

The Ohio State University
Fisher College of Business
M&L 8250 - Consumer Behavior
Autumn 2023

Time: Mondays, 1:00-4:00 PM

Location: Fisher 500 conference room

Professor: Dr. Rebecca Walker Reczek
Email and Twitter: reczek.3@osu.edu @Rebecca_Reczek
Office: 506a Fisher Hall
Phone: (614) 247-6433 (office); (614) 961-8987 (cell)
Office hours: Tuesdays, 4:00-5:00 PM or by appointment (just send me an email)

COURSE DESCRIPTION

This course is designed to serve as an overview of and introduction to academic research in consumer behavior. We will focus on research published in the elite marketing journals, the *Journal of Consumer Research*, *Journal of Marketing Research*, and *Journal of Marketing*. The course will be a seminar style course where we will discuss a set of academic articles on a specific theme each week.

COURSE LEARNING OBJECTIVES

- (1) Develop a broad foundation of knowledge across various content areas and critically evaluate theoretical and empirical aspects of behavioral research (*breadth*)
- (2) Gain additional understanding in areas of your particular interest (*depth*)
- (3) Assist you in strengthening your ability to identify, develop, and present your research ideas to prepare you for life as a scholar (*practical*)

The breadth objective will be achieved through our weekly class meetings. Each week we will discuss an aspect of consumer behavior drawing primarily upon readings from marketing and psychology. You are responsible for reading all readings and preparing a written evaluation of one article per week (the article for which you are assigned to write a Reader Response). You should come to the seminar prepared to discuss ALL articles in-depth and to present your perspective about the major ideas, contributions, and/or shortcomings of each article.

Those who have written a Reader Response will lead the discussion on that particular article, although all are expected to participate.

The depth objective will be accomplished through independent reading in conjunction with the development of an in-depth research paper. The research paper is intended to provide you with

an opportunity to develop a research idea that may prove useful for future research activity in your area of interest.

The practical objective will be accomplished through assignments designed to socialize students into academic life. You will practice various research and teaching activities, including:

- Experimental design, theory development, and testing
- Research presentation
- Article summary and reviewing
- Class discussion

MODE OF COURSE DELIVERY

This course is 100% in-person in our scheduled classroom.

COURSE MATERIALS AND TECHNOLOGIES

Required Readings

This readings in this course are all academic articles available via the OSU library website for free or available online for free. You are responsible for downloading the articles to read each week. They are listed later in this syllabus.

Course Technology

For help with your password, university email, Carmen, or any other technology issues, questions, or requests, contact the OSU IT Service Desk. Standard support hours are available at <https://ocio.osu.edu/help/hours>, and support for urgent issues is available 24/7.

- **Self-Service and Chat support:** <http://ocio.osu.edu/selfservice>
- **Phone:** 614-688-HELP (4357); **TDD:** 614-688-8743
- **Email:** servicedesk@osu.edu

Baseline technical skills

- Basic computer and web-browsing skills
- Navigating Carmen: for questions about specific functionality, see the [Canvas Student Guide](#).

Required equipment

- Computer: current Mac (OS X) or PC (Windows 7+) with high-speed internet connection
- Other: a mobile device (smartphone or tablet) or landline to use for BuckeyePass authentication

Required software

- [Microsoft Office 365](#): All Ohio State students are now eligible for free Microsoft Office 365 ProPlus through Microsoft's Student Advantage program. Full instructions for downloading and installation can be found [at go.osu.edu/office365help](http://go.osu.edu/office365help).

Carmen access

You will need to use [BuckeyePass](#) multi-factor authentication to access your courses in Carmen. To ensure that you are able to connect to Carmen at all times, it is recommended that you take the following steps:

- Register multiple devices in case something happens to your primary device. Visit the [BuckeyePass - Adding a Device](#) help article for step-by-step instructions.
- Request passcodes to keep as a backup authentication option. When you see the Duo login screen on your computer, click "Enter a Passcode" and then click the "Text me new codes" button that appears. This will text you ten passcodes good for 365 days that can each be used once.
- Download the [Duo Mobile application](#) to all of your registered devices for the ability to generate one-time codes in the event that you lose cell, data, or Wi-Fi service.

If none of these options will meet the needs of your situation, you can contact the IT Service Desk at 614-688-4357 (HELP) and the IT support staff will work out a solution with you.

