



Universiteit  
Leiden  
The Netherlands

## **Making up your mind about a complex technology : an investigation into factors that help or hinder the achievement of cognitive closure about CCS**

Koot, C.

### **Citation**

Koot, C. (2015, January 21). *Making up your mind about a complex technology : an investigation into factors that help or hinder the achievement of cognitive closure about CCS*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/31555>

Version: Corrected Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/31555>

**Note:** To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/31555> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

**Author:** Koot, Charlotte

**Title:** Making up your mind about a complex technology : an investigation into factors that help or hinder the achievement of cognitive closure about CCS

**Issue Date:** 20151-01-21



# **Appendix**

**Design, Stimulus Materials,  
and Results of the Two Distinct  
Data Collection Waves (Study 2)**

---

## Data Collection Wave I

In the first data collection wave we explored whether communicating an analogy of CCS would reduce participants' risk perception of and negative emotional reactions to the implementation of CCS, and whether this would lead to an increase in the level of cognitive closure they achieved on the topic. To ensure that the effects would not differ depending on CCS-component, we counterbalanced whether participants were prompted to think about CO<sub>2</sub> storage or about CO<sub>2</sub> transport.

### Method

**Participants and design.** Participants were 97 students (33 men and 64 women;  $M_{\text{age}} = 20.32$ ,  $SD = 2.99$ ) who were randomly assigned to either one of the conditions of the 2 (CCS-component: CO<sub>2</sub> transport vs. CO<sub>2</sub> storage)  $\times$  2 (analogy use: analogy vs. no-analogy) design. They received either a monetary reward or course credit in return for their participation.

**Procedure.** The study was the first in a set of unrelated studies. The procedure and measures of this data collection wave were as described in the main text of Chapter 2. Depending on CCS-component condition, participants read information about CO<sub>2</sub> transport or CO<sub>2</sub> storage, and depending on analogy condition, this information did or did not include an analogy of the relevant CCS-component. Participants in the CO<sub>2</sub> transport condition (analogy and no-analogy) read the following information:

CO<sub>2</sub> can be transported via pipelines, ships, or tanker trucks. The manner of transport that is selected depends on many aspects, such as the amount of CO<sub>2</sub> and the transport distance to the location where the CO<sub>2</sub> can be stored. Transport via pipelines is the most likely method in the Netherlands. These pipelines can be located below as well as above the ground. The CO<sub>2</sub> is compressed after it has been captured. Next, the CO<sub>2</sub> can be transported via the pipelines to the storage location.

Those in the CO<sub>2</sub> transport-analogy condition then also read:

CO<sub>2</sub> transport via pipelines is comparable to transport of natural gas, where natural gas is transported via pipelines to provide households and businesses with gas.

Participants in the CO<sub>2</sub> storage condition (analogy and no-analogy) read the following information about the CCS-component:

CO<sub>2</sub> can be stored in depleted natural gas fields, in depleted oil fields, and in so-called aquifers (water-bearing layers). Prior to the selection of CO<sub>2</sub> storage locations, investigations are carried out, after which the most suitable location is selected. Depleted natural gas fields are the most likely storage location for CO<sub>2</sub> in the Netherlands. To be able to store

the CO<sub>2</sub> that has been captured, it is first compressed. The CO<sub>2</sub> is then inserted into the depleted natural gas field via an injection well where it is stored.

In the CO<sub>2</sub> storage-analogy condition participants then also read:

CO<sub>2</sub> storage in depleted natural gas fields is comparable to storage of natural gas in these kinds of fields. Storage of natural gas in depleted natural gas fields takes place to enable effective responses to peaks in gas demand.

## Results

To explore whether participants' general risk perception, specific risk perceptions, negative emotional reactions, and their achievement of cognitive closure were affected by the use of an analogy or differed depending on CCS-component (CO<sub>2</sub> transport or CO<sub>2</sub> storage), we conducted Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) with analogy use and CCS-component as independent variables.

