

Attitudes and Persuasion Psyc661/745

Course Description

Because attitudes involve the evaluation of a particular concept, they are an integral aspect of much contemporary social psychological theory and research. Prejudice, romantic attraction, social influence, self perception, and group dynamics--to name a few--all have important attitudinal components. Rather than focusing on these particular content areas *per se*, this course focuses on the constructs of attitudes and attitude change. Across content areas, this course will address how attitudes are formed, organized, and measured. The course will consider how attitudes influence behavior, and how they can be changed.

Course Requirements and Evaluation

Critical Reviews. Critical reviews of research are an important aspect of scientific enterprise. Students who pursue careers in psychology and allied fields ultimately will be reviewing works-in-progress (e.g., manuscript submissions; conference proposals), but practicing on published work is a good starting point insofar as published pieces are not perfect. These critiques also should enhance discussion quality, by encouraging critical thinking about readings prior to class. These articles are available on-line through ERES. (<http://eres.library.tulane.edu/>). The course password is ELM.

Each Monday by 3 pm, please provide me with three hardcopies of your reviews. There is a large envelope outside my faculty office door Stern 3049. I will collate them, and post copies to the discussion cofacilitators on the 3049 bulletin board by 4pm. **If you are cofacilitating the discussion, do not provide a critical review.** Here are some guidelines:

1. Be professional. A review typically is viewed as an opportunity to provide feedback to the authors while simultaneously assuring that publishable research finds its best home. Reviewers usually are anonymous, and the fact that you are not actually providing the review to the authors may evoke a similar no-retaliation-is-possible mindset. Even so, please resist the temptation to be flippant, pedantic, or savage, or to wax poetic. Your job is to indicate what is laudable and what is problematic about the article in its current form, and why you have made that assessment.

2. Focus on theory. Draw upon your experience in social psychology and related fields to consider the theoretical rationale: Is the theory outlined well, does it contradict or support theoretical work that is not cited, is it old wine in new skins, is it a minor test of the theory or an important new contribution? Further, consider the methodology in light of the presented theoretical rationale: Do the methods provide a compelling test of the theory? Are there artifacts and fatal flaws that went unnoticed? Are the chosen analyses the best or most appropriate way to test the theory?

3. Be precise and explain your criticism (or praise). For example, an introduction or discussion may have ignored inappropriately an important body of literature; a good reviewer notes what is omitted and why it is important, then suggests integration into the appropriate section of the manuscript. As another example, a manuscript may report an inappropriate type of factor analysis or omit important details about a causal model. The reviewer politely but expertly points out the error, and directs the author to a reference that addresses the problem.

Given that critical reviews contribute significantly to the organization of the discussion, **late reviews will not be accepted**. The best 18 of 20 reviews will be used to compute the grade, so you can afford to miss writing 2 critiques if your world is falling apart on a particular day. If you are late submitting a critical review, recognize that my unwillingness to accept it is not the end of the world. Each is worth only 1% of the grade. The cumulative effect of being late would be costly, but one slip is not the apocalypse.

Cofacilitation. Leading an organized discussion is a fundamental skill for most careers pursued by educated individuals, including psychologists. Cofacilitators will have copies of the critical reviews prior to the class meeting. I would suggest comments ahead of time, and expressively setting objectives. The role is **discussion** co-leader, not presenter. That is, your goal should be to facilitate an organized discussion, encouraging people to address one another's points while keeping the conversation on track.

Because discussion will center around two articles each week, co-facilitators either can facilitate the discussion of one article a piece (i.e., student A facilitates the discussion of Article #1; student B facilitates the discussion of Article #2) or both students can work together to facilitate the entire discussion that week. Do not submit a critique on the week that you are assigned as co-facilitator.

Class Participation. The first 11 class meetings will center around discussion of the empirical articles. Contributing meaningfully to the conversation is not commensurate with monopolizing it. Try to make a few good points during each discussion, and address your classmates as well as the instructor. Participation during the last two weeks of the semester (i.e., during student presentations) comprises attentiveness and possibly questions to the presenter about his/her project. I will use the best 11 of 12 possible participation grades, so missing class once during the semester will not count against you (Yes, there are 13 weeks, but one of those weeks you are a co-facilitator). There is no way to "make up" participation if you are absent.

