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Conformity
Social Influence & Conformity

**Social Influence**: Use of social power to change the attitudes or behavior of others in a particular direction

**Conformity**: Change in behavior or belief as a result of real or imagined social influence
Autokinetic Effect Study

Estimate how far point of light moved in dark room

After many trials, individual’s estimates converged

Repeated procedure in a group situation
Autokinetic Effect Study

Estimated movement, inches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First day</th>
<th>Second day</th>
<th>Third day</th>
<th>Fourth day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Person 1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Person 2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Person 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The Johnny Rocco Case

Mode

Most common viewpoint

Deviate

Most deviant viewpoint

Slider

Most deviant then most common viewpoint
The Johnny Rocco Case

Participants rated who they most wanted to leave the group

Mode
4.47

Slider
4.76

D eviate
6.11

Not Significantly Different

W anted Deviate to go the most

Not Significantly Different

W anted Deviate to go the most
Reciprocation
Christmas Card Study

Phil Kunz, a psychologist at Brigham Young University in Provo Utah sent 578 Christmas cards (signed “Joyce and Phil”) to strangers living in Chicago, Illinois.

117 (over 20%) sent a card in return

A significant number of return cards had notes or letters enclosed

Only 6 of the 117 people who returned a card said they could not remember them
Reciprocation

Two step procedure:
1. Large request (get No!)
2. Smaller request (get Yes!)

Works because:
- 1st request makes 2nd request seem more moderate and acceptable
- By making a 2nd, more moderate, request the requester appears to have made a concession, which makes other person feel obligated to make a reciprocal concession
**County Youth Study:**  
*Cialdini et al.* (1975)

**Independent variable:** Request

**Experimental group:**

"Would you be willing to serve as unpaid counselors to juvenile delinquents 2 hrs./wk for 2 years?" *(inflated request)*

"No? Ok, would you be willing to serve as unpaid chaperons for juvenile delinquents on a day trip to the zoo?" *(concession)*

**Control group:** Asked....

"Would you be willing to serve as unpaid chaperons for juvenile delinquents on a day trip to the zoo?"
County Youth Study

% agreeing to go to zoo

Control Group

Experimental Group
Door-in-the-Face Technique

Factors that reduce its effectiveness:

- Initial request too extreme

- Request for selfish purposes

- Delay between 1st and 2nd request
Cupcake Sale: Burger (1986)

3 Conditions:

That’s Not All:
  • Cost per cupcake $1.25, then reduced to $1.00

Bargain:
  • Cost per cupcake $1.00, had been $1.25

Control:
  • Cost per cupcake $1.00
Cupcake Sale

That's Not All Bargain Control % who bought a cupcake

% who bought a cupcake

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60%

That's Not All Bargain Control
Commitment & Consistency
Commitment and Consistency

Once we make a commitment, we feel pressure from ourselves and others to behave consistently with that commitment.
Beach Towel Study

Percent who intervened

Control | Experimental

CP
Here's another example...

Researchers asked 1/2 of the residents in an apt. complex to sign a petition to create a recreation center for the handicapped.

2 weeks later, all residents were approached and asked to donate money to the cause.

This reflects a two-step process for the 1/2 of participants who signed the petition:

Step 1: obtain commitment (i.e., petition signature) Step 2: get consistency in behavior (i.e., donate $)
American Cancer Society Study  
(Cialdini & Schroeder, 1976)

Control Group:
"I’m collecting money for the American Cancer Society. Would you be willing to help by giving a donation."

Experimental Group:
"I’m collecting money for the American Cancer Society. Would you be willing to help by giving a donation. Even a penny would help."
American Cancer Society Study

- Control: $18.55
- Experimental: $30.34
Commitments “grow their own legs”

People add reasons and justifications to support the commitments they have made.

This causes prior commitments to be self-perpetuating because people will stick to their prior commitments even when the original factor leading to compliance is gone.
Factors that Affect Commitment and Consistency

Is the commitment voluntary or forced?

*He that complies against his will is of his own opinion still*

Is the commitment made in public or private?

Did the commitment take effort or not?

Is the commitment made actively or passively?
Social Proof
Social Proof: Craig & Prkachin (1978)

1. Administered shock to participant
2. Asked participant how painful shock was
3. Took physiological measures of pain

Participants felt less shock on both pain indexes if they were in the presence of another participant who was apparently experiencing little or no pain.
Why Social Proof Gains Compliance

Why does it work?