Results revealed no significant main or interaction effects of analogy use and CCS-component on general risk perception,  $F_s(1, 93) \leq 3.08$ ,  $p_s \geq .083$ , or on any of the specific risk perception dimensions (catastrophic potential, lack of control, and lack of familiarity),  $F_s(1, 93) \leq 3.22$ ,  $p_s \geq .076$ . Participants' negative emotional reactions to CCS also remained largely unaffected by analogy use and CCS-component. Analogy use and CCS-component had neither main nor interaction effects on outcome uncertainty-related emotions,  $F_s(1, 93) \leq 1.59$ ,  $p_s \geq .210$ . Results showed only a main effect of analogy use on outcome certainty-related emotions; participants who learned about a natural gas analogue of CCS experienced these emotions more intensely ( $M = 2.45$ ,  $SD = 1.36$ ) than those who did not learn about an analogous technology ( $M = 1.91$ ,  $SD = 0.92$ ),  $F(1, 93) = 5.19$ ,  $p = .025$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = .05$ . There was no main effect of CCS-component or interaction effect of analogy use and CCS-component on outcome certainty-related emotions,  $F_s(1, 93) < 1$ ,  $p_s \geq .585$ . Finally, the level of cognitive closure that participants achieved did differ depending on the CCS-component under consideration; participants who were asked to form an attitude on CO<sub>2</sub> transport achieved more cognitive closure ( $M = 3.94$ ,  $SD = 1.13$ ) than those who formed an attitude on CO<sub>2</sub> storage ( $M = 3.50$ ,  $SD = 1.05$ ),  $F(1, 93) = 4.02$ ,  $p = .048$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = .04$ . There was no main effect of analogy use or an interaction effect of analogy use and CCS-component on cognitive closure achieved,  $F_s(1, 93) \leq 1$ ,  $p_s \geq .319$ .

## Data Collection Wave II

In the second data collection wave we focused on CO<sub>2</sub> storage only. In this wave, we did not only systematically vary whether participants learned about an analogous technology of CO<sub>2</sub> storage, but also whether this analogy contained information that alluded to the safety of the analogous technology. In this way, we aimed to explore whether communicating information that contained an analogy of CO<sub>2</sub> storage as well as safety-related information about the analogue would reduce participants' risk perception and negative emotional reactions to the implementation of the technology. Such reductions would then possibly lead to an increase in the level of cognitive closure that people achieved on the topic. Contrary to the first data collection wave, participants in the analogy conditions first learned about the analogy, and then read further information on the CCS-component.

### Method

**Participants and design.** Participants were 122 students (24 men and 98 women;  $M_{\text{age}} = 20.00$ ,  $SD = 2.69$ ) who were randomly assigned to either one of three experimental conditions (analogy with safety information vs. analogy without safety information vs. no analogy). They received either a monetary reward or course credit in return for their participation.

**Procedure.** The study was the first in a set of unrelated studies. The procedure and measures of this data collection wave were as described in the main text of Chapter 2. Depending on experimental condition, participants read information about CO<sub>2</sub> storage that did or did not include an analogy. Specifically, participants in the “analogy with safety information” condition and the “analogy without safety information” condition first learned about a technology that is analogous to CO<sub>2</sub> storage in depleted natural gas fields; storage of natural gas in depleted natural gas fields. The text on the analogy in the “analogy with safety information” condition additionally contained information that alluded to the safety of the analogous technology. Participants in the “no analogy” condition did not learn about an analogy. Thus, the complete text on CO<sub>2</sub> storage in depleted natural gas fields in the “analogy with safety information” read as follows:

Some parts of the CO<sub>2</sub> capture, transport, and storage technology are comparable to already existing technologies. For instance, storage of CO<sub>2</sub> in depleted natural gas fields is comparable to the storage of natural gas in these types of fields. Storage of natural gas in depleted natural gas fields takes place to enable effective responses to peaks in gas demand in winter. Underground storage of natural gas is a tried and tested method and has been taking place since the 1990s on several locations in the Netherlands. To store the natural gas, it is inserted in depleted

natural gas fields via wells that were originally used for gas extraction. It has been demonstrated that the chance is virtually zero that natural gas will escape from the natural gas field in which it has been stored.

