

Attitudes and Persuasion (PSYC 441)

Instructor:

Dr. Leandre R. Fabrigar
Office: Craine 319
Phone: 533-6492
E-mail: fabrigar@queensu.ca

Office Hour: Monday (2:30 PM - 3:45 PM) or by Appointment

Required Text:

Petty, R. E., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1996). *Attitudes and persuasion: Classic and contemporary approaches*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Course Objectives: This course is designed to provide students with an introduction to attitude and persuasion research. Particular attention will be given to reviewing the various theoretical perspectives that have been proposed as explanations for the psychological processes underlying persuasion.

Format of Course: This course will alternate between several weeks of lecture followed by one week of discussion. Each cycle of lectures will provide students with background information concerning various theoretical perspectives in attitude and persuasion research. Each discussion will focus on selected topics covered in the preceding lectures. There will be a total of eight weeks of lecture and four weeks of discussion.

Class Discussions: Each class discussion will focus on a theoretical perspective in attitude and persuasion research. The discussion will be conducted in a debate format with two teams of students (3 - 4 students each). One team will present a 15 minute presentation demonstrating the value of a particular theoretical perspective by outlining its conceptual/empirical merits and its potential application to real world issues. The other team will present a 15 minute presentation criticizing the theoretical perspective by illustrating its flaws and limitations or by presenting a competing theoretical perspective. Each team will then have 10 minutes to respond to the other team's presentation and ask questions of the other team. The class and the instructor will then have 15 minutes to ask questions of either team. In addition to participating in the discussions, team members will also be required to turn in a short essay (4-5 double spaced pages) outlining their personal position on the debate topic. This paper will be due the **same class session as the debate**. Each team will be required to participate in two debates during the term. Teams not participating in the debate will be required to formulate at least one question for the debate teams. These questions will be the basis of the participation mark in the course.

Exams: There will be two exams. These exams will be in the form of short answer and essay questions.

Prorating Policy: The expectation is that students will complete all components of the course. If the first essay or first debate cannot be completed by the due date, its weight will be prorated to the second essay or debate. If the second essay or debate cannot be completed by the due date, its weight will be prorated to the final exam. If the midterm cannot be completed by its scheduled date, the standard policy will be to prorate its weight to the final exam.

Grading: Midterm Exam (20%)
Final Exam (30 %)
First Essay (12%)

Second Essay (12%)
First Debate (10%)
Second Debate (10%)
Participation (6%)

All components of this course will receive numerical percentage marks. The final grade you receive for the course will be derived by converting your numerical course average to a letter grade according to Queens Official Grade Conversion Scale:

Queen's Official Grade Conversion Scale

Grade	Numerical Course Average (Range)
A+	90-100
A	85-89
A-	80-84
B+	77-79
B	73-76
B-	70-72
C+	67-69
C	63-66
C-	60-62
D+	57-59
D	53-56
D-	50-52
F	49 and below

Statement on Academic Integrity:

Queen's students, faculty, administrators and staff all have responsibilities for upholding the [fundamental values of academic integrity](#); honesty, trust, fairness, respect, responsibility and courage. These values are central to the building, nurturing, and sustaining of an academic community in which all members of the community will thrive. Adherence to the values expressed through academic integrity forms a foundation for the "freedom of inquiry and exchange of ideas" essential to the intellectual life of the University (see the [Senate Report on Principles and Priorities](#)).

Students are responsible for familiarizing themselves with the regulations concerning academic integrity and for ensuring that their assignments and their behaviour conform to the principles of academic integrity. Information on academic integrity is available in the Arts and Science Calendar (see [Academic Regulation 1](#)), on the [Arts and Science website](#), and from the instructor of this course. Departures from academic integrity include plagiarism, use of unauthorized materials, facilitation, forgery and falsification, and are antithetical to the development of an academic community at Queen's. Given the seriousness of these matters, actions which contravene the regulation on academic integrity carry sanctions that can range from a warning or the loss of grades on an assignment to the failure of a course to a requirement to withdraw from the university.

[Accommodations for Disabilities:](#)

Queen's University is committed to achieving full accessibility for people with disabilities. Part of this commitment includes arranging academic accommodations for students with disabilities to ensure they

have an equitable opportunity to participate in all their academic activities. The Senate Policy for Accommodations for Students with Disabilities was approved at [Senate in November 2016](#). If you are a student with a disability and think you may need academic accommodations, you are strongly encouraged to contact the **Queen's Student Accessibility Services (QSAS)** and register as early as possible. For more information, including important deadlines, please visit the [QSAS website](#).

