

## SYLLABUS

### 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. It is assumed that students have the knowledge equivalent of that provided in Psychology 630. This quarter the seminar will focus specifically on issues concerning implicit measures of attitude. Many of the readings will be chapters written very recently for a forthcoming volume edited by Petty, Fazio, and Briñol (in press), *Attitudes: Insights from the new implicit measures*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum Associates.

### GENERAL BACKGROUND READING:

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

*Note.* This chapter will be especially useful for those who are unfamiliar with the development and use of implicit measures in social psychological research over the last decade. The chapter reviews the seminal literature and highlights a number of questions and issues that continue to generate research. Thus, it will provide an informative context for many of the topics we will be pursuing.

**COURSE TOPICS:** (tentative; subject to change depending on the availability of a few key chapters from the edited volume)

- Jan 8: Course overview
- Jan 15: MARTIN LUTHER KING HOLIDAY (No Class)
- Jan 22: Dual systems approaches to evaluative judgment (RP) [A]
- Jan 29: Using implicit measures to assess self-esteem (RF) [B]
- Feb 5: Cognitive consistency and attitudinal ambivalence (RP) [A]
- Feb 12: The IAT: What does it measure and how does it work? (RF) [B]
- Feb 19: Interpretational issues regarding implicit measures (RF) [A]
- Feb 26: Using implicit measures to understand prejudice (RP) [B]
- Mar 5: How shall we conceptualize an attitude?

### COURSE REQUIREMENTS:

Readings from original sources will be assigned each week. These readings will be made available on the Carmen website, <http://carmen.osu.edu>. On the first day, the class will be divided into an "A" and a "B" group. Each week one of the groups (noted above) will write an answer to the "question of the week." This question will be assigned one week in advance. Each week members of the other 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. These papers 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 "question of the week" papers are due at the beginning of class; please hand in two copies. One of the instructors will return these papers with comments the next week. The readings papers should be e-mailed to Rich and Russ by midnight on the Sunday before class ([petty.1@osu.edu](mailto:petty.1@osu.edu); [fazio.11@osu.edu](mailto:fazio.11@osu.edu)). They will be used by the instructors to anticipate and organize the discussion.

### GRADING:

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

**January 22 – Topic 1**  
**Dual Systems Approaches to Evaluative Judgment**

**Background Readings:**

Wilson, T. D., Lindsey, S., & Schooler, T. Y. (2000). A model of dual attitudes. *Psychological Review*, 107, 101-126,

Smith, E. R., & DeCoster, J. (2000). Dual process models in social and cognitive psychology: Conceptual integration and links to underlying memory systems. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 4, 108-131.

**Main Readings:**

Deutsch, R., & Strack, F. (2006). Duality models in social psychology: From dual processes to interacting systems. *Psychological Inquiry*, 17, 166-172.

Deutsch, R., & Strack, F. (2006). Duality models in social psychology: Response to commentaries. *Psychological Inquiry*, 17, 265-268.

DeCoster, J., Banner, M. J., Smith, E. R., & Semin, G. R. (2006). On the inexplicability of the implicit: Differences in the information provided by implicit and explicit tests. *Social Cognition*, 24, 5-21.

Rydell, R. J., & McConnell, A.R. (2006). Understanding implicit and explicit attitude change: A systems of reasoning analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 91, 995-1008.

**Question of the Week:**

Outline the best argument or evidence you have read (or can generate) for a dual *systems* approach to attitudes. Outline the best criticism you have read (or can generate) of this approach.