CO<sub>2</sub> can be stored in different ways. Depleted natural gas fields are the most likely storage location for CO<sub>2</sub> in the Netherlands. Prior to the selection of CO<sub>2</sub> storage locations, investigations are carried out, after which the most suitable location for storage of the CO<sub>2</sub> is selected. To be able to store the CO<sub>2</sub> it is gathered at the depleted natural gas field. The CO<sub>2</sub> is then inserted into the depleted natural gas field via an existing well where it is stored. In this way, storage of CO<sub>2</sub> in depleted natural gas fields is comparable to the storage of natural gas in depleted natural gas fields.

Participants in the “analogy without safety information” read the following text:

Some parts of the CO<sub>2</sub> capture, transport, and storage technology are comparable to already existing technologies. For instance, storage of CO<sub>2</sub> in depleted natural gas fields is comparable to the storage of natural gas in these types of fields. Storage of natural gas in depleted natural gas fields takes place to enable effective responses to peaks in gas demand in winter. To store the natural gas, it is inserted in depleted natural gas fields via wells that were originally used for gas extraction.

CO<sub>2</sub> can be stored in different ways. Depleted natural gas fields are the most likely storage location for CO<sub>2</sub> in the Netherlands. Prior to the selection of CO<sub>2</sub> storage locations, investigations are carried out, after which the most suitable location for storage of the CO<sub>2</sub> is selected. To be able to store the CO<sub>2</sub> it is gathered at the depleted natural gas field. The CO<sub>2</sub> is then inserted into the depleted natural gas field via an existing well where it is stored. In this way, storage of CO<sub>2</sub> in depleted natural gas fields is comparable to the storage of natural gas in depleted natural gas fields.

And, finally, the information on CO<sub>2</sub> storage in depleted natural gas fields in the “no analogy” condition read:

CO<sub>2</sub> can be stored in different ways. Depleted natural gas fields are the most likely storage location for CO<sub>2</sub> in the Netherlands. Prior to the selection of CO<sub>2</sub> storage locations, investigations are carried out, after which the most suitable location for storage of the CO<sub>2</sub> is selected. To be able to store the CO<sub>2</sub> it is gathered at the depleted natural gas field. The CO<sub>2</sub> is then inserted into the depleted natural gas field via an existing well where it is stored.

## Results

To explore whether participants' general risk perception, specific risk perceptions, negative emotional reactions, and achievement of cognitive closure were affected by the use of an analogy that either did or did not include safety-related information, we conducted Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). Results revealed no significant differences between the three experimental conditions on general risk perception, the three risk perception dimensions, negative outcome uncertainty-related emotions, or level of cognitive closure achieved  $F_s(1, 119) \leq 2.54, p_s \geq .083$ . Thus, communication about a natural gas analogue of CO<sub>2</sub> storage (including or excluding safety information) did not affect these measures. Participants in the three conditions, however, did differ in the extent to which they experienced outcome certainty-related emotions,  $F(1, 119) = 3.85, p = .024, \eta_p^2 = .06$ . Bonferroni post hoc tests revealed that participants in the "analogy without safety information" condition experienced less outcome certainty-related emotions (e.g., anger, disappointment) ( $M = 1.77, SD = 0.86$ ), than participants in the "analogy with safety information" condition ( $M = 2.33, SD = 1.09, p = .051$ ) or the "no analogy" condition ( $M = 2.32, SD = 1.14, p = .054$ ).