GRADING AND ASSIGNMENTS

Grading

Weekly reader responses:	20%
Class participation:	20%
Research paper and presentation:	20%
Reviewing assignment:	20%
Final exam:	20%

Reader Responses

Students are responsible for all primary readings, which will be discussed in a seminar format in class. You should come to the seminar prepared to discuss each primary article in depth and to present your point of view about the major ideas, contributions, or shortcomings of each article. The weekly article write-ups, or reader responses, should be no more than one typed page (single-spaced). Late submissions will not be accepted. Reader responses should be prepared for a person who has read the original article. Therefore, your write-ups should not be seen as a summary or review of the article. Primary dimensions on which these reader responses will be evaluated are the logic supporting your evaluation of the paper and its contribution, as well as your ability to either constructively critique or build on the work (e.g., by proposing a novel

extension). Each critique will be graded on a scale from 1 to 4, where 1 is only a weak analysis and little to no discussion and 4 represents a rigorous, complete analysis. A grading rubric will be posted to Carmen

Class Participation

Students with a variety of backgrounds and research interests are welcome to participate in this graduate seminar. Although the course is designed for marketing students and taught by a marketing faculty member, it is relevant to students who are interested in behavioral research in a variety of other disciplines. Individual participation will be evaluated based on your ability to generate a lively and productive discussion of the assigned papers.

It is therefore vital that students come to class prepared for discussion. What you get out of this course depends upon what you - and your fellow students - put into it. You cannot expect to develop your research skills by passively attending class and taking careful notes. You should actively listen and think critically about the concepts and issues discussed. You should be willing and able to present your analysis and viewpoint to the class when the opportunity presents itself.

To help you in doing this, I encourage you to complete the Article Summary Sheet for all articles each week (not just those for which you are writing a reader response), as a way of keeping track of what's done in the papers. Be sure to write the "at least one question or comment" at the bottom of the Summary Sheet, as this may become the basis of a discussion as well.

Research Paper and Presentation

This paper should include a brief literature review, conceptual framework and hypotheses, experimental design and procedures, stimulus development, methods for testing, a discussion of how to analyze the data, and implications of the research. You are welcome to, but not required, to collect actual data. Papers are typically 20 pages in length and written in *JCR* format. The research paper is intended to provide you with an opportunity to develop a research idea that may prove useful for future research activity in your area of interest. See Syllabus Supplement I for guidelines for writing an academic research paper.

You will have the opportunity to present your research project and receive feedback from class members during the last week of class. You should prepare Power Point slides and plan on spending no more than 20 minutes describing your research project to your peers. Your presentation should include a brief review of the relevant literature, the conceptual framework you are proposing/testing (including testable hypotheses), and the experimental design, procedures and stimuli you plan to use for testing the hypotheses.

During the presentation class period, you will each be required to ask one question of every other presenter and make constructive suggestions about their idea. Active participation in talks, from job talks to brown bags, is an essential part of being a good department member. This is your chance to try out the formulation and answering of questions and respond to answers in a non-threatening environment. See Syllabus Supplement II for guidelines for preparing and responding to academic presentations.

Reviewing Assignment

You will serve as a “reviewer” for a paper submitted for consideration at either the *Journal of Marketing Research* or the *Journal of Consumer Research*. Write no more than a three-page review and break your issues into major and minor concerns. See Syllabus Supplement III for guidelines for writing an academic review. There is also a tutorial on review writing posted on the *JCR* website (ejcr.org) that I recommend you [read](#).

Final Exam

You will have a short answer essay final exam during the scheduled final exam period.

OTHER COURSE POLICIES

Academic Integrity and Collaboration

Your written assignments should be your own original work. In formal assignments, you should follow *JCR*'s style guidelines to cite the ideas and words of your research sources. You are welcome to ask a trusted person to proofread your assignments before you turn them in, but no one else should revise or rewrite your work.

Ohio State's Academic Integrity Policy

Academic integrity is essential to maintaining an environment that fosters excellence in teaching, research, and other educational and scholarly activities. Thus, The Ohio State University and the Committee on Academic Misconduct (COAM) expect that all students have read and understand the university's [Code of Student Conduct](http://studentconduct.osu.edu) (studentconduct.osu.edu), and that all students will complete all academic and scholarly assignments with fairness and honesty. Students must recognize that failure to follow the rules and guidelines established in the university's *Code of Student Conduct* and this syllabus may constitute “Academic Misconduct.”

The Ohio State University's *Code of Student Conduct* (Section 3335-23-04) defines academic misconduct as: “Any activity that tends to compromise the academic integrity of the university or subvert the educational process.” Examples of academic misconduct include (but are not limited to) plagiarism, collusion (unauthorized collaboration), copying the work of another student, and possession of unauthorized materials during an examination. Ignorance of the university's *Code of Student Conduct* is never considered an excuse for academic misconduct, so I recommend that you review the *Code of Student Conduct* and, specifically, the sections dealing with academic misconduct.

If I suspect that a student has committed academic misconduct in this course, I am obligated by university rules to report my suspicions to the Committee on Academic Misconduct. If COAM determines that you have violated the university's *Code of Student*

Conduct (i.e., committed academic misconduct), the sanctions for the misconduct could include a failing grade in this course and suspension or dismissal from the university.

If you have any questions about the above policy or what constitutes academic misconduct in this course, please contact me.

