

PhD Seminar in Consumer Psychology
Fall 2021

Time: 10am to 1pm Fridays

Instructor and Contact Information

Professor: Dr. Caleb Warren
e-mail: calebwarren@arizona.edu OR calebwarren12@gmail.com
Phone: 617-240-1749 (this is a backup option; I prefer email)
Office Hours: By appointment

Description of Course

This PhD seminar will introduce students to academic research in consumer psychology. In seven weeks, we will read, discuss, and evaluate articles published in marketing, psychology, and the social sciences.

Objectives and Learning Outcomes:

- Students will gain a basic familiarity with topics and methods used to study consumer psychology.
- Students will learn how to understand, critique, and build upon consumer psychology research published in leading journals.
- Students will better be able to apply theory from consumer psychology to strengthen their own research (regardless of whether they specialize in psychological, sociological, economic, or quantitative research).

Grading

1. Discussion participation: 20%

I expect you to come to class having read all of the required readings and ready to ask questions, answer questions, and share your thoughts about the articles. 20% of your class grade will come from how well you prepare and contribute to the discussions during class.

2. Discussion leadership: 40%

A large part of your grade will come from how effectively you manage the discussion about the readings on which you are the discussion leader. For each paper where you are the discussion leader, you will need to both (a) prepare a lesson plan for class, and (b) create a one-page memory aid to help you and your classmates remember the paper. I provide more detail about both requirements below.

3. Take-home final: 40%

After the last class, I will give you a take-home final. For the final, you will need to review a consumer psychology manuscript. Writing a good review requires a strong understanding of

the literature and is thus both a good way for me to evaluate what you have learned during the semester and good practice for you (as you will likely be writing reviews yourself in a few years). Before completing the take-home final, I recommend that you read (or re-read) Bagchi and colleague's advice on how to write a strong review: Bagchi, R., Block, L., Hamilton, R. W., & Ozanne, J. L. (2017). A field guide for the review process: writing and responding to peer reviews. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 43(5), 860-872.

Grade Scale

- A (90-100%) – exceeds expectations
- B (80-89%) – meets expected standard
- C (70-79%) – below standard

Readings

Each week, I've assigned three types of reading. You will need to read the "Background Reading" and "Discussion Papers" before class. You do not need to read the articles in the "Recommended Reading" section, although I suggest that you do read these at some point, especially if you plan to specialize in consumer psychology.

The purpose of the articles assigned as "Background Reading" is to give you a broader view of the topic that we will be discussing during the week. The "Discussion Papers," in contrast, are empirical papers that tend to focus on narrower research questions.

Students will lead the discussion of the "Discussion Papers." I will assign students to the papers for which they will be the discussion leader at the beginning of the semester.

Leading the Discussion

When you are the discussion leader, read the paper carefully, and then organize a plan to lead a discussion of the paper. The discussion should be interactive. That is, I don't want the discussion leader to be the only student talking. Instead, discussion leaders should raise questions that help the other students understand and debate the article. Discussions should last approximately 30 minutes per paper, and should cover at least some of the following questions:

What is the intended contribution?

- Does it address an important topic?
- Who should change their behavior based on the results?
- How does it differ from previous research?

What is the theory?

- Are the constructs defined and explained?
- Do the conceptual arguments make sense?
- Does the article build on the literature?
- Does the article omit or distort the literature?

What are the methods?

- How well do they operationalize the constructs?

- Are there any confounds/alternative explanations?
- Are there other or better ways to analyze the data?
- What data would provide stronger support for the authors' theory?

What are the limitations and opportunities for future research?

What is one specific idea you can propose based on this paper?

Creating a Memory Aid

After discussing the paper, but before the next seminar, the discussion leader needs to create a one-page infographic or word document that illustrates the research question and key findings in the paper. The purpose of this creation is to help you and your classmates remember the paper we discussed. You can include any visuals or text that you think will help you and others remember the paper, as long as they fit onto a single page. Please save your creation as either a pdf or a word doc and upload it to the shared box folder for the class.

Week 1: Goals

Background Reading:

Stijn M. J. van Osselaer, Suresh Ramanathan, Margaret C. Campbell, Joel B. Cohen, Jeannette K. Dale, Paul M. Herr, Chris Janiszewski, Arie W. Kruglanski, Angela Y. Lee, Stephen J. Read, J. Edward Russo, and Nader T. Tavassoli. (2005). Choice based on goals. *Marketing Letters*, 16(3), 335-346.