# References

- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84, 191-215. doi:10.1037/0033-295X.84.2.191
- Bandura, A. (2006). Toward a psychology of human agency. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 1, 164-180. doi:10.1111/j.1745-6916.2006.00011.x
- Bassili, J. N. (1996). Meta-judgmental versus operative indexes of psychological attributes: The case of measures of attitude strength. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71, 637-653. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.71.4.637
- Bar-Tal, Y. (1994). The effect on mundane decision making of the need and ability to achieve cognitive structure. *European Journal of Personality*, 8, 45-58. doi:10.1002/per.2410080105
- Bishop, G. F., Oldendick, R. W., Tuchfarber, A. J., & Bennet, S. E. (1980). Pseudo-opinions on public affairs. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 44, 189-209. doi:10.1086/268584
- Bohner, G., & Dickel, N. (2011). Attitudes and attitude change. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 62, 391-417. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.121208.131609
- Bohner, G., Ruder, M., & Erb, H.-P. (2002). When expertise backfires: Contrast and assimilation effects in persuasion. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 41, 495-519. doi:10.1348/014466602321149858
- Cass, N., & Walker, G. (2009). Emotion and rationality: The characterisation and evaluation of opposition to renewable energy projects. *Emotion, Space and Society*, 2, 62-69. doi:10.1016/j.emospa.2009.05.006
- Chaiken, S. (1980). Heuristic versus systematic information processing and the use of source versus message cues in persuasion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 39, 752-766. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.39.5.752
- Cialdini, R. B., & Goldstein, N. J. (2004). Social influence: Compliance and conformity. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 55, 591-621. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.74.2.2471
- Clark, J. K., Wegener, D. T., Habashi, M. M., & Evans, A. T. (2012). Source expertise and persuasion: The effects of perceived opposition or support on message scrutiny. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 38, 90-100. doi:10.1177/0146167211420733

- Clarkson, J. J., Hirt, E. R., Jia, L., & Alexander, M. B. (2010). When perception is more than reality: The effect of perceived versus actual resource depletion on self-regulatory behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 98, 29-46. doi:10.1037/a0017539
- Converse, P. E. (1964). The nature of belief systems in mass publics. In D. E. Apter (Ed.), *Ideology and discontent* (pp. 206-261). New York, NY: Free Press.
- Converse, P. E. (1970). Attitudes and non-attitudes: continuation of a dialogue. In E. R. Tuft (Ed.), *The quantitative analysis of social problems* (pp. 168-189). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Crano, W. D., & Prislin, R. (2006). Attitudes and persuasion. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 57, 345-374. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.57.102904.190034
- Cuddy, A. J. C., Glick, P., & Beninger, A. (2011). The dynamics of warmth and competence judgments, and their outcomes in organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 31, 73-98. doi:10.1016/j.riob.2011.10.004
- De Best-Waldhober, M., Daamen, D. D. L., & Faaij, A. P. C. (2009). Informed and uninformed public opinions on CO<sub>2</sub>-capture and storage technologies in the Netherlands. *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, 3, 322-333. doi:10.1016/j.ijggc.2008.09.001
- De Vries, G. (2014). *Pitfalls in the communication about CO2 capture and storage* (Doctoral dissertation, Leiden University, Leiden, the Netherlands). Retrieved from <https://openaccess.leidenuniv.nl/handle/1887/26923>
- Dhar, R., & Simonson, I. (2003). The Effect of Forced Choice on Choice. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 40, 146-160. doi:10.1509/jmkr.40.2.146.19229
- Dütschke, E. (2011). What drives local public acceptance—Comparing two cases from Germany. *Energy Procedia*, 4, 6234-6240. doi:10.1016/j.egypro.2011.02.636
- Fazio, R. H., & Zanna, M. P. (1978). Attitudinal qualities relating to the strength of the attitude-behavior relationship. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 14, 398-408. doi:10.1016/0022-1031(78)90035-5
- Fife-Schaw, C., & Rowe, G. (1996). Public perceptions of everyday food hazards: A psychometric study. *Risk Analysis*, 16, 487-500. doi:10.1111/j.1539-6924.1996.tb01095.x