Review Paper. A critical aspect of psychology is writing critical reviews of the literature on a particular topic. For this course, you should select a attitudes or persuasion topic that would be appropriate for PB or PSPR. **Topics must be approved by October 28.**

A critical review paper is NOT a mere summary of work in the area. A good review identifies themes or gaps in the literature, critiques a body of work, and synthesizes the research in a novel fashion. Please be advised that modest variations on papers from previous and concurrent courses are not acceptable. Journals do not allow multiple submission and self-plagiarism, and neither will I. My usual prohibitions against soliciting pre-submission feedback apply: no friends, roommates, professors, or other sentient entities should be assisting with outlining, wording, revising, et cetera.

I have posted guidelines for the paper on our course website, along with a list of social psychology journals on which you probably will rely. A hard-copy of the paper must be submitted by **4pm on November 28**. Papers submitted after that time will be penalized 3 points (i.e., about 1 grade category) for each working day they are late.

Presentation. The last two weeks will be reserved for students to present their project to the group. Depending on how many students ultimately are enrolled, each student probably will have 12-15 minutes maximum for presentation and questions. I will figure out the time allotment, and will hold each student to that maximum.

Graduate/Undergraduate Distinctions

In an undergraduate/graduate course, I can imagine undergraduate students being concerned that they are being compared to graduate students and graduate students wondering if the applied criteria for them are at the 600- or 700-level. I will attempt to clarify in writing here:

Evaluation in the bulk of the course (critical reviews, presentation, cofacilitation, class participation) is at the 600-level of an advanced undergraduate seminar. Grades will be assigned in an *absolute* rather than a *relative* sense. That is, after over 15 years of teaching, I have a clear idea of what comprises a "A" for juniors and seniors in terms of class participation, presentations, cofacilitation, and critical reviews in 600-level course. You will receive grades each week on the critical reviews to help assess your progress, and I will post final cofacilitation and presentation grades on *Blackboard* as these portions of the course are completed. If you have concerns about your participation, you are welcome to discuss your progress with me outside of class.

The requirements for the review paper differ depending upon whether you are an undergraduate enrolled in 661 versus a graduate student enrolled in 745. Undergraduate students should prepare a 10-12 page review, which will be graded upon four equally weighted criteria: appropriate use of material, critical thought, organization/flow, and technical writing. Again, I have a clear idea of what an "A" (or any other grade) connotes for each of these criteria in a 600-level junior/senior seminar. Graduate students enrolled in 745 should prepare an 18-20 page review, and will be graded by what connotes an "A" (or any other grade) on each criterion in a 700-level graduate seminar.

Summary of Requirements and Evaluation

Task	N	Weight	Due
Critical Reviews	18 of 20	18%	Mondays by 3pm
Cofacilitation	1	10%	TBA
Presentation	1	10%	11/30 or 12/7
Class Participation	11 of 12	12%	Weekly
Review Paper	1	50%	11/28

Letter Grades

	87-89	B+	77-79	C+	67-69	D+	
93-100	A	83-86	B	73-76	C	63-66	D
90-92	A-	80-82	B-	70-72	C-	60-62	D-
					59	≥	F

Note: Per Graduate School policy, grades of B- or above are required for graduate credit.

General Policies

Blackboard, a secure website, will be used to post grade information, as well as announcements and course materials (<http://blackboard.tulane.edu>). Unless you request explicitly **in writing** not to post your information, it will be posted. Blackboard access is automatic if you are in the system already and/or have an @Tulane email address. If you are not in the system or have difficulty logging on, please contact the ILC Help Desk at 862-8888.

Academic honesty is expected, and breaches of the honor code will not be tolerated. Our blackboard site is linked to the honor code of Tulane University's Liberal Arts and Sciences (<http://www.tulane.edu/~lasdean/honor%20code.htm>) and to my own examples of plagiarism and inappropriate citation (<http://www.tulane.edu/~jruscher/dept/plagiarism.html>).

CellPhones and beepers should be turned off during class. If you anticipate an emergency (e.g., you belong to the TEMS unit), please set it to vibrate or some other silent signal.

