & Society*, 18, 424-442. doi: 10.1080/1369118X.2014.957711

Wang, Z., Irwin, M., Cooper, C., & Srivastava, J. (2015). Multidimensions of media multitasking and adaptive media selection. *Human Communication Research*, 41, 102-127. doi: 10.1111/hcre.12042

Whitley, B. E. (1997). Gender differences in computer-related attitudes and behavior: A meta-analysis. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 13, 1-22. doi: 10.1016/S0747-5632(96)00026-X

Williams, D., Yee, N., & Caplan, S. E. (2008). Who plays, how much, and why? Debunking the stereotypical gamer profile. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 13, 993-1018. doi: 10.1111/j.1083-6101.2008.00428.x

Thursday, October 6 – Attention & multitasking

David, P., Kim, J. H., Brickman, J. S., Ran, W., & Curtis, C. M. (2015). Mobile phone distraction while studying. *New Media & Society*, 17, 1661-1679. doi: 10.1177/1461444814531692

Jeong, S. H., & Fishbein, M. (2007). Predictors of multitasking with media: Media factors and audience factors. *Media Psychology, 10*, 364-384. doi: 10.1080/15213260701532948

Szalma, J. L., & Hancock, P. A. (2008). Task loading and stress in human-computer interaction: Theoretical frameworks and mitigation strategies. In A. Sears & J. A. Jacko (Eds.), *The human-computer interaction handbook: Fundamentals, evolving technologies, and emerging applications* (2nd ed.; pp.115-132). New York, NY: CRC Press.

Recommended

Hollender, N., Hofmann, C., Deneke, M., & Schmitz, B. (2010). Integrating cognitive load theory and concepts of human-computer interaction. *Computers in Human Behavior, 26*, 1278-1288. doi: 10.1016/j.chb.2010.05.031

Jeong, S. H., & Hwang, Y. (2012). Does multitasking increase or decrease persuasion? Effects of multitasking on comprehension and counterarguing. *Journal of Communication, 62*, 571-587. doi: 10.1111/j.1460-2466.2012.01659.x

Ophir, E., Nass, C., & Wagner, A. D. (2009). Cognitive control in media multitaskers. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 106*, 15583-15587. doi: 10.1073/pnas.0903620106

Pea, R., Nass, C., Meheula, L., Rance, M., Kumar, A., Bamford, H., ... & Zhou, M. (2012). Media use, face-to-face communication, media multitasking, and social well-being among 8-to 12-year-old girls. *Developmental Psychology, 48*, 327-336. doi: 10.1037/a0027030

Segijn, C. M., Voorveld, H. A., & Smit, E. G. (in press). The underlying mechanisms of multiscreening effects. *Journal of Advertising*. doi: 10.1080/00913367.2016.1172386

Wang, Z., & Tchernev, J. M. (2012). The “myth” of media multitasking: Reciprocal dynamics of media multitasking, personal needs, and gratifications. *Journal of Communication, 62*, 493-513. doi: 10.1111/j.1460-2466.2012.01641.x

West, R., & Bailey, K. (2013). Video games and attention. In K. E. Dill (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of media psychology* (pp. 403-420). New York, NY: Oxford.

Yeykelis, L., Cummings, J. J., & Reeves, B. (2014). Multitasking on a single device: Arousal and the frequency, anticipation, and prediction of switching between media content on a computer. *Journal of Communication, 64*, 167-192. doi: 10.1111/jcom.12070

Tuesday, October 11 - Experiences with HCI

Biocca, F. (1997). The cyborg's dilemma: Progressive embodiment in virtual environments. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 3*(2), n. p. Available at: <http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol3/issue2/biocca2.html>

Caroux, L., Isbister, K., Le Bigot, L., & Vibert, N. (2015). Player-video game interaction: A systematic review of current concepts. *Computers in Human Behavior, 48*, 366-381. doi: 10.1016/j.chb.2015.01.066

Ksiazek, T. B., Peer, L., & Lessard, K. (2016). User engagement with online news: Conceptualizing interactivity and exploring the relationship between online news videos and user comments. *New Media & Society, 18*, 502-520. doi: 10.1177/1461444814545073

Recommended

Bracken, C. C., & Skalski, P. D. (2010). *Immersed in media: Telepresence in everyday life*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Klimmt, C., Hefner, D., & Vorderer, P. (2009). The video game experience as “true” identification: A theory of enjoyable alterations of players’ self-perception. *Communication Theory, 19*, 351-373.

