

FOREWARNING, DEFENSIVE STRATEGIES, AND NARRATIVE PERSUASION

Jordan Carpenter

A dissertation submitted to the faculty of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the
Department of Psychology

Chapel Hill
2013

Approved by:

Melanie Green

Chet Insko

Keith Payne

Kurt Gray

Joe Lowman

ABSTRACT

JORDAN CARPENTER: Forewarning, defensive strategies, and narrative persuasion
(Under the direction of Melanie Green)

Narrative transportation is a process of emotional, cognitive, and mental imagery engagement with a story, which often results in greater agreement with that story's themes (e.g., Green & Brock, 2000). Previous research (e.g., Green & Donahue, 2011) has shown that people are often unwilling or unable to resist narrative persuasion, despite a motivation to do so. The current studies directly examine different defensive strategies to resist narrative persuasion. Study 1 directed participants to adopt strategies to either attempt to remain unaffected by a narrative or to actively counterargue counter-attitudinal themes of the narrative. It found that, contrary to the hypothesis, preparing counterarguments may be more effective than attempting to remain emotionally unaffected, although neither strategy entirely eliminated persuasion. Study 2 attempted to demonstrate that people spontaneously are less transported into a story after being previously warned of the author's persuasive intent, but are more transported when warned of the topics and themes advocated by a persuasive narrative. Again, the hypotheses were not confirmed. Possible reasons for the studies' failures are discussed, as well as findings that may be useful for future research.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Sincere and powerful gratitude is extended to my adviser, Melanie Green and my colleagues Joe Simons, John Donahue, Jenna Clark, and Keenan Jenkins. I also thank Brooke Magnus, who aided with analysis on this project. Finally, I would like to especially thank my parents, Jo and James Carpenter.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLESv
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION.1
II. STUDY 1	11
III. STUDY 2	23
IV. GENERAL DISCUSSION	32
ENDNOTES	37
APPENDICES	44
REFERENCES	67

LIST OF TABLES

2.1. Mean attitude responses by condition in Study 1 (with standard deviations in parentheses)	38
2.2. Mean monetary donation by condition in Study 1 (with standard deviations in parentheses)	39
2.3. Means of transportation, character response survey, and subjective resistance in Study 1 (with standard deviations in parentheses)	40
3.1. Mean attitude responses by condition in Study 1 (with standard deviations in parentheses)	41
3.2. Mean monetary donation by condition in Study 1 (with standard deviations in parentheses)	42
3.3. Means of transportation, character response survey, and subjective resistance in Study 1 (with standard deviations in parentheses)	43

Introduction

Ray Bradbury's 1953 novel *Fahrenheit 451* describes a dystopian future in which literature is considered so dangerous and subversive, it is legally mandated to be incinerated upon discovery, to keep the ideas contained in books from damaging or challenging the status quo. In real life, however, people have far more mundane defenses against unwanted narrative persuasion. The purpose of these studies is to look at the strategies people use to protect themselves from counterattitudinal themes in stories.

Narrative Transportation

Narrative transportation is a state of emotional, cognitive, and mental imagery immersion in a narrative (e.g. Gerrig, 1993). This immersion is often enjoyable and enriching (Oatley & Gholamain, 1997). Importantly, transportation has been shown to also lead people to agree more readily with the themes of a story (Green & Brock, 2000). Narratives are effective at communicating a variety of attitudes (e.g., inspiring healthy behaviors; Green 2006), and are potentially powerful, resulting in attitudes that grow stronger over time (Appel & Richter, 2007). Narrative persuasion is an important phenomenon for communicating pro-social or healthy behaviors, a technique called entertainment-education (Singhal & Rogers, 1999) For instance, embedding information and appeals about AIDS in a popular Tanzanian radio drama had effects on listeners' number of sexual partners, condom use, and willingness to discuss sexually transmitted diseases (Vaughan, Rogers, Singhal, & Swelehe, 2000). Narrative transportation also is effective in an advertising context (Wang & Calder, 2006). Transportation can also affect

political attitudes and lead to greater support for controversial government policies if a story's themes are relevant to those policies (Slater, Routner, & Long, 2009).

Narrative transportation appears to operate under different mechanisms from traditional persuasion: despite deep attention paid to the story, transported individuals' immersion often leads them to passively accept the stories' themes or facts. Under the framework of the elaboration likelihood model, personal relevance will often make people more attentive toward arguments (higher elaboration), resulting in increased persuasion if those arguments are strong and reduced persuasion if the arguments are weak (Petty & Cacioppo, 1986). However, Green (2004) found that a personally relevant connection to the content of a story increased the perceived realism of the story, transportation, and subsequent attitude change, despite the fact that the story's themes were not phrased explicitly as the kind of high-quality arguments typically found in attitude research. Rather, the attitudes were implied by story events.

In the context of self-referencing, Escalas (2004) found that wording an advertisement in a transporting way led to greater persuasion even when the ad contained weak arguments: participants engaged in the advertisement, but not in a way that facilitated elaborative processing. Also, transported individuals have been shown to be generally unwilling or unable to distinguish between weak and strong persuasive arguments within a transporting story (Escalas, 2007). Green, Garst, & Brock (2004) speculate that the narrative form serves as a cue to engage with the information in a relatively uncritical manner.

Dal Cin, Zanna, & Fong (2004) suggest that narratives, unlike traditional persuasion techniques, present attitudes without readers or viewers being aware an

attitude appeal has been made. However, even if one is aware of narratives' potential persuasiveness, one will not necessarily choose to raise defenses. The well-established third-person effect illuminates this lack of defense. The third-person effect describes the phenomenon that people often readily believe that mass-mediated messages will profoundly affect naïve, weak targets (such as children), but believe themselves to be relatively immune to such influence (e.g., Davidson, 1983; Perloff, 1993). Therefore, attempts to ban or restrict messages are not performed out of a perceived threat to one's own attitudes, but rather concern about the effect of the message on others. This is because people generally believe themselves to not be in danger of unwanted persuasion. Implicit in this theory is the idea that people do consider narratives to potentially be effective at persuasion, but that they themselves have successful strategies for avoiding it.

However, readers transported into a story are often unable to bring seemingly important information to bear. Research has found that even when readers dislike the author of a story, and indeed even when that dislike causes them to be motivated to correct against any influence, narrative persuasion still occurs (Green & Donahue, 2011). Similarly, labeling a speech as fact increased critical scrutiny towards it compared to when it was labeled fiction, but that did not affect its persuasive impact (Green, Garst, Brock, & Chung, 2006). Within the context of narratives, Strange and Leung (1999) found that labeling a story as fiction or fact did not affect readers' subsequent attitudes toward a relevant social issue; they were persuaded regardless of the fact/fiction label. Generally, when transported into a narrative, people sometimes seem unable or unwilling to correct for contextual information when later considering that narrative's themes.

Given this lack of correction, it may be useful to examine how people react to an explicit warning about a story's persuasive nature before encountering it.

Forewarning Effects

Previous research indicates that people are more likely to remain unpersuaded in the face of a persuasive appeal when forewarned of the author's intent and the object of attempted persuasion (e.g., Quinn & Wood, 2004). Proactively warning people of potential future persuasion has been shown to have real-world consequences in a number of attitude-relevant domains, such as increasing health behavior by reducing the effectiveness of peer-imposed pro-smoking appeals (e.g., Botvin & Kantor, 2000), and increasing skepticism toward misleading political ads (Cappella & Jamieson, 1994). An important aspect of forewarning is its motivational aspect: it operates by triggering resistant mindsets and motivations to hold accurate attitudes, appear unbiased, and keep from having one's important values unduly altered (Wood & Quinn, 2003). Thus, forewarning works best when the subsequent appeal involves a highly self-relevant issue; in this case, a warning allows people to resist even a strong counterattitudinal argument (e.g. Allyn & Festinger, 1961; Chen, Reardon, Rea, & Moore, 1992).

Types of forewarning. Sometimes, forewarning involves informing people of the subject of a persuasive appeal prior to exposure. In this case, participants often engage in pre-emptive counterarguing, allowing them to prepare adequate responses to anticipated arguments as they are encountered, a process that is motivated and conscious (Petty & Cacioppo, 1977). To be maximally effective, such a warning should be followed by a delay, which gives people time to develop and prepare counterarguments against the

expected appeal; providing no delay or distracting participants during this time precludes the generation and rehearsal of useful counterarguments (e.g., Petty, 1977).

In other cases, researchers merely forewarn persuasive intent on the part of the source of an upcoming communication. The knowledge of this intent can inspire resistance by creating reactance, wherein people act out against perceived external control out of a desire to maintain their autonomy even without knowing the topic (Haas & Grady, 1975). For instance, forewarning can reduce the effectiveness of advertisements because it creates negative feelings toward the advertiser, which then spread to the content of the message (Lee, 2010). Also, knowing that a source intends persuasion may make the appeal seem biased, and participants can attempt to resist out of a motivation to hold objectively correct attitudes. For example, this type of warning can serve as a discounting cue of the information in a subsequent appeal (e.g. Watts & Holt, 1979).

Transportation and Forewarning

Previous work on persuasion has found that, when people receive a highly persuasive message with which they disagree, their level of resistance is at least partly dependent on their concentrated, active, engagement in that message. Their failure to do so (for instance, because of distraction) results in greater acceptance of the advocated position (Festinger & Maccoby, 1964). With traditional types of persuasion, this distraction outcome implies that lower engagement with and attention to a counterattitudinal appeal will lead to higher acceptance, due to reduced counterarguing. However, greater engagement with a narrative, at least in the form of transportation, tends to lead to greater persuasion (Green & Brock, 2000). It may be the case that even participants who are warned about a forthcoming narrative's counterattitudinal elements

and given the chance to create counterarguments will lose the ability to properly apply those arguments once they engage with the story.

In fact, it is possible that participants motivated to counterargue themes in a narrative they expect to read will ironically only become more transported as a result due to their failure to remain detached from the characters or images in the story. Warned participants are motivated to attend to a forthcoming attack on their attitudes, but when attending deeply to a well-written story, they may be unable to properly utilize the evaluative mindset of counterarguing and instead fall into the immersive mindset of transportation.

One alternate hypothesis is that the relationship between attempting to counterargue with a story's themes and subsequently being transported into that story are moderated by a person's tendency to be transported overall, an individual difference which has been termed transportability. Transportability has been measured in studies previously using the transportability scale (e.g. Mazzocco, Green, Sasota, & Jones, 2010; see also Dal Cin, Zanna, & Fong, 2004). Individuals who are low in trait transportability may be able to maintain a counterarguing mindset and engage with the material without being transported, but those high in trait transportability may not be able to counterargue narrative themes without being drawn in.

