

Editorial Note

Research Dialogue introduction

That choice is constructed, and hence influenced by a wealth of variables, has become axiomatic to consumer psychology, indeed, marketing and psychology in general (see for example, Bettman, Luce, and Payne, 1998). In this Research Dialogue, Ravi Dhar and Margaret Gorlin (2013a—in this issue) advance a conceptual framework by which to organize, and understand, the myriad effects previously uncovered. Specifically, the authors build upon the dual-process model advanced by Kahneman and Frederick (2002). In brief, this model hypothesizes that human judgment can be understood to be the result of two broad sets of processes, one of which is intuitive, requiring little or no deliberation (referred to as System I) and the other of which is deliberative, thoughtful, and effortful (referred to as System II). Dhar and Gorlin further develop this dual-process approach to account for when and how preferences are constructed. Specifically, they hypothesize that choices will be the result of System I to the extent that System I's response is strongly consistent with a choice, and to the extent that motivation is relatively low. In contrast, choices will be the result of System II to the extent that System I's response is weak, and/or there exists motivation to modify System I's reaction.

Four commentaries to Dhar and Gorlin's paper are provided by noted experts. Duane Wegener and Yi-Wen Chien (2013—in this issue) rely upon the dual-processing framework offered by the Elaboration Likelihood Model (Petty, 1977; Petty & Briñol, 2012; Petty & Cacioppo, 1979, 1981, 1986) to suggest how Dhar and Gorlin's framework might be enhanced. Justin Martin and Steven Sloman (in this issue) suggest that Systems I and II ought to be better understood as operating in parallel (and interactively) rather than sequentially. They articulate how such a modification bears upon their categorization of choice effects. Bertam Gawronski (2013—in this issue) is concerned that the dual-process model explanation offered by Dhar and Gorlin is potentially circular in logic. As a way to overcome this difficulty, he articulates the distinction between associative and propositional evaluative processes (APE; Gawronski & Bodenhausen, 2006, 2011), and suggests that such a distinction may prove more useful in developing a framework by which to understand choice. Keith Stanovich (2013—in this issue) applauds Dhar and Gorlin's integration of choice with dual-process models. He suggests, however, that such an integration does not undermine

or contradict previously offered explanations. Dhar and Gorlin (2013b—in this issue) provide a response to the commentaries.

It is hoped that this Research Dialogue will be of interest to choice researchers in that the Dhar and Gorlin paper provides an interesting and potentially useful framework by which to consider choice construction. At the same time, it is hoped that this Research Dialogue will be of interest to those interested in dual-model processes. This set of papers provides a particularly helpful means by which to consider and evaluate different approaches to theoretical conceptualization of dual-processes.

References

- Bettman, J. R., Luce, M. F., & Payne, J. W. (1998). Constructive consumer choice processes. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 25(3), 187–217 (Journal of Consumer Psychology).
- Dhar, R., & Gorlin, M. (2013a). A dual-system framework to understand preference construction processes in choice. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 23(4), 528–542 (in this issue).
- Dhar, R., & Gorlin, M. (2013b). Refining the dual process theory of preference construction: A reply to Gawronski, Martin and Sloman, Stanovich, and Wegener and Chien. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 23(4), 564–568 (in this issue).
- Gawronski, B. (2013). What should we expect from a dual-process theory of preference construction and choice? *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 23(4), 556–560 (in this issue).
- Gawronski, B., & Bodenhausen, G. V. (2006). Associative and propositional processes in evaluation: An integrative review of implicit and explicit attitude change. *Psychological Bulletin*, 132, 692–731.
- Gawronski, B., & Bodenhausen, G. V. (2011). The associative-propositional evaluation model: Theory, evidence, and open questions. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 44, 59–127.
- Kahneman, D., & Frederick, S. (2002). Representativeness revisited: Attribute substitution in intuitive judgment. *Heuristics and biases: The psychology of intuitive judgment*, 49–81.
- Martin, J. W., & Sloman, S. A. (2013). Refining the dual system theory of choice. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 23(4), 552–555 (in this issue).
- Petty, R. E. (1977). *A cognitive response analysis of the temporal persistence of attitude changes induced by persuasive communications*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University.
- Petty, R. E., & Briñol, P. (2012). The elaboration likelihood model. In P. A. M. Van Lange, A. W. Kruglanski, & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Handbook of theories of social psychology, Vol. 1*. (pp. 224–245) London, England: Sage.

- Petty, R. E., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1979). Issue involvement can increase or decrease persuasion by enhancing message-relevant cognitive responses. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37, 1915–1926.
- Petty, R. E., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1981). *Attitudes and persuasion: Classic and contemporary approaches*. Dubuque, IA: Wm. C. Brown.
- Petty, R. E., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1986). *Communication and persuasion: Central and peripheral routes to persuasion*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Stanovich, K. E. (2013). Dual process theory and the context of choice: Comments on Dhar and Gorlin. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 23(4), 561–563 (in this issue).
- Wegener, D. T., & Chien, Y. (2013). Elaboration and choice. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 23(4), 543–551 (in this issue).

Joseph R. Priester
University of Southern California, USA
Corresponding author.
E-mail address: priester@usc.edu.

Richard E. Petty
The Ohio State University, USA

31 May 2013