**January 29 – Topic 2**  
**Using implicit measures to assess self-esteem**

**Readings:**

Dijksterhuis, A., Albers, L. W., & Bongers, K. C. A. (in press). Digging for the real attitude:

Lessons from research on implicit and explicit self-esteem. In R. E. Petty, R. H. Fazio, & P. Briñol (Eds.) *Attitudes: Insights from the new implicit measures*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Jordan, C. H., Logel, C., Spencer, S. J., Zanna, M. P., & Whitfield, M. L. (in press). The heterogeneity of self-esteem: Exploring the interplay between implicit and explicit self-esteem. In R. E. Petty, R. H. Fazio, & P. Briñol (Eds.) *Attitudes: Insights from the new implicit measures*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

DeHart, T., Pelham, B. W., & Tennen, H. (2006). What lies beneath: Parenting style and implicit self-esteem. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 42, 1-17.

Olson, M. A., Fazio, R. H., & Hermann, A. D. (in press). Reporting tendencies underlie discrepancies between implicit and explicit measures of self-esteem. *Psychological Science*.

**Question of the Week:**

The readings outline very different ways of conceptualizing implicit and explicit measures of self-esteem and their relation to one another, including dual and single construct approaches.

What reasons do you see for adopting one approach over the other?

**February 5 – Topic 3**  
**Consistency and Ambivalence Processes in Explicit/Implicit Attitude Change**

**Background Reading:**

Gawronski, B., & Bodenhausen, G. V. (2006). Associative and propositional processes in evaluation: An integrative review of implicit and explicit attitude change. *Psychological Bulletin*, 132, 692-731.

**Main Readings:**

Gawronski, B., Strack, F., & Bodenhausen, G. V. (in press). Attitudes and cognitive consistency: The role of associative and propositional processes. In R. E. Petty, R. H. Fazio, & P. Briñol (Eds.), *Attitudes: Insights from the new implicit measures*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Gawronski, B., Bodenhausen, G. V., & Becker, A. P. (in press). I like it because I like myself: Associative self-anchoring and post-decisional change of implicit evaluations. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*.

Petty, R. E., Briñol, P., & DeMarree, K. G. (in press). The meta-cognitive model (MCM) of attitudes: Implications for attitude measurement, change, and strength. *Social Cognition*.

Petty, R. E., Tormala, Z. L., Briñol, P., & Jarvis, W. B. G. (2006). Implicit ambivalence from attitude change: An exploration of the PAST model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90, 21-41.

**Question of the Week:**

Can people have feelings of “inconsistency” or “hidden conflicts” of which they are not consciously aware? Based on the readings and your own thoughts, do your best to outline some arguments both for and against this idea.

**February 12 – Topic 4**  
**The Implicit Association Test: What does it measure and how does it work?**

**Readings:**

- Nosek, B. A., Greenwald, A. G., & Banaji, M. R. (in press). The Implicit Association Test at age 7: A methodological and conceptual review. In J. A. Bargh (Ed.), *Automatic processes in social thinking and behavior*. New York: Psychology Press.
- Blanton, H., & Jaccard, J. (2006). Arbitrary metrics in psychology. *American Psychologist*, 61, 27 - 41.
- Greenwald, A. G., Nosek, B. A., & Sriram, N. (2006). Consequential validity of the Implicit Association Test: Comment on the article by Blanton and Jaccard. *American Psychologist*, 61, 56–61.
- Han, H. A., Olson, M. A., & Fazio, R. H. (2006). The influence of experimentally-created extrapersonal associations on the Implicit Association Test. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 42, 259-272.

**Optional Readings:**

- De Houwer, J., Beckers, T., & Moors, A. (in press). Novel attitudes can be faked on the Implicit Association Test. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*.
- De Houwer, J., Custers, R., & De Clercq, A. (2006). Do smokers have a negative implicit attitude towards smoking? *Cognition and Emotion*, 20, 1274-1284.
- Karpinski, A., & Steinman, B. (2006). The Single Category Implicit Association Test as a measure of implicit social cognition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 91, 16-32.

**Question of the Week:**

The IAT has attracted a great deal of attention and has been used widely over the last few years. Given what has been learned to date, 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 19 – Topic 5**  
**Interpretational issues regarding implicit measures**

**Readings:**

De Houwer, J. (in press). Comparing measures of attitudes at the functional and structural level:

Analysis and implications. In R. E. Petty, R. H. Fazio, & P. Briñol (Eds.)

