

Contents

Foreword by J. T. Lanzetta	v
Preface and Acknowledgements	vii
1. The Cohen-Rosenberg Controversy and our 1964 Research	1
1. <i>Festinger's cognitive dissonance theory (1957) and the campus-riot experiment of Cohen (1962)</i>	2
2. <i>Rosenberg's "When dissonance fails" (1964-65)</i>	10
3. <i>Our 1964 critical replication of Rosenberg's experiment</i>	17
Experiment One: <i>A close replication of Rosenberg's experiment</i>	23
<i>Problem and design</i>	23
<i>Procedure</i>	24
<i>Results and discussion</i>	34
<i>Conclusion</i>	37
Experiment Two: <i>Experimental test of Rosenberg's attitude change suppressing research contaminants</i>	37
<i>Problem and design</i>	37
<i>Procedure</i>	38
<i>Results and discussion</i>	39
<i>Conclusion</i>	40
4. <i>Inconclusive evidence about the cognitive dissonance effect</i>	40
Experiment Three: <i>Partial replication of Experiment One on female subjects</i>	41
<i>Problem, design and procedure</i>	41
<i>Results</i>	42
<i>Conclusion</i>	42
Experiment Four: <i>Counter- versus pro-attitudinal rewarded advocacy</i>	43
<i>Problem and design</i>	43
<i>Procedure</i>	45
<i>Results and discussion</i>	46
Conclusion	49

2. An Experimental Challenge of the Interpretation of a Cognitive Dissonance Effect	52
1. <i>Some common procedural features of our 1969 research and their rationale</i>	56
2. Experiment Five: <i>The effect of anonymity of public counterattitudinal advocacy (television and radio)</i>	65
<i>Problem and design</i>	65
<i>Procedure</i>	69
<i>Results and discussion</i>	79
3. Experiment Six: <i>The effect of monetary reward for public counterattitudinal advocacy</i>	83
<i>Problem and design</i>	83
<i>Procedure</i>	86
<i>Results and discussion</i>	87
4. Experiment Seven: <i>"Dissonant" reward and counterattitudinal nature of anonymous public advocacy</i>	96
<i>Problem, design and procedure</i>	96
<i>Results and discussion</i>	97
5. Experiment Eight: <i>"Dissonant" reward and public or private nature of the counterattitudinal advocacy</i>	100
<i>Problem and design</i>	100
<i>Procedure for private advocacy</i>	101
<i>Results and discussion</i>	103
Conclusion	106
3. Evidence for an A-Cognitive "Dissonant" View	108
1. Experiment Nine: <i>The effect of a "dissonant" but highly appreciated non-monetary reward (1970 research)</i>	109
<i>Problem</i>	109
<i>Design and procedure</i>	112
<i>Results and discussion</i>	119
<i>Conclusion</i>	129
2. Experiment Ten: <i>The effect of a "dissonant" aversive stimulus (1971 research)</i>	132
<i>Problem and design</i>	132
<i>Procedure</i>	133

<i>Results and discussion</i>	135
<i>Conclusion</i>	137
3. Experiment Eleven: " <i>Dissonant</i> " stimuli and attitude change after pro- and counterattitudinal, persuasive and non-persuasive evaluative verbal responses	139
<i>Problem and design</i>	139
<i>Procedure</i>	147
<i>Results and discussion</i>	150
Conclusion	155
4. The Illusion of Post-advocacy Attitude Change: An Evaluative Response Contagion View of Persuasion	157
1. <i>Enduring attitude change versus stability of a changed attitude response</i>	158
Experiment Twelve: <i>Enduring attitude change five weeks later? (1969)</i>	158
<i>Problem</i>	158
<i>Procedure</i>	159
<i>Results and discussion</i>	160
<i>Conclusion</i>	162
Experiment Thirteen: <i>Stability of a changed attitude response five weeks later? (1971)</i>	163
<i>Problem</i>	163
<i>Procedure</i>	164
<i>Results and discussion</i>	168
<i>Conclusion</i>	171
<i>Further data illustrating the resistance to change of a once emitted attitude response</i>	172
2. <i>Social attitudes: a mere evaluative response view</i>	175
<i>Change of a particular evaluative response: complementary evidence</i>	176
<i>Conclusion</i>	178
3. <i>Dominant "situation-free" evaluative responses and "unpredicted" response change in a precipitating situation</i>	180
<i>"Unpredicted" willingness to hold a plea against exam reform before a nation-wide audience</i>	183
<i>"Unpredicted" corruptibility or lack of integrity</i>	186
<i>Attitude response: a situation-free evaluative response?</i>	187
<i>Conclusion</i>	190

4. <i>Perturbation and evaluative response contagion: rudiments for a theory of persuasion</i>	191
<i>Persuasion and the evaluative response paradigm</i>	191
<i>Response contagion</i>	193
<i>Perturbation and intensity of prior responses</i>	195
5. <i>A response contagion reinterpretation of some representative persuasion experiments</i>	201
* <i>Mintz and Mills (1971)</i>	201
<i>Festinger and Carlsmith (1959)</i>	203
<i>Janis and King (1954)</i>	205
<i>Zimbardo (1965) and Zimbardo and Ebbesen (1970)</i>	207
<i>Collins and Hoyt (1972)</i>	209
Conclusion	214
References	217
Appendix to chapter one	223
Author Index	231
Subject Index	233