

PSY403 (Social Psychology)

Final Term Notes

Table of Contents

Lesson 19 Social Cognition	2
Lesson 20 Attitudes	5
Lesson 21 Attitude Formation	7
Lesson 22 Attitude and Behavior	10
Lesson 23 Attitude Change	12
Lesson 24 Attitude Change (Continued)	14
Lesson 25 Prejudice and Discrimination	16
Lesson 26 Prejudice and Discrimination (Continued)	19
Lesson 27 Reducing Prejudice and Discrimination	23
Lesson 28 Interpersonal Attraction	25
Lesson 29 Interpersonal Attraction (Continued)	28
Lesson 30 Intimate Relationships	30
Lesson 31 Social Influence	33
Lesson 32 Social Influence (Continued)	36
Lesson 33 Social Influence (Obedience & Compliance)	39
Lesson 34 Aggression	42
Lesson 35 Aggression (Continued)	44
Lesson 36 Reducing Aggression	46
Lesson 37 Prosocial Behavior	48
Lesson 38 Prosocial Behavior (Continued)	50
Lesson 39 Group Behavior	52
Lesson 40 Group Behavior (Continued)	55
Lesson 41 Group Behavior (Continued)	58
Lesson 42 Interpersonal Power & Leadership	61
Lesson 43 Social Psychology in Court	63
Lesson 44 Social Psychology in Clinic	65
Lesson 45 Final Review	67

Lesson 19: Social Cognition

What Is Social Cognition?

Social cognition is how we think about and understand people and social situations. It includes how we:

- Analyze and remember information
- Use it to make judgments

Two Ways We Process Social Information (Dual-Process Model):

1. **Explicit Cognition** – Thinking that is deliberate and conscious
 2. **Implicit Cognition** – Automatic thinking we're often unaware of
-

How Do We Make Sense of Social Information?

Categorization

We quickly form impressions by grouping people or things based on shared features.

- **Categories** help us manage large amounts of information (e.g., "insect" = 6 legs, external skeleton).
- Some categories are clear-cut, while others are "fuzzy" (e.g., gender roles in professions).
- We use **prototypes**—typical examples (like male engineer or female nurse)—to classify things, which can sometimes lead to mistakes.

Schemas

Schemas are mental frameworks we use to understand the world.

- They are structured ideas about people, roles, or events.
- **Event schemas** (or "scripts") guide what we expect to happen (e.g., a restaurant visit).
- When applied to groups, schemas can become **stereotypes**.

Benefits of Schemas:

- Help us process and remember info
- Fill in missing details
- Speed up understanding
- Set expectations

Mental Shortcuts: The Cognitive Miser

We save mental energy by using shortcuts called **heuristics**.

Types of Heuristics:

1. **Representativeness Heuristic**

Judging someone by how much they look like a "typical" example (e.g., "He looks like an engineer, so he must be one.").

→ Can lead to **base rate fallacy** (ignoring real statistics).

2. **Availability Heuristic**

Judging how likely something is based on how easily examples come to mind (e.g., Plane crashes seem common because they're dramatic and memorable).

3. **Anchoring and Adjustment**

Relying too much on the first piece of information we hear (e.g., Thinking nuclear war is more likely if the question includes "90%" vs. "1%").

Thinking About the Past:

Hindsight Bias

After something happens, we feel like "we knew it all along."

Counterfactual Thinking

Imagining "what could have happened."

- More likely after bad or surprising events
 - Can help with future planning or worsen distress (e.g., loss of loved ones)
-

How Expectations Shape Our Thinking:

False Consensus Effect

We overestimate how many people share our views or choices.

Confirmation Bias

We seek out info that supports our beliefs and ignore what doesn't.

Self-Fulfilling Prophecy

Our expectations about someone can lead them to behave in ways that confirm those expectations.

(e.g., Teachers told certain students will improve → those students actually perform better)

Beliefs About Fairness and Control:

Just-World Belief

The idea that good things happen to good people and bad things to bad people.

- Helps us feel safe and in control
- But can lead to blaming victims

Learned Helplessness

Feeling powerless after repeated negative events

- Can lead to depression if people believe they can't change their situation
-

Applied Social Psychology:

How Do You Explain Negative Events?

People differ in how they explain bad events:

- **Optimists:** Bad events are temporary, not their fault
 - **Pessimists:** Blame themselves, expect more bad things
Pessimism can lead to health and emotional problems over time.
-

Lesson 20: Attitudes

What is an Attitude?

An **attitude** is a person's positive or negative evaluation of something — this “something” can be a person, event, idea, or thing.

- Example: Your attitude toward exams might be negative ("I hate them") or positive ("They're a chance to prove myself").

Historical Note:

- The term “attitude” originally referred to **body posture** in theater.
- Later, it was used to mean a “posture of mind.”

Key Quote (Allport, 1935):

"Attitudes shape what we notice, think, and do — they give meaning to our world."

The Three Components of Attitudes (ABC Model):

Component	What It Means	Example
Affective	Emotions or feelings	"I enjoy being around cats."
Behavioral	Actions or behavior tendencies	"I feed stray cats."
Cognitive	Beliefs or thoughts	"Cats are clean and independent."

🔗 Today, many psychologists focus mainly on the emotional or evaluative part (good/bad, like/dislike), but the other two still matter.

Special Terms Related to Attitudes:

- **Self-esteem** → Attitude toward yourself
 - **Prejudice** → Negative attitude toward a group
 - **Interpersonal attraction** → Positive attitude toward individuals (friendship, love)
-

How Do We Measure Attitudes?

Direct Methods (Self-Report Scales):

1. **Likert Scale** – Rate your agreement (e.g., from -4 to +4)

Example: “I support co-education.”

Strongly disagree (-4) → Strongly agree (+4)

2. **Semantic Differential Scale** – Rate between opposite words

Example: “This coffee tastes...”

Unpleasant _____ Pleasant

3. **Latitude of Acceptance** – Choose which answers you find acceptable or unacceptable.
-

Indirect Methods:

Used when people might **hide their true attitudes** (due to **social pressure** or **desirability**).

Techniques:

- **Bogus Pipeline**: Tricks people into thinking a machine knows their true feelings → they're more honest
 - **Electromyography (EMG)**: Measures tiny muscle reactions on the face to detect feelings (real attitudes)
-

Coming Up in This Section: Evaluating People and Relationships

This part of the course will cover:

- How attitudes are **formed** and **changed**
 - **Negative** attitudes (e.g., **prejudice**, **discrimination**)
 - **Positive** attitudes (e.g., **attraction**, **friendship**)
 - Causes of **social intolerance**
 - How and why we develop **attachments and preferences**
-

Lesson 21: Attitude Formation

What is Attitude Formation?

Attitude formation refers to how we develop positive or negative feelings about people, things, or ideas. Several psychological theories explain how attitudes are formed.

1. Mere Exposure Effect (Zajonc, 1968)

- The more we are exposed to something, the more we tend to like it — even without knowing much about it.
- **Familiarity** leads to **liking**, not boredom!

Example Study:

- Participants saw random symbols more or less frequently.
- They rated the ones they saw more often as more positive.

Another Study:

- People preferred the **mirror image** of their photo (what they usually see), while their friends preferred the **original** version.
-

2. Classical Conditioning

- We form attitudes by **associating** a neutral object with something we already like or dislike.
- Example: Pairing a nationality (e.g., "Swedish") with positive or negative words can affect our attitude toward that group.

Subliminal Conditioning:

- Attitudes can be influenced by images shown so quickly we don't consciously notice them.
 - Study: Students saw positive or negative images flashed before seeing a stranger → it changed their attitude toward the stranger.
-

3. Operant Conditioning

- We develop attitudes based on **rewards or punishments** we receive.
- Example: A student praised for doing well in math may develop a positive attitude toward the subject.

Also includes:

- **Observational Learning (Bandura):** We learn attitudes by watching others.
 - E.g., If your friend fears driving after an accident, you might also develop a negative attitude toward driving.
-

4. Self-Perception Theory (Bem, 1965)

- We form attitudes by **observing our own behavior**.
- Especially when we don't have a strong attitude beforehand.

Study Example:

- Participants who recalled more pro-environment behaviors reported more positive attitudes toward the environment — but only if they didn't already have strong opinions.
-

5. Facial Feedback Hypothesis

- **Our body expressions affect our feelings.**
- Study: People who held a pen between their teeth (which mimics a smile) liked cartoons more than those who held it in their lips (which blocks a smile).

Vascular Theory (Zajonc, 1993):

- Smiling increases blood flow to the brain → improves mood
- Frowning does the opposite

Posture also matters: Sitting upright can improve attitude and mood.