Discussion Papers:

Chartrand, T. L., Huber, J., Shiv, B., & Tanner, R. J. (2008). Nonconscious goals and consumer choice. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 35(2), 189-201. **CH**

Durante, K. M., Griskevicius, V., Hill, S. E., Perilloux, C., & Li, N. P. (2011). Ovulation, female competition, and product choice: Hormonal influences on consumer behavior. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 37(6), 921-934. **SF**

Etkin, J. (2016). The hidden cost of personal quantification. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 42(6), 967-984. **PZ**

Tuk, M. A., Prokopec, S., & Van den Bergh, B. (2021). Do versus Don't: The Impact of Framing on Goal-Level Setting. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 47(6), 1003-1024. **WT**

Recommended Reading:

Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. (1982). Control theory: A useful conceptual framework for personality—social, clinical, and health psychology. *Psychological Bulletin*, 92(1), 111.

Higgins, E. T. (1997). Beyond Pleasure and Pain. *American Psychologist*, 52, 1280-1300.

Stanovich, K. E., & West, R. F. (2004). Evolutionary versus instrumental goals: How evolutionary psychology misconceives human rationality. In *Evolution and the Psychology of Thinking* (pp. 176-235). Psychology Press.

Kenrick, D. T., Griskevicius, V., Neuberg, S. L., & Schaller, M. (2010). Renovating the pyramid of needs: Contemporary extensions built upon ancient foundations. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 5(3), 292-314.

Van Osselaer, S. M., & Janiszewski, C. (2012). A goal-based model of product evaluation and choice. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 39(2), 260-292.

Huang, J. Y., & Bargh, J. A. (2014). The selfish goal: Autonomously operating motivational structures as the proximate cause of human judgment and behavior. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 37(2), 121.

Dweck, C. S. (2017). From needs to goals and representations: Foundations for a unified theory of motivation, personality, and development. *Psychological Review*, 124(6), 689.

Touré-Tillery, M., & Fishbach, A. (2018). Three sources of motivation. *Consumer Psychology Review*, 1(1), 123-134.

Week 2: Cognition

Background Reading:

Rabb, N., Fernbach, P. M., & Sloman, S. A. (2019). Individual representation in a community of knowledge. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 23(10), 891-902.

Discussion Papers:

Chernev, A., & Gal, D. (2010). Categorization effects in value judgments: Averaging bias in evaluating combinations of vices and virtues. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 47(4), 738-747.

UA

Sparrow, B., Liu, J., & Wegner, D. M. (2011). Google effects on memory: Cognitive consequences of having information at our fingertips. *Science*, 333(6043), 776-778. **CH**

Ward, A. F., Duke, K., Gneezy, A., & Bos, M. W. (2017). Brain drain: The mere presence of one's own smartphone reduces available cognitive capacity. *Journal of the Association for Consumer Research*, 2(2), 140-154. **LW**

Streicher, M. C., Estes, Z., & Büttner, O. B. (2021). Exploratory Shopping: Attention Affects In-store Exploration and Unplanned Purchasing. *Journal of Consumer Research*. <https://doi-org.ezproxy3.library.arizona.edu/10.1093/jcr/ucaa054> **WT**

Recommended Reading:

Lynch Jr, J. G., & Srull, T. K. (1982). Memory and attentional factors in consumer choice: Concepts and research methods. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 9(1), 18-37.

Keller, K. L. (1993). Conceptualizing, measuring, and managing customer-based brand equity. *Journal of Marketing*, 57(1), 1-22.

Sloman, S. A. (1996). The empirical case for two systems of reasoning. *Psychological Bulletin*, 119(1), 3.

Smith, E. R. (1996). What do connectionism and social psychology offer each other? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70(5), 893.

Read, S. J., Vanman, E. J., & Miller, L. C. (1997). Connectionism, parallel constraint satisfaction processes, and gestalt principles:(Re) introducing cognitive dynamics to social psychology. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 1(1), 26-53.

Barsalou, L. W. (1999). Perceptual symbol systems. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 22(4), 577-660.

Gilbert, D. T., & Wilson, T. D. (2007). Propection: Experiencing the future. *Science*, 317(5843), 1351-1354.