- Fischhoff, B., Slovic, P., Lichtenstein, S., Read, S., & Combs, B. (1978). How safe is safe enough? A psychometric study of attitudes towards technological risks and benefits. *Policy Sciences*, 9, 127–152. doi:10.1007/BF00143739
- Fiske, S. T., Cuddy, A. J. C., & Glick, P. (2007). Universal dimensions of social cognition: warmth and competence. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 11, 77–83. doi: 10.1016/j.tics.2006.11.005
- Huijts, N. M. A., Midden, C. J. H., & Meijnders, A. L. (2007). Social acceptance of carbon dioxide storage. *Energy Policy*, 35, 2780–2789. doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2006.12.007
- IPCC (2007). Summary for policymakers. In B. Metz, O. R., Davidson, P. R. Bosch, R. Dave, & L. A. Meyer (Eds.), *Climate change 2007: Mitigation. Contribution of working Group III to the fourth report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* (pp. 7–22). Cambridge, UK and New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Itaoka, K., Saito, A., Paukovic, M., De Best-Waldhober, M., Dowd, A-M., Jeanneret, T., Ashworth, P. & James, M. (2012). *Understanding how individuals perceive carbon dioxide: Implications for acceptance of carbon dioxide capture and storage* (CSIRO Report EP 118160). Retrieved from: <http://www.globalccsinstitute.com/publications/understanding-how-individuals-perceive-carbon-dioxide-implications-acceptance-carbon>
- Jasper, J. (1998). The emotions of protest: Affective and reactive emotions in and around social movements. *Sociological Forum*, 13, 397–424. doi:10.1023/A:1022175308081
- Johnson, E. J., & Tversky, A. (1983). Affect, generalization, and the perception of risk. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45, 20–31. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.45.1.20
- Jonas, K., Diehl, M., & Brömer, P. (1997). Effects of attitudinal ambivalence on information processing and attitude-intention consistency. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 33, 190–210. doi:10.1006/jesp.1996.1317
- Kim, Y. J., Chun, J. U., & Song, J. (2009). Investigating the role of attitude in technology acceptance from an attitude strength perspective. *International Journal of Information Management*, 29, 67–77. doi:10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2008.01.011

- Kimes, H. G., & Troth, W. A. (1974). Relationship of trait anxiety to career decisiveness. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 21*, 277-280. doi:10.1037/h0037611
- KNAW (2013). Summary. In *Vertrouwen in Wetenschap* (pp. 9-19). Amsterdam: Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen. Retrieved from KNAW website: [https://www.knaw.nl/nl/actueel/publicaties/vertrouwen-in-wetenschap/@@download/pdf\\_file/20131005.pdf](https://www.knaw.nl/nl/actueel/publicaties/vertrouwen-in-wetenschap/@@download/pdf_file/20131005.pdf)
- Koot, C., Ter Mors, E., & Ellemers, N. (2014). *How Risk Perception and Negative Emotions Relate to the Achievement of Cognitive Closure on Complex Technologies*. Manuscript in preparation.
- Koot, C., Ter Mors, E., Ellemers, N., & Daamen, D. D. L. (2014a). *Antecedents and consequences of achieving cognitive closure: The ability to achieve closure, and openness to additional information*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Koot, C., Ter Mors, E., Ellemers, N., & Daamen, D. D. L. (2014b). [Factual disagreement among experts and the ability to achieve closure]. Unpublished raw data.
- Koot, C., Ter Mors, E., Ellemers, N., & Daamen, D. D. L. (2014c). *Facilitation of attitude formation through communication: How perceived source expertise enhances the ability to achieve cognitive closure about complex environmental topics*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Kossowska, M., & Bar-Tal, Y. (2013). Need for closure and heuristic information processing: The moderating role of the ability to achieve the need for closure. *British Journal of Psychology, 104*, 457-480. doi:10.1111/bjop.12001
- Kossowska, M., Dragon, P., & Bukowski, M. (2014). When need for closure leads to positive attitudes towards a negatively stereotyped outgroup. *Motivation and Emotion: 1-11*. doi:10.1007/s11031-014-9414-5
- Krehbiel, P., & Cropanzano, R. (2000). Procedural justice, outcome favorability and emotion. *Social Justice Research, 13*, 39-360. doi:10.1023/A:1007670909889
- Krosnick, J. A., & Petty, R. E. (1995). Attitude strength: An overview. In R. E. Petty & J. A. Krosnick (Eds), *Attitude strength: Antecedents and consequences* (pp. 1-24). Hillsdale, NJ; Erlbaum.
- Kruglanski, A. W. (1989). *Lay epistemic and human knowledge: Cognitive and motivational bases*. New York, NY: Plenum.
- Kruglanski, A. W. (1990). Lay epistemic theory in social-cognitive psychology. *Psychological Inquiry, 1*, 181-197. doi:10.1207/s15327965pli0103\_1