6. Functional Theory

- We form or change attitudes based on how well they meet our **psychological needs**.
- Example: You might stop liking a brand of coffee if you find out it harms the environment.

Active vs. Passive Attitudes:

Some attitudes are more flexible and easily changed, while others are more fixed.

Applied Social Psychology Lab

- Acting happy (smiling, good posture) can actually **make you feel happier**.
 - Tip: Your body can influence how you feel and think — maybe parents are right about not slouching!
-

Summary of Theories:

Theory	Key Idea	Example
Mere Exposure	Familiarity = Liking	Seeing the same ad often
Classical Conditioning	Association with feelings	Pairing "coffee" with happy music
Operant Conditioning	Rewards/punishments affect attitude	Praise for speaking English
Self-Perception	We observe our own behavior to form attitudes	"I recycle → I must care"
Facial Feedback	Expression affects emotion	Smiling = feeling happier
Functional Theory	Attitudes meet psychological needs	Stop liking a brand for ethics

Lesson 22: Attitude and Behavior

Do Attitudes Predict Behavior?

In the 1970s, psychologists started **doubting** whether attitudes really influence behavior. Why? Because research showed only a **weak link** between what people say they believe and what they actually do.

LaPierre's Study (1934)

- A Chinese couple traveled across the U.S. with LaPierre.
 - Only **1 out of 66 hotels** and **1 out of 250 restaurants** refused to serve them.
 - BUT: When LaPierre **later wrote letters** asking if they'd serve Chinese guests, **90% said "No."**
 - Shows a gap between **actual behavior** and **expressed attitude**.
-

When Do Attitudes Match Behavior?

There are **certain conditions** where attitude and behavior are more likely to match:

Specificity

- The more **specific** the attitude is, the more likely it will match the behavior.
- Example: "Do you like **this Chinese couple?**" vs. "Do you like **Chinese people** in general?"

Test-Retest Reliability

- If too much time passes between when attitude is measured and when behavior is observed, they may **no longer match**.

Private vs. Public Self-Awareness

- **Privately self-aware** → You behave based on your own beliefs.
- **Publicly self-aware** → You behave based on what others expect.

Study Example (Froming et al., 1982):

- People with negative attitudes toward punishment gave **less intense shocks** when privately self-aware (looking in a mirror).
- But gave **stronger shocks** in front of an audience (public pressure).

Attitude Strength

Stronger attitudes lead to more consistent behavior. Attitudes are stronger when:

- You have **more information**.
- You have **personal involvement**.
- You have **direct experience**.

Study Example:

People with high knowledge about environmental issues were more likely to **act in environmentally friendly ways**.

Attitude Accessibility

- The faster you can **recall** an attitude, the more likely you'll act on it.
- **Highly accessible attitudes** → more influence on behavior.
- Measured by **reaction time** to attitude-related questions (Fazio & Williams, 1986).

Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) – *Fishbein & Ajzen (1975)*

This theory explains how we **decide** to act based on **three things**:

Factor	What it Means	Example
Attitude toward behavior	What you believe will happen if you act	"If I quit smoking, I'll be healthier."
Subjective norms	What others expect of you	"My family wants me to quit smoking."
Perceived control	How easy/hard you think the action is	"I don't think I can quit; I'm addicted."

These three factors lead to your **intention**, which then influences your **behavior**.

! If even one factor is negative (e.g., you think you **can't** do it), the behavior may not happen — even if your attitude is positive.

Criticism of TPB

- **Spontaneous behavior** (like habits) is not well explained.
- **Automatic behavior** happens without thinking — TPB assumes we act rationally.
- We are often "**cognitive misers**" (we avoid deep thinking unless necessary).

Lesson 23: Attitude Change

1. Behavior Can Change Attitudes

- **Self-Perception Theory (Bem, 1965):**
We often infer our attitudes by observing our own behavior.
 - **Unexpected Behavior Can Shift Attitudes**
-

2. Cognitive Dissonance Theory (Festinger, 1957)

When we act in a way that conflicts with our attitudes, we feel discomfort (called dissonance), which motivates us to change our attitude to reduce that discomfort.

Key Study: Festinger & Carlsmith (1959)

- Participants did a boring task.
- Then told to lie to others that it was fun.
- Paid either **\$1** or **\$20**.
- **\$1 group** had *more attitude change* because they had *less justification* for lying, so they changed their attitude to reduce dissonance.

Factors That Influence Dissonance:

- **Justification:** More justification = less dissonance.
 - **Freedom of Choice:** If forced, no dissonance felt.
 - **Investment:** People stick to attitudes they've invested time/energy into.
-

3. Persuasion – External Attitude Change

Changing attitudes through messages and communication.

3 Key Components of Persuasion:

1. **Source** – Who gives the message?
 2. **Message** – What is said?
 3. **Audience** – Who hears the message?
-

Source Factors

- **Credibility = Expertise + Trustworthiness**
 - Example: People trust experts more (Bochner & Insko, 1966).
 - People trust speakers who argue against their own interest (Walster et al., 1966).
 - **Sleeper Effect:**

Over time, people forget who said the message but remember the message itself.
→ Even low-credibility sources become persuasive later.
-

Attractiveness of the Source

- Attractive people are more persuasive.
 - Example: Ad campaigns use attractive people to influence others (like using “liberated” women to promote cigarettes).
 - **Peripheral route of persuasion:** Uses appearance and emotions rather than logical arguments.
-

Other Source Factors

- **Likeability:** Nice, friendly people are more persuasive.
 - **Similarity:** People who are similar to us (in values, background, or appearance) are more convincing.
-

Conclusion

- **Attitude change** can happen through **internal conflict (cognitive dissonance)** or **external influence (persuasion)**.
 - The effectiveness of persuasion depends on **who is speaking, what is said, and who is listening**.
-

Lesson 24: Attitude Change (Continued)

Message Variables – What Makes a Message Persuasive?

1. Facts vs. Vivid Images

- Messages can use **facts** (e.g., “1,100 students died from drug use”) or **vivid images** (e.g., showing disturbing drug-related scenes).
- **Facts are more persuasive**, especially when they come from a **credible source**.
- **Combining facts with vivid images** is powerful, but:
 - Too much vividness can distract from the message.
 - Vivid content works best when it matches the message.

2. Fear Appeals

- Fear can motivate change (e.g., anti-smoking ads or insurance ads using scary outcomes).
- **Protection Motivation Theory**: Fear works only when:
 1. People believe the threat is serious.
 2. They believe the threat is likely.
 3. They believe the suggested solution works.
 4. They believe they can take action.

3. Humor

- **Used in 40% of ads** because it grabs attention and makes the speaker more likable.
- Humor helps persuasion **only if it’s relevant** to the message.
 - Relevant humor → deeper thinking (central route).
 - Irrelevant humor → distraction (peripheral route).

4. One-Sided vs. Two-Sided Messages

- **One-sided**: Only your side is presented.
- **Two-sided**: Acknowledge opposing views and refute them.
 - Two-sided messages are **more credible**, especially when:
 - The audience disagrees.
 - The audience is well-informed or will hear opposing views.
 - It shows fairness and objectivity.

5. Repetition

- **Mere Exposure Effect:** Repeating a message can make people like it more—if they didn't dislike it at first.
- Works best with **variation** (to avoid boredom).

Audience Variables – Who's Receiving the Message?

1. Mood

- **Happy mood = more persuasion**, especially through **peripheral route** (not deep thinking).
- **Sad mood = more careful thinking**, more likely to follow **central route**.
- Happy people rely on simple cues (e.g., speaker attractiveness).

2. Involvement

a) Issue Involvement (Personal relevance):

- When the topic matters personally, people process it deeply (central route).

b) Impression-Relevant Involvement (Worried about social image):

- When people care about how others see them, they focus on who is saying it (peripheral route).

3. Individual Differences

- **Need for Cognition (NFC):**
 - High NFC → Likes deep thinking → Uses **central route**.
 - Low NFC → Avoids deep thinking → Uses **peripheral route**.
- **Age and Life Stage:**
 - Young and older adults are more open to change.
 - Middle-aged adults are more resistant due to stronger, well-developed attitudes.

