Attitudes and Persuasion (PSYC 441)

Instructor:

Dr. Leandre R. Fabrigar
Office: Craine 319
Phone: 533-6492
E-mail: fabrigar@queensu.ca
Office Hour: Monday (10:30 AM - 12:00 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 15-20 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 15-20 minute presentation criticizing the theoretical perspective by illustrating its flaws and limitations or by presenting a competing theoretical perspective. Each team will then have 15 minutes to respond to the other team's presentation and ask questions of the other team. The class and the instructor will then have 20 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.

Grading: Midterm Exam (20%)
Final Exam (30 %)
First Essay (12%)
Second Essay (12%)
First Debate (10%)
Second Debate (10%)
Participation (6%)

Statement on Academic Integrity: Academic integrity is constituted by the five core fundamental values of honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility (see www.academicintegrity.org). 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 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 (see http://www.queensu.ca/calendars/artsci/Regulation_1____Academic_Integrity.html), 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.

Course Outline

	Topic	Readings
Week 1: (Sept. 11, 13)	**Introduction To Attitudes and Persuasion** Definitions/Types Functions Structure Measurement Methods for studying persuasion	Ch. 1
Week 2: (Sept. 18, 20)	**Impact of Attitudes on Behavior and Cognition** Original Conceptualizations Criticisms Methodological Issues Attitude Strength	Ch. 1
Week 3: (Sept. 25, 27)	**Conditioning and Modeling Approaches** Classical Conditioning Operant Conditioning Social Learning Mere Exposure	Ch. 2
Week 4: (Oct. 2, 4)	**Debates** Evaluating the MODE Debate Meta-attitudinal and Operative Measures Debate	Supplementary
Week 5: (Oct. 9, 11)	**The Message Learning Approach** Source Effects Message Effects Recipient Effects Channel Effects Attitude Persistence	Ch. 3
Week 6: (Oct. 16, 18)	**Judgmental/Motivational Approaches/Midterm** Social Judgment Theory Perspective Theory Balance Theory ***Midterm Exam (Oct. 18)***	Ch. 4 & 5
Week 7: (Oct. 23, 25)	**Debates** Explicit and Implicit Attitudes Non-Cognitive Attitude Formation/Change	Supplementary

	Topic	Readings
Week 8: (Oct. 30, Nov.1)	**Dissonance Theory** Cognitive Dissonance Theory New Versions of Cognitive Dissonance Theory	Ch. 5
Week 9: (Nov. 6, 8)	**Dissonance Theory/Elaboration Likelihood Model** Impression Management Theory Self-Perception Theory Self-Affirmation Theory Self-Standards Model Elaboration Likelihood Model	Ch. 6 & 9
Week 10: (Nov. 13, 15)	**The Elaboration Likelihood Model/Debate** Elaboration Likelihood Model (ELM) Heuristic-Systematic Model (HSM) Aronson's Self-Consistency Model Debate (Nov. 15)	Supplementary
Week 11: (Nov. 20, 22)	**Debates** Self-Standards Model of Dissonance Evaluating the ELM	Supplementary
Week 12: (Nov. 27, 29)	**Debate** Evaluating the Unimodel ***No Class Nov. 29*** Final Exam (Dec. 4 - 19)	Supplementary

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.

Ouellette, J. A., & Wood, W. (1998). Habit and intention in everday life: The processes by which past behavior predicts future behavior. *Psychological Bulletin*, *124*, 54-74.

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.

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 (Explicit and Implicit Attitudes):

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.

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.

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.

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.

Sherman, J. W. (2009). Controlled influences on implicit measures: Confronting the myth of process-purity and taming the cognitive monster. In R. E. Petty, R. H. Fazio, & P. Brinol (Eds.), *Attitudes: Insights from the new implicit measures* (pp. 391-426). 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 (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.

Week 10:

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

Harmon-Jones, E., & Mills, J. (1999). An introduction to cognitive dissonance theory and an overview of current perspectives on the theory. In E. Harmon-Jones & J. Mills (Eds.), *Cognitive Dissonance: Progress on a Pivotal Theory in Social Psychology* (pp. 3-21). 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.

Greeenwald, 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. (1999). Dissonance, hypocrisy, and the self-concept. In E. Harmon-Jones & J. Mills (Eds.), *Cognitive Dissonance: Progress on a Pivotal Theory in Social Psychology* (pp. 103-126). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Week 11:

Topic 1 (The Self-Standards Model of Cognitive Dissonance):

Harmon-Jones, E., & Mills, J. (1999). An introduction to cognitive dissonance theory and an overview of current perspectives on the theory. In E. Harmon-Jones & J. Mills (Eds.), *Cognitive Dissonance: Progress on a Pivotal Theory in Social Psychology* (pp. 3-21). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Aronson, J., Cohen, G., & Nail, P. R. (1999). Self-affirmation theory: An update and appraisal. In E. Harmon-Jones & J. Mills (Eds.), *Cognitive Dissonance: Progress on a Pivotal Theory in Social Psychology* (pp. 127-147). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Aronson, E. (1999). Dissonance, hypocrisy, and the self-concept. In E. Harmon-Jones & J. Mills (Eds.), *Cognitive Dissonance: Progress on a Pivotal Theory in Social Psychology* (pp. 103-126). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Steele, C. M., Spencer, S. J., & Lynch, M. (1993). Self-image resilience and dissonance: The role of affirmational resources. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *64*, 885-896.

Aronson, J., Blanton, H., & Cooper, J. (1995). From dissonance to disidentification: Selectivity in the self-affirmation process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *68*, 986-996.

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.

Topic 2 (Evaluating the Elaboration Likelihood Model):

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., & 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.

Petty, R. E., Brinol, P., & Tormala, Z. L. (2002). Thought confidence as a determinant of persuasion: The self-validation hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *82*, 722-741.

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.

Allen, M., & Reynolds, R. (1993). The Elaboration Likelihood Model and the sleeper effect: An assessment of attitude change over time. *Communication Theory*, *3*, 73-82.

Hamilton, M. A., Hunter, J. E., & Boster, F. J. (1993). The Elaboration Likelihood Model as a theory of attitude formation: A mathematical analysis. *Communication Theory*, *3*, 50-65.

Mongeau, P. A., & Stiff, J. B. (1993). Specifying causal relationships in the Elaboration Likelihood Model. *Communication Theory*, *3*, 65-72.

Week 12:

Topic 1 (Evaluating the Unimodel):

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

Chaiken, S., Duckworth, K. L., & Darke, P. (1993). When parsimony fails... *Psychological Inquiry*, *10*, 118-123.

Eagly, A. H. (1993). The processing of nested persuasive messages. *Psychological Inquiry*, *10*, 123-127.

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.

Pierro, A., Mannetti, L., Kruglanski, A. W., & Sleeth-Keppler, D. (2004). Relevance override: On the reduced impact of "cues" under high motivation conditions of persuasion studies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *86*, 251-264.