

**GRADUATE SEMINAR IN ATTITUDES**  
**SOP 6419**  
**SPRING 2013**  
**MONDAYS, 3-6PM**

**Instructor:** Dr. Kate Ratliff  
**Office:** Psych 222  
**Email:** ratliff@ufl.edu  
**Phone:** 352.273.2155

---

**COURSE DESCRIPTION**

The study of attitudes is one of the most central areas of social psychology. Attitudes research has undergone many changes over time: addressing issues about how to construct valid instruments, dealing with concerns about whether attitudes predict behavior, launching debates about whether attitudes are real or are on-the-spot constructions, and provoking controversies about how strongly attitudes are guided by non-conscious processes. It is clear, however, that understanding attitudes is fundamental for understanding impression formation, stereotypes and prejudice, consumer behavior, jury decision-making, political psychology, and many other areas of interest to social scientists.

**STRUCTURE, PREPARATION, AND PARTICIPATION**

The success of this course rests with the students and your preparation. We will focus both on critical discussion of the theories and empirical research covered in the readings, as well as generating new directions and creative connections between topics. Each week, one or two students will organize and facilitate the discussion of that week's topics and readings. Everyone should come to each class prepared to actively contribute to the group discussion. The overarching goal for this course is for you to develop your thinking and research ideas, and it is through the process of discussion and debate that one's research acumen becomes defined and sharpened.

Science tolerates and critically evaluates all points of view when they are advanced with sensitivity for those who may not share them. Please keep in mind that your fellow students may not share your religious affiliations, political beliefs, cultural backgrounds, economic, ethnic, or sexual orientations.

**REQUIREMENTS AND GRADING**

Facilitating class discussion	20%	A = 90-100
Class participation	20%	B = 80-89
Thought papers	20%	C = 70-79
Research workshops	20%	D = 60-69
Final paper	20%	F = 59 and below

## **FACILITATING CLASS DISCUSSION**

Each week, one student will organize and facilitate discussion (one or two times each). As facilitators, you decide how to best accomplish your goal for the week. It is not your responsibility to explain the readings to others; instead, your role is to provide a sensible and interesting framework for discussing the topic. You could circulate an e-mail before class to pose questions of your colleagues. You could collate the questions from the thought papers and use them to guide the class meeting (see below). You might highlight common themes that run throughout the readings. You are strongly encouraged to come up with a class activity to go along with the discussion. For example, you might set up a debate. You could provide a demonstration. You could show a video. You may use handouts, but do not have to. You may bring in other readings if you want. The goal of facilitation is to provide structure and direction for fellow students in order to have a productive discussion; there is no right or wrong way to do so. You must touch base with me the week before you facilitate discussion to briefly discuss your plans and any questions that you might have. The best discussion facilitators are those who start thinking about how to structure the discussion well in advance, and who have backup plans or multiple ideas for how to foster active discussions.

## **THOUGHT PAPERS**

Each week you will submit a brief paper in which you describe your thinking about that week's readings. This assignment is open-ended; the general idea is that you consider some aspects of the strengths, limitations, implications, and interconnections in the week's readings. Your paper should conclude with a question or two that you think would be particularly interesting to discuss in class (these will be shared with the facilitator for that week). You must submit the paper and questions via email to the instructor and the questions to the week's discussion leader by 4pm the day before class. Each assignment should be less than two pages (double-spaced) and should follow APA format for style and citations. A reference page is not necessary. Your papers will be graded primarily on how well you provide a thoughtful, well-argued analysis of the work, but writing style always counts. Late papers will not be accepted.

## **RESEARCH WORKSHOPS**

To help encourage the development of new research ideas and to gain practice in presenting and critiquing research, there are two days (February 25<sup>th</sup> and April 15<sup>th</sup>) devoted to in-class research workshops. Before coming to class on those days, you will identify an interesting research question, describe it and its importance, briefly outline an appropriate methodology to address it, and present the anticipated results. Thus, each student will develop at least two research ideas before the proposal is submitted.

Before arriving in class on the day of the research workshops, each student will prepare a document that is no longer than 1 page (single-spaced) and provide a graph or figure. A copy of each student's pre-class work should be emailed to the professor and all class members by 4pm the day before class meeting. In class, students will present their ideas, using only their handout, for 10-15 minutes. Other students will provide feedback during this presentation. Grading will be based on your own product (5% per workshop) and the quality of your feedback to other students (5% per workshop).

## RESEARCH PROPOSAL

Each student will submit a paper proposing one or two empirical studies that would test an important and novel research question related to the field of attitudes. Although students will not be required to carry out the research they propose, you are encouraged to pick a topic that connects to your own interests. The opportunity to develop your theoretical and empirical thinking should be helpful to those who wish to develop new lines of research or explore ideas relevant to theses, secondary projects, and dissertations. This paper must take the form of a research proposal; it cannot be a literature review. Papers should be approximately 10-15 pages in length (double-spaced) and written in APA style (including a reference section).