Two Routes to Persuasion

Route	Used When...	Characteristics	Effect on Attitude
Central	Message is important; person is focused	Careful thinking; logical evaluation	Strong, long-lasting, predicts behavior
Peripheral	Message isn't important; person is distracted	Uses cues like attractiveness or length of message	Weak, short-term, easily changed

Lesson 25: Prejudice and Discrimination

Activities on Attitude Change

- **Cognitive Dissonance Activity:**
 1. Rate how strongly you agree: “Illiteracy is a serious problem.”
 2. Then ask: “Have you done anything to help?”
→ If your actions don’t match your beliefs, you feel uncomfortable — this is **cognitive dissonance**.
-

Applied Social Psychology Lab Examples

- **Creating a public image** (e.g., political campaigns)
 - **Hidden propaganda** in education (unnoticed influence)
 - **Successive approximation:** Changing strong views gradually, in small steps
-

Prejudice and Discrimination

Definitions

- **Prejudice:** A **negative attitude** toward people based on group membership (e.g., race, religion).
 - **Discrimination:** **Negative behavior** toward those people.
 - **Stereotypes:** Oversimplified beliefs about people in a group.
-

Sources of Prejudice

1. Cognitive Sources

- **Categorization:** We mentally group people (e.g., by race, ethnicity, caste). This helps us simplify but can lead to bias.
- **Social Identity Theory:**
 - We divide people into “us” (in-group) and “them” (out-group).
 - This leads to **in-group favoritism** and **out-group prejudice**.
- **Out-group Homogeneity:** Thinking “they are all the same” but “we are all different.”

- **Stereotypes:**
 - Are mental shortcuts.
 - Help us act quickly but may lead to **wrong judgments**.
 - Filter out information that doesn't fit the stereotype.
-

Examples of Cultural Stereotypes

From UK mental health professionals:

- Assumptions that **South Asian women** are depressed or powerless due to their culture.
 - **Arranged marriage** seen as harmful, without understanding the actual cultural context.
 - Belief that Asians must adopt Western values to fit in.
 - These views ignore **cultural strengths** and show **bias from lack of understanding**.
-

2. Emotional Sources of Prejudice

a. Scapegoat Theory

- When frustrated, people blame weaker groups.
- Examples:
 - **Jews in Nazi Germany** were blamed for national problems.
 - In the US, **Black Americans** were scapegoated during economic crises.

b. Competition (Realistic Conflict Theory)

- Two groups fighting over limited resources may develop hostility toward each other.
-

c. Authoritarian Personality

- Rigid thinking: Believes in clear right/wrong, obeys authority, rejects weak people.
 - Developed from **strict parenting** or **learned through modeling** in teenage years.
 - Measured using the **F-Scale** (Fascist scale).
 - Supported by research (Altemeyer, Duckitt).
-

Key Theories/Terms Summary

Term	Meaning
Prejudice	Negative feelings toward a group
Discrimination	Negative behavior toward a group
Stereotype	Oversimplified belief about a group
Categorization	Mental grouping of people
In-group	Group we belong to ("we")
Out-group	Other groups ("they")
Out-group Homogeneity	Belief that all others are the same
Scapegoat Theory	Blaming others for your problems
Authoritarian Personality	Rigid, obedient, hostile to outsiders

Lesson 26: Prejudice and Discrimination (Continued)

1. Social Conditions That Cause Prejudice

Prejudice Serves Functions

People may hold prejudices because:

- It helps them **fit into a group** (social acceptance)
- It makes them feel **better about themselves** (self-esteem)
- It **reduces fear or anxiety**
- It brings **emotional satisfaction**

Unequal Status and Prejudice

- Prejudice is more common where **social inequalities** (like slavery) existed.
 - Example: In the 1800s, Europeans justified colonizing others by calling them “inferior.”
-

2. Religion and Prejudice

- **True religious teachings** promote **equality and justice**.
Islam emphasizes:
 - Rights of neighbors (Heqooq-ul-Ibad)
 - No superiority based on race or color (Last sermon of Prophet Muhammad ﷺ)
- **However**, strong religious belief **can sometimes be linked with prejudice**.
 - Studies show that people who appear non-prejudiced in surveys may still act with bias.

“We have just enough religion to make us hate but not enough to make us love one another.”

3. Stereotype Threat

What Is It?

- Fear of being judged by a **negative stereotype** about your group.
- Can **reduce performance** in academics, sports, etc.

Examples:

- **Math test** (Spencer & Quinn, 1999): Women performed worse when told men do better.
- **Verbal test** (Steele & Aronson, 1995): Black students performed poorly when reminded of race.
- **Golf test** (Stone et al., 1999): Blacks performed worse when framed as “sports intelligence” but better when framed as “natural ability.”

Difference From Self-Fulfilling Prophecy:

- **Stereotype threat**: Immediate performance drops due to fear.
 - **Self-fulfilling prophecy**: Over time, people believe and act according to others' expectations.
-

4. Social Identity and Group Behavior

We Belong to Groups

Examples:

- Gender, nationality, profession, religion, etc.

We define ourselves by:

- **Personal identity** (e.g., student, friend)
- **Social identity** (e.g., Pakistani, Muslim)

In-group vs. Out-group

- **In-group**: People like us
 - **Out-group**: Others
 - We favor in-groups and often **discriminate** against out-groups.
-

5. Minimal Group Paradigm (Tajfel et al., 1971)

Main Finding:

Even **random group assignments** cause bias.

Experiment:

- Participants grouped by random things (like preference for paintings)
- Asked to allocate money to others
- Gave **more to their own group**, even with no real reason

Conclusion: Just **labeling people** into groups causes favoritism.

6. Social Identity Theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979)

- Our **self-esteem** is tied to our **group's status**.
 - We **favor our group** to feel better.
 - The **more strongly** we identify with our group, the **more biased** we become.
 - When our group's value is **threatened**, we defend it even more.
-

7. Realistic Group Conflict Theory (Levine & Campbell, 1972)

- **Competition** over limited resources causes prejudice.
 - This leads to:
 1. **More hatred** toward other groups
 2. **Stronger loyalty** to your own group
-

8. Sherif's Robbers Cave Experiment (1955)

Setup:

- Boys aged 11–12 at summer camp
 - Divided into 2 groups: **Rattlers** and **Eagles**
 - Researchers created 3 stages:
-

Phase 1: In-group Formation

- Activities like hiking and cooking built **group identity**.
- Groups developed their **own names and behaviors**.

Phase 2: Competition

- Groups competed in sports.
 - Winners got **medals and pocketknives**.
 - Result:
 - Groups became **hostile**.
 - Fights, name-calling, and even property damage.
-

Phase 3: Reducing Conflict

- Friendly contact (e.g., meals, movies) didn't help.
- Only **working together on shared goals** (like pushing a broken bus) improved relations.

Superordinate goals (common goals that require cooperation) can reduce prejudice.

9. Key Takeaways

Concept	Meaning
Stereotype threat	Fear of confirming a negative stereotype affects performance
In-group bias	Favoring your own group
Minimal group effect	Group bias can occur even in random, meaningless groups
Realistic Conflict Theory	Competition causes prejudice
Social Identity Theory	Group membership boosts self-esteem, leads to bias
Superordinate goals	Shared goals reduce conflict

Lesson 27: Reducing Prejudice and Discrimination

1. Contact Hypothesis (Allport, 1954)

Main idea: If people from different groups interact under the right conditions, prejudice can decrease.

Conditions for Contact to Work:

1. **Social norms support equality** – Society, leaders, and media must support fairness.
2. **Sustained close contact** – Frequent and meaningful interactions (not just one-time).
3. **Equal social status** – One group shouldn't be higher or lower in power or status.
4. **Cooperation over competition** – Groups should work together toward a shared goal.

Example Studies:

- **Wright et al. (1997):** Teams who built friendships gave more money to the opposing team.
- **Stephan & Stephan (1984):** Closer contact → more knowledge → more positive attitudes.
- **Robbers Cave (Sherif et al.):** Rival groups became friendly when they had to cooperate.
- **Jigsaw Classroom:** Students from different backgrounds solve problems together.

Problems with Contact Hypothesis:

- **Anxiety:** Minorities fear negative judgment, and majorities fear saying something wrong.
- **Miscommunication:** Silence can be misunderstood as hostility.
- **Subtyping:** People may say, "This person is nice, but their group is still bad."
- **Too many conditions:** It's hard to manage all requirements in real life.

2. Re-categorization

Goal: Change how people think – instead of "us vs. them," think "we are all one."

Two Techniques:

1. **Combination (One Group Identity):**

- Combine groups into one (e.g., “We’re all Pakistanis” instead of Zaat or ethnic divisions).
- Example: Children of interracial marriages seen as “in-between,” reducing prejudice.

2. **Subtypes / Individual Uniqueness:**

- Break large categories into smaller ones.
- View each person as unique, not just a group member.
- Example: Instead of thinking “All doctors are rude,” think “Some doctors are kind.”

Common In-Group Identity Model (Gaertner et al.)

Idea: Make people feel like part of one big group.

Study:

- Groups seated either separately or mixed.
- In the one-group setting, people treated former out-group members more fairly.

Cognitive Dissonance (Festinger, 1957)

- If behavior (e.g., treating others equally due to law) doesn’t match attitude (e.g., still prejudiced), people feel discomfort.
- They may **change their attitude** to match the behavior → leads to reduced prejudice.

