

MCS 6010
CONSUMPTION BEHAVIOUR THEORY II
Ph.D/M.Sc. Special Fields Seminar – 2013

Course Coordinator: Dr. Theodore Noseworthy
Room 202A – (Ex. 54887)

COURSE DESCRIPTION

This course provides a survey of recent theoretical advances in consumer research. We will consider a series of topics that span the areas of *judgment and decision-making* and *information processing*. Topics addressed in this course complement those covered in MCS 6000 (Consumption Behaviour Theory I).

COURSE OBJECTIVES AND CLASS FORMAT

The course has two main objectives: (1) to expose students to emerging ideas that have changed the field of consumer behaviour; and (2) to allow students to develop their own ideas on a more specific research topic that is of interest to them. The course will meet twice a week, covering the seminal concepts (the older material from core disciplines) in the Tuesday class, and then wading into the marketing-specific adoption of the concept in the Thursday class. During each hour and twenty minute seminar, students will review, analyze, and critically evaluate 2 to 3 papers on a specific topic (i.e., 5 – 7 articles a week). The course is generally scheduled from 4:00-5:20pm on Tuesdays and Thursdays in MINS B33, but any given week sessions may be held at a time and place that is mutually convenient for students and the instructor.

Class members are expected to complete the weekly reading assignments and to actively participate in the discussions. To facilitate the discussions in class, participants are required to prepare thought papers which should include a critical discussion of the assigned readings. The thought papers are intended to provide the basis for the discussion in class, which will be moderated by the instructor.

EVALUATION

Performance will be evaluated on the basis of class preparation, contribution to the class discussion, thought papers, and an end-of-term research paper and presentation on a topic of interest to the student. These will be weighted as follows:

Contribution to Discussion:	15%
Thought Papers:	25% (5% each)
Research Paper:	40%
Research Presentation:	<u>20%</u>
	100%

THOUGHT PAPERS (25%)

Following week #3, students will be required to write a thought paper on five out of the remaining nine sessions (worth 5% each); the choice of which five is at the student's discretion. These thought papers should include a critical discussion of the theoretical claims in the readings. These discussions may address unspecified implications of a given theory, relations between theories, or theoretically problematic aspects of a given theory (e.g., logical flaws). Each paper should be one page (single-spaced; 12-point Times New Roman; 1 inch margins on all sides). Thought papers are to be submitted to the instructor at the beginning of class.

CONTRIBUTION TO CLASS DISCUSSION (15%)

Students are expected to take a leadership role in the learning process. The primary role of the instructors is not to teach, but rather to guide the discussion and pose challenging questions. Students will be expected to carry the majority of the discussion, and to provide insights for their peers to consider and respond to. Each week, the quality of the Student's contribution to the class discussion will be evaluated by the instructor, with the final contribution grade being based on an overall review of those assessments.

RESEARCH PAPER (40%)

The main deliverable in this course is a research term paper. The purpose of this paper is to give students an opportunity to explore an issue of interest, and to help them develop the basis for a potential research stream. In general, this will require that the student works with a CME faculty member on a topic of mutual interest. Consequently, it is helpful to start thinking about potential topics early in the term. The paper will be graded by the course instructor.

The research paper may take one of two forms:

1. A submission suitable for a major academic marketing conference, such as the Society for Consumer Psychology's Conference, or the Association for Consumer Research's annual meeting (If you are not in Marketing, of course you may follow the guidelines for your own conferences). This option will generally require that you have empirical data which can be analyzed. Hence, it is suitable for work that is currently in process.
2. The theory and methods section of a paper suitable for submission to a major academic marketing journal, such as the *Journal of Marketing Research*, the *Journal of Consumer Research*, or the *Journal of Marketing* (or the journals in your own field). This is the best choice if you prefer to focus on an idea that you have considered on a theoretical level, but for which you lack data.

Regardless of which option the student selects, the paper should contain the following sections:

- An introduction describing the problem and explaining its importance
- A review of the relevant literature, clearly establishing what is known about the phenomenon and what issues remain unresolved
- A clear statement of the research question(s) being addressed
- A clear statement of the contribution your research will make to the relevant literature
- An explanation of your theory (i.e., your hypotheses – though they need not be formal)
- A thorough description of the methodology you used (or propose to use)

If you choose to write a conference paper (i.e., option 1), you must also report the results of your analysis, discuss your findings in light of methodological limitations, and evaluate their implications for theory and management practice. If you pick option 2, your paper should discuss *anticipated* outcomes, limitations, and contributions. Regardless of the option chosen, your paper should be approximately 20 pages in length, double-spaced.