Other sources of information on academic misconduct (integrity) to which you can refer include:

- [Committee on Academic Misconduct](http://go.osu.edu/coam) (go.osu.edu/coam)
- [Ten Suggestions for Preserving Academic Integrity](http://go.osu.edu/ten-suggestions) (go.osu.edu/ten-suggestions)
- [Eight Cardinal Rules of Academic Integrity](http://go.osu.edu/cardinal-rules) (go.osu.edu/cardinal-rules)

Copyright for Instructional Materials

The materials used in connection with this course may be subject to copyright protection and are only for the use of students officially enrolled in the course for the educational purposes associated with the course. Copyright law must be considered before copying, retaining, or disseminating materials outside of the course.

Creating an Environment Free from Harassment, Discrimination, and Sexual Misconduct

The Ohio State University is committed to building and maintaining a community to reflect diversity and to improve opportunities for all. All Buckeyes have the right to be free from harassment, discrimination, and sexual misconduct. Ohio State does not discriminate on the basis of age, ancestry, color, disability, ethnicity, gender, gender identity or expression, genetic information, HIV/AIDS status, military status, national origin, pregnancy (childbirth, false pregnancy, termination of pregnancy, or recovery therefrom), race, religion, sex, sexual orientation, or protected veteran status, or any other bases under the law, in its activities, academic programs, admission, and employment. Members of the university community also have the right to be free from all forms of sexual misconduct: sexual harassment, sexual assault, relationship violence, stalking, and sexual exploitation.

To report harassment, discrimination, sexual misconduct, or retaliation and/or seek confidential and non-confidential resources and supportive measures, contact the Office of Institutional Equity:

1. Online reporting form at equity.osu.edu,
2. Call 614-247-5838 or TTY 614-688-8605,
3. Or email equity@osu.edu

The university is committed to stopping sexual misconduct, preventing its recurrence, eliminating any hostile environment, and remedying its discriminatory effects. All university employees have reporting responsibilities to the Office of Institutional Equity to ensure the university can take appropriate action:

- All university employees, except those exempted by legal privilege of confidentiality or expressly identified as a confidential reporter, have an obligation to report incidents of sexual assault immediately.
- The following employees have an obligation to report all other forms of sexual misconduct as soon as practicable but at most within five workdays of becoming aware of such information: 1. Any human resource professional (HRP); 2. Anyone who supervises faculty, staff, students, or volunteers; 3. Chair/director; and 4. Faculty member.

Your Mental Health

As a student you may experience a range of issues that can cause barriers to learning, such as strained relationships, increased anxiety, alcohol/drug problems, feeling down, difficulty concentrating and/or lack of motivation. These mental health concerns or stressful events may lead to diminished academic performance or reduce a student's ability to participate in daily activities. No matter where you are engaged in distance learning, The Ohio State University's Student Life Counseling and Consultation Service (CCS) is here to support you. If you find yourself feeling isolated, anxious or overwhelmed, [on-demand mental health resources](https://go.osu.edu/ccsondemand) (go.osu.edu/ccsondemand) are available. You can reach an on-call counselor when CCS is closed at [614- 292-5766](tel:614-292-5766). **24-hour emergency help** is available through the [National Suicide Prevention Lifeline website](https://www.suicideline.org/) (suicideline.org) or by calling [1-800-273-8255\(TALK\)](tel:1-800-273-8255). [The Ohio State Wellness app](https://go.osu.edu/wellnessapp) (go.osu.edu/wellnessapp) is also a great resource.

Accessibility Accommodations for Students with Disabilities

Requesting Accommodations

The university strives to make all learning experiences as accessible as possible. If you anticipate or experience academic barriers based on your disability including mental health, chronic or temporary medical conditions, please let me know immediately so that we can privately discuss options. To establish reasonable accommodations, I may request that you register with [Student Life Disability Services \(SLDS\)](https://www.slds.osu.edu/). After registration, make arrangements with me as soon as possible to discuss your accommodations so that they may be implemented in a timely fashion. In light of the current pandemic, students seeking to request COVID-related accommodations may do so through the university's request process, managed by Student Life Disability Services.

Disability Services Contact Information

- Phone: [614-292-3307](tel:614-292-3307)
- Website: slds.osu.edu
- Email: slds@osu.edu
- In person: [Baker Hall 098, 113 W. 12th Avenue](#)

Accessibility of Course Technology

This online course requires use of CarmenCanvas (Ohio State's learning management system) and other online communication and multimedia tools. If you need additional services to use these technologies, please request accommodations as early as possible.