Real-Life Application:

- Promote **equal-status, cooperative, friendly** contact.
 - Use **teamwork** in schools, sports, workplaces.
 - Encourage **government and media** to support equality.
 - Avoid segregating people by race, class, or status.
-

Lesson 28: Interpersonal Attraction

What Is Interpersonal Attraction?

- It means **wanting to be close to or spend time with someone**.
 - It's not just about physical appearance — many other factors influence attraction.
-

Why Do We Seek Affiliation (Connections with Others)?

People naturally want to be with others. Two main **theories** explain this:

1. Social Comparison Theory (Festinger, 1954)

- We understand ourselves better by **comparing** with others — especially when unsure.
- We prefer to compare with **similar people**.
- It helps us judge ourselves, understand emotions, and choose friends.

2. Social Exchange Theory

- We stay in relationships where **rewards are greater than the costs**.
 - Rewards can be things like love, help, attention.
 - People may **stay in bad relationships** if they think they have no better options.
-

What Influences Our Desire to Affiliate?

1. Evolution

- Humans are **hardwired to form social bonds**.
- Rejection or loneliness causes **emotional pain**, even in the same brain area as physical pain (anterior cingulate).
- Not having connections leads to **stress and anxiety**.

2. Brain & Nervous System

- Some people are biologically more social (extroverts) and enjoy stimulation.
- Others (introverts) avoid too much interaction to stay calm.
- **Extroverts** respond more positively to social rewards (dopamine activation).

3. Culture and Gender

- People in **individualistic cultures** (e.g., USA) form more relationships, but they're often less close.
 - **Women** often define themselves through relationships and are better at remembering dates and events — they tend to be more relational.
-

Situational Factors That Increase Attraction

1. Proximity (Closeness)

- We're more likely to be friends with people who **live or sit close to us**.
- It's easier, cheaper, and more frequent — so we develop relationships naturally.
- Even enemies are often those who live close, due to constant contact.

2. Familiarity

- The more often we see someone, the more we tend to like them.
- Called the "**mere exposure effect**" (Zajonc, 1968).
- Even seeing someone's photo repeatedly increases liking.

3. Anxiety

- When anxious or stressed, people want to be around others.
 - In Schachter's (1959) experiment, women waiting for a painful shock preferred to wait **with others** rather than alone.
 - Being with others helps compare reactions and reduces stress.
-

Summary of Key Points

Factor	Explanation
Social Comparison	We compare ourselves with others to feel secure.
Social Exchange	We stay in rewarding relationships.
Evolution	We're biologically wired to bond.
Brain & Nervous System	Extroverts need more social stimulation; introverts need less.
Culture & Gender	Culture shapes how many and how close our relationships are; women often value closeness more.
Proximity	Closer physical distance = higher chance of friendship.
Familiarity	Repeated exposure leads to liking.
Anxiety	Stress increases the desire to be with others.

Lesson 29: Interpersonal Attraction (Continued)

1. What Makes People Attractive?

A. Physical Attractiveness

- People assume good-looking individuals have better personalities — this is called the **“what is beautiful is good”** stereotype.
- Movies and studies show attractive people are seen as more successful, happy, and socially skilled.
- Even **babies** who are physically attractive are rated as more likable and competent.

Job Impact:

- Attractiveness affects hiring, promotions, and salaries.
- Attractive men and women tend to earn more.
- Obese people may face discrimination, especially in individualistic cultures.

What is Considered Attractive?

- **Symmetry:** Faces that are balanced on both sides.
- **Averageness:** Faces that resemble the population average.
- **Body Shape:** Low waist-to-hip ratio in women is preferred (unless in food-scarce environments).
- **Youthfulness:** In women, features like big eyes and soft jawline are preferred.
- **Maturity:** In men, features like strong jaw and broad forehead are seen as attractive.

Why Do We Care About Attractiveness?

- We think it signals **good health, fertility, and success**.
- Being around attractive people can make us look better, too.

Reality Check:

- Despite the stereotype, research shows **attractiveness doesn't guarantee better intelligence, self-esteem, or mental health**.
-

2. Similarity (Birds of a Feather Flock Together)

- We like people who are **similar to us** — in **age, gender, race, background, attitudes**, etc.
- Studies show we feel closer to people who share more of our views.
- **Matching Hypothesis:** We tend to date or form relationships with people who match us in physical attractiveness.

3. Desirable Traits in Others

Warmth:

- Kindness, approval, smiles, and showing care make someone appear warm.

Competence:

- Social skills, intelligence, and knowing what they're doing.
 - But being "too perfect" can sometimes turn people off.
-

4. When Social Interaction Becomes Difficult

A. Social Anxiety:

- Fear of being judged or rejected can make people avoid social situations.
- Anxious people focus more on negative cues and may act in ways that confirm their fears.

B. Loneliness:

- Feeling like you don't have enough meaningful social relationships.
- **Most common in teens and young adults**, especially during big life transitions.

Age & Gender Differences:

- Young people are lonelier than older adults.
- **Men** often feel lonely without group activities.
- **Women** often feel lonely without emotional one-on-one sharing.

Social Skills and Loneliness:

- Lonely people often think and act in ways that keep them isolated.
 - They expect rejection and believe they can't improve their social life.
-

In Short:

- We're drawn to people who are attractive, similar, warm, and competent.
 - But fears, anxieties, or low self-confidence can hold us back in social life.
-

Lesson 30: Intimate Relationships

1. What is Intimacy?

- **Intimacy means sharing your inner thoughts and feelings** with someone.
- Comes from the Latin word *intimus*, meaning “inner” or “deep within”.
- In close relationships, we begin to **see parts of the other person as part of ourselves** (Aron & Eron, 1997).
- We may even treat or think about them the way we think about ourselves (William James).

“A friend is like a second self” — Cicero

2. How Intimacy Affects Our Thinking (Inclusion of Other in Self)

When we’re close to someone, we:

- Start **sharing self-concepts** — we remember traits that we both have more quickly.
 - Make **similar explanations (attributions)** for their behavior as we do for ourselves.
 - Share **resources**, both emotional and material.
 - Act based on **communal values** (giving without expecting a return), not on “give-and-take” like regular relationships.
 - Build **transactive memory** — we divide tasks and share knowledge (e.g., one remembers bills, other remembers groceries).
-

3. Attachment: Our Biological Drive to Connect

- Humans (like many animals) are **born with the urge to form attachments**.
 - **Newborns** respond to faces, voices, and smells of caregivers.
 - Hormone **oxytocin** strengthens the bond — especially in mothers during labor and breastfeeding.
-

4. Bowlby's Attachment Theory

- **John Bowlby** (1969) said forming attachments is natural and helps survival.
 - Infants show 3 emotional reactions when separated from caregivers:
 1. **Protest** (crying, screaming),
 2. **Despair** (giving up),
 3. **Detachment** (becoming emotionally distant if left too long).
-

5. Parent-Child Attachment

- This early bond **shapes all future relationships**.
 - When a child feels safe and loved, they grow up believing they are lovable and others can be trusted.
-

6. Two Basic Attachment Styles (Mary Ainsworth)

Style	Belief About Self	Belief About Others	Parent Behavior
Secure	"I am worthy of love"	"Others are reliable"	Nurturing and sensitive
Insecure	"I am not worthy of love"	"Others cannot be trusted"	Unresponsive or neglectful

7. Long-Term Effects of Attachment

- Secure children → higher self-esteem, better social skills.
 - Insecure children → feel rejected, fear intimacy, may be indecisive (sometimes friendly, sometimes withdrawn).
 - These patterns may continue into **adulthood** unless changed by life experiences (e.g., trauma or loving relationships).
-

8. Culture and Attachment

- Culture shapes how children are raised.
 - **Individualistic cultures** (like U.S., Germany): Encourage independence → more insecure attachments.
 - **Collectivist cultures** (like Japan): Closer parenting → more secure attachments.

9. Modern View: Four Attachment Styles

Attachment depends on:

- **Self-esteem** (positive or negative)
- **Trust in others** (high or low)

Style	Trust Others	Self-Esteem	Traits
Secure	Yes	High	Trusts partner, not afraid of intimacy, feels valued
Preoccupied	Yes	Low	Craves closeness, fears rejection, feels unworthy
Dismissing-Avoidant	No	High	Avoids intimacy, relies only on self
Fearful-Avoidant	No	Low	Fears intimacy and rejection, feels unworthy

10. Attachment Styles in Adults

- **Secure adults:** Form long-term, healthy relationships, handle conflicts well.
- **Insecure adults:** May struggle with closeness and self-worth.
- A **secure partner** can sometimes help an insecure one become more trusting and confident over time.