There is some evidence that people may have difficulty rejecting narrative-based information even when they are warned that it is inaccurate. Cognitive psychology studies focusing on the effect of misinformation in narratives have shown that people will believe false facts in a story even when warned beforehand that some may be present (Marsh & Fazio, 2006), and even when those false facts are highlighted (Eslick, Fazio, &

Marsh, 2011). These results imply that simple knowledge about deceptive features of stories will not help reduce their influence over readers; likewise, transported individuals may respond similarly to themes within a story, even when warned of their persuasive influence. Finally, the above-mentioned third-person effect (Davidson, 1983) implies that people might have false confidence about their own ability to resist being persuaded compared to others, making them less likely across the board to raise defenses in response to a communication even when aware it could be persuasive. This finding may imply that people exert less effort when attempting to counterargue a narrative than a persuasive argument.

At the same time, forewarnings that successfully reduce people's tendencies to be transported into a story in the first place may be more successful at reducing persuasion. Previous research has found that high trait advertising skepticism led participants to distinguish between weak and strong arguments even when those arguments were presented in a transporting context (Escalas, 2004). However, it is yet unclear whether such skepticism would lead people to spontaneously be untransported outside of an advertising context, or if being untransported is a useful strategy for a story that does not contain clear arguments, but rather implies its themes. Furthermore, the materials used in the Escalas (2004) study used a mental simulation paradigm, wherein the advertisements specifically directed readers to imagine themselves using the product; most persuasive narratives are far more subtle in the manner in which readers are drawn in, and therefore people may be less enthusiastic in their defenses.

Potential Moderators

The current studies will test the extent to which people attempt to remain untransported when warned of an author's persuasive intent, and to counterargue when warned of a forthcoming narrative's counterattitudinal themes. It is important to consider variables that may moderate people's ability to successfully invoke their attempted defensive strategies.

Mind-Reading Motivation. Carpenter, Green, and Vacharkulksemsuk (in preparation) found that narrative engagement and persuasion were positively related to individuals' trait tendency to put effort into considering others' perspectives and mental states, a concept known as Mind-Reading Motivation. Mind-Reading Motivation predicts people's tendencies to attend to and exert effort towards speculating about other people's minds, and it is measured using a 13-item scale, which has been found to have good reliability and validity (Carpenter et al., in preparation). An example item is "When I meet new people, I often find myself wondering how they got to where they are in life." Relevant to the current studies, Mind-Reading Motivation is also associated with greater liking of reading fiction. We expect to replicate the overall effect of higher Mind-Reading Motivation being associated with more transportation.

However, the characters are not the only relevant minds to which readers of a narrative can attend; a reader can also consider the perspective of the author. Previous research has found that people who are higher in Mind-Reading Motivation also tend to be more attentive to persuasive appeals that explicitly emerged from another person's mind: when an appeal is specifically framed as emanating from people's perspectives, participants high in Mind-Reading Motivation distinguished between strong and weak

arguments more readily than those low in Mind-Reading Motivation (Carpenter & Green, under review). This greater attention to the intentions of the source may imply that Mind-Reading Motivation will be a moderator in these studies because people high in Mind-Reading Motivation are more likely to attend to the intentions of the author when their attention is drawn to it (intention being a feature of another person's mindset). Therefore, those people may be more sensitive to a warning of author's persuasive intent than people low in Mind-Reading Motivation.

Need for Cognition. Need for Cognition (Cacioppo & Petty, 1982), the innate tendency to enjoy engaging in mental effort, may also be important. All else being equal, people high in need for cognition should be more willing and more able to engage in counterarguments, implying that this trait may moderate the effect of any manipulation meant to affect counterarguing.

Transportability. Most directly, participants' trait transportability (Mazzocco, Green, Sasota, & Jones, 2010) may moderate these effects, as noted above. Minimally transportable people may be especially able to resist the persuasive effect of stories when motivated to do so, while people who by nature are easily drawn in to narratives may find it especially difficult to engage with a narrative without getting drawn in and subsequently persuaded.

The Current Studies

The purpose of the current studies is to examine the effect of different types of forewarning on narrative persuasion in an attempt to illuminate how people attempt to defend themselves from the influence of stories. As demonstrated by Green & Brock (2000), one way to engage with the content of a narrative but not be persuaded by its

themes is to avoid being transported in the first place. It is plausible that people forewarned about the persuasive intent of a forthcoming narrative will be more skeptical, resulting in less transportation and therefore less persuasion.

Meanwhile, participants forewarned about the specific topic of a narrative (and motivated to avoid persuasion) will attempt to engage more deeply into the story to counterargue the expected appeal. However, this attempted defense will lead to greater transportation and greater persuasion, despite the motivation of the participant, especially for people who are easily drawn in to stories.

In Study 1, participants will be directed to adopt strategies of either remaining untransported or counterarguing to demonstrate the effects of these defenses. Study 2 will attempt to demonstrate that topic forewarning will increase transportation by motivating counterarguing strategies, but intent warnings will reduce transportation. Importantly, even if Study 1 finds that counterarguing is the more successful technique, Study 2 can still illuminate what warnings elicit that more advantageous strategy.

In both studies, the narrative will be the same. “Jimmy’s World” is a newspaper article in narrative form about a young boy addicted to heroin (Cooke, 1980). This story has been used in transportation research (i.e., Green & Donahue, 2011), and it has been found to be transporting under normal circumstances. However, its themes (that efforts should be put in place to keep children from using dangerous drugs; that urban conditions are dangerous and predatory) will likely be mildly counterattitudinal to participants, who will probably agree that drug abuse is bad but will not be likely to accept that young children use heroin often enough for it to be a social problem.

Study 1

Study 1 will attempt to directly manipulate counterarguing and resisting transportation, the strategies assumed to be used by participants given different types of forewarning.

Materials and methods

Participants were first administered individual difference measures. Then, participants were warned about a forthcoming narrative's persuasive intent and topic and then given two different strategies to defend themselves: either they were told to attempt to counterargue expected appeals, or they were instructed to keep from being transported

Afterward, participants were measured in their agreement with themes and attitudes contained within the narrative, asked about their transportation into the story, and given a demographic survey.¹

Introduction. All participants were given the following warning: "Later in this study, you will read a short piece, which was originally published in Sunday Magazine in 2010. The piece posits that young children (elementary school age) are often in danger of being addicted to hard drugs. The article argues that people living in poor communities often experience desperation and hardship. These environmental stressors, which often go back generations, have negative impacts on health and parenting, which in turn makes children in these communities more likely to become addicted to hard drugs.

Because of this immediate danger to children, it focuses on the need for ALL citizens to support social programs which alleviate the social conditions that allow drug

abuse to spread among young children, even if that means giving up other beneficial social programs, such as those that benefit senior citizens, veterans, and the out-of-work.”

Manipulations. There were three sets of instructions:

Counterargument intervention: “We are interested in how different mental strategies help people to respond to articles. Therefore, for the next few minutes, please write down any negative thoughts that might occur to you about the issues and arguments you expect to encounter in the piece. That is, think of arguments or issues that might be raised in the piece, and write down some reasons you DISAGREE with them. Prepare a series of thoughts you can use AGAINST the arguments used in the piece. Then, while you read the piece, try to use what you’ve written down against the issues you encounter.”

No-transportation intervention: “We are interested in how different mental strategies affect people’s experience of reading articles. Therefore, for the next few minutes, please think about narratives, like the one in the article you will read. Please write down things you could do to keep from getting too drawn into this story. That is, write down reactions or thoughts you could have while reading a narrative that would keep you from being too immersed. Finally, while you read the article, USE the techniques you've written to keep from being drawn into THAT story. Do your best to use the techniques as you read. ”

No intervention (control condition): “For the next few minutes, please write down any thoughts you might have about magazines. That is, write down any associations or opinions you have about magazines.”

Baseline attitudes condition: This condition included the no intervention instructions. However, these participants completed the attitudes measures before receiving the instructions and the story.

Narrative. “Jimmy’s World” is a newspaper article in narrative form about a young boy addicted to heroin (Cooke, 1980). It is 2,009 words long, and it focuses on the boy's family life, especially his mother's boyfriend Ron, who is also a heroin user. "Jimmy's World" is included in Appendix A.

Dependent variables. Participants completed dependent variables in the order listed below (Study 1 questionnaires are included in Appendix B).

Initial thought listing. Participants wrote down their thoughts in response to the instructions.

Attitude survey. This set consisted of 22 statements created to represent themes professed in the narrative, and was heavily based on a set of items developed specifically for Jimmy's World by Green and Donahue (2011). Participants rated their agreement with each item on a 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*) scale. Example items are "People convicted of taking hard drugs should always be given the option of drug counseling," and "People who provide illegal drugs to young children should be severely punished." A single item, "Drugs are a race problem," was determined to likely possess important and strongly-held associations unrelated to the narrative, so it was deleted from analysis.

Due to the wide variety of themes contained within the narrative, the attitude items were separated according to theoretical differences. There were three large categories of items: First, a series of nine items reflected a focus on contextual factors,

such as bad parenting, which may influence someone to use drugs (Context). A second series of seven items endorsed sympathy for people addicted to drugs (Sympathy). Finally, a series of four items indicated a willingness to help the poor (Helping). All three of the smaller sets of attitude items, Context, $\alpha = .72$, Sympathy, $\alpha = .77$, and Helping, $\alpha = .79$, showed good reliability. The items within each were averaged to create single dependent variables. The make-up of all three item sets can be found in Appendix C.

Monetary donation. To assess prosocial attitudes in a more subtle manner, participants were told that their participation caused \$10.00 to be donated to charity and that they would be able to choose how. Participants were then given a set of five charities and freely allowed to divide up the \$10.00 among them.

The key variable was money donated to The Albright Center, a fictional charity whose stated goal was to "provide rehabilitation and career counseling to teenage drug users."

Narrative Transportation scale (Green & Brock, 2000). This is a 16-item questionnaire measuring transportation into "Jimmy's World." Participants rate their agreement with statements on a scale from 1 (*not at all*) to 7 (*very much*). Sample items are "The narrative affected me emotionally" and "I wanted to learn how the narrative ended."

Character response survey. This questionnaire was intended to measure emotional response to the characters in the story. It consisted of 8 statements assessing responses to the specific characters in the story. These statements were rated on a scale

from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree), and an example item is "I feel protectiveness toward Jimmy."

Participants were also directly asked to rate their level of emotion toward the three main characters of the story on a scale from 1 (no emotion at all) to 7 (very strong emotion). These items tapped any emotional response and were not focused on any specific emotional reactions.