- [CarmenCanvas accessibility](https://go.osu.edu/canvas-accessibility) (go.osu.edu/canvas-accessibility)
- Streaming audio and video
- [CarmenZoom accessibility](https://go.osu.edu/zoom-accessibility) (go.osu.edu/zoom-accessibility)

READINGS AND CLASS SCHEDULE

We will be reading a number of award-winning articles this semester (marked in the syllabus), including winners of the *JCR* Ferber Award, the annual “Best Article in *JCR*” award, the long-term impact award for *JCR*, and the AMA-EBSCO Annual Award for Responsible Research in Marketing. Descriptions of these awards follow:

- The **Robert Ferber Award** competition is held annually in honor of one of the founders and the second editor of the *Journal of Consumer Research*. The award is given to the best interdisciplinary dissertation article published in the latest volume of *JCR*.
- The **Best Article in *JCR*** for a given year is chosen by the members of the *JCR* Policy Board after receiving nominations from the Editorial Review Board. It is given for an article published three years previously.
- The ***JCR* Long-term Contribution Award** is given “for a long-term contribution to consumer research.” The award is presented once every three years.
- The annual **AMA-EBSCO Annual Award for Responsible Research in Marketing** recognizes research that exemplifies the [Seven Principles of Responsible Research](#) and supports the general notion of individual, societal, and environmental wellbeing, emphasizing marketing’s power to foster a greater good, improve individual lives, strengthen communities, and in general make the world better.

Class 1, Monday, August 28th

Please read the articles assigned for each class **BEFORE** coming to class each week (so read these prior to coming to class on August 28th). You will normally have a reader response due each week (unless otherwise noted in the syllabus), but will **NOT** have one due this first week. Please submit these via Carmen.

Introduction and Overview of Consumer Behavior

- Wells, William (1993), “Discovery-oriented Consumer Research,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 19 (March), 489-503.
- MacInnis, Deborah J. and Valerie K. Folkes (2010), “The Disciplinary Status of Consumer Behavior: A Sociology of Science Perspective on Key Controversies,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, (April), 899-914.
- Morales, Andrea, On Amir, and Leonard Lee (2017), “Keeping it Real in Experimental Research – Understanding When, Where, and How to Enhance Realism and Measure Consumer Behavior,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 44 (August), 465-76.
- Schmitt, Bernd H., June Cotte, Markus Giesler, Andrew T. Stephen, and Stacy Wood (2022), "Relevance—Reloaded and Recoded," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 48 (5), 753-55.
- Philipp-Muller, Aviva, John P. Costello, and Rebecca Walker Reczek (2023), "Get Your Science out of Here: When Does Invoking Science in the Marketing of Consumer Products Backfire?," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 49 (5), 721-740.

Class 2, Monday, September 11

Knowledge, Learning, and Memory

- Alba, Joseph W. and J. Wesley Hutchinson (1988), “Dimensions of Consumer Expertise,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 13 (March), 411-54 (**Winner, Best Article in JCR for 1988; Winner JCR Long-term Impact Award for 2008**)
- LaTour, Kathryn A. and John A. Deighton (2019), “Learning to Become a Taste Expert,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 46 (June), 1-19.
- Braun, Kathryn A. (1999), “Post-Experience Advertising Effects on Consumer Memory,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 25 (March), 319-34. (**Winner, 1999 Ferber Award; Winner, Best Article in JCR for 1999**)
- Nelson, Noelle and Joseph P. Redden (2017), “Remembering Satiation: The Role of Working Memory in Satiation,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 44 (October), 633-35.
- Reczek, Rebecca Walker, Julie R. Irwin, Daniel M. Zane, and Kristine R. Ehrich (2018), “That’s Not How I Remember It: Willfully Ignorant Memory for Ethical Product Attribute Information,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 45 (June), 185-207.

Class 3, Monday, September 18

I will distribute the article you are to review for the Reviewing Assignment at the end of this class period.

Consumer Goal Pursuit

- Nunes, Joseph C. and Xavier Drèze (2006), “The Endowed Progress Effect: How Artificial Advancement Increases Effort,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 32 (March), 504-12.
- Dalton, Amy N. and Stephen A. Spiller (2012), “Too Much of a Good Thing: The Benefits of Implementation Intentions Depend on the Number of Goals,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 39 (October), 600-14.
- Patrick, Vanessa M. and Henrik Hagtvedt (2012), “I Don’t” versus “I Can’t”: When Empowered Refusal Motivates Goal-Directed Behavior,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 39 (August), 371-81.
- Lieberman, Alicea, Andrea C. Morales, and On Amir (2022), “Tangential Immersion: Increasing Persistence in Boring Consumer Behaviors,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 49 (3), 45-472.
- Ruan, Bowen, Evan Polman, and Robin J. Tanner (2023), “The One-Away Effect: The Pursuit of Mere Completion,” forthcoming at the *Journal of Consumer Research*.

Class 4, Monday, September 25

Consumer Lay Theories and Persuasion Knowledge

- Haws, Kelly, L., Rebecca Walker Reczek, and Kevin Sample (2017), “Healthy Diets Make Empty Wallets: The Healthy = Expensive Intuition,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 43 (April), 992-1007. **(Finalist, 2020 AMA-EBSCO Responsible Research in Marketing Award)**
- Yamim, Amanda, Robert Mai, and Carolina O. Werle (2020), “Make It Hot: How Food Temperature (Mis)guides Product Judgments,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 47 (December), 523-43.
- Wooley, Kaitlin, Daniella Kupor, and Peggy J. Liu (2023), “Does Company Size Shape Product Quality Inferences? Larger Companies Make Better High-Tech Products, but Smaller Companies Make Better Low-Tech Products,” *Journal of Marketing Research*, 60 (3), 425-448.
- Friestad, Marian and Peter Wright (1994), “The Persuasion Knowledge Model: How People Cope with Persuasion Attempts,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 21 (1), 1-31. **(Winner, Best Article in JCR for 1994; Winner JCR Long-term Impact Award for 2020)**
- Costello, John P., Jesse Walker, and Rebecca Walker Reczek (2023), “Challenging the Conventional Wisdom behind Unconventional Brand Names,” forthcoming at the *Journal of Marketing*.