Applied Lab Skills (Social Psychology Lab)

To improve social interaction:

- Pay attention to others.
- Learn social norms.
- Control your emotions before interacting.

Training Includes:

- Role playing
- Giving compliments
- Active listening
- Watching your own behavior on video
- Talking on the phone

→ These help improve **confidence**, reduce **loneliness**, and increase **social satisfaction**.

Lesson 31: Social Influence

1. Review from Previous Lesson

- **Attachment styles** developed in childhood affect adult romantic relationships.
- **Hazan & Shaver (1987)** studied adult relationships using a “love quiz.” Securely attached adults reported better relationships with parents.
- **Cultural differences:** Love is more central to marriage in individualistic cultures than in collectivist ones like Pakistan or India.
- **Sternberg’s Triangular Theory of Love:** Love has three components:
 - **Passion:** Physical attraction and intense feelings
 - **Intimacy:** Emotional closeness and sharing
 - **Commitment:** Decision to stay together
- **Friendship:** Voluntary, unlike family. Deeper friendships involve mutual concern and self-disclosure.
- **Social Penetration Theory (Altman & Taylor):** Relationships grow from surface-level talk to deeper, personal sharing.
 - **Cultural note:** North Americans disclose more than people in collectivist cultures.
 - **Gender note:** Women tend to disclose more than men.

2. Introduction to Social Influence

Social influence is how people change others’ attitudes or behavior. It can come from leaders, media, friends, etc.

Types of Social Influence:

- **Conformity:** Changing behavior to match group norms.
 - **Compliance:** Agreeing to a request (e.g., standing during the national anthem).
 - **Obedience:** Following orders from an authority figure.
-

3. Classic Studies on Social Influence

Sherif's Study (1935): Norm Development

- Used a visual illusion (a stationary light appeared to move – *autokinetic effect*).
- Alone: People gave different estimates of how much the light moved.
- In groups: Their estimates became similar — forming a **social norm**.
- Shows that in uncertain situations, we rely on others to guide our behavior.

Asch's Study: (Summary only here; details likely in next lessons)

- Showed how people conform to group pressure even when the group is clearly wrong.
-

4. Why People Conform

- **Informational Influence:** We conform because we think others know better (especially in uncertain situations).
 - **Normative Influence:** We conform to fit in and be accepted.
-

5. Compliance Techniques

Social psychologists studied how people say “yes” to requests. Techniques include:

- **Foot-in-the-door:** Start with a small request, then ask for more.
 - **Door-in-the-face:** Start with a large request, then make a smaller one.
 - **Low-ball:** Get agreement first, then reveal hidden costs.
 - **That's-not-all:** Offer something extra before the person can say no.
 - **Pique technique:** Make an unusual request to grab attention.
-

6. Obedience

- **Obedience** is following direct orders from an authority.
- Taught from childhood in many cultures (e.g., obeying parents, teachers).
- **Milgram's Experiments:** People followed orders to give electric shocks, showing how far people go in obeying authority—even when it's wrong.

- **Key insight:** Obedience can lead to harmful actions, especially when people stop thinking critically.
 - **Criticism:** Ethical concerns about stress on participants in such studies.
-

7. Summary of Social Interaction Topics (Upcoming Chapters)

- **Aggression:** Why people harm others, and how to prevent it.
 - **Prosocial Behavior:** Why we help others and what stops us from helping.
 - **Group Behavior:** How people behave differently in groups.
 - **Power:** Why people follow immoral orders (e.g., genocide, torture).
-

Lesson 32: Social Influence (Continued)

1. Conformity in Clear Situations

People sometimes conform to the group even when they **disagree** or when the situation is clear.

Example: In the 1992 LA riots, one juror originally thought the police were guilty, but later changed her vote due to pressure from other jurors.

2. Asch's Conformity Experiments (1951)

- Participants took part in a **"visual perception test."**
- 6 out of 7 people were **actors** (confederates).
- They had to match the correct line out of 3 options to a standard line (simple task).
- The confederates **intentionally gave wrong answers** on 12 out of 18 trials.

Results:

- 37% of participants **conformed** to the wrong answer.
- 76% conformed at least once.
- When done **privately**, only 1% made errors.

Why conform?

- It's easier to go with the group than to stand out.
-

3. What Happens After We Conform?

- People try to **justify** their behavior after conforming.
 - They may **change how they remember** the situation to stay consistent with the group.
-

4. Two Reasons People Conform (Deutsch & Gerard, 1955)

Normative Influence

- Wanting to fit in and **avoid disapproval or rejection**.
- Common in Asch's experiment.

Informational Influence

- Wanting to be **correct**, especially in **uncertain situations**.
- Common in Sherif's autokinetic light experiment.

Both types of influence can occur together.

5. Schachter's Study on Nonconformists

- Group discussed a case of a boy named **Johnny Rocco**.
- Most supported a soft approach, but 3 "confederates" disagreed.
- Group first tried to **persuade**, then **rejected** the nonconformists.

Findings:

- **Nonconformists often face social rejection.**
 - This rejection is a strong type of **normative pressure**.
 - Especially common among teens who conform to **peer pressure** (e.g., drugs, alcohol) to fit in.
-

6. Factors That Influence Conformity

Group Size

- Conformity increases with group size, but only up to **3-4 people**.
- After that, the effect **levels off**.
- In **ambiguous situations**, even 1-2 people can influence you.

Group Cohesiveness

- Groups that are **close-knit** (strong bond) show more conformity.
- Cohesive groups are **less tolerant** of different views.

Social Support

- If **just one person** supports you, conformity drops.
- But if that person later switches sides, **conformity returns**.
- Consistent support reduces group pressure.

7. Minority Influence

Even a **small group or individual** can change the majority's view, but it takes time and effort.

Key Conditions for Minority Influence:

1. Consistency & Confidence

- Must stick to their view without being aggressive.
- Example: **Nelson Mandela** influenced change with patience and determination.

2. Flexibility & Open-mindedness

- Being too rigid reduces influence.

3. Cultural Alignment

- If minority views match society's **core values** (e.g., justice, equality), they are more likely to be accepted.

Moscovici's Study (1969)

- 4 participants + 2 confederates viewed colored slides.
 - When the minority **consistently** said "green" for blue slides, they influenced the group.
 - **Consistent minorities** had more impact than inconsistent ones.
-

8. How Minority Influence Works

- **Majority** influence often causes **quick but shallow** change (to avoid rejection).
 - **Minority** influence causes **deeper thinking** (called **divergent thinking**).
 - Attitudes formed through **minority influence** are more **permanent and harder to change**.
-

9. Summary

- **Conformity** happens due to pressure to fit in (normative) or be right (informational).
 - **Social rejection** is a powerful way groups control behavior.
 - **Minorities**, though initially rejected, can create real change if they're consistent, open-minded, and align with society's values.
-

Lesson 33: Social Influence (Obedience & Compliance)

Obedience

- **Obedience** is when someone follows direct orders from someone in authority.
 - Unlike **conformity** (which is subtle), obedience is **clear and obvious**.
 - People usually obey because they believe the authority figure has the **right to give orders**.
 - But if the order is **dangerous or harmful**, people may **refuse**.
-

Crimes of Obedience

- These happen when people **follow immoral or illegal orders** from authority.
 - **Example:** Nazis claimed they were “just following orders” during the Holocaust.
-

Milgram’s Obedience Study (1963)

Setup:

- Participant = "teacher", Confederate = "learner"
- Learner was in another room and pretended to get electric shocks for wrong answers.
- Shocks started from 15 volts to 450 volts (labeled “XXX – danger”).
- Learner screamed and begged to stop after 150 volts.
- The experimenter just said “**Please continue**”.

Findings:

- **65%** of participants gave the full 450V shock.
 - All obeyed at least until 300V.
 - Most showed signs of **stress and discomfort**, but still obeyed.
 - These were **normal people**, not sadists.
-

Cross-Cultural Obedience Rates:

- **Germany:** 85%
 - **Australia:** 68%
 - **Jordan:** 63%
 - **U.S. (Milgram):** 65%
 - In a **less formal setting** or with a **non-authoritative experimenter**, obedience dropped (48%, 20%).
-

Meeus & Raaijmakers (1995) Study

- Participants had to make **stressful comments** to a fake job candidate.
 - **91% obeyed** until the end.
 - Higher obedience than Milgram because the harm was **indirect**.
 - Even when people knew the setup in advance, **obedience remained high**.
 - Obedience was lower only when people were told they might be held **legally responsible**.
-

What Affects Obedience?

Increases Obedience:

- Authority figure nearby
- Others are also obeying
- Watching peers obey

Decreases Obedience:

- Authority is distant or absent
 - Seeing others refuse to obey
 - Being close to the victim
-

Gamson et al. (1982) - Group Resistance

- Group asked to support an unethical company in a fake legal case.
 - Many participants **refused**, argued back, and even wanted to expose the experiment.
 - Shows that **group support can help resist authority**.
-

Compliance

Compliance = saying “yes” to a direct request.