A paragraph summarizing your planned paper topic is due by email no later than April 15<sup>th</sup>. Papers should be submitted by 4pm on Monday, April 29<sup>th</sup>. Please turn in a hard copy to my office (Psych 222); emailed papers and/or late papers will not be accepted.

## COURSE SCHEDULE

*Note:* The reading list is tentative and could change up to two weeks prior to a class meeting.

<b>Meeting</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Discussion Leader</b>
January 7	Organizational meeting	
January 14	What is an attitude and why does it matter?	Shanee/Kirsten
January 21	MLK Day – No class	
January 28	Measuring attitudes	Kate
February 4	The limits of introspection	Kate
February 11	The influence of attitudes on behavior	Steve
February 18	The influence of behavior on attitudes	Jenny
February 25	Research Workshop #1	
March 4	Spring Break – No class	
March 11	Dual-Process models of attitude change	Jimmy
March 18	Implicit and explicit attitude change	Kate
March 25	Affect-as-information	Kirsten
April 1	Meta-cognitive processes	Shanee
April 8	Flexibility and the question: what is an attitude?	Rick
April 15	Research Workshop #2 (last day of class)	

## REQUIRED TEXT

Wilson, Timothy. (2002). *Strangers to Ourselves: Discovering the Adaptive Unconscious*.

All other readings will be posted on the course e-learning site (Sakai).

## **JANUARY 14<sup>th</sup>: WHAT IS AN ATTITUDE AND WHY DOES IT MATTER**

- 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.
- Greenwald, A. G., & Banaji, M. R. (1995). Implicit social cognition: Attitudes, self-esteem, and stereotypes. *Psychological Review*, 102, 4-27.
- Skitka, L., Bauman, C. W., & Sarqis, E. G. (2005). Moral conviction: Another contributor to attitude strength or something more? *JPSP*, 88, 895-917.

## **JANUARY 21<sup>st</sup>: NO CLASS, MLK DAY**

## **JANUARY 28<sup>th</sup>: MEASURING ATTITUDES**

- Krosnick, J. A., Judd, C. M., & Wittenbrink, B. (2005). The measurement of attitudes. In D. Albaraccin, B. T. Johnson, & M.P. Zanna (Eds.), *The handbook of attitudes*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum. [Read pages 31-50.]
- Gawronski, B., & De Houwer, J. (in press). Implicit measures in social and personality psychology. In H. T. Reis, & C. M. Judd (Eds.), *Handbook of research methods in social and personality psychology* (2nd edition). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Greenwald, A. G., Poehlman, A. T., Uhlmann, E. L., & Banaji, M R. (2009). Understanding and using the Implicit Association Test: III. Meta-analysis of predictive validity. *JPSP*, 97, 17-41. [You should closely skim this article, but don't need to read it thoroughly.]
- Schwarz, N. (1999). Self-reports: How the questions shape the answers. *American Psychologist*, 54, 93-105
- Please go to the Project Implicit Research Website (<http://implicit.harvard.edu>). Take a test. Read the FAQs and other background information.

## **FEBRUARY 4<sup>th</sup>: THE LIMITS OF INTROSPECTION**

Wilson, Timothy. (2002). Strangers to Ourselves: Discovering the Adaptive Unconscious.

## **FEBRUARY 11<sup>th</sup>: INFLUENCE OF ATTITUDES ON COGNITION AND BEHAVIOR**

- Eagly, A. H. (1992). Uneven progress: Social psychology and the study of attitudes. *JPSP*, 63, 693-710. [Only pages 694-697 on Attitude-Behavior relations.]
- Fazio, R. H., & Roskos-Ewoldsen, D. R. (2005). Acting as we feel: When and how attitudes guide behavior. In T. C. Brock & M. C. Green (Eds.), *Persuasion: Psychological insights and perspectives* (pp. 41-62). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dovidio, J.F., Kawakami, K., & Gaertner, S.L. (2002). Implicit and explicit prejudice and interracial interaction. *JPSP*, 82, 62-68.
- Amodio, D. M. & Devine, P. G. (2006). Stereotyping and evaluation in implicit race bias: Evidence for independent constructs and unique effects on behavior. *JPSP*, 91, 652-661.
- Greenwald, A. G., Poehlman, A. T., Uhlmann, E. L., & Banaji, M R. (2009). Understanding and using the Implicit Association Test: III. Meta-analysis of predictive validity. *JPSP* 97, 17-41. [You should have already skimmed this article once, but do so again because it's worth revisiting.]

