

UC Merced

Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Cognitive Science Society

Title

Testing the persuasiveness of meme based arguments by analogy

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5862p4h4>

Journal

Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Cognitive Science Society, 46(0)

Authors

Horne, Zachary

Doumas, Leonidas A. A.

Hallin, Katherine

Publication Date

2024

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Peer reviewed

Testing the persuasiveness of meme based arguments by analogy

Zachary Horne

University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, United Kingdom

Leonidas A. A. Doulas

University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, United Kingdom

Katherine Hallin

University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, United Kingdom

Abstract

Psychologists have noted that analogical reasoning is pervasive in argumentation (Kuhn, 1992; Holyoak, 1997), but the forms these arguments can take varies substantially. Memes are one common format or argument-by-analogy. Memes are widely recognized images or templates that compares two situations to each other for the purpose of making some (often questionable) point. Even though memes-as-arguments are readily visible on social media, the persuasiveness of this category of argument-by-analogy—and specifically the features that predict their persuasiveness—have not been established. This study investigates whether and in what ways arguments by analogy, delivered in the form of a meme, are persuasive. We develop a large set of memes representing common meme structures, political leaning, and familiarity and examined how these factors predict a meme’s perceived clarity, persuasiveness, and memorability, along with these memes effects on beliefs about issues such as climate change, immigration, and racism.