For this survey, one item was dropped because in retrospect it did not relate to an emotional response to the characters, "Jimmy's situation is part of a larger trend, rather than a result of special circumstances." The subsequent set of ten items showed good reliability, $\alpha = .83$, and were averaged to create a single variable.

Narrative thought listing. Participants were given the chance to write any reactions to the story.

Story quiz. This was a quiz of ten factual questions about *Jimmy's World*. Sample questions are, "What is the name of the main character of the story?" and "What object does the main character hold in the last scene of the story?" Participants were considered to have failed this quiz if they answered two or more questions incorrectly.

Manipulation checks.

Instructions check. This item asked participants, "Which of the following is closest to the instructions you were given at the beginning of the story?" with three of the options matching the manipulations: "To write down ways to keep from getting immersed in the story," "To write down thoughts about magazines in general," and "To write down thoughts against the arguments I expected to encounter in the story" (the fourth option, "To write down interpretations about the author of the story," conformed to

no manipulations and is simply a trap answer for participants who remember nothing of the instructions).

Subjective resistance. Participants were asked their subjective sense of how difficult they found the instructions: “How easy was it to follow the instructions you were given before the story?” on a scale from 1 (*very hard*) to 7 (*very easy*). They were also asked their subjective level of resistance: “Did you try to prevent the article you read from affecting your beliefs and opinions?” on a scale of 1 (*not at all*) to 7 (*very much*).

Individual differences.

Mind-reading motivation scale (MRM; Carpenter, Green, & Vacharkulksemsuk, under review). This 13-item scale measures participants’ trait tendency to put effort toward speculating about other people’s mental states. It is measured on a 7-point scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). An example item is “When I see two strangers arguing, I often catch myself speculating about what their problem is.” Because MRM is related to an interest in people’s intentions and thoughts, we expect people with high MRM to be drawn deeper into the characters’ thoughts and therefore more transported, regardless of condition.

General transportability (Mazzocco, Green, Sasota, & Jones, 2010). This four-item scale asks participants to rate their own tendencies toward being transported into narratives on a scale from 1 (not at all) to 7 (very much). An example item is “Characters in stories can seem real to me.”²

Participants

Participants were 87 undergraduates (40 male, 46 female, 1 declined to indicate sex) completing the experiment for class credit.

One participant missed the manipulation check but was not eliminated from analysis due to an earlier thought listing that indicated understanding of the instructions. Furthermore, 21 participants failed the memory check, but because intentionally refusing to attend to details in a story may actually be a valid way of remaining distant from a story, these participants were also not eliminated from analysis.³

Hypotheses

There are three hypotheses for Study 1:

H1. Participants given the counterarguing intervention or no intervention will show more persuasion than participants who were not exposed to the story.

H2. Participants given the no-transportation intervention will show lower transportation than participants given the counterarguing intervention or no intervention.

H3. The effect in hypothesis 2 will be moderated by trait transportability, such that individuals low in transportability will be less transported than individuals high in transportability in the counterarguing condition.

I expected each of the DVs (Context, Sympathy, Helping items and the monetary donation) to follow the pattern described above.

Results

Attitudes. The means for each of the three sets of attitude items are in Table 2.1.

For each dependent variable, the effect of condition was assessed by one-way ANOVAs.

For the Context attitude items, condition had a significant effect on participants' responses, $F(3, 83) = 10.00, p < .01$. According to Least Significant Difference post-hoc tests, the means of the counterargument condition, the no-transportation condition, and

the no intervention condition were all significantly greater than that of the baseline attitudes condition. These results indicate that *all* the participants who read the story showed stronger endorsement of the Context items than participants who did not read the narrative.

The manipulation had a significant overall influence on the Sympathy items, $F(3, 83) = 3.52, p = .02$. The least-significant difference post-hoc test revealed that neither membership in the no-intervention condition nor in the no-transportation condition was associated with different responses from that of the baseline attitudes group, counter to my hypothesis. That is, the story itself did not appear to change attitudes on these items. However, participants in the counterargument condition unexpectedly showed significantly *less* endorsement of the Sympathy items compared to baseline.

The manipulation had a marginally significant effect on the Helping items, $F(3, 83) = 2.34, p = .07$. Post-hoc analysis revealed that participants in the no intervention condition had significantly higher attitudes than those in the baseline attitudes condition, indicating that reading the story but not resisting led to significant endorsement of helping the poor. However, neither the counterargument condition, nor the no-transportation condition differed significantly from baseline, indicating that, counter to my hypothesis, the no-transportation manipulation was not more effective at reducing persuasion than the counterargument manipulation. However, both interventions appeared to be successful at reducing persuasion for the Helping items. The means for each of the attitude items are in Table 2.1.

Monetary donation. The manipulation did not have a significant overall effect on money donation intentions $F(3, 81) = 1.35, p = .26$. The means of the monetary donation variable are in Table 2.2.

Transportation. The means for this and the other story-related variables are in Table 2.3.

As this survey directly related to characters in the story, it could not be administered to participants in the baseline attitudes condition. Thus, I conducted an ANOVA excluding participants in that condition, and I found that the manipulation was marginally significant, $F(2, 60) = 2.12, p = .13$. Contrary to my hypothesis, participants in the counterargument condition were significantly less transported, but curiously, participants in the no-transportation condition showed no significant difference from the no-intervention condition.

Character response survey. Again, the manipulation was marginally significant, $F(2, 60) = 2.60, p = .08$. The counterargument condition showed no difference from the no intervention condition. However, the LSD post-hoc test revealed that participants in the no-transportation condition showed significantly lower responses to the characters. Thus, participants told to keep from being transported were less emotionally involved in the characters' plight.

Self-reported resistance. Condition had a significant effect on participants' self-reported levels of resistance, $F(2, 60) = 7.58, p < .01$. Participants in the counterargument condition did not rate themselves as trying harder to resist than participants in the no-intervention condition, but participants in the no-transportation condition did report trying harder.

Transportability. To test the hypothesis that transportability would lead to greater transportation only in the counterargument condition, I again excluded the baseline attitudes condition from analysis, as it was irrelevant to the question of how transportability affected reaction to the narrative. As the counterargument condition was my condition of interest, I created dummy-coded variables indicating membership in the other two groups and then created interaction terms between these dummy-coded variables and transportability. I then used hierarchical regression to test whether including the interaction terms significantly changed the F statistic for the model.

The initial model, $R^2 = .10$, $F(3, 59) = 2.06$, $p = .12$, did not imply a significantly different F statistic than when the interaction terms were included in the regression equation, $R^2 = .12$, $F(5, 57) = 1.62$, $p = .17$ (change in $F = 1.00$, $p = .39$), indicating that the overall interaction is not significant: transportability did not affect transportation differently in the counterargument condition than in the other two conditions.⁴

Discussion

Hypotheses. H1 and H2 were not confirmed: the no-transportation intervention resulted in the same level of transportation and overall persuasion than control; in fact, counterargument intervention that led to lower transportation and endorsement of narrative themes, which is the opposite pattern as hypothesized. Finally, H3 was not confirmed: Transportability did not moderate the effect of intervention on transportation.

Though my hypotheses were not validated, some patterns did emerge from the data. Neither intervention appeared to affect the narrative's power to persuade readers that the context and environment of drug use is important and should be considered. All

participants who were exposed to the narrative endorsed those items more strongly than baseline, regardless of intervention.

However, only participants who received no intervention endorsed attitudes about helping drug users more strongly. Thus, *both* the counterargument intervention *and* the no-transportation intervention appeared to reduce the story's power to encourage actual prosocial motives.

General sympathy vs. sympathy for characters. However, the counterargument and no-transportation conditions did lead to different reactions to the story. Participants who were told to keep from being transported were less emotionally involved in the specific characters: they were less likely to strongly endorse items such as "I feel anger towards Ron." However, counterarguers were less likely to report sympathy toward drug users *generally*: they less strongly endorsed items such as "Getting addicted to drugs is beyond a person's control." It is also important to reiterate that counterarguers reported general sympathy that was *lower* than baseline, and that in no condition did participants report higher general sympathy than baseline. In other words, the story did not actually increase general sympathy, and so the counterarguers' lower sympathy cannot be attributed to successful resistance.

This pattern illuminates the results of these two strategies of resisting narrative influence. When told to keep from being emotionally involved with the story, participants focused on remaining cold and detached from the characters. However, counterarguers focused on keeping from feeling strong emotions about people *similar to* the characters in the story.

However, again, these two strategies do not appear to largely be differentially effective at reducing further persuasion. Both successfully reduced their users' desire to help drug users but not their acknowledgement of the importance of external factors on drug use. This may be a feature of the fact that spurring prosocial behavior is a more salient persuasive message than the importance of contextual factors affecting drug use, and thus participants focused their attention on the former rather than the latter.

Transportation. Surprisingly, and despite its name, the no-transportation intervention did not lead to reduced transportation into the story. Instead, the counterargument intervention reduced transportation. The process of using prepared counterarguments against items in a story likely involves cognitive distance from the narrative. However, this lowered transportation did not lead to different patterns in attitude change beyond the Sympathy items discussed above.

Study weaknesses. Participants in the counterargument condition did not report more effort resisting the narrative than control, though that may be because having a battery of counterarguments pre-prepared allows people to then expend minimal effort while subsequently resisting the themes in the story. In other words, participants may have interpreted the question as asking about their effort engaged *while* reading, and therefore they did not report the effort spent *before* reading. Because of this, it is difficult to discern when participants tried and failed to resist and when they did not try at all.

Furthermore, participants were directly told to engage in different strategies, and it is unclear how people choose to spontaneously attempt resistance when they fear a forthcoming persuasive narrative. It was this question that Study 2 was designed to answer.

Study 2

Though Study 1 was not successful, its results indicated that different resistance strategies do have different effects on people exposed to a persuasive narrative. Although the evidence was somewhat weak, Study 1 suggests that counterarguing may be a better way of avoiding narrative influence than attempting to remain unaffected by the story, because it led to lower transportation than for people not told to resist.

Study 2 was devised to replicate these results of Study 1, but instead of being directed to take different mindsets toward the story, participants will be given forewarnings hypothesized to inspire similar reactions. There are two types of forewarnings: a warning of persuasive intent, which I predict will cause participants to attempt to avoid being transported, or a warning of topic, which I predict will lead participants to attempt counterarguing strategies (although it is impossible to warn content without also warning intent, I predict that participants will take the opportunity to prepare counterarguments if they are able). Participants will be given a brief period after the warning to write down any thoughts they have, which will be available for coding to determine the strategies participants intended to use. Then, the participants will read a slightly altered version of “Jimmy’s World.”

Afterward, participants will be asked to rate their level of transportation into the story (Green & Brock, 2000) and will be asked to rate their agreement with attitude items relevant to themes of the narrative. The set of materials given to participants will be based heavily on those used in Study 1 but with minor alterations.

