

Attitudes and Persuasion (PSYC 441) 43.6 session

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.

For 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.

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.

Grading:

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 <http://www.queensu.ca/secretariat/policies/senateandtrustees/principlespriorities.html>).

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 <http://www.queensu.ca/artsci/academic-calendars/regulations/academic-regulations/regulation-1>), on the Arts and Science website (see <http://www.queensu.ca/artsci/academics/undergraduate/academic-integrity>), and from the instructor of this course. Departures from academic integrity include plagiarism, use of unauthorized materials, id 2009.00a900 0.0000 TD(iarism)T8800 0it34.3,00 0.0000 TD(ac)Tj12.6.8g00 0.0000 TD(e)Tj4.920ry00 0.00

Course Outline

	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Readings</u>
Week 1: (Sept. 14, 16)	Introduction To Attitudes and Persuasion Definitions/Types Functions Structure Measurement	Ch. 1

	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Readings</u>
Week 8: (Nov. 2, 4)	Motivational Approaches/Dissonance Theory Balance Theory Cognitive Dissonance Theory New Versions of Cognitive Dissonance Theory	Ch. 5
Week 9: (Nov. 9, 11)	Dissonance Theory/Debate Impression Management Theory Self-Perception Theory Self-Affirmation Theory Self-Standards Model Aronson's Self-Consistency Model Debate (Nov. 11)	Ch. 6
Week 10: (Nov. 16, 18)	Debate/Elaboration Likelihood Model Self-Standards Model of Dissonance Debate (Nov. 16) Elaboration Likelihood Model (ELM)	Supplementary Ch. 8 & 9
Week 11: (Nov. 23, 25)	Elaboration Likelihood Model/Heuristic-Systematic Model Elaboration Likelihood Model (ELM) Heuristic-Systematic Model (HSM) NO CLASS (November 25)	
Week 12: (Nov. 30, Dec. 2)	Debates Evaluating the ELM Evaluating the Unimodel Final Exam (Dec. 7 - 21)	Supplementary

Supplementary Readings

Week 4:

Topic 1 (Evaluation)

ue effects on information interest and persuasion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 94, 938-955.

Week 6:

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

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 9:

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.

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. (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 10:

Topic 1 (The Self-Standards Model of Cognitive Dissonance

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: ~~Ans~~