- People make fewer errors when they “follow the crowd”

- Following the crowd is easier – takes less mental effort
Factors that Influence Effectiveness of Social Proof

Social Proof works better under conditions of uncertainty.
Factors that Influence Effectiveness of Social Proof

Dissimilar to Similar

Social Proof works better when others are similar to the self
Copycat Suicides
Schmidtke & Hafter (1988)

Examined # of suicides following broadcast of FICTIONAL TV show

• TV show lasted 6 weeks
• Depicted 19 yr. old male who committed suicide by leaping in front of a train

Following the series, railway suicides increased substantially

This increase was greatest for males who were same age as TV character

Copy cat suicides called the Werther Effect
Fluctuations in U.S. suicides before, during, and after 26 publicized suicide stories (Phillips, 1974).
Scarcity
Strategies Derived from Scarcity Principle

1. Limited Numbers:
   - Customer told that a particular product is in short supply

2. Time Limits:
   - Customer told that there is a deadline to the sale of a product
Reactance and Toy Preference
Brehm & Weintraub (1977)

Toddlers put in room with attractive toys

One toy behind a Plexiglas sheet that was:
- 1 foot high (no barrier)
- 2 feet high (barrier)

Toddlers made contact with toy behind the barrier 3 times faster
Reactance and Teen Love
Driscoll, Davis, & Lipetz (1972)

The more parents objected to their teens' relationship, the more in love the couples said they were, and the more the couples wanted to get married.

The couples' love increased as parental interference increased and decreased as parental interference decreased.
Factors that Influence Effectiveness of Scarcity

1. New scarcity

People are more likely to want something that has just become scarce than something that has already been scarce for some time.
Cookie Study
Worchel, Lee, & Adewole (1975)

Showed people a jar of cookies

Jar had either:
-10 cookies in it
-2 cookies in it

People rated cookies as more desirable, more attractive, & more expensive when there were only 2 in the jar. They were the SAME cookies!
Cookie Study: A Modification

Participants given jar of:

-2 cookies (Always scarce)

-10 cookies, which was then replaced with a jar of 2 cookies (Newly scarce)

More positive reaction to the newly scarce cookies than the always scarce cookies
Factors that Influence Effectiveness of Scarcity

1. New scarcity
2. Competition for scarce resources

People are more likely to want a scarce item that they are competing for
Authority
Stanley Milgram

Milgram’s participants obeyed because of the experimenter’s authority, and not because of abnormal psychological problems.
Experimenter told “teacher” to stop delivering the shock even though the “learner” clearly indicated that he wanted the study to go on

100% of the time, the “teacher” stopped delivering shock
Obedience Study: Replications

The experimenter (the authority figure) was hooked up to the shock generator, and the “learner” gave the directives to continue.

100% of the time the “teachers” stopped delivering shock when the experimenter said to
Obedience Study: Replications

Two experimenters gave contradictory orders. One ordered the “teacher” to continue giving the shock, the other ordered the “teacher” to stop.

“Teachers” asked for consensus, but 100% of the time ultimately stopped delivering shock.
Why Do People Obey Authority?

1. Socialization practices

From a very young age, we are taught that obedience to authority is the correct way to behave.
Why Do People Obey Authority?

1. Socialization practices
2. Heuristic

Authority is a heuristic for knowledge, wisdom, and power
Doctor's Orders

There were 4 reasons why the nurse should have refused the order:

• Prescription given over the phone, which was in violation of hospital policy

• Medication was unauthorized

• Dosage was obviously and dangerously excessive

• Physician was unknown to the nurse
Liking
Why Attractiveness Works

Halo Effect:

One very positive trait possessed by a person influences the total judgment of that person.

