Psy 630
Foundations of Social Psychology: Attitudes

Professor: Allen McConnell
E-mail: mcconnar@miamioh.edu
Office: 316 Psychology Building
Hours: Thursdays, 1-2:15 p.m., and at other times by appointment
Phone: 513.529.2407

Course location and meeting time
Class meets in 343 Psychology Building, Thursdays, 9:15 - 11:45 a.m.

Course website
The class's Canvas site has all of the assigned readings in PDF format (see *Resources*). All class assignment documents should be uploaded to Canvas in either PDF, RTF, or DOC formats (see *Assignments*).

Overview
Like all sections of Foundations of Social Psychology (PSY 630), this course provides an introductory survey of a core theme of social psychology. At the end of this course, you should be able to:

1) Describe and analyze relationships between the actual, implied, or imagined presence of others and individuals' thoughts, feelings, and behaviors
2) Describe and analyze the common research methods used in social psychology
3) Apply the knowledge gained in this course across topics in social psychology and to other disciplines (e.g., clinical psychology, developmental psychology, cognitive psychology)
4) Communicate and create innovative research hypotheses that would further our understanding of core themes of social psychology

Course readings, discussions, and assignments are structured to facilitate the mastery of these student learning outcomes. Namely, students will read, analyze, and discuss primary research that emphasizes both classic and cutting-edge approaches to social aspects of behavior. Students will also engage in hypothesis generation, research design, and scientific proposal writing.

This section of PSY 630 is intended to provide a foundation in understanding a core issue in social psychology: how people's attitudes (i.e., their enduring evaluations of attitude objects such as people, social groups, and consumer products) develop and change. The study of attitudes has been one of the most central topics in social psychology since Gordon Allport (1935) described attitudes as the "indispensable concept." Over the years, the study of attitudes has evolved and focused on issues such as how constructing valid instruments, determining how and when attitudes predict behavior, debates about whether attitudes are real or are on-the-spot constructions, and controversies about how strongly attitudes are guided by nonconscious processes. Understanding attitudes is fundamental for many social phenomena, including impression formation, group prejudice, clinical practice, marketing and consumer behavior, jury decision making, and political psychology (just to name a few). In addition to studying how attitudes are formed, we will also explore how attitudes are changed (i.e., persuasion), and how people respond to persuasion attempts. The area of attitudes is incredibly expansive, thus it will be impossible to cover every important topic in one semester. Instead, we will explore some important and enduring themes in the area of attitudes and persuasion (first half of the course) and then move to more focused issues that reflect contemporary, cutting-edge work (second half of the course).

Assignments

1) Student facilitation (twice during course, 10 points each, 20 points max)

Twice during the semester, students will facilitate class discussion and determine how best to accomplish this goal each week. As facilitators, it is *not* your responsibility to explain the readings to others or review the important points of each paper. Instead, your role is to provide a framework that is productive for discussing the topic. For example, facilitators may circulate e-mails before class to pose questions to ponder beforehand. Perhaps they might present an initial framework at the beginning of class to highlight common (or divergent) themes that run throughout the readings. There are no right or wrong ways to facilitate (one exception would be starting class by saying, "Well, what did you think of this week's readings?"). The goal of facilitation is to provide structure and organization for fellow students during discussion, not *be* the discussion. Facilitators should emphasize analysis of readings and integration of readings within any given week and across weeks.

2) Weekly reaction papers (up to 7 papers per semester, 2 points each, 14 points max)

Each week, students may submit a brief reaction paper (2-3 double-spaced pages) describing their reactions to the week's readings during weeks when they do not facilitate class discussion (up to a maximum of 7 papers total). This assignment is very open-ended. Because some students may specialize in different disciplines (e.g., clinical psychology, cognitive psychology), they may want to "spin" the week's themes in a reasonable fashion toward their interests, which is fine. The goal is to make sure that students not only read before coming to class, but more important, that students put some degree of thought into the implications of, and interconnections among, the readings before class begins.