Liberman, N., & Trope, Y. (2008). The psychology of transcending the here and now. *Science*, 322(5905), 1201-1205.

Baumeister, R. F., & Masicampo, E. J. (2010). Conscious thought is for facilitating social and cultural interactions: How mental simulations serve the animal–culture interface. *Psychological Review*, 117(3), 945.

Mercier, H., & Sperber, D. (2011). Why do humans reason? Arguments for an argumentative theory. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 34(2), 57-74.

Week 3: Emotion

Background Reading:

Baumeister Roy F., Kathleen D. Vohs, Nathan DeWall, and Liqing Zhang (2007), “How Emotion Shapes Behavior: Feedback, Anticipation, and Reflection Rather Than Direct Causation,” *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 11, 167-203.

Discussion Readings:

Griskevicius, V., Shiota, M. N., & Nowlis, S. M. (2010). The many shades of rose-colored glasses: An evolutionary approach to the influence of different positive emotions. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 37(2), 238-250. **PZ**

Chang, H. H., & Tuan Pham, M. (2013). Affect as a decision-making system of the present. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 40(1), 42-63. **UA**

Bhattacharjee, A., & Mogilner, C. (2014). Happiness from ordinary and extraordinary experiences. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 41(1), 1-17. **SF**

Duke, K. E., & Amir, O. (2019). Guilt dynamics: Consequences of temporally separating decisions and actions. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 45(6), 1254-1273. **LW**

Recommended Reading:

Holbrook, M. B., & Hirschman, E. C. (1982). The experiential aspects of consumption: Consumer fantasies, feelings, and fun. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 9(2), 132-140.

Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. (1990). Origins and functions of positive and negative affect: a control-process view. *Psychological Review*, 97(1), 19.

Izard, C. E. (1992). Basic Emotions, Relations Among Emotions, and Emotion-Cognition Relations. *Psychological Review*, 99(3), 561-565.

Keltner, D., & Buswell, B. N. (1997). Embarrassment: its distinct form and appeasement functions. *Psychological Bulletin*, 122(3), 250.

Fredrickson, B. L. (2001). The role of positive emotions in positive psychology: The broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions. *American Psychologist*, 56(3), 218.

Han, S., Lerner, J. S., & Keltner, D. (2007). Feelings and consumer decision making: The appraisal-tendency framework. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 17(3), 158-168.

Clore, G. L., & Huntsinger, J. R. (2007). How emotions inform judgment and regulate thought. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 11(9), 393-399.

Lindquist, K. A., Wager, T. D., Kober, H., Bliss-Moreau, E., & Barrett, L. F. (2012). The brain basis of emotion: a meta-analytic review. *The Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 35(3), 121.

Gross, J. J. (2015). Emotion regulation: Current status and future prospects. *Psychological Inquiry*, 26(1), 1-26.

Wondra, J. D., & Ellsworth, P. C. (2015). An appraisal theory of empathy and other vicarious emotional experiences. *Psychological Review*, 122(3), 411.

Warren, C., Barsky, A., & McGraw, A. P. (2018). Humor, comedy, and consumer behavior. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 45(3), 529-552.

Westgate, E. C., & Wilson, T. D. (2018). Boring thoughts and bored minds: The MAC model of boredom and cognitive engagement. *Psychological Review*, 125(5), 689.

Week 4: Attitudes/Persuasion

Background Reading:

Petty, R. E., & Brinol, P. (2008). Persuasion: From single to multiple to metacognitive processes. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 3(2), 137-147.

Discussion Papers:

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(6), 995. **WT**

Laran, J., Dalton, A. N., & Andrade, E. B. (2011). The curious case of behavioral backlash: Why brands produce priming effects and slogans produce reverse priming effects. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 37(6), 999-1014. **CH**

Cian, L., Longoni, C., & Krishna, A. (2020). Advertising a Desired Change: When Process Simulation Fosters (vs. Hinders) Credibility and Persuasion. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 57(3), 489-508. **PZ**

Wang, X. S., Lu, S., Li, X. I., Khamitov, M., & Bendle, N. (2021). Audio Mining: The Role of Vocal Tone in Persuasion. *Journal of Consumer Research*. <https://doi-org.ezproxy3.library.arizona.edu/10.1093/jcr/ucab012> **SF**

Recommended Reading:

Fazio, R. H. (1990). Multiple processes by which attitudes guide behavior: The MODE model as an integrative framework. In *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 23, pp. 75-109). Academic Press.

