

SYLLABUS

GENERAL BACKGROUND READINGS

Attitude Structure:

Eagly, A. H., & Chaiken, S. (1998). Attitude structure and function. In D. Gilbert, S. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (4th ed., Vol. 1, pp. 269-322). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Attitude Change:

Petty, R. E., Wheeler, S. C., & Tormala, Z. L. (2003). Persuasion and attitude change. In T. Millon & M. J. Lerner (Eds.), *Handbook of psychology: Volume 5: Personality and social psychology* (pp. 353-382). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

COURSE GOALS:

The goal of this course, geared toward graduate students in social psychology, is to have students become familiar with some of the major issues and controversies that currently engage researchers interested in attitudes and persuasion. It is assumed that students have the knowledge equivalent of that provided in Psychology 630.

COURSE TOPICS:

- Jan 3: Course overview
- Jan 10: Negation effects in evaluative judgment and persuasion (RP) [A]
- Jan 17: MARTIN LUTHER KING HOLIDAY (No Class)
- Jan 24: Valence asymmetries in attention and evaluation: Is negative > positive? (RF) [B]
- Jan 31: Single versus dual process models of persuasion and social judgment (RP) [A]
- Feb 7: The IAT: What does it measure and how does it work? (RF) [B]
- Feb 14: Fit and fluency effects in attitudes and social judgment (RP) [B]
- Feb 21: Unconscious evaluative processing (RF) [A]
- Feb 28: How emotion affects information processing, judgment, and persuasion (RP) [B]
- Mar 7: Attitudes and the social context: How shall we conceptualize an attitude? (RF) [A]

COURSE REQUIREMENTS:

Readings from original sources will be assigned each week. These readings will either be e-mailed to you as pdf files, or placed on the table outside Shirley's office for you to copy. The class will be divided into an "A" and a "B" group. Each week the A group will write an answer to the "question of the week." This question will be assigned one week in advance. Each week members of the B group will be assigned a particular reading for the following week. Their job will be to summarize the key points of their assigned reading for the class, and to indicate what the strengths and weaknesses are of this reading, and how it contributes to the question of the week. Their paper will focus on these issues as related to their assigned reading rather than the thought question more generally. Papers will be no longer than 2 pages (typed, double spaced, 12 point font, 1 in. margins) in length. The "A" group papers are due at the beginning of class. The "B" group papers should be e-mailed to Rich and Russ by midnight on the Sunday before class (petty.1@osu.edu; fazio@psy.ohio-state.edu).

GRADING:

The grading will be based on the weekly papers (50%) and class discussion (50%).

January 10 – Topic 1
Negation Effects in Evaluative Judgment and Persuasion

Background Readings:

- Gilbert, D. (1991). How mental systems believe. *American Psychologist*, 46, 107-119.
Downing, L. L. (1992). How mental systems believe. *American Psychologist*, 47, 669-670.
Gilbert, D. (1992). Reply to Downing. *American Psychologist*, 47, 670-671.

Main Readings:

- Kumkale, T., & Albarracin, D. (2004). The sleeper effect in persuasion: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 130. ONLY THE INTRO AND DISCUSSION ARE REQUIRED READING (i.e., pp. 143-148(Method) and 164(Discussion)-169.
- Mayo, R., Schul, Y., & Burnstein, E. (2004). “I am not guilty” versus “I am innocent”: Successful negation may depend on the schema used for its encoding. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 40, 433-449.
- Schul, Y., Mayo, R. & Burnstein, E. (2004). Encoding under trust and distrust: The spontaneous activation of incongruent cognitions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 86, 668-679.
- Petty, R. E., Tormala, Z. L., Briñol, P., & Jarvis, B. (2005). *Implicit ambivalence from attitude change: An exploration of the PAST model*. Unpublished manuscript. Ohio State University.

Question of the Week:

How does recent work on “negation” inform our understanding of the sleeper effect and any other phenomena in the attitudes literature to which it has not yet been applied?

January 24 – Topic 2:
Valence Asymmetries in Attention and Evaluation: Is negative > positive?

Background Reading:

Cacioppo, J. T., Gardner, W. L., & Berntson, G. G. (1997). Beyond bipolar conceptualizations and measures: The case of attitudes and evaluative space. Personality and Social Psychology Review, 1, 3-25.

Main Readings:

Rozin, P., & Royzman, E. B. (2001). Negativity bias, negativity dominance, and contagion. Personality and Social Psychology Review, 5, 296-320.

Wentura, D., Rothermund, K., & Bak, P. (2000). Automatic vigilance: The attention-grabbing power of approach- and avoidance-related social information. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 78, 1024-1037.