Academic Consideration for Students in Extenuating Circumstances:

Academic consideration is a process for the university community to provide a compassionate response to assist students experiencing unforeseen, short-term extenuating circumstances that may impact or impede a student's ability to complete their academics. This may include but is not limited to:

- Short-term physical or mental health issues (e.g., stomach flu, pneumonia, COVID diagnosis, vaccination, etc.)
- Responses to traumatic events (e.g., Death of a loved one, divorce, sexual assault, social injustice, etc.)
- Requirements by law or public health authorities (e.g., court date, isolation due to COVID exposure, etc.)

Queen's University is committed to providing academic consideration to students experiencing extenuating circumstances. For more information, please see the [Senate Policy on Academic Consideration for Students in Extenuating Circumstances](#).

Each Faculty has developed a protocol to provide a consistent and equitable approach in dealing with requests for academic consideration for students facing extenuating circumstances. Arts and Science undergraduate students can find the Faculty of Arts and Science protocol and the [portal where a request can be submitted](#). Students in other Faculties and Schools who are enrolled in this course should refer to the protocol for their home Faculty.

For guidance on **submitting requests**, please see refer to the Resource Guides available on the [Academic Consideration website](#) under "Applying for Academic Consideration."

N.B: The COVID-19 pandemic is an evolving situation. If you have symptoms or are deemed a close contact of someone with COVID, please access our [COVID-Related Absence Reference Guide](#) on the [Academic Consideration website](#). This guide will provide you with information on applying for consideration, the types of documentation (including non-medical documentation) you can use to support your request, as well as insight into how the Faculty office will assess these requests.

If you need to request academic consideration for this course, you will be required to provide the following name and email address to ensure it reaches our team accordingly:

Course Coordinator Name: Tara Karasewich

Course Coordinator email address: psyc.accom@queensu.ca

Students are encouraged to submit requests as soon as the need becomes apparent and to contact their Course Coordinator as soon as possible once Consideration has been verified. Any delay in contact may limit the Consideration options available.

Please follow up with Tara Karasewich using email (psyc.accom@queensu.ca) within 2 days of receiving verification of your Consideration request.

For more information on the Academic Consideration process, what is and is not an extenuating

circumstance, and to submit an Academic Consideration request, [please see our website](#).

Timing of Final Examinations:

The exam dates for each Term are listed on the Faculty of Arts and Science webpage under “Important Dates”. Student exam schedules for the Fall Term are posted via SOLUS immediately prior to the Thanksgiving holiday; for the Winter Term they are posted on the Friday before Reading Week, and for the Summer Term they are individually noted on the Arts and Science Online syllabi. **Students should delay finalizing any travel plans until after the examination schedule has been posted. Exams will not be moved or deferred to accommodate employment, travel/holiday plans or flight reservations.**

Copyright of Course Materials

Course materials created by the course instructor, including all slides, presentations, handouts, tests, exams, and other similar course materials, are the intellectual property of the instructor. It is a departure from academic integrity to distribute, publicly post, sell or otherwise disseminate an instructor’s course materials or to provide an instructor’s course materials to anyone else for distribution, posting, sale or other means of dissemination, without the instructor’s *express consent*. A student who engages in such conduct may be subject to penalty for a departure from academic integrity and may also face adverse legal consequences for infringement of intellectual property rights.