## **FEBRUARY 18<sup>th</sup>: THE INFLUENCE OF BEHAVIOR ON ATTITUDES**

- Festinger, L. & Carlsmith, J.M. (1959). Cognitive consequences of forced compliance. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 58, 203-210.
- Bem, D. J. (1967). Self-perception: An alternative interpretation of cognitive dissonance phenomena. *Psychological Review*, 74, 183-200.
- Fazio, R. H., Zanna, M. P., & Cooper, J. (1977). Dissonance and self-perception: An integrative review of each theory's proper domain of application. *JESP*, 13, 464-479.
- Kitayama, S., Snibbe, A. C., Markus, H. R., & Suzuki, T. (2004). Is there any "free" choice? *Psychological Science*, 15, 527-533.
- Gawronski, B. (in press). Back to the future of dissonance theory: Cognitive consistency as a core motive. *Social Cognition*.

## **FEBRUARY 25<sup>th</sup>: RESEARCH WORKSHOP #1**

### **MARCH 11<sup>th</sup>: DUAL-PROCESS MODELS OF FORMATION AND CHANGE**

- Chaiken, S., & Ledgerwood, A. (2012). A theory of heuristic and systematic information processing. In P. A. M. van Lange, A. W. Kruglanski, & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Handbook of theories of social psychology* (pp. 246-266). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Smith, C. T., De Houwer, J., & Nosek, B. A. (in press). Consider the source: Persuasion of implicit evaluations is moderated by source credibility. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*.
- Kruglanski, A. W., & Thompson, E. P. (1999). Persuasion by a single route: A view from the unimodel. *Psychological Inquiry*, 10, 83-109.
- Smith E. R., & DeCoster, J. (1999). Associative and rule-based processing: A connectionist interpretation of dual process models. In S. Chaiken & Y. Trope (Eds.), *Dual process theories in social psychology* (pp. 323-336). New York: Guilford Press.

### **MARCH 18<sup>th</sup>: IMPLICIT AND EXPLICIT FORMATION AND CHANGE**

- Gawronski, B., & Bodenhausen, G. V. (2011). The associative-propositional evaluation model: Theory, evidence, and open questions. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 44, 59-127. [Only read the first four sections, pages 59-98.]
- Rydell, R. J., & McConnell, A. R. Understanding Implicit and Explicit Attitude Change: A Systems of Reasoning Analysis. (2006). *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 91, 991-1008.
- Ratliff, K. A., & Nosek, B. A. (2011). Negativity and outgroup biases in attitude formation and transfer. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 37, 1692-1703.
- Lai, C. K., Hoffman, K. M., & Nosek, B. A. (In press). Reducing implicit prejudice. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*.

### **MARCH 25<sup>th</sup>: AFFECT-AS-INFORMATION**

- Schwarz, N., & Clore, G. L. (2007). Feelings and phenomenal experiences. In E. T. Higgins & A. W. Kruglanski (Eds.), *Social psychology: Handbook of basic principles* (2nd ed., pp. 385-407). New York: Guilford.
- Huntsinger, J. R., & Smith, C. T. (2009). First thought, best thought: Positive mood maintains and negative mood degrades implicit-explicit attitude correspondence. *PSPB* 35, 187-197.
- Tiedens, L. Z., & Linton, S. (2001). Judgment under emotional certainty and uncertainty: The effects of specific emotions on information processing. *JPSP*, 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.

### **APRIL 1<sup>st</sup>: META-COGNITIVE PROCESSES**

- Petty, R. E., Briñol, P., Tormala, Z. L., & Wegener, D. T. (2007). The role of metacognition in social judgment. In A. W. Kruglanski & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Social psychology: Handbook of basic principles* (2th ed., pp. 254- 284). New York: Cambridge Press.
- Claypool, H. M., Hall, C. E., Mackie, D. M., & Garcia-Marques, T. (2008). Positive mood, attribution, and the illusion of familiarity. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 44*, 721-728.
- Schwarz, N. (1998). Accessible content and accessibility experiences: The interplay of declarative and experiential information in judgment. *PSPR, 2*, 87-99.
- Petty, R. E., Briñol, P., & Tormala, Z. L. (2002). Thought confidence as a determinant of persuasion: The self-validation hypothesis. *JPSP, 82*, 722-741.

### **APRIL 8<sup>th</sup>: REVISITING THE QUESTION – WHAT IS AN ATTITUDE**

- Ferguson, M. J., & Bargh, J. A. (2004). Liking is for doing: Effects of goal-pursuit on automatic evaluation. *JPSP, 87*, 557-572.
- 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. *JPSP, 87*, 5–22.
- Sinclair, S., Lowery, B., Hardin, C. D., & Colangelo, A. (2005). Social tuning of automatic racial attitudes: The role of affiliative motivation. *JPSP, 89*, 583-592.
- Smith, E. R., & Conrey, F. R. (2007). Representations are states, not things: Implications for implicit and explicit measurement. In B. Wittenbrink & N. Schwarz, *Implicit measures of attitudes: Procedures and controversies* (pp. 247-264). New York: Guilford.

### **APRIL 15<sup>th</sup>: RESEARCH WORKSHOP #2**