Attractiveness is one such very positive trait.
Devil Effect:

One very negative trait possessed by a person influences the total judgment of that person.
Attractiveness
Stewart (1980)

1. Evaluated attractiveness of 74 male defendants prior to trial

2. Followed the defendants to find out their trial outcomes

Result: Unattractive defendants were 2 times more likely to get a jail sentence than attractive defendants
Attractiveness
Kurtzburg, Safar, & Cavior (1968)

Jail Inmates: All with facial disfigurements

- Got plastic surgery
  - Also received rehabilitation counseling services
  - Did not receive rehabilitation counseling services

- Did not get plastic surgery
  - Also received rehabilitation counseling services
  - Did not receive rehabilitation counseling services
Attractiveness
Kurtzburg, Safar, & Cavior (1968)

Results:

Inmates who had the plastic surgery were significantly LESS likely to return to jail regardless of whether they had counseling or not.
Familiarity
Mita, Dermer, & Knight (1977)

Participants liked their mirror image more
Friends liked participants' true image more
Close Relationships
Filtering Model of Mate Selection

Romantic relationships involve 4 fixed stages:

- Stage 1: Proximity Filter
- Stage 2: Stimulus Filter
- Stage 3: Value Filter
- Stage 4: Role Filter
Social Exchange Theory

Based on the Max-Min principle

- People seek to maximize their benefits and minimize their costs

- A relationship is more satisfying the more rewards and fewer costs it entails
Social Exchange Theory

**Rewards**: All positive things that a close relationship offers people. These are all of the reasons why somebody would want to be in a relationship.

**Costs**: All of the downsides to a relationship. These are all of the reasons why somebody would not want to be in a relationship.

**Outcome**: The difference between the rewards and costs of a relationship.

\[
\text{Outcome} = \text{Rewards} - \text{Costs}
\]
Social Exchange Theory

Additional factors that influence one’s interpretation of the outcome:

**Comparison level (CL):** The standard against which the outcome is compared.

**Comparison level alternative (CLalt):** A person’s expectations about his or her other alternatives.
Social Penetration Theory

Proposes that:

1. Relationships progress from superficial exchanges to more intimate ones.

2. Specific stages of relationships are characterized by specific patterns of self-disclosure.
Social Penetration Theory

Stage 1: Initial encounters
- Self-disclosure follows strict pattern of reciprocity

Stage 2: Established relationships
- Self-disclosure does NOT follow strict pattern of reciprocity. Partners self-disclose but do not expect nor receive reciprocity each time they self-disclose
Love in the Lab

1. Two strangers put in a room together for 90 minutes during which time they exchange intimate information.

2. They stare into each others’ eyes for 2 min. without talking.

3. “Tell the other person what you like about him/her.”

4. Participants leave by separate doors.
Group Influence
Terms to Know

**Group:** Two or more people who interact for more than a few moments, feel like a group, and who influence each other via interdependent goals/needs.

**Aggregate:** A collection of people who are in the presence of one another, but do not typically interact for more than a few moments and who do not feel like a group. Independent goals/needs.

**Critical difference:**
- Level of interaction
- Feeling
- Interdependent vs. independent goals/needs
Are These Groups?

___  ___ Five people waiting at the same corner for a bus
Yes  No

___  ___ People attending a worship service
Yes  No

___  ___ The ‘Spice Girls Fan Club’
Yes  No

___  ___ Students in a seminar class
Yes  No
Sorority Study
Crandall (1988)

New Members of Alpha

Moderate binging
Too much – too little binging

More Popular
Less Popular
Sorority Study
Crandall (1988)

New Members of Beta

Heavy binging
More Popular

Light or no binging
Less Popular
Ant Study
Chen (1937)

Observed ants excavating soil for 4 days
- Day 1: alone
- Day 2: groups of 2
- Day 3: groups of 3
- Day 4: alone

How long did the ants take to begin excavating?
How much soil (in weight) was excavated?
The ants took longer to begin when they worked alone.

Ant Study
Chen (1937)
The ants moved more soil when they worked in groups.
Cockroach Study
Gates & Allee (1933)

1. Taught cockroaches to learn a maze whereby they could escape the light by running into a dark bottle.

2. The maze was difficult for a roach to learn.

3. Learned the maze alone, groups of two, groups of three

Result: Learned maze faster when alone, than when in a group
Zajonc: An Integrative Theory

Proposed that:

- Presence of others increases arousal
- Arousal enhances whatever response is dominant

Dominant response: Response elicited most easily and most quickly

- **Easy tasks**: Correct response is dominant
- **Difficult tasks**: Incorrect response is dominant
Cockroach Study: A Replication
Zajonc et al. (1969)

The presence of others (a) improved running times in the simple maze but (b) worsened running times in the difficult maze.
Social Facilitation Effect

The strengthening of the dominant response in the presence of others

Or

The presence of others improves performance on simple tasks but worsens performance on difficult tasks
Factors that Influence Deindividuation