HINT: Students may find it helpful to use one of the core readings as a moderating hypothesis to the student's core domain of interest, or using one of the core readings to moderate another core reading.

RESEARCH PRESENTATION (20%)

You are also required to present your research paper to the CME marketing faculty and graduate students at the end of the school term (this may take place in a 6950 seminar). This presentation will be evaluated by the faculty and form part of your final grade. There is a good opportunity to use the presentation in conjunction with the paper to prepare for a conference (option 1) or to begin your thesis (option 2). Either way, the presentation will be evaluated on professionalism, clarity, parsimony (i.e., never present a lit review the way you write it), and the ability to navigate questions with logic and poise.

CONFERENCE/JOURNAL SUBMISSION GUIDELINES

The following information is provided for informational purposes, to help guide you in selecting a topic for your paper. Please check the conference websites for current submission guidelines.

Association for Consumer Research Conference (www.acrwebsite.org)

Papers representing completed research and dealing with substantive, methodological, or theoretical consumer research issues are invited as Competitive Paper submissions. All authors should submit a 50 word abstract and a 4,000 word paper, which cannot exceed 6 single-spaced pages, Times New Roman Font Size 12, 1" margins. The paper must contain full references. Empirical papers must contain a single table summarizing all results and can contain up to one figure (optional). References, table, and figure are not included in the word count or the page limit. Page limits will be strictly enforced.

Society for Consumer Psychology Conference (<http://www.myscp.org>)

Competitive papers present completed work and address substantive, methodological, or theoretical topics in consumer psychology. The SCP conference provides a relatively intimate forum, with opportunities for a high level of interaction among participants interested in the integration of psychology and consumer research. Submissions include a 75-100 word short abstract and a 750-1000 word extended abstract.

Journal Websites

Journal of Consumer Research	http://ejcr.org/
Journal of Marketing Research	www.marketingpower.com/jmr
Journal of Marketing	www.journals.marketingpower.com/loi/jmkg
Journal of Consumer Psychology	www.journals.elsevier.com/journal-of-consumer-psychology

AMA Ph.D. Student Website - <http://www.docsig.org/>

PLAGIARISM

Plagiarism may be defined as "The act of appropriating the literary composition of another, or parts or passages of his writings, or the ideas or language of the same, and passing them off as the product of one's own mind." Excerpted from H.C. Black, Black's Law Dictionary, West Publishing Co., 1979, 5th Ed., p. 1035. This concept applies with equal force to all assignments including laboratory reports, diagrams, and computer projects and is considered a major Scholastic Offence.

Students must write their essays and assignments in their own words. Whenever students take an idea, or a passage from another author, they must acknowledge their debt both by using quotation marks where appropriate and by proper referencing such as footnotes or citations. Plagiarism is a major academic offence (see graduate calendar on academic misconduct).

All required papers may be subject to submission for textual similarity review to the commercial plagiarism detection software under license to the University for the detection of plagiarism. All papers submitted will be included as source documents in the reference database for the purpose of detecting plagiarism of papers subsequently submitted to the system. Use of the service is subject to the licensing agreement, currently between The University of Guelph and Turnitin.com (hyperlink www.turnitin.com).

Sessions Overview (Winter 2013)