Lee, K. M. (2004). Presence, explicated. *Communication Theory, 14*(1), 27-50.

Lee, K. M., & Nass, C. (2005). Social-psychological origins of feelings of presence: Creating social presence with machine-generated voices. *Media Psychology, 7*, 31-45. doi: 10.1207/S1532785XMEP0701_2

Lombard, M., & Ditton, T. (1997). At the heart of it all: The concept of presence. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 3*(2), n. p. Available at: <http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol3/issue2/lombard.html>

Minsky, M. (1980). Telepresence. *Omni, 2*(9), 45-51.

Ratan, R. A., & Dawson, M. (in press). When Mii is me: A psychophysiological examination of avatar self-relevance. *Communication Research*. doi: 10.1177/0093650215570652

Riva, G., Waterworth, J., & Murray, D. (Eds.) (2014). *Interacting with presence: HCI and the sense of presence in computer-mediated environments*. Berlin, Germany: DeGruyter Open.

Short, J., Williams, E., & Christie, B. (1976). *The social psychology of telecommunications*. New York: Wiley.

Skalski, P., Tamborini, R., Shelton, A., Buncher, M., & Lindmark, P. (2011). Mapping the road to fun: Natural video game controllers, presence, and game enjoyment. *New Media & Society, 13*, 224-242. doi: 10.1177/1461444810370949

Takayama, L. (2015). Telepresence and apparent agency in human-robot interaction. In S. S. Sundar (Ed.), *The handbook of the psychology of communication technology* (pp. 160-175). New York: Wiley & Sons.

Thursday, October 13 – Fall break, no class

Tuesday, October 18 – Seeking and selecting media & information

Garrett, R. K. (2009). Echo chambers online? Politically motivated selective exposure among Internet news users. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 14*, 265-285. doi: 10.1111/j.1083-6101.2009.01440.x

Johnson, B. K., & Knobloch-Westerwick, S. (2014). Glancing up or down: Mood management and selective social comparisons on social networking sites. *Computers in Human Behavior, 41*, 33-39.

Tokunaga, R. S., & Gustafson, A. (2014). Seeking interpersonal information over the Internet: An application of the theory of motivated information management to Internet use. *Journal of Social & Personal Relationships, 31*, 1019-1039. doi: 10.1177/0265407513516890

Recommended

Bowman, N. D., & Tamborini, R. (2015). "In the mood to game": Selective exposure and mood management processes in computer game play. *New Media & Society, 17*, 375-393. doi: 10.1177/1461444813504274

Geidner, N., & D'Arcy, D. (2015). The effects of micropayments on online news story selection and engagement. *New Media & Society, 17*, 611-628. doi: 10.1177/1461444813508930

Knobloch-Westerwick, S., Johnson, B. K., & Westerwick, A. (2015). Confirmation bias in online searches: Impacts of selective exposure before an election on political attitude strength and shifts. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 20*, 171-187. doi: 10.1111/jcc4.12105

Li, N., Anderson, A. A., Brossard, D., & Scheufele, D. A. (2014). Channeling science information seekers' attention? A content analysis of top-ranked vs. lower-ranked sites in Google. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 19*, 562-575. doi:10.1111/jcc4.12043

Ruppel, E. K., & Rains, S. A. (2012). Information sources and the health information-seeking process: An application and extension of channel complementarity theory. *Communication Monographs, 79*, 385-405. doi: 10.1080/03637751.2012.697627

Thursday, October 20 -- Evaluating information

Fu, W. W. (2012). Selecting online videos from graphics, text, and view counts: The moderation of popularity bandwagons. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 18*, 46-61. doi: 10.1111/j.1083-6101.2012.01593.x

Metzger, M. J., & Flanagin, A. J. (2015). Psychological approaches to credibility assessment online. In S. S. Sundar (Ed.), *The handbook of the psychology of communication technology* (pp. 445-466). New York: Wiley & Sons.

Van Der Heide, B., Johnson, B. K., & Vang, M. H. (2013). The effects of product photographs and reputation systems on consumer behavior and product cost on eBay. *Computers in Human Behavior, 29*, 570-576. doi: 10.1016/j.chb.2012.11.002

Recommended

Armstrong, C. L., & McAdams, M. J. (2009). Blogs of information: How gender cues and individual motivations influence perceptions of credibility. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 14*, 435-456. doi: 10.1111/j.1083-6101.2009.01448.x

DeAndrea, D. C. (2014). Advancing warranting theory. *Communication Theory*, 24, 186-204. doi: 10.1111/comt.12033

Flanagin, A. J., Hocevar, K. P., & Samahito, S. N. (2014). Connecting with the user-generated Web: how group identification impacts online information sharing and evaluation. *Information, Communication & Society*, 17, 683-694. doi: 10.1080/1369118X.2013.808361

Southwell, B. G. (2013). *Social networks and popular understanding of science and health*. Research Triangle Park, NC: RTI Press.