Fazio, R. H., Eiser, J. R., & Shook, N. J. (2004). Attitude formation through exploration: Valence asymmetries. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 87, 293-311.

Dijksterhuis, A., & Aarts, H. (2003). On wildebeests and humans: The preferential detection of negative stimuli. Psychological Science, 14, 14-18.

Also:

Labiouse, C. L. (2004). Is there a real preferential detection of negative stimuli? A comment on Dijksterhuis and Aarts (2003). Psychological Science, 15, 364-365.

Dijksterhuis, A., Corneille, O., Aarts, H., Vermeulen, N., & Luminet, O. (2004). Yes, there is a preferential detection of negative stimuli. Psychological Science, 15, 571-572.

Question of the Week:

Consider the evidence regarding the existence of a valence asymmetry. Are you convinced that an asymmetry exists? If not, why not? If so, how general is it, when does it occur, and what mechanism(s) might be responsible for the asymmetry?

January 31 – Topic 3
Single versus Dual Process Models of Persuasion and Social Judgment

Core Background Reading:

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.

Additional Readings:

Kruglanski, A., & Thompson, E., (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, 156-163.

Lieberman, M. D. (2003). Reflexive and reflective judgment processes: A social cognitive neuroscience approach. In J. P. Forgas, K. D. Williams, & W. von Hippel (Eds.), *Social judgments: Implicit and explicit processes* (pp. 44-67). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Brewer, M. (2003). Implicit and explicit processes in social judgment. In J. P. Forgas, K. D. Williams, & W. von Hippel (Eds.), *Social judgments: Implicit and explicit processes* (pp. 387-396). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Question of the Week:

What is your view on the single versus dual (or multi-process) models of persuasion and social judgment? If there is more than one mode of processing, how is it best to conceptualize the multiple processes? What are the criteria for establishing when we should have one versus more than one process of persuasion (or social judgment)?

February 7 - Topic 4:
The Implicit Association Test: What does it measure and how does it work?

Background Readings:

Fazio, R. H., & Olson, M. A. (2003). Implicit measures in social cognition research: Their meaning and use. Annual Review of Psychology, 54, 297-327.

Main Readings:

Govan, C. L., & Williams, K. D. (2004). Changing the affective valence of the stimulus items influences the IAT by re-defining the category labels. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 40, 357-365.

Olson, M. A., & Fazio, R. H. (2004). Reducing the influence of extra-personal associations on the Implicit Association Test: Personalizing the IAT. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 86, 653-667.

Rothermund, K., & Wentura, D. (2004). Underlying processes in the Implicit Association Test: Dissociating salience from associations. Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 133, 139-165.

Greenwald, A. G., Nosek, B. A., Banaji, M. R., & Klauer, K. C. (in press). Validity of the salience asymmetry interpretation of the IAT: Comment on Rothermund and Wentura (2004). Journal of Experimental Psychology: General.

Klauer, K. C., & Mierke, J. (2005). Task-set inertia, attitude accessibility, and compatibility-order effects: New evidence for a task-set switching account of the Implicit Association Test effect. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 31, 208-217.

Optional Reading:

Frantz, C. M., Cuddy, A. J. C., Burnett, M., Ray, H., & Hart, A. (2004). A threat in the computer: The race Implicit Association Test as a stereotype threat experience. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 30, 1611-1624.

Question of the Week:

The IAT has attracted a great deal of attention and has been used widely over the last few years. Yet, we only recently have begun to learn about the mechanism(s) that underlie performance on the IAT. Given what has been learned, what does the IAT measure? What would you conclude about the validity of the IAT as an implicit measure of attitudes? In other words, provide an assessment of the IAT.

February 14 – Topic 5

Fit and Fluency Effects in Attitudes and Social Judgment

Core Background Reading:

Schwarz, N. (2004). Meta-cognitive experiences in consumer judgment and decision-making. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 14*, 332-348.

Additional Readings:

Reber, R., Schwarz, N., & Winkielman, P. (2004). Processing fluency and aesthetic pleasure: Is beauty in the perceiver's processing experience? *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 8*, 364-382.

Cesario, J. Grant, H., & Higgins, E. T. (2004). Regulatory fit and persuasion: Value from "feeling right." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 86*, 388-404.

Freitas, A. L., Azizian, A., Travers, S., & Berry, S. A. (2005, in press). The evaluative connotation of processing fluency: Inherently positive or moderated by motivational context. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*.

Briñol, P., Petty, R. E., & Tormala, Z. (2005). *The meaning of subjective ease and its malleability*. Unpublished manuscript. Ohio State University.

