when participants were told to consider how they would have evaluated the study had the findings supported the position opposite their own (see Mussweiler, Strack, & Pfieffer, 2000, for related research).

D. Summary of Attitude Bias

In this section, we have seen that people’s attitudes strongly bias the way they interpret information. Most often, these biases lead people to see greater support for their position than would be seen by a neutral observer. Far from being of little consequence, these biases can exacerbate conflicts between opposing parties and constitute barriers to peaceful settlements. The good news is that biases resulting from strongly held attitudes can be reduced if people are counseled to view the evidence from the opposition’s point of view.

IV. Attitudes and Behavior

People generally act in accordance with their attitudes. For example, people who prefer Pepsi to Coke tend to buy more Pepsi than Coke, and people who favor a particular presidential candidate usually vote for that candidate come election time. Attitudes do not, however, always guide behavior. Pepsi lovers sometimes buy Coke, and people who favor particular candidates don’t always bother to vote. Inconsistencies between attitude and behavior occur for a number of reasons. In this section of the chapter, you will study some of these factors and consider the complexities of the attitude–behavior relation.

A. Early Investigations of the Attitude–Behavior Relation

Research in this area was initiated by a Stanford sociologist named Richard LaPiere. In the mid 1930s, LaPiere and a young Chinese couple took an automobile trip around
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Telling participants they should be impartial did not reduce the assimilation bias, but urging them to consider the opposite did eliminate the bias.