Friestad, M., & Wright, P. (1994). The persuasion knowledge model: How people cope with persuasion attempts. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 21(1), 1-31.

Wilson, T. D., Lindsey, S., & Schooler, T. Y. (2000). A model of dual attitudes. *Psychological Review*, 107(1), 101.

Gawronski, B., & Bodenhausen, G. V. (2006). Associative and propositional processes in evaluation: an integrative review of implicit and explicit attitude change. *Psychological Bulletin*, 132(5), 692.

Kruglanski, A. W., Jasko, K., Chernikova, M., Milyavsky, M., Babush, M., Baldner, C., & Pierro, A. (2015). The rocky road from attitudes to behaviors: Charting the goal systemic course of actions. *Psychological Review*, 122(4), 598.

Ledgerwood, A., Eastwick, P. W., & Smith, L. K. (2018). Toward an integrative framework for studying human evaluation: Attitudes toward objects and attributes. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 22(4), 378-398.

Week 5: Identity

Background Reading:

Berger, J. A., Heath, C., & Ho, B. (2005). Divergence in cultural practices: Tastes as signals of identity. Unpublished manuscript: https://repository.upenn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1386&context=marketing_papers

Discussion Papers:

Griskevicius, V., Tybur, J. M., & Van den Bergh, B. (2010). Going green to be seen: status, reputation, and conspicuous conservation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 98(3), 392. **CH**

Warren, C., & Mohr, G. S. (2019). Ironic consumption. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 46(2), 246-266. **SF**

Grewal, L., Stephen, A. T., & Coleman, N. V. (2019). When posting about products on social media backfires: the negative effects of consumer identity signaling on product interest. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 56(2), 197-210. **UA**

Bellezza, S., & Berger, J. (2020). Trickle-Round Signals: When Low Status Is Mixed with High. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 47(1), 100-127. **LW**

Background Reading:

Blanton, H., & Christie, C. (2003). Deviance regulation: A theory of action and identity. *Review of General Psychology*, 7(2), 115-149.

Baumeister, R. F. (2010). *The self*. In R. F. Baumeister & E. J. Finkel (Eds.), *Advanced social psychology: The state of the science* (p. 139–175). Oxford University Press.

Leonardelli, G. J., Pickett, C. L., & Brewer, M. B. (2010). Optimal distinctiveness theory: A framework for social identity, social cognition, and intergroup relations. In *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 43, pp. 63-113). Academic Press.

Reed II, A., Forehand, M. R., Puntoni, S., & Warlop, L. (2012). Identity-based consumer behavior. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 29(4), 310-321.

Anderson, C., Hildreth, J. A. D., & Howland, L. (2015). Is the desire for status a fundamental human motive? A review of the empirical literature. *Psychological Bulletin*, 141(3), 574.

Baumeister, R. F. (2019). Stalking the true self through the jungles of authenticity: Problems, contradictions, inconsistencies, disturbing findings—And a possible way forward. *Review of General Psychology*, 23(1), 143-154.

Week 6: Social Influence

Background Reading:

Argo, J. J. (2020). A contemporary review of three types of social influence in consumer psychology. *Consumer Psychology Review*, 3(1), 126-140.

Discussion Articles:

Salganik, M. J., Dodds, P. S., & Watts, D. J. (2006). Experimental study of inequality and unpredictability in an artificial cultural market. *Science*, 311(5762), 854-856. **WT**

Goldstein, N. J., Cialdini, R. B., & Griskevicius, V. (2008). A room with a viewpoint: Using social norms to motivate environmental conservation in hotels. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 35(3), 472-482. **PZ**

Chen, Z. (2017). Social acceptance and word of mouth: How the motive to belong leads to divergent WOM with strangers and friends. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 44(3), 613-632. **LW**

Valsesia, F., Proserpio, D., & Nunes, J. C. (2020). The positive effect of not following others on social media. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 57(6), 1152-1168. **UA**

Background Reading:

Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117(3), 497-529.

Cialdini, R. B., & Trost, M. R. (1998). *Social influence: Social norms, conformity and compliance*. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The Handbook of Social Psychology* (p. 151–192). McGraw-Hill.

Tetlock, P. E. (2002). Social functionalist frameworks for judgment and choice: intuitive politicians, theologians, and prosecutors. *Psychological Review*, 109(3), 451.