Electronic Mail is the primary way in which I will contact class members, and by which appointments should be made. For security reasons, I do not send grades via email or phone. Please do not ask. Be advised that your @tulane.edu address is the one loaded into blackboard, and will be the address that I use when e-mailing the entire class (i.e., please check this address regularly, or have it forward automatically to your preferred address).

Special Needs. Please bring any authorized accommodations from the ERC (<http://erc.tulane.edu/>) to my attention during the first week of the semester. Consistent with ERC policy, there are no retroactive accommodations. Unless approved by the ERC and cleared with the instructor, audio- or video-recording of lecture is prohibited.

2005 Reading List

September 7: Attitude Measurement

Ito, T. A., & Cacioppo, J. T. (2000). Electrophysiological evidence of implicit and explicit categorization processes. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 36*, 660-676.

Vargas, P. T., von Hippel, W., & Petty, R. E. (2004). Using partially structured attitude measures to enhance the attitude-behavior relationship. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 30*, 197-211.

September 14: Implicit Attitudes and Accessibility

Devos, T., & Banaji, M. R. (2005). American = White? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 88*, 447-466.

Giner-Sorolla, R. (2004). Is affective material in attitudes more accessible than cognitive material? The moderating role of attitude basis. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 34*, 761-780.

September 21: Attitude Structure and Organization

Huskinson, T. L. H., & Haddock, G. (2004). Individual differences in attitude structure: Variance in the chronic reliance on affective and cognitive information. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 40*, 82-90.

van Harreveld, F., & van der Pligt, J. (2004). Attitudes as stable and transparent constructions. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 40*, 666-674.

September 28: The Attitude-Behavior Relation

Ajzen, I., Brown, T. C., & Carvajal, F. (2004) Explaining the discrepancy between intentions and actions: The case of hypothetical bias in contingent valuation. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 30*, 1108-1121.

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

October 5: Attitude Polarization

Crawford, M., & McCrea, S. M. (2004). When mutations meet motivations: Attitude biases in counterfactual thought. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 40*, 65-74

Fleming, M. A., Petty, R. E., & White, P. H. (2005). Stigmatized targets and evaluation: Prejudice as a determinant of attribute scrutiny and polarization. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 31*, 496-507.

October 12: Attitudinal Ambivalence

Kachadourian, L. K., Fincham, F., & Davila, J. (2005). Attitudinal ambivalence, rumination, and forgiveness of partner transgressions in marriage. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 31*, 334-342.

van Harreveld, F., van der Pligt, J., de Vries, N. K., Wenneker, C., Verhue, D. (2004). Ambivalence and information integration in attitudinal judgment. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 43*, 431-447.

October 19: Attitude Formation

Briñol, P., & Petty, R. E. (2003). Overt head movements and persuasion: A self-validation analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84*, 1123-1139.

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 and Social Psychology, 87*, 665-683.

October 26: Metacognition and Implicit Theories

Ames, D. R., & Iyengar, S. S. (2005). Appraising the unusual: Framing effects and moderators of uniqueness-seeking and social projection. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 41*, 271-282.

Douglas, K. M., & Sutton, R. M. (2004). Right about others, wrong about ourselves? Actual and perceived self-other differences in resistance to persuasion. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 43*, 585-603.

November 2: Dual Process Model of Persuasion

Claypool, H. M., Mackie, D. M., Garcia-Marques, T., McIntosh, A., & Udal, A. (2004). The effects of personal relevance and repetition on persuasive processing. *Social Cognition*, *22*, 310-335.

Rucker, D. D., & Petty, R. E. (2004). When resistance is futile: Consequences of failed counterarguing for attitude certainty. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *86*, 219-235.

November 9: Dissonance

Albarracín, D., & McNatt, P. S. (2005). Maintenance and decay of past behavior influences: Anchoring attitudes on beliefs following inconsistent actions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *31*, 719-733.

Botti, S., & Iyengar, S. S. (2004). The psychological pleasure and pain of choosing: when people prefer choosing at the cost of subsequent outcome satisfaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *87*, 312-326.

November 16: Attitude Change and Groups

Matz, D. C., & Wood, W. (2005). Cognitive dissonance in groups: The consequences of disagreement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *88*, 22-37.

Rydell, R. J., & McConnell, A. R. (2005). Perceptions of entitativity and attitude change. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *31*, 99-110.

November 30 and December 7: Class Presentations