Walther, J. B., & Parks, M. R. (2002). Cues filtered out, cues filtered in. In M. L. Knapp & J. A. Daly, *Handbook of interpersonal communication* (3rd ed., pp. 529-563). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Westerman, D., Spence, P. R., & Van Der Heide, B. (2014). Social media as information source: Recency of updates and credibility of information. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 19, 171-183. doi: 10.1111/jcc4.12041

Tuesday, October 25– Psychological effects

Leung, L. (2009). User-generated content on the internet: An examination of gratifications, civic engagement and psychological empowerment. *New Media & Society*, 11, 1327-1347. doi: 10.1177/1461444809341264

Rosen, L. D., Whaling, K., Rab, S., Carrier, L. M., & Cheever, N. A. (2013). Is Facebook creating “iDisorders”? The link between clinical symptoms of psychiatric disorders and technology use, attitudes and anxiety. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 29, 1243-1254. doi: 10.1016/j.chb.2012.11.012

Verduyn, P., Lee, D. S., Park, J., Shablack, H., Orvell, A., Bayer, J., ... & Kross, E. (2015). Passive Facebook usage undermines affective well-being: Experimental and longitudinal evidence. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 144, 480-488. doi: 10.1037/xge0000057

Weinstein, E. C., & Selman, R. L. (2016). Digital stress: Adolescents' personal accounts. *New Media & Society*, 18, 391-409. doi: 10.1177/1461444814543989

Recommended

Bucher, E., Fieseler, C., & Suphan, A. (2013). The stress potential of social media in the workplace. *Information, Communication & Society*, 16, 1639-1667. doi: 10.1080/1369118X.2012.710245

Gonzales, A. L., & Hancock, J. T. (2011). Mirror, mirror on my Facebook wall: Effects of exposure to Facebook on self-esteem. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, & Social Networking*, 14, 79-83. doi: 10.1089/cyber.2009.0411

Hampton, K. N., Lu, W., & Shin, I. (2016). Digital media and stress: the cost of caring 2.0. *Information, Communication & Society*, 19, 1267-1286. doi: 10.1080/1369118X.2016.1186714

Kraut, R., Patterson, M., Lundmark, V., Kiesler, S., Mukophadhyay, T., & Scherlis, W. (1998). Internet paradox: A social technology that reduces social involvement and psychological well-being? *American Psychologist*, *53*, 1017-1031. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.53.9.1017

Kraut, R., Kiesler, S., Boneva, B., Cummings, J., Helgeson, V., & Crawford, A. (2002). Internet paradox revisited. *Journal of Social Issues*, *58*(1), 49-74. doi: 10.1111/1540-4560.00248

Kross, E., Verduyn, P., Demiralp, E., Park, J., Lee, D. S., Lin, N., ... & Ybarra, O. (2013). Facebook use predicts declines in subjective well-being in young adults. *PLoS One*, *8*(8), e69841.

Toma, C. L. (2013). Feeling better but doing worse: Effects of Facebook self-presentation on implicit self-esteem and cognitive task performance. *Media Psychology*, *16*, 199-220. doi: 10.1080/15213269.2012.762189

Thursday, October 27 -- Prevalence, ubiquity, & problematic use

Caplan, S. E. (2003). Preference for online social interaction a theory of problematic Internet use and psychosocial well-being. *Communication Research*, *30*, 625-648. doi: 10.1177/0093650203257842

Cumiskey, K. M., & Ling, R. (2015). The social psychology of mobile communication. In S. S. Sundar (Ed.), *The handbook of the psychology of communication technology* (pp. 228-246). New York: Wiley & Sons.