- Kruglanski, A. W., & Boyatzi, L. M. (2012). The psychology of closed and open mindedness, rationality, and democracy. *Critical Review*, 24, 217-232. doi:10.1080/08913811.2012.711023
- Kruglanski, A. W., Dechesne, M., Orehek, E., & Pierro, A. (2009). Three decades of lay epistemics: The why, how, and who of knowledge formation. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 20, 146-191. doi:10.1080/10463280902860037
- Kruglanski, A. W., & Webster, D. M. (1991). Group members' reactions to opinion deviates and conformists at varying degrees of proximity to decision deadline and of environmental noise. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 61, 212-225. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.61.2.212
- Kruglanski, A. W., & Webster, D. M. (1996). Motivated closing of the mind: "Seizing" and "freezing". *Psychological Review*, 103, 263-283. doi:10.1037/0033-295X.103.2.263
- Kruglanski, A. W., Webster, D. M., & Klem, A. (1993). Motivated resistance and openness to persuasion in the presence or absence of prior information. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65, 861-876. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.65.5.861
- Lee, C.-J., Scheufele, D. A., & Lewenstein, B. V. (2005). Public attitudes toward emerging technologies: Examining the interactive effects of cognitions and affect on public attitudes toward nanotechnology. *Science Communication*, 27, 240-267. doi:10.1177/1075547005281474
- Lerner, J. S., & Keltner, D. (2000). Beyond valence: Toward a model of emotion-specific influences on judgement and choice. *Cognition & Emotion*, 14, 473-493. doi:10.1080/026999300402763
- Lerner, J. S., & Keltner, D. (2001). Fear, anger, and risk. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81, 146-159. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.81.1.146
- Lewandowsky, S., Ecker, U. K. H., Seifert, C. M., Schwarz, N., & Cook, J. (2012). Misinformation and its correction: Continued influence and successful debiasing. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 13, 106-131. doi:10.1177/1529100612451018
- Libby, L. K., & Eibach, R. P. (2002). Looking back in time: Self-concept change affects visual perspective in autobiographical memory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82, 167-179. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.82.2.167



- Loewenstein, G. F., Weber, E. U., Hsee, C. K., & Welch, N. (2001). Risk as feelings. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127, 267-286. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.127.2.267
- Mackie, D. M., & Worth, L. T. (1989). Processing deficits and the mediation of positive affect in persuasion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57, 27-40. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.57.1.27
- Markusson, N., Ishii, A., & Stephens, J. C. (2011). The social and political complexities of learning in carbon capture and storage demonstration projects. *Global Environmental Change*, 21, 293-302. doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2011.01.010
- Mayseless, O., & Kruglanski, A. W. (1987). What makes you so sure? Effects of epistemic motivations on judgmental confidence. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Making Processes*, 39, 162-183. doi:10.1016/0749-5978(87)90036-7
- Moors, A., Ellsworth, P. C., Scherer, K. R., & Frijda, N. H. (2013). Appraisal theories of emotion: State of the art and future development. *Emotion Review*, 5, 119-124. doi:10.1177/1754073912468165
- Petrocelli, J. V., Tormala, Z. L., & Rucker, D. D. (2007). Unpacking attitude certainty: Attitude clarity and attitude correctness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 92, 30-41. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.92.1.30
- Petty, R.E., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1986a). *Communication and persuasion: Central and peripheral routes to attitude change*. New York, NY: Springer-Verlag.
- Petty, R. E., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1986b). The elaboration likelihood model of persuasion. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (pp. 123-205). New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Pidgeon, N., Harthorn, B., & Satterfield, T. (2011). Nanotechnology risk perceptions and communication: Emerging technologies, emerging challenges. *Risk Analysis*, 31, 1694-1700. doi:10.1111/j.1539-6924.2011.01738.x
- Poortinga, W., Aoyagi, M., & Pidgeon, N. F. (2013). Public perceptions of climate change and energy futures before and after the Fukushima accident: A comparison between Britain and Japan. *Energy Policy*, 62, 1204-1211. doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2013.08.015
- Pornpitakpan, C. (2004). The persuasiveness of source credibility: A critical review of five decades' evidence. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 34, 243-281. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2004.tb02547.x