What Increases Compliance?

- **Positive Mood**: Happy people are more likely to agree.
 - **Reciprocity**: People return favors.
 - **Giving a reason**: Even silly reasons make people more likely to agree.
-

Compliance Strategies (Tricks):

1. **Foot-in-the-Door**
 - Start with a small request → then ask for a big one
 - More likely to agree
 2. **Door-in-the-Face**
 - Start with a big request → then ask for something smaller
 - The second request feels more reasonable
 3. **Low-Ball Technique**
 - Get someone to agree → then add extra costs after agreement
 4. **That’s-Not-All**
 - Offer something big → then quickly add a bonus or discount
 - Makes it seem like a better deal
-

Social Impact Theory (Latane, 1981)

Explains how people are influenced by others.

Influence depends on:

- **Number** of people
- **Strength** (authority, expertise)
- **Immediacy** (closeness in time or space)

Examples:

- Authority in-person = more powerful than over phone
- Group support = less likely to conform or obey

Lesson 34: Aggression

What is Aggression?

Definition:

Aggression is **any behavior meant to hurt or harm** a person, yourself, or an object.

- **Aggression ≠ Anger** (anger is a feeling, aggression is an action)
- **Aggression ≠ Assertiveness** (assertiveness is standing up for yourself without hurting others)

Types of Aggression:

1. **Antisocial** – Hurts others and breaks rules (e.g., bullying, robbery)
2. **Sanctioned** – Accepted by society (e.g., self-defense)
3. **Prosocial** – Helps society but uses force (e.g., police using force legally)

Instrumental vs. Hostile Aggression

Type	Goal	Example
Instrumental	To achieve something else (not just to hurt)	A thief using violence to rob someone
Hostile	To hurt someone out of anger	Hitting someone in a fight

Gender Differences in Aggression

- **Men:** More **physical aggression** (e.g., fights, injuries)
- **Women:** More **indirect aggression** (e.g., gossip, excluding others)
- Both can be equally aggressive but in **different ways**

Personality Traits Linked to Aggression

1. **Irritability** – Easily angered
2. **Rumination** – Keeps thinking about past anger
3. **Emotional Susceptibility** – Feels easily hurt or inadequate

Also:

- People with **fragile high self-esteem** may become aggressive to protect their self-image.

Causes of Aggression

1. Biological Causes

- **Evolution:** Aggression helped humans survive and compete.
- **Genes:** Identical twins show similar aggression, suggesting some genetic link.
- **Hormones:** High testosterone is linked to higher aggression.

Important Note: While biology plays a role, most aggression is shaped by **psychological and social factors**.

2. Frustration-Aggression Hypothesis (Catharsis Theory)

- When we're **blocked** from getting what we want, we get **frustrated** → leads to **aggression**.
- This aggression might give temporary relief (called **catharsis**) but does **not reduce future aggression**.

Example Studies:

- More **lynching** of African Americans occurred when cotton prices dropped (economic frustration).
- **Unemployment** linked with increased child abuse.

Key Study (Mallick & McCandless):

- Children who pretended to be aggressive (shooting a toy gun) were **not less aggressive** later.

Conclusion: Acting out aggression doesn't remove it — it can make it worse.

Ways to Reduce Aggression

- **Fear of punishment** may stop aggression, but can lead to secret or delayed aggression.
 - **Learning to control anger** is more effective.
 - **Non-aggressive role models** help reduce aggression in others.
 - **Creating a calm environment** can reduce angry reactions.
-

Final Thoughts

- Aggression is **complex**: influenced by **personality, biology, frustration, and learning**.
- Reducing aggression needs a **mix of understanding emotions, social learning, and environment**.

Lesson 35: Aggression (Continued)

1. Catharsis Hypothesis

- The theory claims expressing anger (like yelling or hitting) reduces future aggression.
 - **But research disagrees:**
 - **Verbal aggression** often leads to **more** aggression.
 - **Domestic violence** often starts with arguments and escalates to physical abuse.
 - **Straus & Gelles:** Verbal fights in families can grow into physical violence.
 - **Conclusion:** Catharsis doesn't help – it can actually **increase** aggression.
-

2. Cognitive-Neoassociationist Theory (Berkowitz)

- Aggression comes not just from frustration, but from **any negative experience** (e.g., pain, heat, insults).
- These experiences activate **negative feelings**, which are connected in memory.

How It Works:

- **Negative Event → Negative Feelings → Aggression or Escape**
 - We react based on:
 - Genetics
 - Past experiences
 - Focus on situation (Can I get away? Should I fight?)
 - **Two impulses triggered:**
 - **Fight** (aggression)
 - **Flight** (escape)
 - **Higher thinking** can control or stop these impulses if we're self-aware.
-

3. Situational Triggers of Aggression

a. Heat Hypothesis

- **Hot temperatures** increase anger and aggression.
 - Example: Riots, murders, and assaults rise in summer (U.S. and Pakistan).
- **Implication:** More aggression likely with **global warming**.

b. Aggressive Cues

- **Weapons** or **violent symbols** can trigger aggression.
 - **Examples:**
 - Guns, knives, and even harsh attitudes.
 - Just seeing a weapon can increase aggression, especially in angry people.
 - **“Weapons Effect”** – Presence of a weapon makes people more aggressive.
 - A gun in the home is **43x more likely** to kill a friend/family than an intruder.
 - **Women and guns:** Often used against them, not by them.
-

4. Social Learning Theory (Bandura)

Key Points:

- We learn aggression by **watching others**, not just by direct reward or punishment.
- **Children imitate:**
 - People they know (like parents).
 - People they admire or see on TV/media.

Bandura’s Bobo Doll Experiment:

- Children watched an adult beat up a doll.
- Later, those children also **hit the doll**, copying the behavior.
- Even **if punished**, children **still learned** the behavior—they just didn’t show it unless they felt safe to do so.

Reinforcement Matters:

- **Rewards** increase aggressive behavior (e.g., candy, praise).
 - **No rewards or punishment** can stop aggression over time (called **extinction**).
 - **Inconsistent punishment** is worse—it teaches that aggression sometimes works.
-

Takeaways

- **Aggression is learned** – from our surroundings, media, and role models.
- **Catharsis doesn’t reduce aggression** – it may worsen it.
- **Negative situations (like heat or pain)** and **weapons** can trigger aggression.
- **Self-awareness and emotional control** help us stop acting aggressively.

Lesson 36: Reducing Aggression

Four Main Methods to Reduce Aggression:

1. **Punishment**
 2. **Inducing Incompatible Responses**
 3. **Reducing Frustration**
 4. **Teaching Non-Aggressive Responses**
-

1. Punishment

Punishment is often used to stop aggression, but its effectiveness is limited.

For punishment to work, it must be:

- **Quick (Prompt)**
- **Strong enough (but not abusive)**
- **Consistent (used every time)**

Problems with punishment:

- Can teach aggression (especially from parents or authority figures)
 - Only reduces aggression temporarily
 - Can create anger or even **more aggression**
 - Doesn't teach the person what to do instead
 - Too costly or difficult to apply widely
-

2. Inducing Incompatible Responses

We can't feel two opposite emotions at the same time (e.g., anger + empathy).

Robert Baron's Study (1976):

- Drivers were made to wait at a green light to frustrate them.
- Some were exposed to:
 - **Empathy**
 - **Humor**
 - **Mild sexual arousal**
- Others had distractions or weren't present.
- **Result:** Those in empathy/humor/arousal groups honked less = **less aggression**.

Key idea: Introducing positive emotions can block aggression.

3. Reducing Frustration

- Governments try to reduce frustration (like poverty, unemployment), but it's not always effective.
 - **Pakistani studies** show that middle-class people involved in homicide often suffer social and mental stress.
 - So we also need **other strategies** beyond just solving frustration.
-

4. Teaching Non-Aggressive Responses

a. Social Modeling

- People copy what they see.
- Watching calm, non-aggressive role models can reduce aggression.
- Children copy **less violence** when an adult **condemns** aggressive behavior.

b. Internalizing Anti-Aggression Beliefs

- If people **truly believe** aggression is wrong, they behave better.
- Example: Children asked to explain why TV violence is bad were **less affected by it** later.

c. Apologies Reduce Aggression

- Saying sorry can calm angry people.
- **Study:** Japanese students were less angry when someone **apologized** for a mistake.
- **Gender differences:**
 - **Women** are more likely to apologize than men.
 - **Men** may fear losing social status when apologizing.

d. Social Skills Training

- Children learn better ways to handle anger (like compromise, negotiation).
- Children with **low IQ** often struggle and use aggression more.
- **Training** (like role-playing or group sessions) helps them behave more peacefully.
- **Study:** A 12-session training program reduced aggression in troubled teens.

e. Reducing Exposure to Violence

- **Study (Robinson et al., 2001):**
 - One school reduced TV/video game time.
 - Kids at that school showed **less aggression** on the playground.