Week	Topic (listed by date)
1.	<p>“Conceptualizing Consumer Research”</p>
Readings:	<p>Lynch Jr., John G., Joseph W. Alba, Aradhna Krishna, Vicki G. Morwitz and Zeynep Gürhan-Cani (2012) “Knowledge Creation in Consumer Research: Multiple routes, Multiple Criteria,” <i>Journal of Consumer Psychology</i>, 22 () 473-485.</p> <p>MacInnis, Deborah, and Valerie Folkes (2010), “The Disciplinary Status of Consumer Behavior: A Sociology of Science Perspective on Key Controversies,” <i>Journal of Consumer Research</i>, 36 (April), 139-149.</p> <p>Reibstein, David J., George Day, and Jerry Wind (2009), “Guest Editorial: Is Marketing Academia Losing Its Way?” <i>Journal of Marketing</i>, 73 (July), 1-3.</p> <p>Deighton, John. (2007),” The Territory of Consumer Research: Walking the Fences,” <i>Journal of Consumer Research</i>, 34 (October), 279-282.</p> <p>Mick, David Glen (2003), “Appreciation, Advice, and Some Aspirations for Consumer Research,” <i>Journal of Consumer Research</i>, 29 (March), 1-8.</p> <p>Bazerman, Max. (2001), “Consumer Research for Consumers,” <i>Journal of Consumer Research</i>, 27 (March), 499-504.</p>
2.	<p>“Advancements in Consumption Methodology”</p>
Readings:	<p>Bullock, John G., Donald P. Green, and Shang E. Ha (2010), “Yes, but what is the mechanism? (Don’t Expect an Easy Answer),” <i>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</i>, 98 (4), 550-558.</p> <p>Zhao, Xinshu, John G. Lynch Jr., and Qimei Chen (2010) “Reconsidering Baron and Kenny: Myths and Truths about Mediation Analysis,” <i>Journal of Consumer Research</i>, 37 (August), 197-206.</p> <p>Fitzsimmons, Gavan J. (2008), “Editorial: Death to Dichotomizing,” <i>Journal of Consumer Research</i>, 35 (June), 5-8.</p> <p>Preacher, Kristopher J., Derek D. Rucker, and Andrew F. Hayes (2007), “Addressing Moderated Mediation Hypotheses: Theory, Methods, and Prescriptions,” <i>Multivariate Behavioral Research</i>, 42(1), 185-227.</p> <p>Muller, Dominique, Charles M. Judd, and Vincent Y. Yzerbyt (2005), "When Moderation is Mediated and Mediation is Moderated," <i>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</i>, 89 (6), 852-863.</p>

3. **“Evaluating Consumer Research”**

Readings:

Huber, Joel (2008), "The Value of Sticky Articles," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 45 (June), 257-260.

Bem, Daryl J. (2004), "Writing the Empirical Journal Article," in *The Compleat Academic: A Career Guide*, Vol. 2, ed. John M. Darley, Mark P. Zanna and Henry L. III Roediger, Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association, 185-220.

Summers, John O. (2001), "Guidelines for Conducting Research and Publishing in Marketing: From Conceptualization Through the Review Process," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 29 (4), 405-415.

Lynch Jr., John G. (1998), "Presidential Address: Reviewing," *Advances in Consumer Research*, 25, 1-6.

Hyman, Ray (1995), "How to Critique a Published Article," *Psychological Bulletin*, 118 (2), 178-182.

Additional Reading (Sticky Article Example):

Moreau, C. Page and Darren W. Dahl (2005), "Designing the Solution: The Impact of Constraints on Consumers' Creativity," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 32 (June), 13-22. – JCR Best Article Award Winner

4. **“Metacognition & Fluency”**

Readings:

Lee, Angela Y. and Aparna A. Labroo (2004), "The Effect of Conceptual and Perceptual Fluency on Brand Evaluation," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 41 (May), 151-165.

Petrova, Petia K. and Robert B Cialdini (2005), "Fluency of Consumption Imagery and the Backfire Effects of Imagery Appeals," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 32 (December), 442-452.

Schwarz, Norbert (2004), "Metacognitive Experiences in Consumer Judgment and Decision Making," *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 14 (4), 332-348.

Wright, Peter (2002), "Marketplace Metacognition and Social Intelligence," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 28 (March), 677-682.

Reber, Rolf, Piotr Winkielman, and Norbert Schwarz (1998), "Effects of Perceptual Fluency on Affective Judgments," *Psychological Science*, 9 (January), 45 – 48.

Flavell, J. H. (1979), "Metacognition and Metacognitive Monitoring: A New Area of Cognitive-Developmental Inquiry," *American Psychologist*, 34, 906-911.

5. **“Behavioral Decision Theory”**

- Readings: Keren, Gideon. and Karl H. Teigen (2004), “Yet Another Look at the Heuristics and Biases Approach,” In D. Koehler & N. Harvey, *Blackwell Handbook of Judgment and Decision Making*, Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Gigerenzer, Gerg (1996), “On Narrow Norms and Vague Heuristics: A Reply to Kahneman and Tversky (1996).” *Psychological Review*, 103 (3), 592-596.
- Knetsch, Jack. L. (1989), “The Endowment Effect and Evidence of Nonreversible Indifference Curves,” *The American Economic Review*, 79 (5), 1277-1284.
- Thaler, Richard (1985) “Mental Accounting and Consumer Choice,” *Marketing Science*, 4 (Summer), 199-214.
- Tversky, Amos and Daniel Kahneman (1974), “Judgment Under Uncertainty: Heuristics and Biases,” *Science*, 185 (4157), 1124-1131.