Question of the Week:

What do research on "fluency" and "fit" have in common? Explain whether a common theoretical framework can accommodate both phenomena or not.

February 21 – Topic 6:
Unconscious Evaluative Processing

Background Reading:

Loftus, E. F., & Klinger, M. R. (1992). Is the unconscious smart or dumb? *American Psychologist*, *47*, 761-765.

Main Readings:

Dijksterhuis, A. (2004). Think different: the merits of unconscious thought in preference development and decision making. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, *87*, 586-598.

Dijksterhuis, A. (2004). I like myself but I don't know why: Enhancing implicit self-esteem by subliminal evaluative conditioning. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, *86*, 345-355.

Jones, J. T., Pelham, B. W., Carvallo, M., & Mirenberg, M. C. (2004). How do I love thee? Let me count the Js: implicit egotism and interpersonal attraction. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, *87*, 665-683.

Stapel, D. A., & Blanton, H. (2004). From seeing to being: Subliminal social comparisons affect implicit and explicit self-evaluations. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, *87*, 468-481.

Question of the Week:

Does the research from this set of readings force us to “stretch” our view of unconscious processing? What are people capable of doing unconsciously?

February 28 – Topic 7
How Emotion Affects Judgment, Information Processing, and Persuasion

Core Background Reading:

Petty, R. E., DeSteno, D., & Rucker, D. (2001). The role of affect in persuasion and attitude change. In J. Forgas (Ed.), *Handbook of affect and social cognition* (pp. 212-233). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

OR

Forgas, J. P., & East, R. (2003). Affective influences on social judgments and decisions: Implicit and explicit processes. In J. P. Forgas, K. D. Williams, & W. von Hippel (Eds.), *Social judgments: Implicit and explicit processes*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Empirical Readings:

- (1) Blanchette, I., & Richards, A. (2004). Reasoning about emotional and neutral materials: Is logic affected by emotion? *Psychological Science*, 15, 745-751.
- (2) Lerner, J., Small, & Lowenstein, G. (2004). Heartstrings and purse strings: Carryover effects of emotions on economic decisions. *Psychological Science*, 15, 337-341.

Lerner, J., Gonzalez, R., Small, D., & Fishoff, B. (2003). Effects of fear and anger on perceived risks of terrorism: A national field experiment. *Psychological Science*, 14, 144-150.
- (3) DeSteno, D., Petty, R. E., Rucker, D. D., Wegener, D. T., & Braverman, J. (2004). Discrete emotions and persuasion: The role of emotion-induced expectancies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 86, 43-56.
- (4) Hoog, N., Stroebe, W., & de Wit, J. (2004). The impact of fear appeals on processing and acceptance of action recommendations. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31, 24-33.

Question of the Week:

As far as you can tell from the background reading and the empirical readings, what question about emotion and attitudes/evaluations has NOT been addressed that you think warrants scientific scrutiny. Explain your suggestion and relate to the existing literature as much as possible (from the readings assigned).

March 7 - Topic 8:

Attitudes and the social context: How shall we conceptualize an attitude?

Background Reading:

Fazio, R. H. (1995). Attitudes as object-evaluation associations: Determinants, consequences, and correlates of attitude accessibility. In R. E. Petty & J. A. Krosnick (Eds.), Attitude strength: Antecedents and consequences (pp. 247-282). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum. (pp. 247-255 are most relevant).

Main Readings:

A. Influence of the social context

Kawakami, K., Dovidio, J. F., & Dijksterhuis, A. (2003). Effect of social category priming on personal attitudes. Psychological Science, 14, 315-319.

Castelli, L., Zogmaister, C., Smith, E. R., & Arcuri, L. (2004). On the automatic evaluation of social exemplars. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 86, 373-387.

Barden, J., Maddux, W.W., Petty, R. E., & Brewer, M. B. (2004). Contextual moderation of racial bias: the impact of social roles on controlled and automatically activated attitudes. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 87, 5-22.

Ferguson, M. J., & Bargh, J. A. (2004). Liking is for doing: the effects of goal pursuit on automatic evaluation. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 87, 557-572.

B. Are attitudes merely constructions?

Schwarz, N., & Bohner, G. (2001). The construction of attitudes. In A. Tesser & N. Schwarz (Eds.), Blackwell handbook of social psychology: Intraindividual processes (pp. 436-457). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

Question of the Week:

Consider the recent evidence that has accumulated regarding the effects of the social context on attitudes. What are the implications of this evidence for conceptualizing the attitude construct? Does the evidence support, or more boldly, necessitate, the constructionist perspective espoused by Schwarz & Bohner? Why or why not?