Materials and methods

Manipulations. Study 2 has three conditions of warning.

Intent warning: “Later in this study, you will read a short narrative piece, which was originally published in Sunday Magazine in 2010. The author has stated that her main intention was to tell a story that persuaded readers about a social issue. In fact, several people assert that she has told them, 'I don't really care if my readers WANT to agree with me. I just want them to agree with me after they're done with my story, no matter what I have to say to make that happen.'

The author is the chairwoman of an organization which is directly associated with the subject of the article she wrote. In fact, the more people who agree with the themes and content of the story, the more she stands to personally benefit financially.”

Content warning: “Later in this study, you will read a short narrative piece, which was originally published in Sunday Magazine in 2010. The author stated that her main intention was to tell a story that persuaded readers about a social issue. In fact, several people assert that she has told them, 'I don't really care if my readers WANT to agree with me. I just want them to agree with me after they're done with my story, no matter what I have to say to make that happen.'

The author is the chairwoman of an organization which is directly associated with the subject of the article she wrote. In fact, the more people who agree with the themes and content of the story, the more she stands to personally benefit financially. The piece posits that young children (elementary school age) are in danger of being addicted to hard drugs. The article argues that children living in poor communities often have negligent, distracted, undereducated caregivers. This poor caregiving, which is often the result of

poverty and other economic factors, makes the children more likely to use hard drugs. Because of this immediate danger to children, it focuses on the need for all citizens to support social programs which alleviate the social conditions that allow drug abuse to spread among young children. Likely, this would result in less money going to other organizations, especially veterans and the out-of-work. In fact, it is estimated that this would likely result in a 50% increase in homeless veterans, and 75% fewer employment opportunities for North Carolina college graduates. ”

No warning (control condition): “Later in this study, you will read a short piece, which was originally published in *Sunday Magazine* in 2010.”

Baseline attitudes condition. These participants included the no warning instructions, but they were given the attitude surveys before receiving the instructions or story.

Narrative. Because participants in Study 1 were unpersuaded about helping the poor, “Jimmy's World” was modified slightly to put more focus on the importance of organizations that help destitute children. For instance, a paragraph was added describing the caring thoughts of a non-profit worker whose organization was forced to close from lack of funds. Material was also added to match the content warning's claim that effort and money dedicated to helping one group hurts others.

Dependent variables. The battery of dependent variables from Study 1 was used again.

Attitude survey and character connection survey. The Context items, $\alpha = .56$, and Sympathy items, $\alpha = .64$, showed poorer reliability than in Study 1. There were no items that, when excluded, greatly improved reliability for any of these scales. However,

the Helping items, $\alpha = .80$, and the character response survey, $\alpha = .78$, continued to demonstrate good reliability.

Logic survey. This survey was devised to discern where participants “aimed” their attempted defenses. The survey consisted of participants rating seventeen statements on a 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) scale. These statements together were written to mimic a logical argument supporting the major theme of “Jimmy's World” that interventions against urban poverty can help children from becoming addicted to drugs. Some example items are "Using and selling drugs makes children less likely to grow up to be good parents as adults" and "It is bad when people do things that are unhealthy." This survey allowed me to see if the warnings caused participants to attempt to “attack” different assumptions and conclusions underlying the themes of the narrative.

Because this questionnaire was new and untested, I had no official hypotheses about participants' responses. However, I speculated that participants given a content warning, due to preparing counterarguments, would have more logical responses prepared against the themes of the story and thus may be more successful at arguing against a series of logical statements.

Instructions check. The content of this item differed from Study 1. It asked participants, “Which of the following is closest to the instructions you were given at the beginning of the story?” with three of the options matching the manipulations: “A short quote from the author describing her intentions for the article ,” “A description of the article focusing on the effects of poverty and negligent parenting ,” and “A short description of the article containing no detail ” (again, the fourth option was a trap answer: “A description of the article focusing on education ”).

Except for the above, the study materials were identical to that of Study 1. Survey materials added to Study 2 are included in Appendix D.⁶

Hypotheses

There are two hypotheses for Study 2:

H1. Participants given the intent warning or no warning will demonstrate more agreement with story-relevant attitudes than participants' baseline attitudes.

H2. Participants higher in Mind-Reading Motivation will show lower transportation in the intent and content warning conditions compared to participants low in Mind-Reading Motivation, but MRM will not affect transportation in the no warning condition.

Participants

Participants were 179 undergraduates (52 male, 126 female, 1 declined to indicate sex) completing the experiment for class credit.

Unfortunately, 36 participants failed the story quiz. However, as mentioned above, this may be a valid method of resisting persuasion, and so these participants were not eliminated from analysis.⁷

Also, 38 participants failed to accurately recall the instructions. However, the choices for the instruction check item were, in retrospect, more similar to one another than would be ideal (for instance, the content warning contains a "short quote from the author"). Because no participant chose the trap answer, "A description of the article focusing on education," none were eliminated from analysis for failing to accurately recall the instructions.

Results

Attitude survey. As in Study 1, I used ANOVAs to compare the effect of each narrative condition to the baseline attitudes condition. The manipulation had a significant effect for the Context items, $F(3, 175) = 12.40, p < .01$. Post-hoc tests indicated that the means for the intent warning, the content warning, and no warning were all higher than that of participants who did not read the story. Likewise, the same pattern emerged for the Sympathy items, $F(3, 175) = 2.79, p = .04$. All participants exposed to the story demonstrated higher endorsement of these attitudes than participants who did not read narrative.

However, the manipulation did not significantly affect the Helping set of items, $F(3, 175) = 1.79, p = .15$.

All three of these results contradict my hypothesis that the intent warning would invoke stronger resistance than the other two narrative conditions. The means for each of these variables is in Table 3.1.

Monetary donation. The manipulation did not have a significant effect on the money donation variable, $F(3, 175) = 2.0, p = .12$. The means for this variable are in Table 3.2.

Logic survey. The items on this survey showed good reliability, $\alpha = .87$, and so they were averaged to create a single variable. The manipulation did not have a significant effect on this variable, $F(3, 172) = 1.61, p = .19$.

Transportation. Like in Study 1, the baseline attitudes group could not be included in this analysis, and so the means of the intent warning and content warning

groups were compared to that of the no warning group. The manipulation did not cause a significant difference in transportation, $F(2, 129) = 0.51, p = .60$.

Character response survey. The manipulation did not have a significant effect on emotional response to the characters in the story, $F(2, 129) = 0.03, p = .97$.

Self-reported resistance. Warning also had no effect on the amount of resistance participants reported enacting, $F(2, 129) = 0.85, p = .45$. The means of the narrative items are in Table 3.3.

MRM. To test whether MRM affected transportation only when participants were warned, I predicted transportation from MRM and from dummy-coded variables representing membership in the intent warning and content warning conditions, $R^2 = .11, F(3, 132) = 5.29, p < .01$. A subsequent model including the interaction terms, $R^2 = .11, F(5, 130) = 3.23, p = .01$, did not explain significantly more of the variance in transportation, indicating that the overall interaction is not significant: MRM did not differentially affect transportation in the warning conditions than in the no-warning condition.

Discussion

Hypotheses. H1 received only minimal support: of the dependent variables, the content warning condition only led to more successful resistance for the Helping scale. However, for these items, the intent warning was just as successful, and for the monetary donation question, the content condition's mean was only larger than that of the baseline attitudes condition by a marginally significant degree. Thus, generally speaking, the content warning did not appear to inspire more successful resistance than warning of intent alone.

H2 was not validated: Mind-Reading Motivation did not lead to lower transportation in the intent and content warning conditions.

Warnings and resistance. One major problem perhaps explaining the failure to reject the null hypotheses is that the warnings may have failed to motivate participants to attempt resistance. When asked to report how hard they worked to resist the messages in the story, participants in the intent warning condition ($M = 2.83$) and those in the content warning condition, ($M = 2.84$) both scored themselves as offering little resistance. In fact, approximately 30% of participants in both conditions rated their efforts as a 1 on the 1-7 scale.

The initial thought listings confirmed that the warnings left many participants with no desire to resist the story. Even participants who noted the story's author was going to attempt to influence them often reported no strong desire to avoid that influence. For example, one participant wrote, "I might feel like the author is trying to force her beliefs on me. I will try to be open about whatever the subject is, but still keep my personal opinions in mind as I read. I will pay close attention to what she is trying to convince me to agree with her on."

In fact, many participants specifically noted that they intended to approach the narrative with an open mind. For example, one participant wrote the following after being given the intent warning, "I'd take everything with a grain of salt, as I should. She may have a legitimate point and she may be bringing some real issues to light. It completely depends on what she is writing about."

Among participants given the content warning, a large number of participants actually reported strong agreement with the author's goals, making no reference to her

duplicity or to the warning's stated consequences of agreement. For instance, one participant wrote, "I strongly agree with the article. Children that are surrounded by drugs in an everyday lifestyle and more likely to become accustomed to this habit. In order to prevent further addiction, we must take a stand against this issue within the given communities..." Generally, despite the strong wording of the warnings, participants did not seem sufficiently motivated to resist. It is also important to note that no participants reported skepticism about the warning itself.

One possible reason for this is the study population: the academic setting may have led participants to be especially concerned with appearing open-minded. Also, while I made efforts to make the content warning relevant to the students, students may be especially unlikely to have spare money to donate to charity, making many of the story's themes more distant than they would be otherwise.

Regardless, the failure of manipulation unfortunately leaves the general questions of this study unanswered. It is still unclear how people spontaneously enact resistance to narrative persuasion given effective intent or content forewarnings. It is also unclear whether participants' lack of motivation to resist stemmed from unwarranted confidence in their ability to resist the messages, or if they simply did not mind the prospect of being convinced by the forthcoming narrative. Unfortunately, this leaves open the question of whether the third-person effect is an important feature in narratives' persuasiveness.

General Discussion

I was unable to find strong evidence for any of my predicted effects in Study 1 or Study 2. In Study 1, it was the counterarguing intervention and not the no-transportation intervention that seemed to lead to more successful resistance. However, the general pattern of results was muddled. When instructed to avoid transportation, participants reduced their emotional reactions to the specific characters in the story, but when instructed to prepare counterarguments, participants reported lower agreement with general attitudes about people in the characters' situation. Although my hypotheses were not confirmed, and thus I cannot conclude that remaining untransported is a more effective strategy of resisting narrative influence, these results do shed light on the mechanisms behind people's attempts to resist a story's influence.