Course Outline

Dates	Topic	Readings
Week 1 (Jan. 9, 11)	Introduction To Attitudes and Persuasion Definitions/Types Functions Structure Measurement Methods for studying persuasion	Ch. 1
Week 2 (Jan. 16, 18)	Impact of Attitudes on Behavior and Cognition Original Conceptualizations Criticisms Methodological Issues Other Constructs Thoughtful/Nonthoughtful Processes Attitude Strength	Ch. 1
Week 3 (Jan. 23, 25)	Conditioning and Modeling Approaches Classical Conditioning Operant Conditioning Social Learning Mere Exposure NO CLASS (Wednesday, January 25)	Ch. 2
Week 4 (Jan. 30, Feb. 1)	Debates Evaluating the MODE Debate (Jan. 30) Meta-attitudinal and Operative Measures Debate (Feb. 1)	Supplementary
Week 5 (Feb. 6, 8)	The Message Learning Approach Source Effects Message Effects	Ch. 3
Week 6 (Feb. 13, 15)	Message Learning/Judgmental Approaches Recipient Effects Channel Effects Attitude Persistence Social Judgment Theory Perspective Theory Midterm Exam (Feb. 15)	Ch. 4
Reading Week (Feb. 20-24)	No Class	
Week 7 (Feb. 27, March 1)	Debates Implicit-Explicit Attitudes Debate (Feb. 27) The Message Learning Theory Evaluated (March 1)	Supplementary

Week 8 (March 6, 8)	Motivational Approaches-Dissonance Theory Balance Theory Cognitive Dissonance Theory New Versions of Cognitive Dissonance Theory	Ch. 5
Week 9 (March 13, 15)	Dissonance Theory Impression Management Theory Self-Perception Theory Self-Affirmation Theory Self-Standards Model	Ch. 6
Week 10 (March 20, 22)	Debates Aronson's Self-Consistency Model Debate (March 20) Self-Standards Model of Dissonance Debate (March 22)	Supplementary
Week 11 (March 27, 29)	Elaboration Likelihood Model/Heuristic-Systematic Model Elaboration Likelihood Model (ELM) Heuristic-Systematic Model (HSM)	Ch. 8 & 9
Week 12 (April 3, 5)	Debates Non-Cognitive Attitude Formation/Change Debate (April 3) The ELM versus the Unimodel (April 5)	Supplementary

Final Exam (April 14-28)

Supplementary Readings

Week 4:

Topic 1 (Evaluating the MODE Theory of Attitude-Behaviour Consistency):

Fazio, R. H. (1990). Multiple processes by which attitudes guide behavior: The MODE model as an integrative framework. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 23, pp. 75-109). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Fazio, R. H., & Towles-Schwen, T. (1999). The MODE model of attitude-behavior processes. In S. Chaiken & Y. Trope (Eds.), *Dual-process theories in social psychology* (pp. 97-116). New York, NY: Guilford.

Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (2005). The influence of attitudes on behavior. In D. Albarricín, B. T. Johnson, & M. P. Zanna, *The handbook of attitudes* (pp. 173-221). New York, NY: Erlbaum.

Neal, D. T., Wood, W., Wu, M., & Kurlander, D. (2011). The Pull of the past: When do habits persist despite conflict with motives? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 37, 1428-1437.

Fabrigar, L. R., Wegener, D. T., & MacDonald, T. K. (2010). Distinguishing between prediction and influence: Multiple processes underlying attitude-behavior consistency. In C. R. Agnew, D. E. Carlston, W. G. Graziano, & J. R. Kelly (Eds.), *Then a miracle occurs: Focusing on behavior in social psychological theory and research* (pp. 162-185). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Topic 2 (Meta-attitudinal versus Operative Measures of Attitude Attributes):

Bassili, J. N. (1996). Meta-judgmental versus operative indexes of psychological attributes: The case of measures of attitude strength. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71, 637-653.

Haddock, G., Rothman, A. J., Reber, R., & Schwarz, N. (1999). Forming judgments of attitude certainty, intensity, and importance: The role of subjective experiences. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 25, 771-782.

Boninger, D. S., Krosnick, J. A., Berent, M. K., & Fabrigar, L. R. (1995). The causes and consequences of attitude importance. In R. E. Petty & J. A. Krosnick (Eds.), *Attitude strength: Antecedents and consequences*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Tormala, Z. L., & Rucker, D. D. (2007). Attitude certainty: A review of past findings and emerging perspectives. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 1, 469-492.

Petty, R. E., Brinol, P., Tormala, Z. L., & Wegener, D. T. (2007). The role of metacognition in social judgment. In A. W. Kruglanski & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Social psychology: Handbook of basic principles* (2nd Ed., pp. 254-282). New York, NY: Guilford.

See, Y. H. M., Petty, R. E., & Fabrigar, L. R. (2008). Affective and cognitive meta-bases of attitudes: Unique effects on information interest and persuasion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 94, 938-955.