Kenrick, D. T., Li, N. P., & Butner, J. (2003). Dynamical evolutionary psychology: Individual decision rules and emergent social norms. *Psychological Review*, 110(1), 3.

Claidière, N., & Whiten, A. (2012). Integrating the study of conformity and culture in humans and nonhuman animals. *Psychological Bulletin*, 138(1), 126.

Chartrand, T. L., & Lakin, J. L. (2013). The antecedents and consequences of human behavioral mimicry. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 64, 285-308.

Berger, J. (2014). Word of mouth and interpersonal communication: A review and directions for future research. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 24(4), 586-607.

Li, R., Gordon, S., & Gelfand, M. J. (2017). Tightness–looseness: A new framework to understand consumer behavior. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 27(3), 377-391.

Legros, S., & Cislighi, B. (2020). Mapping the social-norms literature: An overview of reviews. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 15(1), 62-80.

Week 7: Morality

Background Reading:

Rai, T. S., & Fiske, A. P. (2011). Moral psychology is relationship regulation: moral motives for unity, hierarchy, equality, and proportionality. *Psychological Review*, 118(1), 57.

Discussion Articles:

Mazar, N., Amir, O., & Ariely, D. (2008). The dishonesty of honest people: A theory of self-concept maintenance. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 45(6), 633-644. **WT**

Bhattacharjee, A., J. Z. Berman, & A. Reed (2013), "Tip of The Hat, Wag of The Finger: How Moral Decoupling Enables Consumers to Admire and Admonish," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 39(6), 1167 – 1184. **CH**

Gill, T. (2020). Blame it on the self-driving car: how autonomous vehicles can alter consumer morality. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 47(2), 272-291. **SF**

Jami, A., Kouchaki, M., & Gino, F. (2021). I Own, So I Help Out: How Psychological Ownership Increases Prosocial Behavior. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 47(5), 698-715. **PZ**

Background Reading:

Haidt, J. (2001). The emotional dog and its rational tail: a social intuitionist approach to moral judgment. *Psychological Review*, 108(4), 814.

Fehr, E., & Fischbacher, U. (2004). Social norms and human cooperation. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 8(4), 185-190.

Tomasello, M., & Vaish, A. (2013). Origins of human cooperation and morality. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 64, 231-255.

Graham, J., Haidt, J., Koleva, S., Motyl, M., Iyer, R., Wojcik, S. P., & Ditto, P. H. (2013). Moral foundations theory: The pragmatic validity of moral pluralism. In *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (Vol. 47, pp. 55-130). Academic Press.

Norenzayan, A., Shariff, A. F., Gervais, W. M., Willard, A. K., McNamara, R. A., Slingerland, E., & Henrich, J. (2016). The cultural evolution of prosocial religions. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 39.

Ellemers, an der Toorn, Paunov & van Leeuwen (2019), "The psychology of morality: A review and analysis of empirical studies published 1940 – 2017," *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 23 (4), 332-366.

University Policies

Threatening Behavior Policy

The UA Threatening Behavior by Students Policy prohibits threats of physical harm to any member of the University community, including to oneself. See <http://policy.arizona.edu/education-and-student-affairs/threatening-behavior-students>.

Code of Academic Integrity

Students are encouraged to share intellectual views and discuss freely the principles and applications of course materials. However, graded work/exercises must be the product of independent effort unless otherwise instructed. Students are expected to adhere to the UA Code of Academic Integrity as described in the UA General Catalog.

See <http://deanofstudents.arizona.edu/codeofacademicintegrity>

<http://deanofstudents.arizona.edu/academic-integrity/students/academic-integrity>. The University Libraries have some excellent tips for avoiding plagiarism, available at <http://www.library.arizona.edu/help/tutorials/plagiarism/index.html>.

UA Nondiscrimination and Anti-harassment Policy

The University is committed to creating and maintaining an environment free of discrimination; see <http://policy.arizona.edu/human-resources/nondiscrimination-and-anti-harassment-policy>

Our classroom is a place where everyone is encouraged to express well-formed opinions and their reasons for those opinions. We also want to create a tolerant and open environment where such opinions can be expressed without resorting to bullying or discrimination of others.

Subject to Change Statement

Information contained in the course syllabus, other than the grade and absence policy, may be subject to change with advance notice, as deemed appropriate by the instructor.