Tokunaga, R. S., & Rains, S. A. (2010). An evaluation of two characterizations of the relationships between problematic Internet use, time spent using the Internet, and psychosocial problems. *Human Communication Research*, *36*, 512-545. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2958.2010.01386.x

Recommended

Caplan, S. E. (2005). A social skill account of problematic Internet use. *Journal of Communication*, *55*, 721-736. doi: 10.1111/j.1460-2466.2005.tb03019.x

Caplan, S. E. (2010). Theory and measurement of generalized problematic Internet use: A two-step approach. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *26*, 1089-1097. doi: 10.1016/j.chb.2010.03.012

Enez Darcin, A., Kose, S., Noyan, C. O., Nurmedov, S., Yilmaz, O., & Dilbaz, N. (2016). Smartphone addiction and its relationship with social anxiety and loneliness. *Behaviour & Information Technology*, *35*, 520-525. doi: 10.1080/0144929X.2016.1158319

Lee, Y.-K., Chang, C.-T., Lin, Y., & Cheng, Z.-H. (2014). The dark side of smartphone usage: Psychological traits, compulsive behavior and technostress. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *31*, 373-383. doi:

Pang, A. S.-K. (2013). *The distraction addiction*. New York, NY: Little, Brown and Company.

Seo, M., Kim, J. H., & David, P. (2015). Always connected or always distracted? ADHD symptoms and social assurance explain problematic use of mobile phone and multicommunicating. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 20, 667-681. doi: 10.1111/jcc4.12140

Tokunaga, R. S., & Rains, S. A. (in press). A review and meta-analysis: Examining conceptual and operational definitions of problematic internet use. *Human Communication Research*. doi: 10.1111/hcre.12075

Tuesday, November 1 - Perceiving computers socially -- anthropomorphism, realism, perceptions of humanity

Kramer, N. C., Rosenthal-von der Putten, A., M., & Hoffmann, L. (2015). Social effects of virtual and robot companions. In S. S. Sundar (Ed.), *The handbook of the psychology of communication technology* (pp. 137-159). New York: Wiley & Sons.

Mori, M. (1970). The uncanny valley. *Energy*, 7, 33-35.

Nowak, K. L., & Fox, J. Avatars in computer-mediated communication.

Recommended

Balzarotti, S., Piccini, L., Andreoni, G., & Ciceri, R. (2014). "I know that you know how I feel": Behavioral and physiological signals demonstrate emotional attunement while interacting with a computer simulating emotional intelligence. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, 38, 283-299. doi: 10.1007/s10919-014-0180-6

Nowak, K. (2004). The influence of anthropomorphism and agency on social judgment in virtual environments. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 9(2), available at <http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol9/issue2/nowak.html>. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2958.1993.tb00311.x

Nowak, K. L. (2015). Examining perception and identification in avatar-mediated interaction. In S. S. Sundar (Ed.), *The handbook of the psychology of communication technology* (pp. 89-114). New York: Wiley & Sons.

Waytz, A., Cacioppo, J., & Epley, N. (2010). Who sees human? The stability and importance of individual differences in anthropomorphism. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 5(3), 219-232.

Zhao, S. (2006). Humanoid social robots as a medium of communication. *New Media & Society*, 8, 401-419. doi: 10.1177/1461444806061951

Thursday, November 3 - Perceiving computers socially

Bickmore, T. W., & Picard, R. W. (2005). Establishing and maintaining long-term human-computer relationships. *ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction (TOCHI)*, 12(2), 293-327. doi: 10.1145/1067860.1067867

Lee, E. J., & Schumann, D. W. (2009). Proposing and testing the contextual gender influence theory: An examination of gender influence types on trust of computer agents. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 19*, 440-450. doi: 10.1016/j.jcps.2009.02.019

Lucas, G. M., Gratch, J., King, A., & Morency, L. P. (2014). It's only a computer: Virtual humans increase willingness to disclose. *Computers in Human Behavior, 37*, 94-100. doi: 10.1016/j.chb.2014.04.043

Recommended

Bloch, L. R., & Lemish, D. (1999). Disposable love: The rise and fall of a virtual pet. *New Media & Society, 1*, 283-303. doi: 10.1177/14614449922225591

Fox, J., Ahn, S. J., Janssen, J. H., Yeykelis, L., Segovia, K. Y., & Bailenson, J. N. (2015). A meta-analysis quantifying the effects of avatars and agents on social influence. *Human-Computer Interaction, 30*, 401-432. doi: 10.1080/07370024.2014.921494

Lee, E.-J. (2007). Categorical person perception in computer-mediated communication: Effects of character representation and knowledge bias on sex inference and informational social influence. *Media Psychology, 9*, 309-329. doi: 10.1080/15213260701286007

Lee, E.-J., & Oh, S. Y. (2015). Effects of visual cues on social perceptions and self-categorization in computer-mediated communication. In S. S. Sundar (Ed.), *The handbook of the psychology of communication technology* (pp. -). New York: Wiley & Sons.