1. Group size

Large Group          Small Group

More deindividuation
Factors that Influence Deindividuation

2. Accountability

High Accountability  
Low Accountability

More deindividuation
Factors that Influence Deindividuation

3. Anonymity

Anonymous

More deindividuation

Not Anonymous
Anonymity Study
Zimbardo (1970)

- Anonymous
  - Coats - Hoods
  - Gave 2 times more shock

- Not Anonymous
  - Normal Clothes
  - Name Tags
Conflict & Peacemaking
Conflict

Belief that one's behaviors or goals are not compatible with the behaviors or goals of others
Prisoner's Dilemma

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prisoner A</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Confesses</td>
<td>Does Not Confess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prisoner B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confesses</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does Not Confess</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prisoner's Dilemma

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country B</th>
<th>Country A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develops Nuclear Arms</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does Not Develop Nuclear Arms</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country A</th>
<th>Develops Nuclear Arms</th>
<th>Does Not Develop Nuclear Arms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develops Nuclear Arms</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Does Not Develop Nuclear Arms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does Not Develop Nuclear Arms</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Tragedy of the Commons

Wasting shared resource by acting in one’s self-interest
Factors that Influence Conflict

1. Social Dilemmas

2. Competition

People competing for same resources believe their individual self-interests are not compatible
Jigsaw Classroom

Group 1: Ethnic/gender mix of 5 kids learning about pets

Child 1: Canaries
Child 2: Hamsters
Child 3: Goldfish
Child 4: Dogs
Child 5: Cats

Canary expert group
Hamster expert group
Goldfish expert group
Dog expert group
Cat expert group
GRIT

1. Announces conciliatory intention
2. Does conciliatory act
3. Reciprocates any conciliatory acts
4. Maintains ability to retaliate
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Overview of Stereotypes, Prejudice, and Discrimination
Prejudice, Discrimination, & Stereotypes

Prejudice: Positive or negative feeling about a person based on attitude about the person’s social group membership

Discrimination: Unfair treatment of a person or group in comparison to others who are not members of the same social group

Stereotypes: Attributes believed to describe a social group
Stereotype Threat

Fear that one will be viewed or treated in way consistent with a negative stereotype, or fear that one will confirm the stereotype.
Stereotype Threat Study
Steele & Aronson (1995)

Valid Test

$AA < W$

Invalid Test

$AA = W$
Stereotype Threat Study
Steele & Aronson (1995)

Test Scores

Invalid Test  
Valid Test

African Americans  Whites
Stereotypes: Formation & Maintenance
Labeled Lines Study
Tajfel & Wilkes (1963)
Labeled Lines Study
Tajfel & Wilkes (1963)

The labels caused participants to:

1. perceive the lines in group A as highly similar to one another
2. perceive lines in group B to be highly similar to one another
3. perceive large differences between the line groups
Labeled Lines Study
Tajfel & Wilkes (1963)

Overestimate similarity within groups
➤ (within category homogeneity)

Exaggerate differences between groups
➤ (accentuation of inter-category difference)
Stereotype Formation

People naturally categorize others into groups.

People perceive members of a group as more similar to one another than they really are and as more different from other groups than they really are.

The ways that group members are perceived to be similar to one another and different from other groups becomes the content of the stereotype associated with their social group.
Stereotyping, Self-Fulfilling Prophecies, & Prejudice
Stereotyping

Applying one’s stereotype to an individual

Ambiguous Behavior (e.g., poking)

African American

More mean & threatening

White
Time Pressure Study
Kruglanski & Freund (1983)

Essay

Ashkenazi Jew

Sephardic Jew

Manipulation
Time Pressure
No Time Pressure
Time Pressure Study
Kruglanski & Freund (1983)

The bar chart displays data from Kruglanski & Freund (1983) on time pressure. The chart compares Ashkenazi Jews and Sephardics under conditions of time pressure and no time pressure. The chart indicates that under time pressure, Ashkenazi Jews (B) show a significantly higher response compared to Sephardics (D). Under no time pressure, the response of Ashkenazi Jews (C) is similar to Sephardics (D), suggesting no significant difference in response without time pressure.
Self-Fulfilling Prophecies

A false belief that leads to its own fulfillment:

1. Perceiver develops false belief about a target

2. Perceiver treats target in a manner consistent with false belief

3. Target responds to the treatment in such a way as to confirm the originally false belief
Two Types of SFPs

Positive SFPs:

1. Perceiver overestimates target’s ability

2. Perceiver treats target consistent with that overly positive belief

3. Target responds by confirming the overly positive belief
Two Types of SFPs

Negative SFPs:
1. Perceiver underestimates target’s ability
2. Perceiver treats target consistent with that overly negative belief
3. Target responds by confirming the overly negative belief
Dumb Rat - Smart Rat Study

Positive Belief

Smart Rat

Learned the maze faster

Negative Belief

Dumb Rat
Interview Study

Study 1

Do W treat AA and W different?