Lesson 37: Prosocial Behavior

What is Prosocial Behavior?

Prosocial behavior is when someone **voluntarily helps others**, either by giving time, effort, or resources.

There are **two motives** behind helping:

- **Egoistic helping**: You help because **you benefit** (e.g., praise, reward, or avoiding guilt).
 - **Altruistic helping**: You help **without expecting anything** in return.
-

Types of Helping (McGuire, 1994):

1. **Casual help** – e.g., giving directions
 2. **Substantial help** – e.g., lending money
 3. **Emotional help** – e.g., listening to a friend
 4. **Emergency help** – e.g., saving someone from danger
-

Why Do We Help? (Theories and Perspectives)

1. Evolutionary Perspective

We help because it **helps our genes survive**.

- **Kin selection**: We're more likely to help **relatives** to keep shared genes alive.
- Animals and humans show this pattern.

2. Sociocultural Perspective

We learn to help based on **social rules (norms)**:

- **Reciprocity norm**: Help others because you expect help in return someday
- **Responsibility norm**: Help those **who depend on us** (e.g., children, students)
- **Social justice norm**: Help **only if** the person **deserves it**

3. Learning Perspective

We learn helping behavior through:

- **Observation (modeling)**: Seeing others help makes us more likely to help
- **Reinforcement**: Being **praised** increases future helping; being **ignored or criticized** decreases it

When Do We Help?

The Bystander Effect

Sometimes people **don't help** even when someone clearly needs it – especially if **others are also present**. This is called the **bystander effect**.

Bystander Intervention Model (Latané & Darley)

To help, a person must go through these **5 steps**:

1. **Notice** something unusual
2. **Interpret** it as an emergency
3. **Feel responsible** to act
4. **Know how** to help
5. **Decide to act**

If the answer is “no” at any step, the person might **not help**.

Example:

In the famous **Kitty Genovese case (1964)**, a woman was attacked while **38 neighbors watched** but no one helped. This led to research on the bystander effect.

Factors That Affect Helping Behavior:

- **Mood**: People in a good mood are more likely to help
 - **Empathy**: High empathy leads to more helping
 - **Personality**: Some people are naturally more helpful
 - **Gender**: Differences in how help is given (e.g., physical help vs. emotional support)
 - **Environment**: People in **busy cities** may ignore emergencies due to **distractions or stress**
-

Key Takeaways:

- Helping can be **selfish or selfless**
 - We help based on **biology, society, or learning**
 - **Others' presence** can stop us from helping
 - Helping behavior can be **increased** by **modeling** and **praise**
-

Lesson 38: Prosocial Behavior (Continued)

Why Don't People Help?

1. Bystander Intervention

Two main reasons people don't help in emergencies:

a. Audience Inhibition Effect

- People don't help because they fear being judged or embarrassed if they misinterpret the situation.
- Example: If no one else reacts, we assume it's not serious.
- **Latane & Darley (1968)**: People alone reported smoke more than those with others.

b. Diffusion of Responsibility

- When more people are present, each person feels less responsible.
- **Darley & Latane (1968)**: Fewer participants helped during a fake emergency when others were "present."

Online Version (Markey, 2000):

- In chat rooms, people responded slower to help requests when more users were present.
 - **BUT**: Naming someone specifically increased the chances of getting help.
-

Emotional Arousal & Cost-Reward Model

Piliavin et al. (1981):

- Emergencies cause emotional discomfort.
- People want to reduce this discomfort by:
 - Helping directly
 - Helping indirectly (calling someone)
 - Ignoring or denying the situation

Cost-Reward Thinking:

- **Cost of helping**: Time, risk, embarrassment
- **Cost of not helping**: Guilt, discomfort
- People balance these before acting.

Who Helps?

1. Positive Mood

People in a good mood are more likely to help because:

- They see others as deserving.
- Helping feels rewarding.
- They're more aware of others' needs.
- They want to stay in a good mood.

Examples:

- Helping more after success or on sunny days.
 - Uplifting music or a small gift increases helping.
-

2. Negative Mood

People can also help when feeling bad:

- Helping makes them feel better (called the **Negative State Relief Model**).
- Guilt increases helping.
 - **Cunningham (1980)**: People who broke a camera were more likely to help later due to guilt.

BUT:

- If the negative mood is too strong (grief, depression), people may not notice others' needs.
 - People help only if the **rewards of helping** seem greater than the **costs**.
-

Mood & Helping Summary

Mood	Helping Behavior
Good Mood	More helping (to maintain good mood)
Bad Mood	More helping (if it improves mood)
Very Bad Mood	Less helping (too self-focused)

Lesson 39: Group Behavior

Leftover from Previous Topic: Prosocial Behavior & Gender Differences

Do men and women help others differently?

Yes. Based on research:

- **Men:**
 - More likely to help in risky, heroic, or public situations.
 - More likely to help strangers, especially if the person is female or others are watching.
- **Women:**
 - More likely to help emotionally (e.g., comfort, care).
 - Often serve as caregivers for children and the elderly.
 - Help more in routine situations (e.g., helping friends or family).

Key Point:

Men tend to help more in public and dramatic ways; women help more in private and nurturing ways.

Can learning about social psychology increase helping?

Yes!

- People who learn about the **bystander effect** (how people hesitate to help when others are around) are **more likely to help** in real-life emergencies.
 - Teaching about **helping barriers** makes people more aware and responsive.
-

Main Topic: Group Behavior

What is a Group?

A group is:

- 2 or more people
- Who interact
- Share common goals
- Feel part of the group

Examples: Family, sports team, work crew

Basic Features of Groups

1. Social Norms

- Shared rules or expectations (e.g., don't smoke in university).
- Norms increase **conformity** and improve group functioning.

2. Social Roles

- Expected behaviors for specific positions (e.g., leader, helper).
- Roles can be assigned or taken naturally.

3. Social Status

- The level of respect, power, or attention someone has in a group.
- High-status members:
 - Talk more
 - Are more confident
 - Are often more liked
- But they are blamed more if things go wrong.

4. Cohesiveness

- The strength of bond among group members.
- High cohesiveness = more unity and productivity

Positive Cohesiveness:

- Members like each other
- Work well together
- Achieve goals

Negative Cohesiveness:

- People stay because they feel stuck
 - Lack better options
-

Group Influence on Individuals

Even **minimal interaction** can influence behavior.

1. Social Facilitation

- **Presence of others improves performance** on easy tasks but **hurts performance** on hard tasks.

Example:

- Cyclists ride faster with others around.
- Pool players play better if skilled, worse if unskilled when watched.

Why it happens:

- **Drive Theory (Zajonc):**
Being watched increases arousal, which:
 - Helps with easy tasks (well-practiced responses)
 - Hurts performance on complex or new tasks
 - **Evaluation Apprehension:**
We perform differently when we **feel judged**.
 - **Distraction-Conflict Theory:**
Being around others divides attention (task vs. audience), creating arousal.
 - **Mere Presence:**
Simply having others around can trigger arousal—even if they're not watching.
-

2. Social Loafing

- In groups, people may **put in less effort** if they think others will carry the load.
-

3. Deindividuation

- In crowds, people may **lose self-awareness** and act in ways they normally wouldn't (e.g., aggressive, wild).
-

Quick Activity – What's a Real Group?

Which of these are **actual groups**? (Need interaction + shared goals)

Family at dinner

Cricket team

Construction crew

Rotary club

Protest mob

Not groups (no real interaction or common goal):

- Audience
- Elevator riders
- People waiting in line
- All citizens of Pakistan

Lesson 40: Group Behavior (Continued)

Social Loafing: Doing Less in Groups

What is Social Loafing?

- When people **put in less effort in a group** because:
 - Their individual effort can't be judged
 - They feel "lost in the crowd"
- The opposite of **social facilitation** (where performance improves when being watched)

Classic Studies

- **Max Ringleman (1913)**: People pulled rope with less effort in groups than alone.
 - **Latane et al. (1979)**:
 - Participants shouted less loudly when they thought others were shouting too.
 - Showed both **behavioral** and **mental** loafing (less effort + less focus).
 - Cause: **Diffusion of responsibility** – "Others will do it."
-

Task Complexity & Loafing

- **Jackson & Williams (1985)**:
 - Participants worked on a **complex maze** task.
 - Performance improved when they were **collectively evaluated**, not individually.
 - Why? Less fear of judgment helped them focus better.