- Preacher, K., & Hayes, A. (2008). Asymptotic and resampling strategies for assessing and comparing indirect effects in multiple mediator models. *Behavior Research Methods*, 40, 879-891. doi:10.3758/BRM.40.3.879
- Read, D. L., Brown, R. F., Thorsteinsson, E. B., Morgan, M., & Price, I. (2013). The theory of planned behaviour as a model for predicting public opposition to wind farm developments. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 36, 70-76. doi:10.1016/j.jenvp.2013.07.001
- Reimer, T., Mata, R., & Stoecklin, M. (2004). The use of heuristics in persuasion: deriving cues on source expertise from argument quality. *Current Research in Social Psychology*, 10, Retrieved from: <http://www.uiowa.edu/~grpproc/crisp/crisp.10.6.html>
- Roets, A., & Soetens, B. (2010). Need and ability to achieve closure: Relationships with symptoms of psychopathology. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 48, 155-160. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2009.09.013
- Roets, A., & Van Hiel, A. (2007). Separating ability from need: Clarifying the dimensional structure of the need for closure scale. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 33, 266-280. doi:10.1177/0146167206294744
- Roets, A., & Van Hiel, A. (2011). Item selection and validation of a brief, 15-item version of the Need for Closure Scale. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 50, 90-94. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2010.09.004
- Roets, A., Van Hiel, A., & Cornelis, I. (2006). The dimensional structure of the need for cognitive closure scale: Relationships with “seizing” and “freezing” processes. *Social Cognition*, 24, 22-45. doi:10.1521/soco.2006.24.1.22
- Rucker, D. R., Preacher, K. J., Tormala, Z. L., & Petty, R. E. (2011). Mediation analysis in social psychology: Current practices and new recommendations. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 6, 359-371. doi:10.1111/j.1751-9004.2011.0035.x
- Savadori, L., Savio, S., Nicotra, E., Rumiati, R., Finucane, M., & Slovic, P. (2004). Expert and public perception of risk from biotechnology. *Risk Analysis*, 24, 1289-1299. doi:10.1111/j.0272-4332.2004.00526.x
- Scheufele, D., & Lewenstein, B. (2005). The public and nanotechnology: How citizens make sense of emerging technologies. *Journal of Nanoparticle Research*, 7, 659-667. doi:10.1007/s11051-005-7526-2

- Sharp, J. D., Jaccard, M. K., & Keith, D. W. (2009). Anticipating public attitudes toward underground CO<sub>2</sub> storage. *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, 3, 641-651. doi:10.1016/j.ijggc.2009.04.001
- Siegrist, M. (1999). A causal model explaining the perception and acceptance of gene technology. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 29, 2093-2106. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.1999.tb02297.x
- Singleton, G., Herzog, H., & Ansolabehere, S. (2009). Public risk perspectives on the geologic storage of carbon dioxide. *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, 3, 100-107. doi:10.1016/j.ijggc.2008.07.006
- Slovic, P. (1987). Perception of risk. *Science*, 236, 280-285. doi:10.1126/science.3563507
- Slovic, P. (1992). Perception of risk: Reflections on the psychometric paradigm. In S. Krimsky & D. Golding (Eds.), *Social theories of risk* (pp 117-152). New York: Praeger.
- Slovic, P. (2010). The Psychology of risk. *Saúde e Sociedade*, 19, 731-747. Retrieved July 21, 2014, from <http://www.scielo.br/pdf/sausoc/v19n4/02.pdf>
- Slovic, P., Finucane, M. L., Peters, E., & MacGregor, D. G. (2004). Risk as analysis and risk as feelings: Some thoughts about affect, reason, risk, and rationality. *Risk Analysis*, 24, 311-322. doi:10.1111/j.0272-4332.2004.00433.x
- Smith, C. A., & Ellsworth, P. C. (1985). Patterns of cognitive appraisal in emotion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 48, 813-838. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.48.4.813
- Sparks, P. & Shepherd, R. (1994). Public perceptions of the potential hazards associated with food production and food consumption: An empirical study. *Risk Analysis*, 14, 799-806. doi:10.1111/j.1539-6924.1994.tb00291.x
- Strack, F., Schwarz, N., & Wänke, M. (1991). Semantic and pragmatic aspects of context effects in social and psychological research. *Social Cognition*, 9, 111-125. doi:10.1521/soco.1991.9.1.111
- Teeuw, B., Schwarzer, R., & Jerusalem, M. (1994). *Dutch adaptation of the general self-efficacy scale*. Retrieved from <http://userpage.fu-berlin.de/~health/dutch.htm>