Lee, J. E. R., Nass, C., Brave, S. B., Morishima, Y., Nakajima, H., & Yamada, R. (2007). The case for caring colearners: The effects of a computer-mediated colearner agent on trust and learning. *Journal of Communication, 57*, 183-204. doi: 10.1111/j.1460-2466.2007.00339.x

Lee, J.-E. R., & Park, S. G. (2011). "Whose Second Life is this?" How avatar-based racial cues shape ethno-racial minorities' perception of virtual worlds. *CyberPsychology, Behavior, & Social Networking, 14*, 637-642. doi: 10.1089/cyber.2010.0501

Ullman, E. (1997). *Close to the machine: Technophilia and its discontents*. San Francisco: City Lights.

Tuesday, November 8 -- MIDTERM

Thursday, November 10 – NCA; no class

Tuesday, November 15 – Emotional and affective experiences in HCI

Nass, C., & Yen, C. (2010). *The man who lied to his laptop: What we can learn about ourselves from our machines*. New York: Penguin. (ch. 4, Emotion)

Norman, D. A. (2004). *Emotional design: Why we love (or hate) everyday things*. New York, NY: Basic Books. [selections]

Picard, R. W., & Klein, J. (2002). Computers that recognise and respond to user emotion: Theoretical and practical implications. *Interacting with Computers*, 14, 141-169. doi: 10.1016/S0953-5438(01)00055-8

Recommended

Blascovich, J. (2013). Challenge, threat, and social influence in digital immersive virtual environments. In J. Gratch & S. Marsella (Eds.), *Social emotions in nature and artifact* (pp. -197). New York, NY: Oxford.

Brave, S., & Nass, C. (2008). Emotion in human-computer interaction. In A. Sears & J. A. Jacko (Eds.), *The human-computer interaction handbook: Fundamentals, evolving technologies, and emerging applications* (2nd ed.; pp. 77-92). New York, NY: CRC Press.

Calvo, R., D'Mello, S., Gratch, J., & Kappas, A. (Eds.) (2015). *The Oxford handbook of affective computing*. New York, NY: Oxford.

Gratch, J., Kang, S. H., & Wang, N. (2013). Using social agents to explore theories of rapport and emotional resonance. In J. Gratch & S. Marsella (Eds.), *Social emotions in nature and artifact* (pp. 181-197). New York, NY: Oxford.

Konijn, E. A. (2013). The role of emotion in media use and effects. In K. E. Dill (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of media psychology* (pp. 186-211). New York, NY: Oxford.

Konijn, E. A., & Van Vugt, H. C. (2008). Emotions in mediated interpersonal communication: Toward modeling emotion in virtual humans. In E. A. Konijn, S. Utz., M. Tanis, & S. B. Barnes (Eds.) *Mediated interpersonal communication* (pp. 100-130). New York: Taylor & Francis.

Oberzaucher, E., Grammer, K., & Shmehl, S. (2011). Embodiment and expressive communication on the internet. In A. Kappas & N. C. Kramer (Eds.), *Face-to-face communication over the internet: Emotions in a web of culture, language, and technology* (pp. 237-279). New York, NY: Cambridge.

Picard, R. W. (2003). Affective computing: Challenges. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, 59, 55-64. doi: 10.1016/S1071-5819(03)00052-1

Thursday, November 17 & Tuesday, November 22 - Persuasive technology

Fogg, B. J., Cuellar, G., & Danielson, D. (2008). Motivating, influencing, and persuading users: An introduction to captology. In A. Sears & J. A. Jacko (Eds.), *The human-computer interaction handbook: Fundamentals, evolving technologies, and emerging applications* (2nd ed.; pp. 133-146). New York, NY: CRC Press.

Nass, C., & Yen, C. (2010). *The man who lied to his laptop: What we can learn about ourselves from our machines*. New York: Penguin. (ch. 5, Persuasion)

Nodder, C. (2013). *Evil by design: Interaction design to lead us into temptation*. New York: Wiley & Sons.

Wang, Y., Leon, P. G., Scott, K., Chen, X., Acquisti, A., & Cranor, L. F. (2013, May). Privacy nudges for social media: an exploratory Facebook study. In *Proceedings of the 22nd international conference on World Wide Web companion* (pp. 763-770). International World Wide Web Conferences Steering Committee.