Each acceptable reaction paper contributes 2 points to the overall grade. Students must upload their reaction papers using Canvas (*Assignments*) before noon on the day *before* class (i.e., by Wednesdays, 12 noon). At the very beginning of class (i.e., Thursday morning), the professor will provide comments and feedback before class discussion begins. Late reaction papers, regardless of the circumstances, will not be accepted.

3) Research workshops (twice during course, 10 points per workshop, 20 points max)

To encourage the development of new research and to gain practice in presenting and critiquing research, there are two days (i.e., October 19th, December 7th) devoted to in-class research workshops. On these days, there are no readings. Instead, each student will (before coming to class) identify an interesting research question, describe it and its import, briefly outline an appropriate methodology to address it, and present the anticipated results (in either table or graph form). Thus, students will develop at least two research ideas in the course (one for October 19, a different one for December 7) before the research proposal is submitted.

Before arriving in class, each student will prepare a document that is no longer than 1 page (single spaced) and provide a graph or figure (page 2). A copy of each student's pre-class work should be uploaded to Canvas by the normal reaction paper deadline (i.e., Wednesday by 12 noon). These documents will be circulated to all class participants later that (Wednesday) evening, providing students with the opportunity to read each proposal and develop feedback for it (to be shared in class). In class, students will present their ideas orally without the benefit of computers, powerpoint slides, etc. for approximately 5 minutes. Other students will provide feedback during this presentation. Student evaluations will consist of the quality of the pre-class document (5 points per workshop) and their feedback to other students (another 5 points per workshop).

Additional details will be provided once the class composition and number of students is known. Students do not have to base their research proposal (see below) on their research workshop projects, however doing so may be beneficial in that the student's ideas will receive feedback long before the research proposal deadline.

4) Research proposal (paper is due at end of semester, 40 points max)
Students will submit a major paper by choosing an area of attitudes based on their own interests and developing a research proposal. The topic need not be one that a student facilitated, though doing so may benefit some students. The research proposal must address an important research question from the perspective of attitudes. Students outside of social psychology are encouraged to relate attitudes to their area (e.g., clinical psychologists may want to explore how implicit measures can help evaluate and assess clients in therapy, developmental psychologists may want to study the formation of group prejudice in children). Although students will not be required to carry out the research they propose, the opportunity to develop a well-thought-out proposal should be helpful to those who wish to develop new lines of research or explore ideas relevant to theses, minor projects, and dissertations. This paper must take the form of a research proposal (e.g., it *cannot* be simply a literature review). The instructor will be available to help students refine their ideas and suggest appropriate resources and references. There is no correct page length. Papers *must* be written in accordance with APA Style. The **research proposal is due no later than 12 Noon, on December 12** (late papers receive a 10% deduction for each 24-hour period that they are late). More details will be provided in a handout later in the semester.

5) Class participation (every class, 1 point per class, 10 points max)
Because the success of this course rests with the students and their preparation, students are evaluated for class participation. Because this is a small class that focuses on discussion of research material and ideas, active participation in group discussions is essential. Moreover, it is through the process of discussion and analysis that one's research acumen is defined and sharpened. Thus, students are evaluated for their participation each class meeting (1 point per class day with a reading assignment).

Course evaluation summary
1) Facilitation during the semester (2x; 10 points per class) 20
2) Weekly reaction papers (2 points per paper, 7 papers maximum) 14
3) Workshops (2x; 5 points for one's idea, 5 points feedback to others) ... 20   October 19, December 7
4) Research proposal (40 points total) 40   Due *Tuesday*, December 12
5) Class participation (1 point per class) 10

Letter grades are assigned based on standard 10 percent gradients, including plus and minus designations (e.g., $104 \leq A \leq 93$, $92 \leq A\text{-} \leq 90$, $89 \leq B\text{+} \leq 87$, $86 \leq B \leq 83$, $82 \leq B\text{-} \leq 80$, $79 \leq C\text{+} \leq 77$, $76 \leq C \leq 73$).