Class 5, Monday, October 2 – Emotions and Happiness

- Shiv, Baba and Fedorikhin, Alexander (1999), “Heart and Mind in Conflict: The Interplay of Affect and Cognition in Consumer Decision Making,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 26 (December), 278-292.
- Rocklage, Matthew D., Derek D. Rucker, and Loran F. Nordgren (2021), “Emotionally Numb: Expertise Dulls Consumer Experience,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 48 (3), 355-373.
- Etkin, Jordan and Cassie Mogilner (2016), “Does Variety among Activities Increases Happiness,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 43 (August), 210-220.
- Etkin, Jordan (2016), “The Hidden Cost of Personal Quantification,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 42 (April), 967-984 **(Winner, Best Article in JCR for 2016)**
- Faraji-Rad, Ali and Leonard Lee (2022), “Banking Happiness,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 49 (August), 336-358.

Class 6, Monday, October 9

Social Influence on Consumption

- Argo, Jennifer J., Darren W. Dahl, and Rajesh Manchanda (2005), “The Influence of a Mere Social Presence in a Retail Context,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 32 (September), 207-12.
- McFerran, Brent, Darren W. Dahl, Gavan J. Fitzsimons, and Andrea C. Morales (2010), “I’ll Have What She’s Having: Effects of Social Influence and Body Type on the Food Choices of Others,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 36 (April), 915-29 (**Honorable Mention, 2010 Ferber Award**)
- Ariely, Dan and Jonathan Levav (2000), “Sequential Choice in Group Settings: Taking the Road Less Traveled and Less Enjoyed,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 27 (December), 279-90.
- Yonat Zwebner and Rom Y. Schrift (2020), “On My Own: The Aversion to Being Observed during the Preference-Construction Stage,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 47 (December), 475-99.
- Garcia-Rada, Ximena, Michael I. Norton, and Rebecca K. Ratner (2023), “A Desire to Create Shared Memories Increases Consumers’ Willingness to Sacrifice Experience Quality for Togetherness,” *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, forthcoming.

Class 7, Monday, October 16

Reviewing Assignment is due at the beginning of this class period. Author of reviewing assignment paper will join us at the beginning of class to discuss their paper.

No Reader Responses due this week.

Signaling via Consumption

- Belk, Russell W. (1988), “Possessions and the Extended Self,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 15 (September), 139-68 (**Winner JCR Long-term Impact Award for 2005**).
- Fournier, Susan (1998), “Consumers and Their Brands: Developing Relationship Theory in Consumer Research,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 24 (March), 343-73. (**Honorable Mention, 1998 Ferber Award; Winner, Best Article in JCR for 1998; Winner JCR Long-term Impact Award for 2011**)
- Warren, Caleb and Margaret C. Campbell (2014), “What Makes Things Cool? How Autonomy Influences Perceived Coolness,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 41 (August), 543-63. (**Winner, 2015 Ferber Award**)
- Bellezza, Silvia, Francesca Gino, and Anat Keinan (2014), "The Red Sneakers Effect: Inferring Status and Competence from Signals of Nonconformity." *Journal of Consumer Research*, 41 (June 2014), 35–54.
- Goor, Dafna, Anat Keinan, and Nailya Ordabayeva (2021), “Status Pivoting,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 47 (April), 978-1002. (**Runner-up, 2021 Ferber Award**)

Class 8, Monday, October 23

Technology and Consumer Research

- Longoni, Chiara, Andrea Bonezzi, and Carey K. Morewedge (2019), “Resistance to Medical Artificial Intelligence,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 46 (4), 629-50. **(Winner Best Article in JCR for 2022)**
- Castelo, Noah, Maarten W. Bos, and Donald R. Lehmann (2019), “Task-Dependent Algorithm Aversion,” *Journal of Marketing Research*, 56 (5), 809-25.
- Yalcin, Gizem, Sarah Lim, Stefano Puntoni, and Stijn van Osselaer (2022), “Thumbs Up or Down: Consumer Reactions to Decisions by Algorithms versus Humans,” *Journal of Marketing Research*, 59 (4), 696-717.
- Barasch, Alixandra, Gal Zauberaman, and Kristin Diehl (2018), “How the Intention to Share Can Undermine Enjoyment: Photo-Taking Goals and Evaluation of Experiences,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 44 (April), 1220-37.
- Melumad, Shiri and Michel Tuan Pham (2020), “The Smartphone as a Pacifying Technology,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 47 (August), 237-55. **(Runner-up, 2021 Ferber Award)**

Class 9, Monday, October 30

We will discuss one fewer paper this week because we will have a discussion at the end of class on “where good research ideas come from” to help you get started on thinking about an idea for your final project. I also encourage you to skim the program for the 2023 Association for Consumer Research Conference to get an idea of what topics are popular right now among consumer researchers.