In Study 2, I was again unable to find support for my hypotheses. However, I did find small support for a replication of the findings of Study 1: Participants who were given the content warning (and thus were able to prepare counterarguments) did not choose to donate more money to a story-relevant charity than people not exposed to the story, while participants just given an intent warning did. While it would be foolish to place too much emphasis on an effect that is so small in magnitude, it does appear that participants who directly confronted the attitudes in the story (either through instruction or being explicitly warned about them) were less willing to apply the story's themes of charity to their own behavior.

The failure of Study 2 is likely explained by warnings that did not inspire the desired resistance to the story's themes. However, this failure is enlightening in its own

way. Despite knowing that they were to read a story written by a greedy, duplicitous author and that the consequences of being persuaded would be contributing to the destitution of American veterans, many participants showed no evidence of attempting to resist the story's persuasive effect. Thus, a useful area of study would be to examine exactly why it is so difficult to spontaneously inspire resistance to forthcoming narrative persuasion.

Given that stories are typically used for entertainment, it will especially be important to consider that people's motivations may be more complex regarding persuasive narratives than traditional persuasive appeals. In many cases, the pleasure of engaging with a good story may cause people motivated to transport themselves despite being fully aware of potential persuasive impact. This fact may have influenced why participants showed little motivation to resist even given a strong warning.

Forewarning and transportation. Study 1 found that participants who were told to remain distant from the story did not report lower transportation into that story. However, I do not believe this finding to be the result of a failure of the manipulation, because participants given this instruction successfully kept themselves from being emotionally involved with the characters in the study. These results suggest that people may have insufficiently broad lay-theories about the ways they can be "drawn into" a narrative: they focused their attention on remaining cold toward the characters but did not keep themselves from being cognitively and imaginatively drawn into the story.

Researchers are increasingly interested in the ways in which adopting the experiences of fictional characters can affect real-world attitudes (e.g. Kaufman & Libby, 2012; Carpenter & Green, under review), but the findings of Study 1 imply that too much

focus on the persuasive power of characters may draw attention away from the important effects of narratives more generally. In the future, it will be important to specifically look at the ways narratives can be persuasive beyond just having characters whose experiences are emotionally engaging.

Simultaneous narrative persuasion. Finally, one finding in both studies may illuminate the effects of attempted resistance of participants. In both studies, participants warned or told to resist successfully avoided being persuaded about the importance of *actually helping* drug users. However, also in both studies, being exposed to the story led to higher endorsement of the *importance of context* for drug users, regardless of condition.

These results may illustrate one pernicious aspect of stories: they are almost necessarily laden with large amounts of information and they can be persuasive about many things at once. Participants were able to resist the narrative's blatant message about charity, but they showed no ability or desire to avoid the more subtle message about the importance of context. In the future, it may be important to examine whether an obvious, "decoy" message in a story can reduce resistance toward a more subtle, concurrent message.

Ability. One factor these studies touch on only slightly is the issue of ability. Because maintaining a critical distance from a narrative is something often explicitly taught in school, education level may be a very important factor in people's ability to remain untransported by a story, even when they try. In the future, it will be important to examine a wider population to assess this hypothesis, especially because it implies certain segments of society may be especially at risk of unwanted narrative persuasion.

Narrative medium. Another issue not addressed in these studies is medium: narratives are often in text form, but they also appear in movies, television, video games, internet blogs, and even conversations. It is not clear whether people attempt different defenses for stories appearing in different media, or if people possess different lay-theories about the persuasiveness of narratives across media (e.g., if people consider films generally persuasive but video games not persuasive). Complicating the issue, previous research in other media, particularly video games and virtual reality simulations, tends to use a measure similar to transportation but distinct from it, presence (e.g. Lombard & Ditton, 1997), which makes cross-medium research somewhat difficult. Nonetheless, in the future, it will be important to extend these findings to other media and to see if similar effects apply to narratives high in presence as in narratives high in transportation.

Conclusion. Stories are often dense collections of information, and that is just one reason that they can be such effective agents of persuasion. The results of these studies were likewise complex: forewarnings are not useless at minimizing this kind of attitude change, but the evidence remains decidedly mixed about how a warning best provokes resistance and about what kind of resistance works best. Despite my failure to confirm my hypotheses, Study 1 illustrated two strategies attempted by resisters: remaining cold toward the specific story's characters, and refusing to have sympathy toward people in the characters' situations, and it showed that neither strategy is fully effective. Study 2 then demonstrated the difficulty of invoking spontaneous resistance to narrative influence.

In general, perhaps people are not sufficiently suspicious about narratives, and they would be well-served to follow the example set by *Fahrenheit 451* and destroy all books that could be manipulative. However, these studies may be early steps toward a far less drastic and more socially beneficial solution to the problem of unwanted narrative persuasion.

Endnotes

¹One wave of data collection was carried out before the present study (N = 197). However, upon observing the results, it was clear that participants did not understand the instructions. Study 1 was carried out with revised instructions, which are the ones described.

²The survey also included the need for cognition scale (Cacioppo, Petty, & Kao, 1984) However, it did not directly related to my hypotheses, nor did it influence the effect of the interventions, and so it was not included in analysis. The survey also included a series of narrative tendency questions (e.g. "If a novel or story has themes you don't like, how easy is it for you to disengage from the story?"), but it was determined these items were redundant to the more established transportability scale. Finally, participants were asked how long they would choose to incarcerate characters in the story. However, these questions could not be analyzed due to a large number of participants giving non-numerical responses (i.e. "life in prison").

³ The percentage of participants failing the story quiz did not differ significantly by condition, $\chi^2(3, N=87) = 0.01, p > .99$.

⁴The same pattern of non-significance held true for all other dependent variables.

⁵The survey also included the emotion regulation questionnaire (Gross & John, 2003). It did not affect the manner that participants reacted to the warnings, nor did it relate directly to my hypotheses, so it was not included in analysis.

⁶One wave of data was collected (N = 67) before concern over the strength of the manipulations led me to revise them to be stronger (e.g. adding to the intent warning that the author stood to benefit financially). These original data are not included in analysis, and the revised instructions are the ones described in this paper.

⁷Deleting participants who failed the story quiz did not affect the significance level of any of the dependent variables. Furthermore, as in Study 1, the percentage of participants failing the story quiz did not differ significantly by condition, $\chi^2(3, N=179) = 1.45, p = .69$.

Table 2.1

Mean attitude responses by condition in Study 1 (with standard deviations in parentheses)

	<i>Baseline</i>	Counterargument	No- transportation	No intervention
Context	<i>4.13 (0.70)</i>	5.10 (0.77)*	5.13 (0.58)*	4.94 (0.82)*
Sympathy	<i>4.22 (0.75)</i>	3.56 (1.06)*	4.20 (0.80)	4.37 (0.88)
Helping	<i>4.69 (0.60)</i>	4.68 (1.32)	5.10 (1.09)	5.37 (1.09)*

Note: Italics indicate comparison condition. * indicates a significantly different value from the comparison condition ($p < .05$)

Table 2.2

Mean monetary donation by condition in Study 1 (with standard deviations in parentheses)

	<i>Baseline</i>	Counterargument	No- transportation	No intervention
Monetary donation	<i>2.46 (1.02)</i>	3.02 (2.66)	3.70 (2.01)*	3.40 (2.66)

Note: Scale is in dollars. Italics indicate comparison condition. * indicates a significantly different value from the comparison condition ($p < .10$)

Table 2.3

Means of transportation, character response survey, and subjective resistance in Study 1 (with standard deviations in parentheses)

	<i>No intervention</i>	Counterargument	No- transportation
Transportation	<i>4.73 (0.82)</i>	4.24 (0.77)*	4.45 (0.75)
Character response	<i>5.77 (0.65)</i>	5.46 (1.02)	5.14 (0.94)*
Resistance	<i>2.81 (1.50)</i>	2.33 (1.65)	4.29 (1.90)*

Note: Italics indicate comparison condition. * indicates a significantly different value from the comparison condition ($p < .05$)

Table 3.1

Mean attitude responses by condition in Study 2 (with standard deviations in parentheses)

	<i>Baseline</i>	Content warning	Intent warning	No warning
Context	<i>4.29 (0.57)</i>	4.83 (0.63)*	4.98 (0.67)*	4.98 (0.58)*
Sympathy	<i>3.79 (0.82)</i>	4.13 (0.81)*	4.23 (0.82)*	4.17 (0.68)*
Helping	<i>4.69 (1.01)</i>	5.06 (1.02)	5.10 (1.15)	5.17 (1.04)*

Note: Italics indicate comparison condition. * indicates a significantly different value from the comparison condition ($p < .05$)

Table 3.2

Mean monetary donation by condition in Study 2 (with standard deviations in parentheses)

	<i>Baseline</i>	Content warning	Intent warning	No warning
Monetary donation	<i>2.66 (1.22)</i>	3.30 (2.26)	3.50 (2.56)*	3.77 (2.71)*

Note: Scale is in dollars. Italics indicate comparison condition. * indicates a significantly different value from the comparison condition ($p < .10$)

Table 3.3

Means of transportation, character response survey, and subjective resistance in Study 2 (with standard deviations in parentheses)

	<i>No warning</i>	Content warning	Intent warning
Transportation	<i>4.73 (0.89)</i>	4.80 (0.83)	4.91 (0.78)
Character response	<i>5.23 (1.04)</i>	5.25 (0.95)	5.28 (1.00)
Resistance	<i>2.47 (1.20)</i>	2.83 (1.64)	2.82 (1.60)

Note: Italics indicate comparison condition. * indicates a significantly different value from the comparison condition ($p < .05$)

Appendix A

Note: Highlighted sections indicate text added for Study 2.

"Jimmy's World"

Jimmy is 8 years old and a third-generation heroin addict, a precocious little boy with soft hair, velvety brown eyes and needle marks freckling the baby-smooth skin of his thin brown arms.

He nestles in a large beige reclining chair in the living room of his home in Southeast Washington. There is an almost cherubic expression on his small, round face as he talks about life--clothes, money, the Baltimore Orioles, and heroin. He has been an addict since the age of 5.

His hands are clasped behind his head, fancy running shoes adorn his feet, and a striped Polo T-shirt hangs over his thin frame. "I got me six of these."

Jimmy's is a world of hard drugs, fast money and the good life he believes both can bring. Every day, junkies casually buy heroin from Ron, his mother's live-in lover, in the dining room of Jimmy's home. They "cook" it in the kitchen and "fire up" in the bedrooms. And every day, Ron or someone else fires up Jimmy, plunging a needle into his bony arms, sending the fourth grader into a hypnotic nod.

Jimmy prefers this atmosphere to school, where only one subject seems relevant to fulfilling his dreams. "I want to have me a cool car and dress good and also have me a good place to live," he says. "So, I pretty much pay attention in math because I know I got to keep up when I finally get me something to sell."