Participants interviewed confederate for a job

Confederate: African American or White
Interview Study

Results: Study 1

Interview length: AA < W
Distance: AA > W
Eye contact: AA < W
Speech dysfluencies: AA > W
Interview Study

Study 2

Does differential treatment influence behavior?

Confederates interviewed participant for job

Treated participant like AA or W were treated in Study 1
Interview Study

Results: Study 2

- Treated like African Americans: Worse Performance
- Treated like Whites: Better Performance
Realistic Group Conflict Theory

Prejudice stems from competition between groups
Terms

**Group**: Individuals who are interdependent

**In-Group**: Social group to which a person belongs

**Out-Group**: Social group to which a person does not belong

**Intergroup relations**: When individuals from one group interact with individuals from another group
Robber’s Cave Study

Bean Toss:

- Collected as many beans as possible
- Estimate # beans in a sack

➤ Overestimated beans collected by in-group

➤ Underestimated beans collected by out-group
Minimal Group Paradigm

Simple distinction between groups causes bias
Minimal Group Paradigm

1. Alone & anonymous

2. Estimated dots

3. Labeled: Over- or Underestimators

4. Completed pay off matrices


Minimal Group Paradigm

Payoff Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#26, one of the: overestimators (in-group)</th>
<th>7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#17, one of the: underestimators (out-group)</td>
<td>1 3 5 7 9 11 13 15 17 19 21 23 25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Boys most often selected 12:11 strategy

Fairness combined with ingroup profit
Aggression
Is It Aggression?

A hit man kills an unfaithful husband for 1,000 dollars

A jealous man kills his wife and her lover

A prison ward executes a criminal

A depressed person commits suicide

A man mentally rehearses a murder

A hunter kills an animal for a trophy

A Girl Scout tries to help an elderly women cross the street, but trips her by accident

A person punches a hole in the wall in anger

One person calls another a racial slur

A person slams a door shut after an argument
Aggression: What is it?

Any form of behavior directed toward the goal of harming or injuring another living being who is motivated to avoid such treatment.

- Behavior
- Directed toward a living organism
- Behavior is intentional
- Victim motivated to avoid harm
Types of Aggression

1. Instrumental aggression:

A means to an end

Intentional harm for purpose other than desire to inflict harm
Examples of Instrumental Aggression

A hit man kills an unfaithful husband for 1,000 dollars

A prison ward executes a criminal

A hunter kills an animal for a trophy

An American soldier kills an Iraqi soldier
Types of Aggression

2. Hostile aggression:

Aggression IS the end goal

Intentional harm done for purpose of inflicting harm
What level shock did the participant give the confederate?

![Shock Given By Participant](image)

- Consistently high shock
- Consistently low shock
- Increasing shock
- Decreasing shock
Alternative Explanations

**Culture:** More crimes in south than north because south more steeped in a “culture of violence”

**Demographics:** Temperature doesn’t matter. Age, race, SES of South is what matters

**Idle hands:** More crimes summer than winter because children out of school and adults on vacation
RESULTS

1. Violent crime higher in hotter summers than cooler summers in both South and North (rules out culture)

2. Violent crimes higher in hotter summers than cooler summers in the same cities (rules out demographics)

3. Violent crime higher in hotter summers than cooler summers even though in both summers kids are not in school and adults take vacations (rules out idle hands)
Arousal

Excitation-Transfer Theory

• Physiological arousal dissipates slowly

• Arousal caused by 1st event can be misattributed to 2nd event
Bridge Study
Dutton & Aron (1974)

Arousal caused by high bridge misattributed as sexual attraction

Men on high bridge:
- Called experimenter more
- Stories had more sexual content
Excitation Transfer Theory

Misattribution occurs unconsciously

Misattribution more likely when people believe arousal of first event has worn off, when it actually hasn’t

This theory may explain why hot temperatures increase aggression
Typical Experimental Design