Owning, Consuming, and Disposing

- Atasoy, Ozgun and Carey K. Morewedge (2018), “Digital Goods Are Valued Less Than Physical Goods,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 44 (6), 1343-57.
- Ross, Gretchen R., Margaret G. Meloy, and Lisa E. Bolton (2021), “Disorder and Downsizing,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 47 (April), 959-977. **(Winner, 2021 Ferber Award)**
- Goldstein, Noah, Robert Cialdini, and Vladas Griskevicius (2008), “A Room with a Viewpoint: Using Social Norms to Motivate Environmental Conservation in Hotels,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 35 (October), 472-82. **(Winner Best Article in JCR for 2008)**
- Trudel, Remi, Jennifer J. Argo, and Matthew D. Meng (2016), “The Recycled Self: Consumers’ Disposal Decisions of Identity-Linked Products,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 43 (August), 246-64.

Class 10, Monday, November 6

Product Creation and Authenticity

- Fuchs, Christophe, Martin Schreier, and Stijn van Osselaer (2015), "The Handmade Effect: What's Love Got to Do with It?," *Journal of Marketing*, 79 (March), 98-110.
- Newman, George E. and Ravi Dhar (2014), "Authenticity is Contagious: Brand Essence and the Original Source of Production" *Journal of Marketing Research*, 51 (June), 371-86.
- Smith, Rosanna K., George E. Newman, and Ravi Dhar (2016), "Closer to the Creator: Temporal Contagion Explains the Preference for Earlier Serial Numbers," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 42 (February), 653-68.
- Valsesia, Francesca, Josph C. Nunes, and Andrea Ordanini (2016), "What Wins Awards Is Not Always What I Buy: How Creative Control Affects Authenticity and Thus Recognition (But Not Liking)," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 42 (April), 897-914.
- Valsesia, Francesca and Kristin Diehl (2022), "Let Me Show You What I Did Versus What I Have: Sharing Experiential Versus Material Purchases Alters Authenticity and Liking of Social Media Users," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 49 (3), 430-449.

Class 11, Monday, November 13

Consumer Choices for Others

- Liu, Peggy J., Steven K. Dallas, and Gavan J. Fitzsimons (2019), "A Framework for Understanding Consumer Choices for Others," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 46 (3), 407-34.
- Botti, Simona, Kristina Orfali, and Sheena S. Iyengar (2009), "Tragic Choices: Autonomy and Emotional Responses to Medical Decisions," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 36 (October), 337-352. (**Winner, Best Article in JCR for 2009**)
- Nikolova, Hristina and Cait Lamberton (2016), "Men and the Middle: Gender Differences in Dyadic Compromise Effects," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 43 (3), 355-71.
- Liu, Peggy J. and Kate E. Min (2020), "Where Do You Want to Go for Dinner? A Preference Expression Asymmetry in Joint Consumption," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 57 (December), 1037-54.
- Garbinsky, Emily N., Joe J. Gladstone, Hristina Nikolova, and Jenny G. Olson (2020), "Love, Lies, and Money: Financial Infidelity in Romantic Relationships," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 47(1), 1-24.

Class 12, Monday, November 20

How To Write a Research Paper/Details on your Final Paper Assignment

You do not have a reader response due this week but are required to bring in an idea for your final paper for us to discuss – this doesn't have to be written out, but we will give preliminary feedback on each idea as a group. I will also give you the randomly determined order for presenting on our last day of class.

We will also discuss this paper (consistent with next week's theme of pursuing meaning) in honor of the Thanksgiving holiday.

- Wallendorf, Melanie and Eric J. Arnould (1991), "We Gather Together: Consumption Rituals on Thanksgiving Day," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 18 (1), 13-31

Class 13, Monday, November 27

Pursuing Meaning, Fairness, and Morality in the Marketplace

- Keinan, Anat and Ran Kivetz (2011), "Productivity Orientation and the Consumption of Collectable Experiences." *Journal of Consumer Research*, 37 (April), 935-50. (**Winner, 2011 Ferber Award**)
- Garcia-Rada, Ximena, Mary Steffel, Elanor F. Williams, and Michael I. Norton (2022), "Consumers Value Effort over Ease When Caring for Close Others," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 48 (6), 970–90.
- Mead, Nicole and Lawrence E. Williams (2023), "The Pursuit of Meaning and the Preference for Less Expensive Options," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 49 (5), 741-761.
- Rifkin, Laura Schrier, Colleen P Kirk, and Canan Corus (2023), "A Turn of the Tables: Psychological Contracts and Word of Mouth about Sharing Economy Platforms When Consumers Get Reviewed," forthcoming at the *Journal of Consumer Research*.
- Goenka, Shreyans and Stijn M.J. van Osselaer (2023), "Why Is It Wrong to Sell Your Body? Understanding Liberals' Versus Conservatives' Moral Objections to Bodily Markets," *Journal of Marketing*, 87 (1), 64-80.