Statement on academic misconduct
Both Miami University and the Department of Psychology are dedicated to providing a learning environment based not only upon academic excellence but academic integrity as well. In this course, it is expected that students will adhere to all Miami University guidelines regarding academic misconduct (for details, see Part 5, Miami Student Handbook: Academic Misconduct). Academic misconduct includes, but is not limited to:
• Submitting work (tests, homework, papers, etc.) done for another course without gaining approval.
• Submitting the work of another (whether in part or in whole) as one's own.
• Possessing prohibited materials during a test or quiz.
• Providing or receiving assistance from another student unless explicitly permitted by the professor.

Engaging in academic misconduct can result in penalties ranging from a minimum of an F on the assignment to an F in the course, an "AD" signifying academic dishonesty on your Miami transcripts, academic suspension, and expulsion from Miami University. "Misunderstanding of the appropriate academic conduct will not be accepted as an excuse for academic misconduct" (Section 501, Student Handbook). Please visit with the professor if you need any of these policies clarified. Also, the professor encourages students to meet with him if they suspect that another student in the course has engaged in academic misconduct.

Course Schedule and Readings

August 31 • Organizational meeting

September 7 • Introduction to attitudes
Fazio, R. H. (1986). How do attitudes guide behavior? In R. M. Sorrentino & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Handbook of motivation and cognition* (Vol. 1, pp. 204-243). New York: Guilford.
Schwarz, N. (1999). Self-reports: How the questions shape the answers. *American Psychologist, 54*, 93-105.
Schwarz, N. (2007). Attitude construction: Evaluation in context. *Social Cognition, 25*, 638-656.
Petty, R. E. & Briñol, P. (2010). Attitude change. In R. F. Baumeister & E. J. Finkel (Eds.), *Advanced social psychology: The state of the science* (pp. 217-259). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

September 14 • Elaboration Likelihood Model and its progeny
Petty, R. E., & Briñol (2012). The Elaboration Likelihood Model. In P.A.M. Van Lange, A. Kruglanski, & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Handbook of theories of social psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 224-245). London: Sage.
Wegener, D. T., Silva, P. P., Petty, R. E., & Garcia-Marques, T. (2012). The metacognition of bias regulation. In P. Briñol & K. G. DeMarree (Eds.), *Social meta-cognition* (pp. 81-99). New York: Psychology Press.
Petty, R. E., & Briñol, 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: Guilford Press.

September 21 • Limits of introspection and prediction
Nisbett, R. E., & Wilson, T. D. (1977). Telling more than we can know: Verbal reports on mental processes. *Psychological Review, 84*, 231-259.
Wilson, T. D., Lisle, D. J., Schooler, J. W., Hodges, S. D., Klaaren, K. J., & LaFleur, S. J. (1993). Introspecting about reasons can reduce post-choice satisfaction. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 19*, 331-339.
Dunn, E. W., Wilson, T. D., & Gilbert, D. T. (2003). Location, location, location: The misprediction of satisfaction in housing lotteries. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29*, 1421-1432.
McConnell, A. R., Dunn, E. W., Austin, S. N., & Rawn, C. D. (2011). Blind spots in the search for happiness: Implicit attitudes and nonverbal leakage predict affective forecasting errors. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 47*, 628-634.

September 28 • Self-perception
Fazio, R. H. (1987). Self-perception theory: A current perspective. In M. P. Zanna, J. M. Olson, & C. P. Herman (Eds.), *Social influence: The Ontario symposium* (Vol. 5, pp. 129-150). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
Dutton, D. G., & Aron, A. P. (1974). Some evidence for heightened sexual attraction under conditions of high anxiety. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 30*, 510-517.
Strack, F., Martin, M. L., & Stepper, S. (1988). Inhibiting and facilitating conditions of the human smile: A nonobtrusive test of the facial feedback hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54*, 768-777.
Wagenmakers, E.-J., et al. (2016). Registered replication report: Strack, Martin, & Stepper (1988). *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 11*, 917–928.
Strack, F. (2016). Reflection on the smiling registered replication report. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 11*, 929-930.