Week 7:

Topic 1 (Do Implicit Attitudes Exist and If So What Are They?):

- Petty, R. E., Fazio, R. H., & Brinol, P. (2009). The new implicit measures: An overview. In R. E. Petty, R. H. Fazio, & P. Brinol (Eds.), *Attitudes: Insights from the new implicit measures* (pp. 3-18). New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Greenwald, A. G., & Banaji, M. R. (1995). Implicit social cognition: Attitudes, self-esteem, and stereotypes. *Psychological Review*, *102*, 4-27.
- Wilson, T. D., Lindsey, S., & Schooler, T. Y. (2000). A model of dual attitudes. *Psychological Review*, *107*, 101-126.
- Greenwald, A. G., & Nosek, B. A. (2009). Attitudinal dissociation: What does it mean? In R. E. Petty, R. H. Fazio, & P. Brinol (Eds.), *Attitudes: Insights from the new implicit measures* (pp. 85-117). New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Olson, M. A., & Fazio, R. H. (2009). Implicit and explicit measures of attitudes: The perspective of the MODE model. In R. E. Petty, R. H. Fazio, & P. Brinol (Eds.), *Attitudes: Insights from the new implicit measures* (pp. 19-63). New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Petty, R. E., Briñol, P., & DeMarree, K. G. (2007). The meta-cognitive model (MCM) of attitudes: Implications for attitude measurement, change, and strength. *Social Cognition*, *25*, 657-686.

Topic 2 (Evaluating the Message Learning Theory)

- McGuire, W. J. (1968). Personality and attitude change: An information-processing theory. In A. G. Greenwood, T. C. Brock, & T. M. Ostrom (Eds.), *Psychological foundations of attitudes* (pp. 171-196). New York: Academic Press.
- McGuire, W. J. (1972). Attitude change: The information-processing paradigm. In C. G. McClintock (Ed), *Experimental social psychology* (pp. 108-141). New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Greenwald, A. G. (1968). Cognitive learning, cognitive response to persuasion, and attitude change. In A. G. Greenwald, T. C. Brock, & T. M. Ostrom (Eds.), *Psychological foundations of attitudes* (pp. 147-170). New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Love, R. E., & Greenwald, A. G. (1978). Cognitive responses to persuasion as mediators of opinion change. *Journal of Social Psychology*, *104*, 231-241.
- Sherif, M., & Sherif, C. W. (1967). Attitudes as the individual's own categories: The social judgment-involvement approach to attitude and attitude change. In C. W. Sherif & M. Sherif (Eds.), *Attitude, ego-involvement, and change* (pp. 105-158). New York, NY: Wiley.

Week 10:

Topic 1 (Aronson's Self-Consistency Model of Dissonance Versus the World):

Harmon-Jones, E., & Mills, J. (2019). An introduction to cognitive dissonance theory and an overview of current perspectives on the theory. In E. Harmon-Jones & J. Mills (Eds.), *Cognitive dissonance: Reexamining a pivotal theory in social psychology* (2nd Edition, pp. 3-24). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Aronson, E. (1992). The return of the repressed: Dissonance theory makes a comeback. *Psychological Inquiry*, 3, 303-311.

Brehm, J. W. (1992). An unidentified theoretical object. *Psychological Inquiry*, 3, 314-315.

Cooper, J. (1992). Dissonance and the return of the self-concept. *Psychological Inquiry*, 3, 320-323.

Greenwald, A. G. (1992). Dissonance theory and self theory: Fifteen more years. *Psychological Inquiry*, 3, 329-331.

Jussim, L. (1992). Dissonance: A second coming? *Psychological Inquiry*, 3, 332-333.

Kunda, Z. (1992). Can dissonance theory do it all? *Psychological Inquiry*, 3, 337-339.

Lord, C. G. (1992). Was cognitive dissonance theory a mistake? *Psychological Inquiry*, 3, 339-342.

Schlenker, B. R. (1992). Of shape shifters and theories. *Psychological Inquiry*, 3, 342-344.

Aronson, E. (1992). Totally provocative and perhaps partly right. *Psychological Inquiry*, 3, 353-356.