Did they **believe** they were drinking alcohol

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Did they **actually** drink alcohol
Findings

Believe drinking alcohol

Are drinking alcohol

Believe drinking alcohol and are drinking alcohol

Aggressive

Aggressive

Most aggressive
Weapon Study
Berkowitz & Le Page (1967)

Contents on Adjacent Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Shocks Given to Participant</th>
<th>Revolver &amp; Shotgun</th>
<th>Sporting equipment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Weapon Study
Berkowitz & Le Page (1967)

10 shocks + Weapons Table

More Shocks

10 shocks + Sports Table

Fewer Shocks

Weapons Effect
### Honking Study
Turner et al. (1975)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rifle + Vengeance Bumper Sticker</th>
<th>Rifle + Friend Bumper Sticker</th>
<th>No Rifle + No Bumper Sticker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honked</td>
<td>Honked</td>
<td>Honked</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You fill in the percentage of people who honked
• Amount TV children watched at age 8 correlated with number violent crimes committed by age 30

• Violent media affects some people more than others

• The effects of TV violence accumulate
Violent Porn → Aggression

The Empirical Evidence

Sales soft-core magazines
Rates of rape in all 50 states

Non-violent pornography → Aggression

Violent pornography
Reducing Aggression

What does work:

• Delay
• Distraction
• Relax
• Incompatible response
Helping
Why do People & Animals Help?

1. Socio-Biological Theory

Behavior understood in terms of reproductive success
Why do People & Animals Help Strangers?

Kin Protection

Predisposed to help others who share our genes
Kin Protection Study
Burnstein et al. (1994)

Predictions:

1. Help family over non-family

2. Help is proportional to relatedness

3. Help young over old
Kin Protection Study
Burnstein et al. (1994)

Life & Death Situations

More likely to help relatives than non-relatives
Kin Protection Study
Burnstein et al. (1994)

Tendency to Help

Relatedness

Sibling
Cousin
Kin Protection Study
Burnstein et al. (1994)

Tendency to Help

Age of Victim

1 yr. 10 yrs. 18 yrs. 45 yrs. 75 yrs.
Reciprocity Norm

People will help those who:

1. Recognize them
2. Live close enough to return the favor
3. Have the recourses to return the favor

People are less likely to help another if doing so puts their life in danger
Social Responsibility
Norm Study
Barnes et al. (1979)

- Doesn’t feel like taking good notes
- Family Emergency

More willing to help
Bystander Effect

The tendency to NOT help another in need when others are present.
Five Steps To Helping

1. Notice an emergency

Crowd effect: Distraction
Five Steps To Helping

1. Notice an emergency
2. Interpret event as an emergency

Crowd effect: Social proof
Five Steps To Helping

1. Notice an emergency
2. Interpret event as an emergency
3. Take responsibility for providing help

Crowd effect:
Diffusion of responsibility
Five Steps To Helping

1. Notice an emergency
2. Interpret event as an emergency
3. Take responsibility for providing help
4. Decide how to help

Crowd effect: Confidence
Results: Falling Ladder Study

Percent Helping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confederate</th>
<th>Alone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RNs</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Good Samaritan Study
Darley & Batson (1973)
Long Term Nurturing Helping:

Religious > non-religious

Emergency Helping:

Religious = non-religious
Stress & Coping
Stress and Coping Model
Lazarus & Folkman (1984)

Stage 1: Primary Appraisal

Is potential stressor a threat or challenge?

No
Feel no stress

Yes
Go to Stage 2
Stress and Coping Model
Lazarus & Folkman (1984)

Stage 2: Secondary Appraisal

Can I cope with the stressor?

- Yes
  - Feel No Stress

- No
  - Feel Stress
Yoked Shock Study
Staub et al., (1971)

Participant 1
In control

Participant 2
Yoked

Better able to tolerate shock
Perceived Control Shock Study
Geer, Davison, & Gatchel (1970)

Phase 1

Feel shock  Press Switch
Perceived Control Shock Study
Geer et al., (1970)

Phase 2

Perceived Control \hspace{5cm} No Control

\[\text{Lower Skin Conductance}\]
Biological Coping Study
(Brown, 1991)

Low Stress
- Fit
  - Few Illnesses
- Not Fit
  - Few Illnesses

High Stress
- Fit
  - Few Illnesses
- Not Fit
  - Many Illnesses