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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>Individual</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Person 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First day  Second day  Third day  Fourth day
The Johnny Rocco Case

Participants rated who they most wanted to leave the group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Slider</th>
<th>Deviate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>6.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not Significantly Different

Wanted Deviate to go the most

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
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?"

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

Commitment and Consistency

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

Uncertain about correct behavior

Certain about correct behavior

Social Proof works better under conditions of uncertainty

Factors that Influence Effectiveness of Social Proof

Dissimilar

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

Copycat suicides called the Werther Effect
Fluctuations in U.S. suicides before, during, and after 26 publicized suicide stories (Phillips, 1974).

Number of suicides in comparison to what would have normally been expected

-1 0 1 2 3

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

Stanley Milgram

Milgram's participants obeyed because of the experimenter's authority, and not because of abnormal psychological problems

Authority

Obedience Study: Replications

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

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

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

Liking

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)

Results:
Inmates who had the plastic surgery were significantly LESS likely to return to jail regardless of whether they had counseling or not

Attractiveness
Mita, Dermer, & Knight (1977)

Participants liked their mirror image more. 
Friends liked participants’ true image more.

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.

Outcome = Rewards - 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?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Five people waiting at the same corner for a bus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People attending a worship service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The 'Spice Girls Fan Club'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students in a seminar class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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
- Light or no binging

More Popular  
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?

---

**Ant Study**  
Chen (1937)

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 → Not Anonymous

More deindividuation

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>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does Not Confess</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prisoner’s Dilemma

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

Prisoner’s Dilemma
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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid Test</th>
<th>Invalid Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA &lt; W</td>
<td>AA = W</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stereotype Threat Study  
Steele & Aronson (1995)

![Bar chart showing test scores for Invalid Test and Valid Test for African Americans and Whites.]

Stereotypes: Formation & Maintenance

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

Applying one’s stereotype to an individual

Ambiguous Behavior (e.g., poking)

African American ➔ White

More mean & threatening
**Time Pressure Study**
*Kruglanski & Freund (1983)*

- **Essay**
  - Ashkenazi Jew
  - Sephardic Jew

**Manipulation**
- Time Pressure
- No 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

Negative Belief

Smart Rat

Dumb Rat

Learned the maze faster

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
Better Performance
Treated like Whites
Worse 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

Payoff Matrix

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

---

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did they believe they were drinking alcohol</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did they actually drink alcohol</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings

Believe drinking alcohol

Are drinking alcohol

Believe drinking alcohol and are drinking alcohol

Most aggressive

Aggressive

Aggressive

Weapon Study

Berkowitz & Le Page (1967)

Contents on Adjacent Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revolver &amp; Shotgun</th>
<th>Sporting equipment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25% 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>25% 25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Weapon Study

Berkowitz & Le Page (1967)

10 shocks + Weapons Table

10 shocks + Sports Table

More Shocks

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 \(\rightarrow\) Aggression
The Empirical Evidence

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

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

---

**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

Results: Falling Ladder Study

Good Samaritan Study
Darley & Batson (1973)
Long Term Nurturing Helping:

Religious > non-religious

Emergency Helping:

Religious = non-religious

Stress and Coping Model
Lazarus & Folkman (1984)

Stage 1: Primary Appraisal
Is potential stressor a threat or challenge?

Yes
Go to Stage 2

No
Feel no stress

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  Participant 2

In control  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  No Control

Lower Skin Conductance

Biological Coping Study
(Brown, 1991)

Low Stress
Fit  Not Fit
Few Illnesses  Few Illnesses

High Stress
Fit  Not Fit
Few Illnesses  Many Illnesses