ate a swimmer; the other half read a factual account of the animal’s unpredictable temperament in the wild and its adverse effects on the fishing industry. Finally, the researchers gathered attitudes toward the animal.

Figure 7.2 shows some of the results from this investigation. In the figure, higher numbers indicate more negative attitudes toward the lemphur, so they indicate attitude change from the initially positive attitude. Although the affectively based persuasion attempt was more effective at changing affectively based attitudes than cognitively based ones, the reverse was true for the cognitively based persuasion attempt. In short, the data show a matching effect: Appeals are most effective when their tone matches the manner in which the attitude was initially formed (see also Edwards, 1990; Edwards & von Hippel, 1995; Huskinson & Haddock, 2004).

**FIGURE 7.2**

Affective–Cognitive Matching Effects in Persuasion

An affectively based persuasion attempt was more effective at changing affectively based attitudes, but a cognitively based persuasion attempt was more effective at changing cognitively based attitudes. These findings demonstrate an affective–cognitive matching effect: Persuasive appeals tend to be most effective when the nature of the appeal matches the basis of the attitude.


Message Order Effects. Every four years, the Republican and Democratic parties hold their national conventions to select their respective candidates for president. By agreement, the two parties alternate which convention is held first. In half of the election years the Republicans go first, and in the other half the Democrats go first. The conventions are designed to persuade Americans to vote for their party’s candidate, so the question arises as to whether it is advantageous to go first (primacy effect) or last (recency effect).

N. Miller and Campbell (1959) addressed this question in the context of a simulated jury decision. Arguments for the plaintiff and defendant were condensed, and half of the participants heard the plaintiff’s case first and the other half heard the defendant’s case first. Miller and Campbell included two other variables of