6. **“Category Uncertainty”**

- Readings: Markman, Arthur. B. and Jeffrey Loewenstein, J. (2010), “Structural Comparison and Consumer Choice,” *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 20 (2), 126-137.
- Lajos, Joseph, Zsolt Katona, Amitava Chattopadhyay, and Miklos Sarvary (2009), “Category Activation Model: A Spreading Activation Network Model of Subcategory Positioning When Categorization Uncertainty is High,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 36 (June), 122-136.
- Rajagopal, Priyali and Robert E. Burnkrant (2009), “Consumer Evaluations of Hybrid Products,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 36 (August), 232-241.
- Herzenstein, Michal, Steven S. Posavac, and J. Joško Brakus (2007), “Adoption of New and Really New Products: The Effects of Self-Regulation Systems and Risk Salience,” *Journal of Marketing Research*, 44 (May), 251-260.
- Gregan-Paxton, Jennifer, Steve Hoeffler, and Min Zhao (2005), “When Categorization Is Ambiguous: Factors That Facilitate the Use of a Multiple Category Inference Strategy,” *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 15 (2), 127-140.
- Moreau, Page C., Arthur B. Markman, and Donald R. Lehmann (2001), “What is it? Categorization Flexibility and Consumer Response to Really New Products,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 27 (March), 489-498.

7. **“Evolutionary Psychology & Neurological Advances”**

Readings:

Logothetis, N. K. (2008), “What we Can Do and What we Cannot Do with fMRI,” *Nature*, 453, 869-878.

Yoon, Carolyn, Angela H. Gutchess, Fred Feinberg, and Thad A. Polk (2006), “A fMRI Study of Neural Dissociations between Brand and Person Judgments,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 33 (June), 31-40.

Colarelli, Stephen M., and Joseph R. Dettmann (2003), “Intuitive Evolutionary Perspectives in Marketing Practices,” *Psychology & Marketing*, 20 (9), 837-865.

Conway, Lucian G. and Mark Schaller (2002), “On the Verifiability of Evolutionary Psychological Theories: An Analysis of the Psychology of Scientific Persuasion,” *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 6 (2), 152-166.

Caporael, Linnda R. (2001), “Evolutionary Psychology: Toward a Unifying Theory and a Hybrid Science,” *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 607-628.

Ketelaar, Timothy & Bruce J. Ellis (2000), “Are Evolutionary Explanations Unfalsifiable? Evolutionary Psychology and the Lakatosian Philosophy of Science,” *Psychological Inquiry*, 11 (1), 1-21.

8. **“Embodied Cognition”**

Readings:

Van Den Bergh, Bram, Julien Schmitt, and Luk Warlop (2011), “Embodied Myopia,” *Journal of Marketing Research*, 48 (December), 1033-1044.

Hung, Iris W. and Aparna A. Labroo (2011), “From Firm Muscles to Firm Willpower: Understanding the Role of Embodied Cognition in Self-Regulation,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 37 (April), 1046-1064.

Schwarz, Norbert (2006), “Feelings, Fit, and Funny Effects: A Situated Cognition Perspective,” *Journal of Marketing Research*, 43 (February), 20-23.

Niedenthal, Paul. M., Lawrence W. Barsalou, Piotr Winkielman, Silvia Krauth-Gruber, and François Ric (2005), “Embodiment in Attitudes, Social Perception, and Emotion,” *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 9 (3), 184-211.

Wilson, Margaret (2002), “Six Views of Embodied Cognition,” *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 9 (4), 625-636.

Zaltman, Gerald (1997), “Rethinking Market Research: Putting People Back In,” *Journal of Marketing Research*, 34 (4), 424-437.

