

2ND MEETING

LISBOA- MADRID

JANUARY 28TH-29TH 2022
ISPA-INSTITUTO UNIVERSITÁRIO

PABLO BRIÑOL

Universidad Autonoma de Madrid

KEYNOTE

SELF-VALIDATION THEORY: MAKING THOUGHTS CONSEQUENTIAL FOR GOOD OR BAD

Self-validation theory (SVT) postulates that thoughts become more consequential for judgment and action as the perceived validity of the thoughts is increased. Instead of focusing on the objective accuracy of thoughts, SVT focuses on a subjective sense that one's thoughts are appropriate to use. In this presentation, I will emphasize the difference between merely having a metacognitive experience associated with a thought (e.g., this thought came to mind with ease, I feel confident in it, I feel good about it) and subsequently using that experience to inform judgment and behavior. Although having metacognitive experiences and then using those experiences are closely related processes, they are conceptually and empirically distinct. Importantly, there are individual and situational factors capable of moderating when people rely on their metacognitive experiences. Specifically, recent research has identified three key moderators of metacognition usage. Using metacognition is impaired (and therefore people become blind to their metacognitive experiences) when the extent of elaboration is low, when individuals feel socially observed, and when people act for selfish motives.

FRIDAY. 28TH

17H30 – 18H30

AUDITÓRIO 1

TERESA GARCIA-MARQUES

*William James Center for Research, ISPA – Instituto
Universitário*

THIS IS WHY! WHAT DO WE ACCEPT AS A JUSTIFICATION FOR
RESISTING /ACCEPTING A PERSUASIVE APPEAL?

Asking and presenting justifications for either approving or disapproving a persuasive claim is a prevalent action in our daily lives. However, there is no theoretical or empirical approach that directly focuses the meta-persuasive attempt beyond such justifications. Here, we offer a first approach to the issue, focusing on how persuasive is a justification that either focuses on the arguments presented by the communicator or on peripheral features of the persuasive context. In two studies, we address how individuals evaluate these justifications for both resisting and allowing the persuasion to occur. We address their perceived frequency use by others and by the self; their perceived epistemic value and their likelihood of being accept as a good justification. Results show that individuals accept as valid an attitude being changed as a direct influence of some but not all persuasive appeals. The expertise and credibility of the source and the number of arguments presented were all evaluated as good as the quality of the argument's justifications. These evaluations only partially anchor in the perceived epistemic value of a justification.

FRIDAY. 28TH
10H30 – 11H00
SALA DE ACTOS

MADRID

JOSH GUYER
IE University

LISBOA-

THE METACOGNITIVE INFLUENCE OF PITCH ON ATTITUDES AS A RECIPIENT, CHANNEL AND CONTEXT FACTOR

Across three experiments, we explored the metacognitive effects of pitch on attitudes when changes in pitch originated from the message recipient, channel of communication (keyboard), and as a context factor (background music). First, participants listed positive or negative thoughts about a proposal to implement comprehensive exams (Experiments 1, 2) and about their academic abilities (Experiment 3). Experiment 1 showed that when the message recipient vocally expressed their thoughts using low (vs. high) pitch, thought direction had a greater effect on attitudes. Similarly, Experiment 2 revealed that low (vs. high) pitch heard while typing thoughts on a keyboard (modified to vary in pitch) yielded the same pattern of effects by polarizing attitudes. Finally, Experiment 3 replicated this pattern by showing that thoughts had a greater impact when listed while background sound in the environment was low (vs. high) in pitch. As predicted, the impact of pitch on attitudes was mediated by thought-confidence. These data reveal that pitch can influence persuasion by affecting meta-cognitive processes, and show for the time that the very same variable (pitch) can influence attitudes regardless of whether it comes from the recipient, the channel, or the context.

FRIDAY. 28TH
11H00 - 11H30
SALA DE ACTOS

MADRID

FILIPE LOUREIRO

*William James Center for Research, ISPA – Instituto
Universitário*

TAKE THE ROAD THAT FEELS RIGHT: MATCHING NAÏVE THEORIES OF INTUITION AND THE USE OF INTUITION APPEALS IN PERSUASION

In 2 studies, we tested for matching effects between intuition and analysis appeals and participants' naïve theories of perceived validity of intuition and analysis. In Study 1, under unrestricted elaboration likelihood conditions, more favorable attitudes towards an advertisement with intuition appeals (/analysis appeals) were observed among participants with higher (vs. lower) levels of perceived validity of intuition (/analysis). Importantly, these matching effects were mediated by the favorability of participants' thoughts, suggesting that this matching positively influenced attitudes via a biased generation of thoughts elicited by the ad. In study 2, we manipulated baseline participant involvement, allowing us to test the mechanisms through which these matching effects influence attitudes. Participants saw an ad with a message manipulating a car's features as intuitive or analytic. Results replicated the previous matching effects for the intuitive ad, but only for motivated participants. Additionally, we found further evidence for a biasing influence of matching on attitudes through thought favorability, in conditions of high, but not low motivation.