Aronson, E. (2019). Dissonance, hypocrisy, and the self-concept. In E. Harmon-Jones (Ed.), *Cognitive dissonance: Reexamining a pivotal theory in social psychology* (2nd Edition, pp. 141-157). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Topic 2 (The Self-Standards Model of Cognitive Dissonance):

Harmon-Jones, E., & Mills, J. (2019). An introduction to cognitive dissonance theory and an overview of current perspectives on the theory. In E. Harmon-Jones & J. Mills (Eds.), *Cognitive dissonance: Reexamining a pivotal theory in social psychology* (2nd Edition, pp. 3-24). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

- Aronson, J., Cohen, G., & Nail, P. R. (2019). Self-affirmation theory: An update and appraisal. In E. Harmon-Jones (Ed.), *Cognitive dissonance: Reexamining a pivotal theory in social psychology* (2nd Edition, pp. 159-174). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Aronson, E. (2019). Dissonance, hypocrisy, and the self-concept. In E. Harmon-Jones (Ed.), *Cognitive dissonance: Reexamining a pivotal theory in social psychology* (2nd Edition, pp. 141-157). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Stone, J. , & Cooper, J. (2001). A self-standards model of cognitive dissonance. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *37*, 228-243.
- Stone, J. , & Cooper, J. (2003). The effect of self-attribute relevance on how self-esteem moderates attitude change in dissonance processes. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *39*, 508-515.
- Cooper, J. (2019). In search of the motivation for dissonance reduction: The drive to lessen aversive consequences. In E. Harmon-Jones (Ed.), *Cognitive dissonance: Reexamining a pivotal theory in social psychology* (2nd Edition, pp. 175-193). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Week 12:

Topic 1 (Noncognitive Attitude Formation and Change):

Fishbein, M., & Middlestadt, S. (1995). Noncognitive effects on attitude formation and change: Fact or artifact. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 4*, 181-202.

Haugtvedt, C. P. (1997). Beyond fact or artifact: An assessment of Fishbein and Middlestadt's perspectives on attitude change processes. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 6*, 99-106.

Miniard, P. W., & Barone, M. J. (1997). The case for noncognitive determinants of attitude: A critique of Fishbein and Middlestadt. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 6*, 77-91.

Priester, J. R., & Fleming, M. A. (1997). Artifact or meaningful theoretical constructs?: Examining evidence for nonbelief- and belief-based attitude change processes. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 6*, 67-76.

Schwarz, N. (1997). Moods and attitude judgments: A comment on Fishbein and Middlestadt. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 6*, 93-98.

Fishbein, M., & Middlestadt, S. (1997). A striking lack of evidence for nonbelief-based attitude formation and change: A response to five commentaries. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 6*, 107-115.

Topic 2 (The ELM versus The Unimodel):

Petty, R. E., & Wegener, D. T. (1999). The Elaboration Likelihood Model: Current status and controversies. In S. Chaiken & Y. Trope (Eds.), *Dual process theories in social psychology* (pp. 41-72). New York: Guilford Press.

Petty, R. E., & Brinol, P. (2014). The Elaboration Likelihood and Metacognitive Models of Attitudes: Implications for Prejudice, the Self, and Beyond. In J. W. Sherman, B. Gawronski, & Y. Trope (Eds.), *Dual-process theories of the social mind* (pp. 172-187). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Petty, R. E., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1984). The effects of involvement on response to argument quantity and quality: Central and peripheral routes to persuasion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46*, 69-81.

Petty, R. E., Schumann, D. W., Richman, S. A., & Strathman, A. J. (1993). Positive mood and persuasion: Different roles for affect under high- and low-elaboration conditions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 64*, 5-20.

Tormala, Z. L., Brinol, P., & Petty, R. E. (2007). Multiple roles for source credibility under high elaboration: Its all in the timing. *Social Cognition, 25*, 536-552.

Kruglanski, A. W., & Thompson, E. P. (1999). Persuasion by a single route: A view from the unimodel. *Psychological Inquiry, 10*, 83-109.

Petty, R. E., Wheeler, S. C., & Bizer, G. Y. (1999). Is there one persuasion process or more? Lumping versus splitting in attitude change theories. *Psychological Inquiry, 10*, 156-162.

Wegener, D. T., & Claypool, H. M. (1999). The elaboration continuum by any other name does not smell as sweet. *Psychological Inquiry, 10*, 176-181.

Kruglanski, A. W., & Thompson, E. P. (1999). The illusory second mode or, the cue is the message. *Psychological Inquiry, 10*, 182-193.