Persuasion

Definition
Elaboration Likelihood Model (ELM)

Factors in Persuasion
1. The Communicator
   a. credibility
   b. likeability
2. The Communication
   a. mood
   b. 2 sides or 1 side
   c. which side first?
   d. Multiple sources
   e. Mode of presentation
3. The Audience

Influencing Techniques

Avoid Attitude Change

Behavior and Attitude Change

Persuasion – the process of changing attitudes.

Elaboration Likelihood Model –> lots of information about persuasion. To deal with all the information and to understand the mechanism of persuasion ELM was proposed.

→ Says there are two routes to persuasion- the central and peripheral
Central Route – when we consider how strong or consistent an argument is--- scrutinize a message to see if it is persuasive.

Peripheral route -- not message content that persuades but other factors such as mood, personal characteristics like expertise, likeability, similarity etc… nothing to do with the argument or message.

Elaboration – used to refer to the scrutiny with which a person examines a message content – important to know which conditions will cause elaboration….more scrutiny = more persuasion

The Communicator
----peripheral route persuasion-----
1. Credibility – a source is more effective at persuading if perceived as credible. Source is more credible if a. Competent b. Trustworthy…..

competence – refers to speaker’s ability….knowledgeable, smart, well spoken, credentialed

trustworthy – willing to report what they know truthfully---trust established by speakers who are not purposefully trying to change our views….nothing to personally gain.

2. Likeability --- the more likable a person is the more persuasion accomplished through the peripheral route……people are likeable b/c 1. similarity 2. physical beauty.

The Communication – central route
--Persuasion can only occur on the basis of the communication if the target is motivated to use the central route…..personal involvement and importance are reason for using the central route.

Mood – A message is more persuasive if the audience is in a positive mood. ---feeling bad –common to use fear to try and persuade.—attitude change will follow a fear-arousing communication only if people know what to do to reduce their fear.........

Two-sided arguments?—should you present one side of an argument or both?....one-sided communications are more convincing, but, people who realize that there is a second side may feel freedom is threatened and react negatively. One-sided arguments best
only if the audience doesn’t realize there is another side.

Which side first?---usually explored with mock juries----test whether a closing argument works better if presented first or last.

Summation, summation….time…decision = prime

Summation..time…summation, decision = recency

Multiple Sources – info presented by multiple sources tends to get greater scrutiny than the same info presented by single source
----when info is strong, increasing the number of sources tends to increase favorable issue-relevant thinking (more agreement) than when week.
----multiple sources increase the likelihood of processing the message via
the central route, so argument has to be strong.

Mode of presentation -- tv versus print media........when the message is complex, print is better than tv-+
---when the message is simple the tv produces more attitude change

Audience → Don’t want to say the same thing to everyone....Important to tailor message to attitudes of audience.....not too extreme so arguments are rejected
→ When people hear a communication they either assimilate or contrast the message.....if they feel strongly about an issue they will find fewer positions other then their own to be acceptable and unacceptable opinions will be distorted.

1. Assimilation –opinions that are acceptable are made to appear more
similar to their own position than they really are.

2. Contrast – unacceptable opinions are made to appear more extreme than they really are (contrast).

Influencing Techniques
1. Private/Public attitudes—private attitudes more susceptible to change than those that are public---feel committed with public attitudes
2. Foot in the Door ➔ having someone commit to a small request increases the chance they will comply with a larger request.
3. Door in the face—to get someone to perform a moderately large task first ask them to perform a very difficult task---once they refuse then ask them to comply with a smaller task…
4. Low Ball – influencer gets agreement with someone, then increase the size
of the request by revealing hidden cost.

Avoiding Attitude Change
1. Forewarning--- advance knowledge that we are to get a persuasive message leads to less attitude change.....forewarning gives audience time to collect their thoughts and come up with counter-arguments.
2. Selective avoidance $\rightarrow$ tendency to direct attention away from info that challenges our existing attitudes.
3. Inoculation $\rightarrow$ hearing counterargument against our position inoculates these attitudes from change----those in which there are few counter-arguments more likely to be changed......

Behavior and Attitude Change—behavior can change your attitude as
much as your attitude can change your behavior.

One theory about this is cognitive dissonance (Festinger, 1957).--- concerned with the relationships among cognitions, if the relationships are irrelevant (bulk of them) then there is no effect, or if they are in agreement then no effect either. But, if they are dissonant (disagree with each other) it creates a motivational state. A state of dissonance......motivated to reduce the tension dissonance produces. → can reduce the tension and dissonance by adding more consonant cognitions, alter their importance, or change cognitions.

Boring Task → ½ get $20 → lie → Att. mesure (peg turning) → ½ get $1 → lie → Att. Mesure

Group that got $20 did not their change their attitude and reported that they hated the task. Those getting $1 changed
their attitude and said they enjoyed the task.

→ Telling the next person the task was fun created dissonance because they knew it was not. Those that got $20 had a reason for lying (justification). Those that got $1 didn’t have a justification for lying and so had cognitive dissonance.....they had to change their attitude (more positive) to justify the lie.