

Psychology 944

Seminar in Social Psychology (Contemporary Issues in Attitude and Persuasion Research)

Dr. Leandre R. Fabrigar
E-mail: fabrigar@queensu.ca
Office Hour: Wednesday (11:15 AM - 12:30 PM) or by Appointment

Recommended Background Readings:

Albarracin, D., & Johnson, B. T. (2019). *The handbook of attitudes* (2nd Edition, Vol. 1). New York, NY: Routledge.

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 familiarize students with current issues in attitude and persuasion research. The course will also focus on developing students' ability to critically evaluate theory/research and students' ability to formulate original research ideas.

Format of Course: This course will be taught in a discussion format. Each week, students will be expected to read several target readings on a current issue in attitudes research. All students will be required to generate two to three thought questions concerning the readings. These questions will be due the day before class. Additionally, each week, half of the class will be responsible for writing a reaction paper (3 to 4 double spaced pages) about the readings. Each of these papers will address some set of issues specified by the instructor. The topic for each reaction paper will be provided one week in advance. Reaction papers will be due in class. All students will be required to write a total of four reaction papers.

All students will also be required to complete a research paper (15 to 25 double spaced pages). This paper should propose one to two original studies addressing some topic related to attitudes research. The topic may be directly related to class readings or may address some issue in attitudes research not covered in class. Students should obtain approval for their topic from the instructor by no later than the eighth week of class. Research papers should provide the conceptual rationale for the proposed project, a description of the method to be used, a description of expected results, and a discussion of the implications of the expected results.

Grading: Thought Questions (20%)
Reaction Papers (40%)
Research Paper (40%)

Weekly Topics (please read articles in the order they are listed):

Week 1: What is an Attitude? (September 4)

Gawronski, B. (2007). Editorial: Attitudes can be measured! But what is an attitude? *Social Cognition*, 25, 573-581.

Fazio, R. H. (2007). Attitudes as object-evaluation associations of varying strength. *Social Cognition*, 25, 603-637.

Schwarz, N. (2007). Attitude construction: Evaluation in context. *Social Cognition*, 25, 638-656.

Petty, R. E., Brinol, P. & DeMarree, K. G. (2007). The Meta-Cognitive Model (MCM) of attitudes: Implications for attitude measurement, change, and strength. *Social Cognition*, 25, 657-686.

Gawronski, B., & Bodenhausen, G. V. (2007). Unraveling the processes underlying evaluation: Attitudes from the perspective of the APE Model. *Social Cognition*, 25, 687-717.

Week 2: Implicit versus Explicit Attitudes (September 11)

Greenwald, A. G., & Banaji, M. R. (1995). Implicit social cognition: Attitudes, self-esteem, and stereotypes. *Psychological Review*, 102, 4-27.

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.

Brinol, P., Petty, R. E., & McCaslin, M. J. (2009). Changing attitudes on implicit versus explicit measures: What is the difference? In R. E. Petty, R. H. Fazio, & P. Brinol (Eds.), *Attitudes: Insights from the new implicit measures* (pp. 285-326). New York, NY: Psychology Press.

Week 3: Implicit Attitude Measures (September 18)

- Cunningham, W. A., Preacher, K. J., & Banaji, M. R. (2001). Implicit attitude measures: Consistency, stability, and convergent validity. *Psychological Science, 12*, 163-170.
- 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.
- Hahn, A., Judd, C. M., Hirsh, H. K., & Blair, I. V. (2014). Awareness of implicit attitudes. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 143*, 1369-1392.
- Rivers, A. M., & Hahn, A. (2019). What cognitive mechanisms do people reflect on when they predict IAT scores. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 45*, 878-892.
- Payne, B. K., Burkley, M. A., & Stokes, M. B. (2008). Why do implicit and explicit attitude tests diverge? The role of structural fit. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 94*, 16-31.
- Hannay, J. W., & Payne, B. K. (2022). Effects of aggregation on implicit bias measurement. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 101*.