October 5 • Dissonance and self-affirmation

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.

Fried, C. B., & Aronson, E. (1995). Hypocrisy, misattribution, and dissonance reduction. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *21*, 925-933.

Kitayama, S., Snibbe, A. C., Markus, H. R., & Suzuki, T. (2004). Is there any "free" choice? *Psychological Science*, *15*, 527-533.

Sherman, D. K., & Cohen, G. L. (2006). The psychology of self-defense: Self-affirmation theory. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 38, pp. 183-242). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

October 12 • No class (SESP meeting)

October 19 • Research Workshop #1

October 26 • Attitude accessibility and valence sensitivity

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

Fazio, R. H., Jackson, J. R., Dunton, B. C., & Williams, C. J. (1995). Variability in automatic activation as an unobtrusive measure of racial stereotypes: A bona fide pipeline? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *69*, 1013-1027.

Fazio, R. H., Pietri, E. S., Rocklage, M. D., & Shook, N. J. (2015). Positive versus negative valence: Asymmetries in attitude formation and generalization as fundamental individual differences. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, *51*, 97-146.

November 2 • Goals and motivations

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.

Lord, C. G., Ross, L., & Lepper, M. R. (1979). Biased assimilation and attitude polarization: The effects of prior theories on subsequently considered evidence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *37*, 2098-2109.

Cohen, G. L., Aronson, J., & Steele, C. M. (2000). When beliefs yield to evidence: Reducing biased evaluation by affirming the self. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *26*, 1151-1164.

Monteith, M. J., Lybarger, J. E., & Woodcock, A. (2009). Schooling the cognitive monster: The role of motivation in the regulation and control of prejudice. *Social and Personality Compass*, *3*, 211-226.

November 9 • Implicit evaluations

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

Gawronski, B., & Bodenhausen, G. V. (2014). Implicit and explicit evaluation: A brief review of the Associative Propositional Evaluation model. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, *8*, 448-462.

McConnell, A. R., & Rydell, R. J. (2014). The Systems of Evaluation Model: A dual-systems approach to attitudes. In J. W. Sherman, B. Gawronski, & Y. Trope (Eds.), *Dual process theories of the social mind* (pp. 204-217). New York: Guilford.

Mann, T. C., & Ferguson, M. J. (2015). Can we undo our first impressions? The role of reinterpretation in reversing implicit evaluations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *108*, 823-849.

November 16 • Subtle affective experiences

Schwarz, N., & Clore, G. L. (2007). Feelings and phenomenal experiences. In A. Kruglanski & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Social psychology: Handbook of basic principles* (2nd ed., pp. 385-407). New York: Guilford.

Tiedens, L. Z., & Linton, S. (2001). Judgment under emotional certainty and uncertainty: The effects of specific emotions on information processing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *64*, 317-326.

Gasper, K., & Clore, G. L. (2002). Attending to the big picture: Mood and global versus local processing of visual information. *Psychological Science*, *13*, 33-39.

Ratner, K. G., Dotsch, R., Wigboldus, D. H. J., van Knippenberg, A., Amodio, D. M. (2014). Visualizing minimal ingroup and outgroup faces: Implications for impressions, attitudes, and behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 106, 897-911.

November 23 • No class (Thanksgiving Day)

November 30 • Social influence and persuasion

Cialdini, R. B. (1995). Principles and techniques of social influence. In A. Tesser (Ed.), *Advanced social psychology* (pp. 257-281). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Cialdini, R. B., & Goldstein, N. J. (2004). Social influence: Compliance and conformity. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *55*, 591-621.

Briñol, P., & Petty, R. E. (2005). Individual differences in attitude change. In D. Albarracin, B. T. Johnson, & M. P. Zanna (Eds.), *The handbook of attitudes and attitude change* (pp. 575-616). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

December 7 • Research Workshop #2

December 12 • Research proposal due by 12 noon (Tuesday of finals week)