

**Changing Attitudes in Public Discourse  
Workshop 2**

Friday 20<sup>th</sup> October 2017  
Room 2.01, Psychology Department, 10 West Buildings,  
University of Bath

**FINAL PROGRAMME**

**11.30-11:45 Coffee/Tea and Arrivals (Room 2.01)**

**12.15-13.00 Lunch**

**13.00-13.15 Presentation of the workshop objectives (Greg Maio)**

**13.15-15.40 Work shop Talks (Room 2.47)**

**13.20- 13.40 Matthew Rocklage, North Western University (Kellog).**

**Title: The Evaluative Lexicon: The measurement of emotionality, extremity, and valence in language**

**Summary:** The Evaluative Lexicon (EL) is a quantitative linguistic approach to measuring the emotionality, extremity, and valence of individuals' reactions and attitudes. I provide an introduction to the EL, its uses, and a selection of findings regarding the associated consequences of attitude emotionality.

**13.40- 14.00 Anat Bardi University of London**

**Title: Understanding the motivational bases of unethicity**

**Summary:** The talk will show how the circle of the Schwartz (1992) values can help us understand the motivational bases of unethicity including different types of unethicity. Implications to arrogance in debate will be discussed.

**14.00-14.20 Malgorzata (Gosia) Gocłowska, University of Bath**

**Title: The helpful and unhelpful role of open-mindedness in public debate**

**Summary:** Psychologists understand open- and closed-mindedness as personality traits underpinning people's views on diversity, innovation and on societal issues. But open- and closed-mindedness are more than that. Open-mindedness is a social value that people aspire to, and a norm that they fear violating. In addition, the terms "open" and "closed-minded" can serve as labels or social categories dividing people into "good" and "bad" or similar and dissimilar from ourselves. In this talk I will try to capture when and what kind of open-mindedness can be helpful, and when and what kind of open-mindedness can be *unhelpful* in debate.

**14:20-14.40 Coffee/tea break**

**14.40-15.00 Rob Holland, Radboud University, Nijmegen**

**Title: Overcoming arrogance: some lessons from the literature on implicit and explicit attitudes**

**Summary:** The talk will focus on interpersonal attitudes as explaining arrogant behaviour, both displayed verbally and/or non-verbally. These attitudes may bias behaviour either implicitly or explicitly. Finally, I will provide some ideas to counter these biases from attitudes, derived from research on affect, control and self-affirmation.

**15.00- 15.20 Tim Kurz, University of Bath**

**Title: Might one person's arrogance be another person's moral conviction?**

**Summary:** Arguably one of the biggest challenges in social psychology (and the social sciences more broadly) is that our topics of investigation are almost inescapably ideologically and morally laden. One might suggest that notions such as 'arrogance' are no different in this regard. Attempts to develop ways of 'spotting' arrogance when it occurs and/or reduce its prevalence within social interaction are likely to inevitably bump up against the 'context' problem. Namely, is the same (para) linguistic action always going to be attributed equivalent properties (e.g. humility, arrogance) across different contexts of debate? I briefly discuss some recent experimental work investigating how (potentially 'arrogant') interpersonal confrontation in two domains (climate change and racism) are perceived by those bearing witness to the interaction. In doing so, I seek to highlight potential challenges that are inherent not only in deciding what counts as 'arrogance', but also in deciding whether or not we should even necessarily be seeking to reduce it.

**15.20-15.40 Travis Proulx, University of Cardiff**

**Title: Invalid beliefs: Genetic essentialism and the reporting of political psychology.**

**Summary:** In recent years, the focus of political psychology has shifted towards supposed genetic traits that characterize political conservatives. These traits are understood as atavistic responses to threat and uncertainty, and media reporting of political psychology has emphasized this portrayal. I'll discuss the acceptability and consequences of portraying this social category in denigrating genetic terms.

**15.40- 17.30 Tea/coffee and discussions (Room 2.01)**

**18.00 Drinks/dinner at Aqua in Bath**