*Attitudes: Insights from the new implicit measures*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Payne, B. K. (2005). Conceptualizing control in social cognition: How executive control

modulates the expression of automatic stereotyping. *Journal of Personality and Social*

*Psychology*, 89, 488-503.

Sherman, J. W. (in press). Controlled influences on implicit measures: Confronting the myth of

process-purity and taming the cognitive monster. In R. E. Petty, R. H. Fazio, & P. Briñol

(Eds.) *Attitudes: Insights from the new implicit measures*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Greenwald, A. G., & Nosek, B. A. (in press). Attitudinal dissociation: What does it mean? In

R. E. Petty, R. H. Fazio, & P. Briñol (Eds.) *Attitudes: Insights from the new implicit*

*measures*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

**Question of the Week:**

This set of readings will expose you to a variety of conceptual and methodological distinctions regarding implicit measures. The authors argue that the distinctions are essential to the proper understanding of implicit measures. Which distinctions do you view as especially important, and why?

**February 26 – Topic 6**  
**Impact of Implicit Measures on Understanding Prejudice**

**Core Readings: READ ALL THREE OF THE ARTICLES BELOW**

- Dovidio, J. F., Kawakami, K., Smoak, N., & Gaertner, S. L. (in press). The nature of contemporary racial prejudice: Insight from implicit and explicit measures of attitudes. In R. E. Petty, R. H. Fazio, & P. Briñol (Eds.), *Attitudes: Insights from the new implicit measures*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Amodio, D. M., & Devine, P. G. (2006). Stereotyping and evaluation in implicit race bias: Evidence for independent constructs and unique effects on behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 91, 652-661.
- Olson, M. A., & Fazio, R. H. (2004). Trait inferences as a function of automatically activated racial attitudes and motivation to control prejudiced reactions. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 26, 1-11.

**Empirical Examples (focus on correction processes): READ ONE OF THE ARTICLES BELOW**

- Maddux, W. W., Barden, J., Brewer, M. B., & Petty, R. E. (2005). Saying no to negativity: The effects of context and motivation to control prejudice on automatic evaluative responses. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 41, 19-35.
- Towles-Schwen, T., & Fazio, R. H. (2006). Automatically activated racial attitudes as predictors of the success of interracial roommate relationships. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 42, 698-705.
- Dasgupta, N., & Rivera, L. M. (2006). From automatic antigay prejudice to behavior: The moderating role of conscious beliefs about gender and behavioral control. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 91, 268-280.
- Gawronski, B., Deutsch, R., Mbirkou, S., Seibt, B., & Strack, F. (in press). When “just say no” is not enough: Affirmation versus negation training and the reduction of automatic stereotype activation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*.

**Question of the Week:**

All things considered, how important have implicit measures been to our understanding of prejudice (e.g., very important, minimal importance?). What have implicit measures contributed to our understanding of prejudice? For example, can you identify psychological mechanisms or processes that were unlikely to be discovered with explicit measures alone? Be specific in defending your position (pro or con) on the importance of implicit measures for understanding prejudice.

**March 5 – Topic 7**  
**How shall we conceptualize an attitude?**

**Readings:** (all are to appear in a forthcoming special issue of *Social Cognition* edited by Bertram Gawronski)

Eagly, A. H., & Chaiken, S., The advantages of an inclusive definition of attitude.

Schwarz, N., Attitude construction: Evaluation in context.

Conrey, F. R., & Smith, E. R., Attitude representation: Attitudes as patterns in a distributed, connectionist representational system.

Fazio, R. H., Attitudes as object-evaluation associations of varying strength.

Note: Gawronski's "Call for Papers" for the special issue is also posted for you to read

**Question of the Week:**

Considering the above readings, as well as the literature we have reviewed in this seminar regarding implicit and explicit measures, how would you propose that we view attitudes? What is an attitude?