Class 14, Monday, December 4

Research Paper Presentations in Class

Your paper is due on Canvas before class begins.

Final Exam Date and time: Tuesday, December 12, 12:00 - 1:45 PM

The final exam will be open notes/open book. Format is short answer essay. The exam will be posted on Canvas at 12:00 PM (noon) as a word file, and you will need to email it back to me (Reczek.3@osu.edu) by 1:45 PM. No collaboration of any kind is allowed on the exam.

SYLLABUS SUPPLEMENT I
Guidelines for Writing a Behavioral Paper
(Adapted from Jim Bettman, Duke University)

- Introduction
 - Positioning
 - Importance - big picture - knowing the literature and important issues
 - State purpose early and often
 - Issue in marketing/conceptual issue/combination of the two
 - Not no one has studied this (as the main reason)
 - Overview of the paper
- Literature Review and Hypotheses
 - Use only what you need for the case at hand
 - Use subheads and overviews of coming points - try to have a logical flow
 - Summarize main points you want the reader to get
 - Hypotheses - explicit or not?
- Method
 - Overview
 - Sections - see psychology journals
 - Subjects, Design, Procedure, Measures, Analyses
- Results
 - Only present results relevant to hypotheses
 - Organize by H (repeat) or by major dependent variable
 - Try to present in some logical flow
 - Use tables and figures
 - Discuss after presenting - discussion section for each study
- Overall Discussion
 - Summary
 - Relate back to introduction and purpose - conclusions
 - Some issues better in discussion than up front
- References
 - Pick a style and stick with it – in this class we will use the *JCR* style guide available on the *JCR* website.

SYLLABUS SUPPLEMENT II

Guidelines for Preparing an Academic Presentation

(Adapted from Cait Lambertson, University of Pennsylvania)

The main thing to keep in mind as you prepare to present your work at an academic conference is that you have a limited amount of time (typically 15-20 minutes) in which to convey the main ideas. So be succinct! You cannot discuss all of the details of your work. The most common mistake that I see at conferences is poor time management – specifically, overkill on the literature review and hypotheses. It is important that you embed your work in the relevant theoretical network, but it is critical that you leave sufficient time to convince the audience that your work makes a contribution to the field's body of knowledge. This is done by presenting your empirical work.

The key aspects of your presentation and ballpark estimates for time allocation are below:

- | | |
|--------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1-2 minutes | The Problem – What is the phenomenon and why is it interesting? |
| 3-5 minutes | Literature review/hypothesis development – Focus only on the most relevant literature. |
| 8-10 minutes | Empirical work – For our class, discuss the study that you will run to test your hypothesis. BE SPECIFIC. Be sure to explain how the theoretical components of the paper are operationalized...specifically and clearly. Though you will likely not have data at this point, discuss how you will analyze the data you collect and what you anticipate finding in the results. Also, take this opportunity to practice explaining graphs. Take your time. Be clear. |
| 2-3 minutes | Conclusions/Implications – Clearly articulate the theoretical and practical contributions. Also, go beyond what's written to CONNECT this work to other papers we've read in class. Does it converge with prior work? Diverge? Challenge? Explain? Extend? |
| 1-2 minutes | Next steps – How would you follow up on this work? |
| Questions | Learn how to respond to questions and suggestions. We'll discuss this. |

As an Audience Member: Asking Questions and Providing Suggestions

Each non-presenter will be required to ask a question or give a suggestion for each presentation (time permitting). Remember that questions should be phrased in constructive ways. Also, remember that your response to an answer is important; if you get a bad answer, is it because your question was unclear? Or is it because the speaker simply didn't answer your question? At what point is it time to accept the answer as provided or move the discussion off-line? Understanding these dynamics is crucial to being a good audience member and departmental citizen.

SYLLABUS SUPPLEMENT III
Guidelines for Critiquing a Research Article
(Adapted from Ryan Hamilton, Emory University)

How to Write Reviews

Things to remember when writing a review:

1. You, as a reviewer, do NOT get to decide whether a paper is published or not. Your role is to provide a recommendation to the Editor, who makes the final decision. This means that your review should not include a disposition (e.g., don't say, "This paper shouldn't be published" in the review itself.) Include a separate, confidential note to the editor with your recommendation. In the note to the editor, include a specific recommendation and a brief justification for your recommendation. Don't repeat a lot of information you included in your review—the editor will read your review. At most journals, the possible outcomes are:
 - a. Accept – No changes need to be made. The paper can be published as-is.
 - b. Conditional Accept – Minor changes need to be made. Minor changes include things like flow, clarity, and length-to-contribution ratio (i.e., make it shorter).
 - c. Revise and Resubmit – Some major concerns need to be addressed. Major concerns include things like problems with the empirical results (e.g., incorrect statistical tests, problematic manipulations), problems with the theory (e.g., insufficient explanation, insufficient support for propositions), or problems with contribution (e.g., too much like other published work, nothing surprising)
 - d. Risky Revision – Many major concerns. This is a signal that even though a revision has been invited, the bar for making it to the next round is substantial.
 - e. Reject – Insurmountable problems. No amount of change is likely to fix it. Don't send it back to this journal.