Jimmy wants to sell drugs, maybe even on the District's meanest street, Condon Terrace SE, and some day deal heroin, he says, "just like my man, Ron."

Ron, 27, was the one who first turned Jimmy on. "He'd be buggin' me all the time about what the shots were and what people was doin' and one day he said, 'When can I get off?'" Ron says, leaning against a wall in a narcotic haze, his eyes half closed, yet piercing. "I said, 'Well s---, you can have some now.' I let him snort a little and, damn, the little dude really did get off."

Six months later, Jimmy was hooked. "I felt like I was part of what was goin' down," he says. "I can't really tell you how it feel. You never done any? Sort of like them rides at King's Dominion...like if you was to go on all of them in one day."

"It be real different from pot (marijuana). That's baby s---. Don't nobody here hardly ever smoke pot. It ain't worth it."

Ron usually laughs when Jimmy says such things ("Big Man Jim," Ron calls him when the tough, grown-up side emerges), but only with his typical coldness. There is just one subject that can bring out any emotion in Ron: his former home, New Orleans. "You don't want to hear about that," is all he ever says on the topic, a hitch in his voice that makes him sound older than he is.

Jimmy's mother Andrea accepts her son's habit as a fact of life, although she will not inject the child herself and does not like to see others do it.

“I don’t really like to see him fire up,” she says. “But, you know, I think he would have got it into it one day, anyway. Everybody does. When you live in the ghetto, it’s all a matter of survival... who out there is going to help us? If he wants to get away from it when he’s older, then that’s his thing. But right now, things are better for us than they ever been...Drugs and black folk been together for a very long time.”

Heroin has become a part of life in many of Washington’s neighborhoods, affecting thousands of teenagers and adults who feel cut off from the world around them, and filtering down to the untold numbers of children like Jimmy who are bored with school, battered by life, and apparently forgotten by the rest of America. There is no safety net for Jimmy. Social programs for drug abuse prevention and rehabilitation are focused on teenagers and young adults, not children.

But on street corners and playgrounds across the city youngsters often no older than 10 relate with uncanny accuracy the names of important dealers in their neighborhoods, and the going rate for their wares. For the uninitiated, they can recite the color, taste, and smell of things such as heroin, cocaine, and marijuana, and rattle off all the colors in a rainbow made of pills.

The heroin problem in the District has grown to what some call epidemic proportions, with the daily influx of so-called “Golden Crescent” heroin from Iran, Pakistan, and Afghanistan making the city fourth among six listed by the U.S. Drug Enforcement Agency as major points of entry for heroin in the United States. The “Golden Crescent” heroin is stronger and cheaper than the Southeast Asian and Mexican varieties previously available on the street, and its easy accessibility has added to what has been a serious problem in the nation’s capital. Law enforcement agencies and hospitals are both too financially starved to address the situation, and there is a dire need for resources to address this problem. D.C.’s medical examiner, James Luke, has recorded a substantial increase in the number of deaths from heroin overdose, from seven in 2009 to 43 so far this year.

Death has not yet been a visitor to the house where Jimmy lives.

The kitchen and upstairs bedrooms are a human collage. People of all shapes and sizes drift into the dwelling and its various rooms, some jittery, uptight and anxious for a fix, others calm and serene after they finally “get off.”

A fat woman wearing a white uniform and blond wig with a needle jabbed in it like a hatpin, totters down the staircase announcing that she is “feeling fine.” A teen-age couple drifts through the front door, the girl proudly pulling a syringe of the type used by diabetics from the hip pocket of her pair of low-rise jeans. “Got me a new one,” she says to no one in particular as she and her boyfriend wander off to the kitchen to cook their smack and shoot each other up.

These are normal occurrences in Jimmy’s world. Unlike most children his age, he doesn’t usually go to school, preferring instead to hang out with older boys between the ages of 11 and 16 who spend their day getting high on pot (marijuana) or meth (crystal methadone) and doing a little dealing to collect spare change.

When Jimmy does find his way into the classroom, it is to learn more about his favorite subject--math.

“You got to know how to do some figuring if you want to go into business,” he says pragmatically. Using his mathematical skills in any other line of work is a completely foreign notion.

“They don’t BE no jobs,” Jimmy says. “You got to have some money to do anything, got to make some cash. Got to be selling something people always want to buy. Ron say people always want to buy

some drugs. My mama say it, too. She be using it and her mama be using it. It's always going to be somebody who can use it..."

"The rest of them dudes on the street is sharp. You got to know how many of them are out there, how much they charge for all the different s---, who gonna buy from them and where their spots be...they bad, you know, cause they in business for themselves. Ain't nobody really telling them how to act."

In a city overflowing with what many consider positive role models for a black child with almost any ambition--doctors, lawyers, politicians, bank presidents--Jimmy wants most to be a good dope dealer. He says that when he is older, "maybe about 11," he would like to "go over to Condon Terrace (notorious for its open selling of drugs and violent way of life) or somewhere else and sell." With the money he says he would buy a German Shepherd dog and a bicycle, maybe a basketball, and save the rest "so I could buy some real s--- and sell it."

His mother doesn't view Jimmy's ambitions with alarm, perhaps because drugs are as much a way of Andrea's world as they are of her son's.

She never knew her father. Like her son, Andrea spent her childhood with her mother and the man with whom she lived for 15 years. She recalls that her mother's boyfriend routinely forced her and her younger sister to have sex with him and Jimmy is the product of one of those rapes.

Depressed and discouraged after his birth ("I didn't even name him, you know? My sister liked the name Jimmy and I said, 'OK, call him that, who gives a fu--? I guess we got to call him something, don't we?") she quickly accepted the offer of heroin from a woman who used to shoot up with her mother.

Three years later, the family moved after police discovered the shooting gallery in their home and many of Andrea's sources of heroin dried up. She turned to prostitution and shoplifting to support a \$250-a-day habit. Soon after, she met Ron, who had just moved from New Orleans and was selling heroin. She saw him as a way to get off the street and readily agreed when he asked her to move in with him.

"I was tired of sleeping with all those different dudes and boosting (shoplifting) at Wal-Mart. And I didn't think it would be bad for Jimmy to have some kind of man around," she says. "I mean, who else going to help us out? You?"

Indeed, social workers in the Southeast Washington community say that so many young black children become involved with drugs because there are few opportunities for breaking the cycle of poverty and addiction, a problem that local agencies lack the recourses to mitigate.

"A lot of these parents (of children involved with drugs) are the unwed mothers of the past ten years and they are bringing up their children by trial and error," says Linda Gilbert, a social worker at the underfunded Southeast Neighborhood House.

"The family structure and the community support is not there so they [the children] establish a relationship with their peers. If the peers are into drugs, it won't be very long before the kids are too...they don't view drugs as illegal, and if they are making money, too, then it's going to be OK in the eyes of an economically deprived community. If more were done to help the community overall, then that would stop the problems from even beginning."

Addicts who have been feeding their habits for 35 years or more are not uncommon in Jimmy's world, and although medical experts say that there is an extremely high risk of his death from an overdose, it is not inconceivable that he will live to reach adulthood.

“He might already be close to getting a lethal dose,” Dr. Dorynne Czechowicz of the National Institute on Drug Abuse says. “Much of this depends on the amount he’s getting and the frequency with which he’s getting it. But I would hate to say that his early death is inevitable. He could certainly grow into an addicted adult. If he were to get treatment, it probably isn’t too late to help him. But the funding just isn’t there right now for the programs that could save these children – that has to change if we want to give kids like Jimmy a chance at a normal life.”

Longitudinal studies have shown that early intervention to prevent and stop drug use among children has a good track record of success. Despite the urgent and growing youth drug problem, few state and local governments have been willing to fund such programs. “We have to make tough budget choices every day,” said one city councilman, who declined to be identified on the record. He continued, “The unfortunate truth is that helping one group takes away money from another group who needs it.”

“It’s easy to blame a woman with no apparent desire to care for a young child, and it’s even easier to blame the drug dealer getting them both high,” Gilbert says, frustration clear in her tone. “But you and I can’t understand the hopelessness they live with every day. I can’t just tell them to be responsible for their children, because how can they see dealing drugs as irresponsible when they believe it’s their only way of putting food on the table?”

She sighs and casts a hopeless eye to her bulging folder of urgent cases. “I grew up poor and I grew up black, and I never turned to drugs,” she says. “But I didn’t grow up *stuck*. Economically, psychologically, some of these neighborhoods are just trapped. The tragedy is, most of these people would be wonderful parents under different conditions.” Her organization was forced to close from lack of funding last month.

At the end of an evening of strange questions about his life, Jimmy slowly changes into a different child. The calm and self-assured little man recedes. The jittery and ill-behaved boy takes over as he begins going into withdrawal. He is twisting uncomfortably in his chair one minute, irritatingly raising and lowering a vinyl window blind the next.

“Be cool,” Ron admonishes him, walking out of the room.

Jimmy picks up a green “Star Wars” force beam toy and begins flicking the light on and off.

Ron comes back into the living room, syringe in hand, and calls the little boy over to his chair: “Let me see your arm.”

He grabs Jimmy’s left arm just above the elbow, his massive hand tightly encircling the child’s small limb. The needle slides into the boy’s soft skin like a straw pushed into the center of a freshly baked cake. Liquid ebbs out of the syringe, replaced by bright red blood. The blood is then reinjected into the child.

Jimmy has closed his eyes during the whole procedure, but now he opens them, looking quickly around the room. He climbs into a rocking chair and sits, his head slipping and snapping upright again, in what addicts call “the nod.”

“Pretty soon, man,” Ron says, “you got to learn how to do this for yourself.”

Appendix B

Attitude Questionnaire

Sometimes individuals' attitudes affect how they respond to a story. Please give your opinions for the questions below. There are no right or wrong answers, so please answer each question as honestly as possible.

1. Society should do more to help the very poor.
2. Teenagers who take hard drugs like cocaine or heroin can't have successful lives as an adult.
3. People convicted of taking hard drugs should always be given the option of drug counseling.
4. People convicted of taking hard drugs should always be required to do at least some jail time.
5. Children should always be supervised by a responsible adult.
6. Social programs with goals to assist young people always seem to fail.
7. People who are addicted to cocaine or heroin are responsible for their own behavior.
8. The influence of people in a person's neighborhood can lead that person to doing hard drugs.
9. The city or town where a person is raised will lead the people living there to doing hard drugs.
10. Parents should always be held responsible for their children's cocaine or heroin use.
11. Other members of society should express sympathy for those people who are addicted to hard drugs like cocaine or heroin.
12. Society should construct more drug counseling clinics and fund more drug counselors.
13. People who die from a drug death overdose have gotten what they deserved.
14. Drugs are a race problem.
15. Becoming addicted to hard drugs is easy.
16. Getting addicted to drugs is beyond a person's control.