Recommended

Ahn, S. J., & Fox, J. (2016). Persuasive avatars: Extending the self through new media advertising. In R. E. Brown, V. K. Jones, & M. Wang (Eds.), *The new advertising: Branding, content, and consumer relationships in the data-driven social media era*. Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger.

Hanus, M. D., & Fox, J. (2015). Persuasive avatars: The effects of customizing a virtual salesperson's appearance on brand liking and purchase intentions. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, 84, 33-40. doi: 10.1016/j.ijhcs.2015.07.004

Madigan, J. (2016). *Getting gamers: The psychology of video games and their impact on the people who play them*. New York, NY: Rowman & Littlefield.

Oh, J., & Sundar, S. S. (2015). How does interactivity persuade? An experimental test of interactivity on cognitive absorption, elaboration, and attitudes. *Journal of Communication*, 65, 213-236. doi: 10.1111/jcom.12147

Tuesday, November 29 - HCI and health

Ahn, S. J., Johnsen, K., Robertson, T., Moore, J., Brown, S., Marable, A., & Basu, A. (2015). Using virtual pets to promote physical activity in children: An application of the youth physical activity promotion model. *Journal of Health Communication*, 20, 807-815. doi: 10.1080/10810730.2015.1018597

Duggan, G. B. (2016). Applying psychology to understand relationships with technology: from ELIZA to interactive healthcare. *Behaviour & Information Technology*, 1-12. doi: 10.1080/0144929X.2016.1141320

Fox, J., & Bailenson, J. N. (2009). Virtual self-modeling: The effects of vicarious reinforcement and identification on exercise behaviors. *Media Psychology*, 12, 1-25. doi: 10.1080/15213260802669474

Recommended:

Ahn, S. J., & Fox, J. (in press). Virtual worlds: Avatars and agents. In R. Parrott (Ed.), *Oxford encyclopedia of health and risk message design and processing*. New York, NY: Oxford.

Bickmore, T. W. (2015). Relational agents in health applications: Leveraging affective computing to promote healing and wellness. In R. Calvo, S. D'Mello, J. Gratch, & A. Kappas (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of affective computing* (pp.) New York, NY: Oxford. doi: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199942237.013.037

Hu, Y., & Sundar, S. S. (2010). Effects of online health sources on credibility and behavioral intentions. *Communication Research*, 37, 105-132. doi: 10.1177/0093650209351512

Kim, H. S. (2015). Attracting views and going viral: How message features and news-sharing channels affect health news diffusion. *Journal of Communication*, 65, 512-534. doi: 10.1111/jcom/12160

Noar, S. M., & Harrington, N. G. (Eds.) (2012). *eHealth applications: Promising strategies for behavior change*. New York: Routledge.

Thursday, December 1 - Expanding human capacity

Abril, E. P. (2016). Tracking myself: Assessing the contribution of mobile technologies for self-trackers of weight, diet, or exercise. *Journal of Health Communication*, 21, 638-646. doi: 10.1080/10810730.2016.1153756

Englebart, D. C. (1963). A conceptual framework for the augmentation of man's intellect. In P. W. Howerton & D. C. Weeks (Eds.), *Vistas in information handling* (pp. 1-29). Washington, DC: Spartan Books.

Stevenson Won, A., Bailenson, J., Lee, J., & Lanier, J. (2015). Homuncular flexibility in virtual reality. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 20, 241-259. doi: 10.1111/jcc4.12107

Recommended

Etkin, J. (2016). The hidden cost of personal quantification. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 42, 967-984. doi: 10.1093/jcr/ucv095

Licklider, J. C. R. (1960). Man-computer symbiosis. *IRE Transactions on Human Factors in Electronics*.

Van Dijck, J. (2005). From shoebox to performative agent: The computer as personal memory machine. *New Media & Society*, 7, 311-332. doi: 10.1177/1461444805050765

Tuesday, December 6 – Computers as superior humans

Elkins, A., Zafeiriou, S., Pantic, M., & Burgoon, J. (2015). Unobtrusive deception detection. In R. Calvo, S. D'Mello, J. Gratch, & A. Kappas, A. (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of affective computing* (pp. New York, NY: Oxford. doi: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199942237.013.037

Jonze, S. (Director). (2013). *Her*. Warner Bros.

Youyou, W., Kosinski, M., & Stillwell, D. (2015). Computer-based personality judgments are more accurate than those made by humans. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 112, 1036-1040. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1418680112

Recommended

Levy, D. L. (2007). *Love and sex with robots: The evolution of human-robot relationships*. New York: Harper Collins.