9. **“Automaticity & Context Effects”**

- Readings: Cosman, Joshua D. and Shaun P. Vecera (2012), “Context-Dependent Control Over Attentional Capture,” *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, DOI: 10.1037/a0030027.
- Chartrand, Tanya L. (2005), “The Role of Conscious Awareness in Consumer Behavior,” *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 15 (3), 203-210.
- Dijksterhuis, Ap, Pamela K. Smith, Rick B. van Baaren, and Daniël H. J. Wigboldus (2005), “The Unconscious Consumer: Effects of Environment on Consumer Behavior,” *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 15 (3), 193-202.
- Wilson, Timothy. D., & Elizabeth W. Dunn (2004), “Self-knowledge: Its Limits, Value and Potential for Improvement,” *Annual Review of Psychology*, 55, 493-518
- Bargh, John. A. and Melissa J. Ferguson (2000), “Beyond Behaviorism: On the Automaticity of Higher Mental Processes,” *Psychological Bulletin*, 126 (6), 925-945.
- Wegner, Daniel. M. and Thalia Wheatley (1999), “Apparent Mental Causation: Sources of the Experience of Will,” *American Psychologist*, 54 (7), 480-492.

10. **“Goal-Directed Behavior”**

- Readings: Johnson, Russell E., Chu-Hsiang Chang, and Robert G. Lord (2006), “Moving from Cognition to Behavior: What the Research Says,” *Psychological Bulletin*, 132 (3), 381-415.
- Lee, Leonard and Dan Ariely (2006), “Shopping Goals, Goal Concreteness, and Conditional Promotions,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 33 (June), 60-70.
- Oettingen, Gabriele, Hyeon-ju Pak, and Karoline Schnetter (2001), “Self-Regulation of Goal-Setting: Turning Free Fantasies About the Future Into Binding Goals,” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 80 (5), 736-753.
- Huffman, Cynthia, S. Ratneshwar, and David Glen Mick (2000), “Consumer Goal Structures and Goal-Determination Processes, in *The Why of Consumption: Contemporary Perspectives on Consumer Motives, Goals and Desires*,” S. Ratneshwar, Cynthia Huffman, and David Glen Mick (Eds.), Routledge, London, P. 9-35.
- Bagozzi, Richard P. and Utpal Dholakia (1999), “Goal Setting and Goal Striving in Consumer Behavior,” *Journal of Marketing*, 63, 19-32.

11. **“Experiential Consumption”**

Readings:

Wilcox, Keith, Anne L. Roggeveen, and Dhruv Grewal (2011), “Shall I Tell You Now or Later? Assimilation and Contrast in the Evaluation of Experiential Products,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 38 (December), 763-773.

Nicolao, Leonardo, Julie R. Irwin, and Joseph K. Goodman (2009), “Happiness for Sale: Do Experiential Purchases Make Consumers Happier Than Material Purchases?” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 36 (August), 188-198.

Zauberman, Gal, Rebecca K. Ratner, and B. Kyu Kim (2009), “Memories As Assets: Strategic Memory Protection in Choice Over Time,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 35 (February), 715-28.

Ramanathan, Suresh and Ann L. McGill (2007), “Consuming with Others: Social Influences on Moment-to-Moment and Retrospective Evaluations of an Experience,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 34 (December), 506-24.

Pine II, B. Joseph and James H. Gilmore (1998), “Welcome to the Experience Economy,” *Harvard Business Review* (July-August), 97-105.

Holbrook, Morris B. and Elizabeth C. Hirschman (1982), “The Experiential Aspects of Consumption: Consumer Fantasies, Feelings, and Fun,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 9 (September), 132-140.

12. **“Memory & Mental Time Travel”**

Readings:

Anderson, Rachel J. (2012), “Imagining Novel Futures: The Role of Event Plausibility and Familiarity,” *Memory*, 20 (5), 443-451.

Pham, Michel T., Leonard Lee, and Andrew T. Stephen (2012), “Feeling the Future: The Emotional Oracle Effect,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 39 (October), 461-477.

Suddendorf, Thomas and Michael C. Corballis (2007), “The Evolution of Foresight: What is Mental Time Travel, and is it Unique to Humans?” *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 30, 299-351. **[read Schacter & Addis 2007; 1 page]**

Tulving, Endel (2002), “Episodic Memory: From Mind to Brain,” *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53, 1-25.

Krishnan, H. Shanker and Stewart Shapiro (1999), “Prospective and Retrospective Memory for Intentions: A Two-Component Approach,” *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 8 (2), 141-166.

Baumgartner, Hans, Mita Sujana, and James R. Bettman (1992), “Autobiographical Memories, Affect, and Consumer Information Processing,” *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 1 (1), 53-82.