17. Drug addiction among children is an important problem in the United States.
18. People who provide illegal drugs to young children should be severely punished.
19. Poverty makes people more likely to use hard drugs.
20. Individual responsibility is the most important thing.
21. The poor are more likely to commit crimes than the rich
22. Money should be given to programs that would help children at risk of being addicted to drugs, even if it would take away from other beneficial programs.
23. Jimmy (the boy in the article) should be removed from his current situation as soon as possible.
24. I feel protectiveness toward Jimmy.
25. Jimmy is blameless.
26. Jimmy's situation is part of a larger social trend, rather than a result of specific circumstances.
27. If I had the chance to meet Jimmy at the age he is today, I would want to.
28. If I had grown up in Jimmy's position, I would have been in danger of becoming addicted to hard drugs.

In general, how long do you believe someone who sells drugs to a child should be put in jail? _____ years

If you had the power to put Ron in jail, how long would you put him there? That is, how long would you want him incarcerated if you had complete power over that? _____ years

If you had the power to put Jimmy's mother in jail, how long would you put her there? That is, how long would you want her incarcerated if you had complete power over that? _____ years

Please indicate how strongly you reacted emotionally to the following individuals. By "emotional reaction," we mean any emotions at all: happiness, sadness, pity, anger, etc.

Jimmy

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

not at all very much

What emotion did you mostly feel about Jimmy? _____

Jimmy's mother

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

not at all very much

What emotion did you mostly feel about Jimmy's mother? _____

Ron

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

not at all very much

What emotion did you mostly feel about Ron? _____

Transportation Questionnaire

Choose the number under each question that best represents your opinion about the article you just read.

1. While I was reading the article, I could easily picture the events in it taking place.
2. While I was reading the article, activity going on in the room around me was on my mind.
3. I could picture myself in the scene of the events described in the article.
4. I was mentally involved in the article while reading it.
5. After the article ended, I found it easy to put it out of my mind.
6. I wanted to learn how the article ended.
7. The article affected me emotionally.
8. I found myself thinking of ways the article could have turned out differently.
9. I found my mind wandering while reading the article.
10. The events in the article are relevant to my everyday life.
11. The events in the article have changed my life.
12. I had a vivid mental image of Jimmy.
13. I had a vivid mental image of Jimmy's mother.
14. I had a vivid mental image of Ron (the boyfriend of Jimmy's mother).
15. I had a vivid mental image of the home in which Jimmy lived.
16. I had a vivid mental image of the city in which the article took place.

Thought Listing

In the space below, please take a minute or two to list all of the thoughts you had when you were reading the narrative. Don't worry about spelling or grammar—just write down all the thoughts you can recall. These thoughts may be positive, negative, or neutral toward the narrative. Please do not spend more than 1-2 minutes on this section.

Story quiz

Please answer these questions to the best of your ability. If you do not know the answer to a question, just make your best guess based on what you remember.

1. What was the name of the main character in the story?
2. Approximately how old was the main character in the story?
3. What was the “hard drug” mentioned the most in the story?
4. What is the main character’s favorite subject in school?
5. How did the main character’s mother support herself before moving in with her boyfriend?
6. What object does the main character hold in the last scene of the story?
7. What is at least one thing the main character intends to buy when after he has made money?
8. What is the main character’s favorite baseball team?

For each of the statements below, please indicate whether or not the statement is characteristic of you or of what you believe. If the statement is extremely uncharacteristic of you or of what you believe (not at all like you), please choose 1. If the statement is extremely characteristic of you or of what you believe (very much like you), please choose 5.

1. _____ I prefer complex to simple problems.
2. _____ I like to have the responsibility of handling a situation that requires a lot of thinking.
3. _____ Thinking is not my idea of fun.
4. _____ I would rather do something requiring little thought than something that is sure to challenge my thinking abilities.
5. _____ I try to anticipate and avoid situations where there is likely chance I will have to think in depth about something.
6. _____ I find satisfaction in deliberating hard and for long hours.
7. _____ I only think as hard as I have to.
8. _____ I prefer to think about small, daily projects to long-term ones.
9. _____ I like tasks that require little thought once I've learned them.
10. _____ The idea of relying on thought to make my way to the top appeals to me.
11. _____ I really enjoy a task that involves coming up with new solutions to problems.
12. _____ Learning new ways to think doesn't excite me very much.
13. _____ I prefer my life to be filled with puzzles that I must solve.
14. _____ The notion of thinking abstractly is appealing to me.
15. _____ I would prefer a task that is intellectual, difficult, and important to one that is somewhat important but does not require much thought.
16. _____ I feel relief rather than satisfaction after completing a task that required a lot of mental effort.
17. _____ It's enough for me that something gets the job done; I don't care how or why it works.
18. _____ I usually end up deliberating about issues even when they do not affect me personally.

Transportability Scale

Before you read the short story, we are interested in your typical reactions when you read stories. These may include novels, newspaper stories, or other kinds of narratives. Please select the number by each question that best represents your opinions and experiences with narratives and stories you have read.

- ___1. While I am reading stories, I can easily picture the events in them taking place.
- ___2. While I am reading stories, activity going on in the room around me is on my mind.
- ___3. I can picture myself in the scene of the events described in stories.
- ___4. I am mentally involved in stories while reading them.
- ___5. After finishing stories, I find it easy to put them out of my mind.
- ___6. I want to learn how stories end.
- ___7. Stories affect me emotionally.
- ___8. I find myself thinking of ways stories could have turned out differently.
- ___9. I find my mind wandering while reading stories.
- ___10. The events in stories are relevant to my everyday life.
- ___11. The events in stories have changed my life.
- ___12. Sometimes I react to events in stories as if I were one of the characters.
- ___13. I can become so absorbed in a story that I forget the world around me.
- ___14. Characters in stories can seem real to me.
- ___15. I have vivid mental images of settings or characters in stories.
- ___16. The idea of reading stories for fun doesn't really appeal to me.
- ___17. Characters in stories sometimes feel like friends of mine.
- ___18. Stories affect my mood.
- ___19. I sometimes want to communicate with characters in stories (for example, when reading a murder mystery, I want to warn characters that the killer is near.)

Mind-Reading Motivation

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with each of the statements below. Use a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 represents “strongly disagree,” and 7 represents “strongly agree.”

1. When I meet new people, I like wondering how they got to where they are in life.
2. If someone's actions do not relate to me directly, I generally do not concern myself with why they do what they do.
3. When I am conversing with more than one person, I like to think about how one person is interpreting what another person says in the conversation.
4. I don't tend to actively seek out other people's opinions, even when they probably agree with my own.
5. I rarely find myself wondering what other people are thinking.
6. There is just something intriguing about the insight different people can offer about someone else's motivations and perspective.
7. In a social group, I don't make any special effort to keep track of what each person thinks about the other people in the group.
8. When I see two strangers arguing, I often catch myself speculating on what their conflict is.
9. People who disagree with me about important issues are generally just misinformed.
10. It is pointless to try to see things from other people's points of view.
11. I have little patience for listening to other people's problems
12. If I can tell where someone is coming from, I don't need other people's thoughts on the matter.
13. If the way I define something works for me, I don't need to know what other people think about it.
14. Everyone is pretty much the same.
15. I have no real curiosity about what someone else might be thinking unless it involves me.
16. Thinking too much about what someone else wants or feels will just get in the way of doing what I need to do.
17. I really don't like the idea that being aware of someone else's perspective, viewpoint, or thoughts could change the way I think.
18. The more different a person is from me, the more interesting it is to think about their motivations.
19. No matter how well you know someone, there is always something new to learn about why they do what they do.
20. I honestly don't feel that there's anything threatening about being open to other people's perspectives, whoever they are.
21. I just have a hard time getting excited about all the different ways people might see the same thing.
22. When I'm interacting with people, I try to think of them the way they think about themselves.
23. It's silly to feel like you should “protect yourself” from other people's thoughts or viewpoints.
24. It's honestly just kind of boring to speculate about all the things that people

could be thinking.

25. Some people are just so different from me, it's not worth spending any time trying to figure out what they're thinking.

26. I'm open to speculating about pretty much anything someone else might be thinking.

Narrative Tendencies

1. Did you think the article you read might have affected your beliefs or opinions about real-world issues?
2. Did you try to prevent the article you read from affecting your beliefs or opinions?
3. When you read, watch, or otherwise engage with a fictional narrative, how often do you notice yourself becoming consciously aware of its themes or morals?
4. If a novel or story has themes or morals you don't like, how easy is it for you to disengage yourself from that story?
5. If you try to focus on a narrative from a critical point of view, how likely is it that you will get drawn into its plot and characters anyway?
6. Overall, how often do you find yourself remaining detached from a book or film, rather than being immersed?

Had you heard or read the experiment article before entering this study?

___ No, I had not read or heard this article before today

___ Yes, I have read or hear this article before

If yes, where did you read or hear the article?

Which of the following is closest to the instructions you were given before the story?

- a. To write down ways to keep from getting immersed in the story
- b. To write down thoughts about magazines in general
- c. To write down thoughts against the arguments I expected to encounter in the story
- d. To write down interpretations about the author of the story

Demographic Information

It is helpful to us to know something about the kinds of people who are participating in our studies. Please complete the demographic information below. Again, all of your responses will be kept completely confidential.

Sex: Male Female Intersex/Prefer not to say

Race: _____

Age: _____

Year in school: 1 2 3 4 5+

In which category does your major or intended major fall?

Humanities

Natural sciences

Social sciences

Arts

Other/Unsure

What is your political orientation?

very liberal

liberal

moderate

conservative

very conservative

If you had to choose one, which of the following most accurately describes you?

Republican

Democrat

Independent

Major or intended major: _____

Out of 800, what was your score on the reading section of the SAT? If you can't remember exactly, please estimate. If you did not take the SAT, please write an X.

Do you have any comments about the study? If so, please write them in the space below.

*** Thank you very much for your participation! ***

This study was developed in part thanks to a grant from the James McDaniel Memorial Foundation. As part of this organization's commitment to community philanthropy, they have provided a fund which will be split among the charities considered most important by the UNC student population.

We have decided to leave the allotment of these funds directly in the hands of our participants. As such, we will ask you to direct \$10 to the following charities. You may divide the \$10 any way you wish: You may give it all to one charity, split it up evenly among all five, or create any other combination. Afterward, we will simply add up the amount given by every participant and donate those amounts to the charities.

Thank you for your help! Your cooperation helps us stay true to the James McDaniel Memorial Foundation's dedication to giving students a role in philanthropic endeavors.