FRIDAY. 28TH
12H00 – 12H30
SALA DE ACTOS

MADRID

LORENA MORENO

Universidad Autónoma de Madrid

RELIANCE IN CERTAINTY IN ONE'S ATTITUDES AND TRAITS: TESTING THE MODERATING ROLE OF ELABORATION

The present research is based on Self-Validation Theory. The core notion of SVT is that any mental content, including attitudes and traits, become more consequential for judgment and action as the perceived validity of those thoughts is increased. Because certainty in one's thoughts (whether attitudes or traits) requires thinking about thinking, this metacognitive process is postulated to be most likely to operate when people are engaged in considerable thinking. We present two lines of research examining this unique SVT prediction. Using a paradigm of attitude-behavior correspondence, the first set of studies revealed that reliance on attitude certainty was greater when thought at the time of the behavior was relatively high rather than low (e.g., for those high in need for cognition). The second line of research showed that reliance on personality certainty was also greater when thinking at the time of the behavior was relatively high rather than low.

FRIDAY. 28TH
12H30 - 13H00
SALA DE ACTOS

BORJA PAREDES

Universidad Autónoma de Madrid

SITUATION EXTREMITY MODERATING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CERTAINTY AND ATTITUDE-BEHAVIOR

The current research explores whether considering the extremity of the situation improves the ability of attitude certainty to predict attitude-behavior correspondence (ABC). Across three studies, participants first reported their attitudes towards a familiar tech brand (Studies 1 & 3) or sport clothing brand (Study 2). Participants were asked to report how certain they were in their attitudes. Then, participants were randomly assigned to consider an extreme versus non-extreme situation. Attitudes, attitude certainty, and extremity served as predictors of predict brand purchase intentions. Results showed that ABC was greater for those who were relatively more certain, but only for those who were assigned to the non-extreme situation. For those in the extreme situation, ABC was greater for those who were relatively less certain. In conclusion, taking into consideration the extremity of the situation can be useful to predict the association between attitudes, certainty, and subsequent behavior.

FRIDAY. 28TH
13H00 – 13H30
SALA DE ACTOS

MADRID

DAVID SANTOS

Universidad Autónoma de Madrid

LISBOA-

REDUCING PREJUDICED ATTITUDES BY THINKING ABOUT HOW OTHERS THINK

We examined to what extent thinking about mental processes of outgroup members influenced prejudiced attitudes. We compared the impact of thinking about how others think (perceived primary cognition) with how others think about their own thoughts (perceived secondary cognition). In the primary cognition treatment, participants answered questions about the thinking processes of outgroup members. In the secondary cognition treatment, participants answered questions that required them to consider how outgroup members think about their own thoughts (i.e., metacognition). Compared to controls, these treatments were capable of reducing prejudiced attitudes toward Syrian refugees, South American immigrants, and Roma people. Using a minimal group paradigm, a third study showed that the metacognitive treatment improved attitudes toward the fictitious outgroup that was described as having primary (vs. secondary) cognition. These studies suggest that promoting appreciation of the complexity of outgroups' minds can contribute to reduce prejudiced attitudes.

FRIDAY. 28TH
15H00 – 15H30
SALA DE ACTOS

MADRID

RITA SILVA

CIS_ISCTE, ISCTE-University Institute of Lisbon

FLUENT PROCESSING LEADS TO POSITIVE EVALUATIONS EVEN WHEN BASE RATES SUGGEST NEGATIVE EVALUATIONS

Fluency is the experienced ease of mental operations, which increases the subjective positivity of stimuli attributes, such as beauty or truth. This may happen because fluency is an inherently positive experience. Alternatively, the interpretation of fluency may be malleable and context-dependent. We test pseudocontingencies (PCs) as a mechanism through which fluency's meaning is learned. PCs are inferred correlations between two attributes due to the observation of their jointly, albeit uncorrelated, skewed base rates – people relate what is frequent in one attribute to what is frequent in the other. We used the context of online markets with seller evaluations as DV. We manipulated base rates of seller name-fluency and seller reputation, creating conditions where fluency aligned positively or negatively with reputation. However, we observed no PCs between fluency and seller reputation: participants evaluated high-fluency name sellers more positively across base-rate conditions. We discuss the implications for the debate regarding fluency's positive vs. malleable nature.

FRIDAY. 28TH
15H30 – 16H00
SALA DE ACTOS

MADRID

JOÃO MARINS

*William James Center for Research, ISPA – Instituto
Universitário*

ARGUMENT QUALITY

“Argument quality” is central to persuasion studies. Empirically, what operationalizes this concept is that strong arguments elicit favorable thoughts and weak arguments elicit unfavorable thoughts. Why they elicit those thoughts is a question with little empirical support. Fishbein and Ajzen's (1981) expectancy value model suggests that arguments are comprised of two separate components: a subjective probability (likelihood) and a valence (positive or negative), their strength determined by the multiplicative relation of both components. In an empirical study, however, Areni and Lutz (1988) provided evidence that valence is the only important dimension in distinguishing strong from weak arguments. This approach inspired further research, showing, for example, that theory-based structure accounts for the variation in perceived argument strength (Munch et al., 1993), or that even motivated participants cannot distinguish between weak and strong arguments, as operationalized by argumentation theorists (Van Enschot-Van Dijk et al., 2003). While this approach remained relevant (e.g., Zhao et al., 2011) evidence of the role of perceived likelihood is still mixed (O’Keefe, 2013) and a strong understanding of argument quality (e.g., based on normative criteria; Hoeken et al., 2020) is a much needed one.

In this presentation we provide data corroborating that both perceived likelihood and perceived valence have an important role in differentiating strong and weak arguments, but not in a multiplicative relationship. We further show the relevance of perceived valence by providing evidence that one and the same argument generates different thoughts dependent upon how the context in which it is provided modulates its perceived valence.

FRIDAY. 28TH
16H00 – 16H30
SALA DE ACTOS

MADRID