2. There are real people on the other side of that nameless manuscript. Because reviews are double blind, some people feel licensed to be unnecessarily cruel or dismissive. Remember that the manuscript—even if, in your opinion, it is objectively bad—was likely the result of months or years of work by the authors. This does not mean that you should go easy on the manuscript. The authors, the editor, and the field as a whole deserve an honest assessment of the quality of the work. But make your criticism constructive and frame it in a way that is helpful rather than petty and destructive.
 - a. Recognize that most of your review is an expression of your opinion—usually you are not communicating facts. Use language appropriate for expressing opinions.
 - b. Don't make demands of the authors, point out problems and make suggestions for how they can be resolved. Don't say, "You must do X." Instead, say, "One way to resolve this would be to do X."
 - c. Because the decision to reject a paper lies with the Editor, even if you see nothing redeemable in a manuscript, you could still be asked to read the same work again in a subsequent round. Resist the natural urge to be dismissive once you have decided you are going to recommend rejection. Even for manuscripts you don't

like, focus on providing suggestions that will improve the paper. If you believe there is nothing that the authors could do to make it publishable, what would make it less bad?

3. Take the authors' perspective when making your suggestions. As an author, when you read a review, you typically want to know what can be done to resolve the reviewer's concern. Whenever you point out a problem, suggest ways that the authors could convince you. If you call for more data, be specific about what types of data would be sufficient to convince you. If you call for a more detailed theoretical account, be specific about what details are lacking. What would the improved theory look like?
4. Be thorough on your first-round reviews. The implicit contract between reviewers and authors is that you won't raise issues in subsequent rounds that weren't raised in the first round. If a revision has caused new problems, then obviously those should be raised. But authors will rightly think it unfair if they have worked to address all the concerns you raised and then, after they have put in all that work, you come back with a new list of problems that were all there in the original manuscript. Authors (and Editors) can become rightly concerned that you could just come up with new concerns at every round and that there will never be a conclusion.
5. Refer to problems with specific page numbers where appropriate. Pull quotes from the manuscript to illustrate the points you are trying to make. Help the authors to know exactly what you are talking about.

How to organize a review:

There is no one right way to write a review. Unlike research articles, there is not a set format which everyone follows. Your goal should be to make things as clear and easy to follow as possible. Try to group concerns and suggestions together into themes. Here's one way to organize a review:

1. *Note to the Editor*. This is a very brief paragraph giving the Editor your recommendation (e.g., I recommend a Revise and Resubmit) and a justification for the recommendation (e.g., Although the topic is interesting and the data is interesting, the theory needs to be more specific and to build more on previous theory). Do not reiterate a lot of the information from the review—the Editor will read the review. Note: This section is confidential, the authors will not see any of this information unless the Editor chooses to share it (e.g., the Editor might say, "Reviewer 2 recommends that the paper be rejected.").
2. *Note to the Authors* (THIS is the review)

One good way to start a review is by summarizing the purpose of the article and its findings and contribution as you see them. Don't just pull some sentences from the abstract of the paper—restate the main ideas in your own words. This can help the

authors by letting them know whether a thorough reader (you) understands the main ideas of the paper in the way the authors had intended.

You should also try to say something positive upfront about the paper: Is the topic interesting? Is the paper generally well written? Clever studies? Most of the review will inevitably be about things that could be improved. Try to take some time and reassure the authors that all their efforts didn't produce something that was totally worthless. Give them something to build on as they go forward.

Try to cover these topics:

- *Contribution.* Is this work too similar to what we already know? Is this a fundamental problem with the paper, or could a better positioning emphasize what is new and interesting? (In other words, is this just a communications problem?) Is there anything that would convince you that the contribution is larger? Would you be convinced if they went out and talked to managers and the managers were surprised by the findings? Or if they cited more papers that predicted something different from what they find?
- *Conceptual Issues.* Here you organize some of your criticisms of the theory. Was it confusing or incomplete? Are the predictions logical and well supported? Do they cite the relevant papers from the literature? Are there important moderators or boundary conditions they should be considering?
- *Empirical Issues.* Are there problems with the experiments? Were they confusing? Was the link back to the theory unclear? Were all the experiments necessary? Were there other experiments that would improve things?
- *Minor Issues.* This is where you put suggestions dealing with the flow of the paper, where you sometimes suggest other papers they should investigate, or point out typographical errors that were significant enough to cause the reader some confusion.