Please choose how to allot \$10 among the following charities. Again, you may divide the money up however you wish, but please use all \$10.

\$_____ The K. Erickson Fund for the Protection and Support of Firefighters

\$_____ Meals on Wheels (providing meals for homebound senior citizens)

\$_____ The North Carolina Council of the Arts

\$_____ The Albright Center (rehabilitation and career-counseling for teenage drug users)

\$_____ The NOMO Alliance (providing education and counseling to fight adult obesity)

Appendix C

Categorized attitude items

Context Attitude Items

People convicted of taking hard drugs should always be required to do at least some jail time.

Children should always be supervised by a responsible adult.

The influence of people in a person's neighborhood can lead that person to doing hard drugs.

The city or town where a person is raised will lead the people living there to doing hard drugs.

Parents should always be held responsible for their children's cocaine or heroin use.

Poverty makes people more likely to use hard drugs.

Social programs with goals to assist young people always seem to fail.

People who provide illegal drugs to young children should be severely punished.

The poor are more likely to commit crimes than the rich.

Sympathy Attitude Items

People who are addicted to hard drugs are responsible for their own behavior. (r)

Other members of society should express sympathy for those people who are addicted to hard drugs like cocaine or heroin.

Becoming addicted to hard drugs is easy.

Getting addicted to drugs is beyond a person's control.

Drug addiction among children is an important problem in the United States.

Individual responsibility is the most important thing. (r)

People who die from a drug overdose have gotten what they deserved. (r)

Helping Attitude Items

Society should construct more drug counseling clinics and fund more drug counselors.

Money should be given to programs that would help children at risk of being addicted to drugs, even if it would take away from other beneficial programs.

Society should do more to help the very poor.

People convicted of taking hard drugs should always be given the option of drug counseling.

Appendix D

We would like to ask you some questions about your emotional life, in particular, how you control (that is, regulate and manage) your emotions. The questions below involve two distinct aspects of your emotional life. One is your emotional experience, or what you feel like inside. The other is your emotional expression, or how you show your emotions in the way you talk, gesture, or behave. Although some of the following questions may seem similar to one another, they differ in important ways.

1. ____ When I want to feel more positive emotion (such as joy or amusement), I change what I'm thinking about.
2. ____ I keep my emotions to myself.
3. ____ When I want to feel less negative emotion (such as sadness or anger), I change what I'm thinking about.
4. ____ When I am feeling positive emotions, I am careful not to express them.
5. ____ When I'm faced with a stressful situation, I make myself think about it in a way that helps me stay calm.
6. ____ I control my emotions by not expressing them.
7. ____ When I want to feel more positive emotion, I change the way I'm thinking about the situation.
8. ____ I control my emotions by changing the way I think about the situation I'm in.
9. ____ When I am feeling negative emotions, I make sure not to express them.
10. ____ When I want to feel less negative emotion, I change the way I'm thinking about the situation.

Which of the following is closest to the description you were given before the story?

- a. A short quote from the author describing her intentions for the article
- b. A description of the article focusing on the effects of poverty and negligent parenting
- c. A description of the article focusing on education
- d. A short description of the article containing no detail

Below, you will see a set of statements which, together, are a logical argument in favor of financially supporting programs which help poor Americans to avoid drugs.

We want you to read through the statements. For each one, please rate how believable you find it. Don't worry if you aren't exactly sure why you feel the way you do; just report your first reaction.

1. Many people in the United States live in poverty.
2. People who live in poverty often have difficulty making ends meet and live in unpleasant conditions.
3. Because of 2, poor parents are often unable to appropriately care for their children.
4. Children who grow up with insufficient care often are not instilled with healthy or moral values.
5. Children who grow up with insufficient care often are undereducated, desperate, and anxious.
6. Because of 4 and 5, poor children will be more likely to use drugs or become involved in the drug trade.
7. Using and selling drugs makes children less likely to grow up to be good parents as adults.
8. Using and selling hard drugs is unhealthy for individuals.
9. It is bad when children grow up to be inadequate parents.
10. It is bad when people do things that are unhealthy.
11. Because of 7, 8, 9, and 10, it would be better for society if fewer people used or sold illegal drugs such as heroin.
12. Properly funded government and private interventions can ease the economic burden on poor parents.
13. Properly funded government and private interventions can help poor parents learn how to better care for their children.
14. Properly funded government and private interventions can directly educate poor children to keep them from using illegal drugs such as heroin.
15. All citizens should do what they can to make society better.

Conclusion A. Because of 12-15, all citizens should support government and private institutions that help poor communities.

Conclusion B. I am a United States Citizen, and thus I should support government and private institutions that help poor communities.

If possible, please say if you have any other reasons for disagreeing with Conclusion A or B. Again, don't spend too much effort trying to think of something; just write something if it comes to mind easily. If you can't think of anything, just type N/A.

References

- Appel, M. & Richter, T. (2007). Persuasive effects of fictional narratives increase over time. *Media Psychology, 10*, 113-134.
- Botvin, G. & Kantor, L. (2000). Preventing alcohol and tobacco use through life skills training. *Alcohol Research & Health, 24*, 250-257.
- Cappella, J. & Jamieson, K. (1996). News frames, political cynicism, and media cynicism. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 546*, 71-84.
- Cacioppo, J. & Petty, R. (1986). *Communication and persuasion: Central and peripheral routes to attitude change*. New York, NY: Springer-Verlag.
- Cacioppo, N. J., Petty, R., & Kao, C. (1984). The efficient assessment of need for cognition. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 48*, 30-307.
- Carpenter, J.M., & Green, M.C. Mind-Reading Motivation: Individual differences in desire to perspective-take influence narrative persuasion. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Carpenter, J.M., Green, M.C., & Vacharkulksemsuk, T. (in preparation). Individual differences in Mind-Reading Motivation.
- Cialdini, R., Levy, A., Herman, P., & Evenbeck, S. (1973). Attitudinal politics: The strategy of moderation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 25*, 100-108.
- Cialdini, R., Levy, A., Herman, P., Kozlowski, L., & Petty, R. (1976). Elastic shifts of opinion: Determinants of direction and durability. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 34*, 663-672.
- Cooke, J. (1980, September 28). Jimmy's World. *The Washington Post*, pp. A1.
- Dal Cin, S., Zanna, M., & Fong, G. (2004). Narrative persuasion and overcoming resistance. In Knowles, E. & Linn, J. (Eds.), *Resistance and Persuasion* (pp. 175-192). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Durkin, S. & Wakefield, M. (2008). Interrupting a narrative transportation experience: Program placement effects on responses to antismoking advertising. *Journal of Health Communication, 13*, 667-680.
- Escalas, J. (2004). Imagine yourself in the product: Mental simulation, narrative transportation, and persuasion. *Journal of Advertising, 33*, 37-48.

- Escalas, J. (2007). Self-referencing and persuasion: Narrative transportation versus analytical elaboration. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 33, 421-429.
- Eslick, A., Fazio, L., & Marsh, E. (2010). Ironic effects of drawing attention to story errors. *Memory*, 19, 184-191.
- Festinger, L. & Maccoby, N. (1964). On resistance to persuasive communications. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 68, 359-366.
- Gerrig, R.J. (1993). *Experiencing narrative worlds: On the psychological activities of reading*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Green, M. (2006). Narratives and cancer communication. *Journal of Communication*, 56, 168-183.
- Green, M. & Brock, T. (2000). The role of transportation in the persuasiveness of public narratives. *Journal of Social and Personality Psychology*, 79, 701-721.
- Green, M. & Donahue, J. (2011). Persistence of belief change in the face of deception: The effect of factual stories revealed to be false. *Media Psychology*, 14, 312-331.
- Green, M., Garst, J., & Brock, T. (2004). The power of fiction: Determinants and boundaries. In Shrum, L.J. (Ed.) *The Psychology of Entertainment Media: Blurring the Lines Between Entertainment and Persuasion*. (pp.161-176). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Green, M., Garst, J., Brock, T., & Chung, S. (2006). Fact versus fiction labeling: Persuasion parity despite heightened scrutiny of fact. *Media Psychology*, 8, 267-285.
- Haas, R. & Grady, K. (1975). Temporal delay, type of forewarning, and resistance to influence. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 11, 459-469.
- Kaufman, G.F., & Libby, L.K. (2007). Changing beliefs and behavior through experience-taking. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 103, 1-19.
- Lee, S. (2010). Ad-induced affect: The effects of forewarning, affect intensity, and prior brand attitude. *Journal of Marketing Communications*, 16, 225-237
- Lombard, M. & Ditton, T. (1997). At the heart of it all: The concept of presence. *Journal of Computer Mediated Communication*, 13.
- Marsh, E. & Fazio, L. (2006). Learning errors from fiction: Difficulties in reducing reliance on fictional stories. *Memory & Cognition*, 24, 1140-1149.

- Mazzocco, P.M., Green, M.C., Sasota, J.A., & Jones, N.W. (2010). This story is not for everyone: Transportability and narrative persuasion. *Social Psychology and Personality Science*, *1*, 361-368.
- Oatley, K. & Ghohamain, M. (1997). *Emotions and identification: Connections between readers and fiction*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Perloff, R. (1993). Third-person effect research 1983-1992: A review and synthesis. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, *5*, 167-184.
- Petty, R. & Cacioppo, J. (1977). Forewarning, cognitive reasoning, and resistance to persuasion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *35*, 645-655.
- Quinn, J. & Wood, W. (2004). Forewarnings of influence appeals: Inducing resistance and acceptance. In Knowles, E. & Linn, J. (Eds.), *Resistance and Persuasion* (pp. 175-192). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Singhal, A. & Rogers, E. (1999). *Entertainment-education: A communication strategy for social change*. London: Routledge.
- Slater, M., Rouner, D., & Long, M. (2006). Television dramas and support for controversial public policies: Effects and mechanisms. *Journal of Communication*, *56*, 235-252.
- Strange, J. & Leung, C. (1999). How anecdotal accounts in news and in fiction can influence judgments of a social problem's urgency, causes, and cures. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *25*, 436-449.
- Vaughan, P., Rogers, E., Singhal, A., & Swalehe, R. (2000). Entertainment-education and HIV/AIDS prevention: A field experiment in Tanzania. *Health Communication*, *5*, 81-100.
- Wang, J. & Calder, B. (2006). Media transportation and advertising. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *33*, 151-162.
- Watts, W. & Holt, L. (1979). Persistence of opinion change induced under conditions of forewarning and distraction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *37*, 778-789.
- Wood, W. & Quinn, J. (2003). Forewarned and forearmed? Two meta-analysis syntheses of forewarnings of influence appeals. *Psychological Bulletin*, *129*, 119-138.