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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

The Johnny Rocco Case

Participants rated who they most wanted to leave the group

Mode 4.47
Slider 4.76
Divate 6.11

Not Significantly Different
Wanted Deviate to go the most

The Johnny Rocco Case

Mode

Deviate

Slider

Most common viewpoint
Most deviant viewpoint
Most deviant then most common viewpoint

Christmas Card Study

Phil Kanz, a psychologist at Brigham Young University in Provo, Utah sent 558 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:**

*Gibb et al. (1970)*

**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 chaperones for juvenile delinquents on a day trip to the zoo?” *(concession)*

**Control group:** Asked...

“Would you be willing to serve as unpaid chaperones for juvenile delinquents on a day trip to the zoo?”

---

**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

---

**Commitment & 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:

1. Obtain commitment (i.e., petition signature)
2. Get consistency in behavior (i.e., donate $)

---

**Beach Towel Study**

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

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

Factors that Influence Effectiveness of Social Proof
Uncertain about correct behavior
- Social Proof works better under conditions of uncertainty
Certain about correct behavior
- Social Proof works better when others are similar to the self

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
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).

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 & Weintrob (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, & Adewoale (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.

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.

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.

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
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)

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

Attractiveness

Kurtzburg, Safar, & Cavior (1968)

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

Familiarity

Mita, Dermer, & Knight (1977)

Participants liked their mirror image more
Friends liked participants' true image more
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

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
- People attending a worship service
- The 'Spice Girls Fan Club'
- Students in a seminar class
Sorority Study
Crandall (1988)

New Members of Alpha
Moderate binging Too much - too little binging
More Popular Less Popular

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    Not Anonymous

Coats - Hoods    Normal Clothes

Name Tags

Gave 2 times more shock

Conflict

Belief that one’s behaviors or goals are not compatible with the behaviors or goals of others

Conflict & Peacemaking

Prisoner’s Dilemma

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country A</th>
<th>Country B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear Arms</td>
<td>Nuclear Arms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does Not Develop</td>
<td>Does Not Develop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develops</td>
<td>Develops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prisoner A</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confess</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does Not Confess</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confess</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does Not Confess</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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)

Stereotype Threat Study
Steele & Aronson (1995)

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

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

Time Pressure Study
Kruglanski & Freund (1983)

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

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

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

➢ Overestimated beans
➢ Underestimated beans

Minimal Group Paradigm

1. Alone & anonymous
2. Estimated dots
3. Labeled: Over- or Underestimators
4. Completed payoff matrices

Aggression

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 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 woman 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

2. Hostile aggression:
   Aggression IS the end goal
   Intentional harm done for purpose of inflicting harm

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

Typical Experimental Design

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

Findings

Believe drinking alcohol | Are drinking alcohol | Believe drinking alcohol and are drinking alcohol

Aggressive | Aggressive | Most aggressive

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
Weapon Study
Berkowitz & Le Page (1967)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Shocks Given to Participant</th>
<th>Weapons Table</th>
<th>Sports Table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More Shocks
Fewer Shocks

Weapons Effect

Honking Study
Turner et al. (1975)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rifles</th>
<th>Bumper Sticker</th>
<th>Rifles</th>
<th>Bumper Sticker</th>
<th>Rifles</th>
<th>Bumper Sticker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Vengeance</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sticker</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sticker</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sticker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Honked
Honked
Honked

You fill in the percentage of people who honked

Amount TV children watched at age 8 correlated with number of 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

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

**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 resources 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)

Social proof

**Bystander Effect**
The tendency to NOT help another in need when others are present.

**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

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

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

Biological Coping Study
(Brown, 1991)

Low Stress
Fit ➔ Few Illnesses
Not Fit ➔ Few Illnesses

High Stress
Fit ➔ Many Illnesses
Not Fit ➔ Few Illnesses