Week 4: Nonthoughtful Forms of Attitude Formation and Change (September 25)

- Cacioppo, J. T., Priester, J. R., & Berntson, G. G. (1993). Rudimentary determinants of attitudes. II: Arm flexion and extension have differential effects on attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 65*, 5-17.
- Bornstein, R. F., & D'Agostino, P. R. (1992). Stimulus recognition and the mere exposure effect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 63*, 545-552.
- Murphy, S. T., Monahan, J. L., & Zajonc, R. B. (1995). Additivity of nonconscious affect: Combined effects of priming and exposure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69*, 589-602.
- Jones, C. R., Fazio, R. H., & Olson, M. A. (2009). Implicit misattribution as a mechanism underlying evaluative conditioning. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 96*, 933-948.
- Mitchell, C.J., De Houwer, J., & Lovibond, P.F. (2009). The propositional nature of human associative learning. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 32*, 183–198.

Walther, E. Weil, R., & Dusing, J. (2011). The role of evaluative conditioning in attitude formation. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 20, 192-196.

Week 5: Objective and Subjective Measures of Attitude Structure (October 2)

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., Reber, R., & Schwarz, N. Forming judgments of attitude certainty, intensity, and importance: The role of subjective experiences. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 25, 771-782.

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

See, Y. H. M., Petty, R. E., & Fabrigar, L. R. (2013). Affective-cognitive meta-bases versus structural bases predict processing interest versus efficiency. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 39, 1111-1123.

Ledgerwood, A., Eastwick, P. W., & Smith, L. K. (2018). Toward an integrative framework of studying human evaluation: Attitudes towards objects and attributes. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 22, 378-398.

Week 6: Misinformation (October 9)

Eckert et al. (2022). The psychological drivers of misinformation belief and its resistance to correction. *Nature Reviews Psychology*, 1, 13-29.

Prike, T., & Ecker, U. K. H. (2023). Effective correction of misinformation. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 54, 101712.

Fazio, L. K., Brashier, N. M., Payne, B. K., & Marsh, E. J. (2015). Knowledge does not protect against illusory truth. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 144, 993-1002.

Pennycook, G., & Rand, D. G. (2019). Lazy, not biased: Susceptibility to partisan fake news is better explained by lack of reasoning than by motivated reasoning. *Cognition*, 188, 39-50.

Susmann, M. W., & Wegener, D. T. (2023). How attitudes impact the continued influence effect of misinformation: The mediating role of discomfort. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 49, 744-757.

No Class: Fall Reading Week (October 14-18)

Week 7: Perspectives on Cognitive Dissonance Theory I (October 23)

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.

Cooper, J., & Fazio, R. H. (1984). A new look at dissonance theory. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 17, pp. 229-266). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Scher, S. J., & Cooper, J. (1989). Motivational basis of dissonance: The singular role of behavioral consequences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56, 899-906.

Harmon-Jones, E., Amodio, D. M., & Harmon-Jones, C. (2009). Action-based model of dissonance: A review, integration, and expansion of conceptions of cognitive conflict. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 41, pp. 119–166). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Harmon-Jones, E., Harmon-Jones, C., Fearn, M., Sigelman, J. D., & Johnson, P. (2008). Left frontal cortical activation and spreading of alternatives: Tests of the action-based model of dissonance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 94, 1-15.

Harmon-Jones, E., Price, T. F., & Harmon-Jones, C. (2015). Supine body posture decreases rationalizations: Testing the action-based model of dissonance. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 56, 228–234.

Week 8: Perspectives on Cognitive Dissonance Theory II (October 30)

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.

Steele, C. M. (1988). The psychology of self-affirmation: Sustaining the integrity of the self. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 21, pp. 261-302). San Diego: Academic Press.

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.

Association.

Stone, J., & Cooper, J. (2001). A self standards model of cognitive dissonance. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 37*, 228-243.

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 9: The Elaboration Likelihood Model (November 6)

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.

Week 10: Challenging “Noncognitive” Attitude Formation and Change (November 13)

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

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.

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.

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

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.

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 11: The Unimodel of Persuasion (November 20)

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.

Week 12: NO CLASS (November 27)