- Ter Mors, E., Weenig, M. W. H., Ellemers, N., & Daamen, D. D. L. (2010). Effective communication about complex environmental issues: Perceived quality of information about carbon dioxide capture and storage (CCS) depends on stakeholder collaboration. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 30, 347-357. doi:10.1016/j.jenvp.2010.06.001
- Terwel, B. W., Harinck, F., Ellemers, N., & Daamen, D. D. L. (2009). How organizational motives and communications affect public trust in organizations: The case of carbon dioxide capture and storage. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 29, 290-299. doi:10.1016/j.jenvp.2008.11.004
- Terwel, B. W., Ter Mors, E., & Daamen, D. D. L. (2012). It's not only about safety: Beliefs and attitudes of 811 local residents regarding a CCS project in Barendrecht. *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, 9, 41-51. doi:10.1016/j.ijggc.2012.02.017
- Tokushige, K., Akimoto, K., & Tomoda, T. (2007a). Public acceptance and risk-benefit perception of CO<sub>2</sub> geological storage for global warming mitigation in Japan. *Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global Change*, 12(7), 1237-1251. doi:10.1007/s11027-006-9037-6
- Tokushige, K., Akimoto, K., & Tomoda, T. (2007b). Public perceptions on the acceptance of geological storage of carbon dioxide and information influencing the acceptance. *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, 1, 101-112. doi:10.1016/S1750-5836(07)00020-5
- Van Egmond, S., & Hekkert, M. P. (2012). Argument map for carbon capture and storage. *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, 11, Supplement, S148-S159. doi:10.1016/j.ijggc.2012.08.010
- Van Harreveld, F., Rutjens, B. T., Rotteveel, M., Nordgren, L. F., & Van der Pligt, J. (2009). Ambivalence and decisional conflict as a cause of psychological discomfort: Feeling tense before jumping off the fence. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 45, 167-173. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2008.08.015
- Vohs, K. D., Baumeister, R. F., & Schmeichel, B. J. (2012). Motivation, personal beliefs, and limited resources all contribute to self-control. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 48, 943-947. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2012.03.002

- Vohs, K. D., Baumeister, R. F., Schmeichel, B. J., Twenge, J. M., Nelson, N. M., & Tice, D. M. (2008). Making choices impairs subsequent self-control: A limited-resource account of decision making, self-regulation, and active initiative. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 94, 883-898. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.94.5.883
- Webster, D. M., & Kruglanski, A. W. (1994). Individual differences in need for cognitive closure. *Personality Processes and Individual Differences*, 67, 1049-1062. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.67.6.1049
- Webster, D. M., & Kruglanski, A. W. (1997). Cognitive and social consequences of the need for cognitive closure. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 8, 133-161. doi:10.1080/14792779643000100
- Zhao, X., & Cai, X. (2008). The role of ambivalence in college nonsmokers' information seeking and information processing. *Communication Research*, 35, 298-318. doi:10.1177/0093650208315959