Key Point:

In **complex tasks**, being in a group **can help** because people feel less pressure and can focus better.

Loafing vs. Compensation

- **Karau & Williams (1993)**:
 - If someone **cares about the group's success**, they might work harder — this is called **social compensation**.
 - If they **don't care**, they may **loaf** (put in less effort).
-

How to Reduce Social Loafing

- Make individual efforts **identifiable**
 - Give **clear goals** or performance standards
 - Offer **rewards** for high group performance
 - Make tasks **meaningful or challenging**
 - Use **social pressure** – lazy members may feel ashamed or be excluded
 - **Gender differences:**
 - **Males:** More likely to get distracted
 - **Females:** More likely to try hard to rejoin group acceptance
-

Social Loafing Across Cultures

- Found in many countries (e.g., India, China, Japan)
 - **More common in individualistic cultures** (like the U.S.) than in collectivist ones (like Asia)
 - **Women** tend to loaf less than men
-

Deindividuation: Losing Yourself in the Group

What is Deindividuation?

- A state where people:
 - Feel **anonymous**
 - **Lose self-awareness**
 - Stop caring about personal values
- This can lead to:
 - **Aggression**, vandalism, rioting, or impulsive behavior

Key Study – Zimbardo (1970)

- Women in **anonymous groups** gave **twice as many electric shocks** than those who were identifiable.
-

Online Example

- People visiting a website tried to access **illegal content** when they thought they were anonymous.
- Shows how the internet can also cause **deindividuation**.

What Leads to Deindividuation? (Zimbardo, 1970)

- Large **group size**
 - **Anonymity**
 - Overstimulation (lights, noise, excitement)
 - Altered mental states
 - Feeling **less responsible**
-

Study – Trick or Treat (Diener, 1980)

- Children told to take **one candy**.
- Those in **anonymous groups** took more candies than those alone or identifiable.

Findings:

- More stealing happened when children were:
 - In groups
 - Not identified
-

Why Deindividuation Happens

- **Diener (1980):** People stop being aware of themselves and their values.
 - They focus on:
 - The group
 - The environment
 - They don't lose their identity — but their behavior shifts to **match the group norm**.
-

Summary

Concept	Meaning	Causes	Effect
Social Loafing	People work less in groups	Effort can't be judged, responsibility is shared	Lower performance
Deindividuation	Losing self-awareness in groups	Anonymity, group size, arousal	Risky or antisocial behavior

Lesson 41: Group Behavior (Continued)

David Dodd's Deindividuation Exercise

- Students were asked:

"If you were invisible for 24 hours and wouldn't be caught, what would you do?"

- **36%** gave **antisocial** answers (e.g., stealing, spying).
 - Same result as inmates in a **maximum-security prison**.
 - Proves that **even normal people** can think or act antisocially when they feel **anonymous** and **not responsible**.
-

Group Decision Making: Risky Shift

What is Risky Shift?

- In groups, people tend to take **more risks** than they would alone.
- **Stoner (1961)**: Students took more risks in group decisions than when deciding alone.

More Evidence

- Risky shift happens across many cultures, ages, and professions.
 - But sometimes, people become **more cautious** instead. So what's happening?
-

Group Polarization: Strengthening Opinions

What is Group Polarization?

- **Group discussion makes initial opinions stronger.**
 - If the group starts cautious, it becomes **more cautious**.
 - If it starts risky, it becomes **more risky**.
- Happens more on **important issues**.

Research

- **Myers & Bishop (1970)**: Prejudiced students became **more prejudiced** after group discussion.
- **Terrorist groups** grow more extreme over time.
- **Juries** tend to form stronger opinions after discussion.

Why Does Group Polarization Happen?

1. Social Comparison (Normative Influence)

- We compare our views with others and want to **fit in**.
- If others seem more extreme in a "socially good" direction, we shift further too.

2. Persuasive Arguments (Informational Influence)

- We hear **new arguments** supporting our view.
- We become more convinced and **move to a stronger position**.

Isenberg's Meta-Analysis: Both social comparison and persuasive arguments work **together**.

☒ Groupthink: When Groups Make Bad Decisions

What is Groupthink?

- A group makes **poor decisions** because:
 - They want **agreement**
 - They avoid **conflict**
 - They ignore **warnings or criticism**

Example: Iraq War (2003)

- President Bush believed Iraq had weapons of mass destruction.
 - CIA supported this, but no real evidence was found.
 - The group ignored dissent, rushed decisions, and made **costly mistakes**.
-

Causes of Groupthink

1. **High Group Unity** – Strong desire to agree and conform.
 2. **Stressful Situations** – Pressure to decide quickly.
 3. **Poor Procedures** – No external input, strong leader influence.
-

Turner et al. (1992) Study

- Groups had to solve a work problem involving "Joe," a lazy worker.

- **High-cohesiveness + High stress = bad decisions** (e.g., promoting Joe instead of rotating workers).
- Shows how groupthink lowers decision quality.

Symptoms of Groupthink

Symptom	Description
Illusion of Invulnerability	Belief that the group can't be wrong
Close-mindedness	Ignoring outside evidence or criticism
Pressure to Conform	Members silence doubts to avoid conflict
Illusion of Agreement	Belief that everyone agrees because no one speaks up

How to Prevent Groupthink

- Leaders should stay **neutral**
- Allow **criticism and disagreements**
- Form **subgroups** for decisions
- Get **outside opinions**
- Encourage **critical thinking**

Summary Table

Concept	Meaning	Outcome
Risky Shift	Group leans toward riskier decisions after discussion	More risk-taking
Polarization	Group discussion amplifies original attitudes	More extreme views
Groupthink	Group desires harmony so much that it ignores better options	Poor decisions due to pressure

Lesson 42: Interpersonal Power & Leadership

What is Leadership?

- A **leader** influences group behavior, guides direction, and motivates members.
 - Leaders may **emerge naturally**, be **elected**, or **appointed**.
 - In simple groups, there's often one leader; in complex groups, multiple leaders may exist.
-

Main Theories of Leadership

1. Great-Person Theory

- Leaders are **born**, not made.
- Certain **traits** make people natural leaders:
 - Intelligence
 - Need for achievement
 - Good at understanding others
 - Confident, optimistic, socially active

2. Situational Theory

- Leadership depends on the **situation**, not personality.
- Example: **Hitler** rose in a time of crisis.
- People who **talk more** or sit in important positions often become leaders.
- **Communication patterns** also affect leadership (central roles = more likely to lead).

3. Contingency Theory (Fiedler)

- Leadership effectiveness depends on the **match between style and situation**.
- Two leadership styles:
 - **Task-oriented**: Focused on getting the job done.
 - **Relationship-oriented**: Focused on harmony and team spirit.
- Effectiveness depends on:
 - Leader's relationship with group
 - Structure of the task
 - Leader's power
- **Task-oriented leaders** perform best in very **good** or **very bad** situations.
- **Relationship-oriented leaders** do better in **moderate** situations.

Transformational vs Transactional Leadership

Transformational Leadership

- **Inspires** and **motivates** followers beyond self-interest.
- Core traits:
 1. Communicates a clear **vision**
 2. **Implements** the vision
 3. Uses **charisma** and strong communication
- Subtypes:
 - **Charismatic**: Role model
 - **Inspirational**: Motivates and gives meaning
 - **Intellectual stimulation**: Encourages creativity
 - **Individual consideration**: Acts as mentor

Transactional Leadership

- Focuses on **exchanging rewards** for performance.
- Subtypes:
 - **Contingent reward**: Rewards for meeting goals
 - **Management by exception**:
 - **Active**: Watches for errors
 - **Passive**: Acts only when problems arise
 - **Laissez-faire**: Avoids decisions, lacks responsibility

Leader's Sources of Power (6 Types)

1. **Expert Power**: Knowledge and skills
2. **Referent Power**: Shared identity (e.g., team spirit)
3. **Informational Power**: Persuasive arguments
4. **Legitimate Power**: Based on rules and norms
5. **Reward Power**: Ability to give rewards
6. **Coercive Power**: Ability to punish

Gender and Leadership

- **"Masculine" tasks** → Male leaders chosen
- **"Feminine" tasks** → Female leaders chosen
- Business leadership is seen as **masculine**, making it harder for women to be chosen.
- **Women leaders** are sometimes unfairly seen as "bossy" if they act assertively.
- **Facial expressions** show people are more comfortable when **men lead** than when **women lead**, even if the woman is competent.

Lesson 43: Social Psychology in Court

What is “Social Psychology in Court”?

This topic shows how psychological principles (like perception, memory, persuasion) apply in **legal systems**—especially in **courtrooms**.

Two Main Topics Covered:

1. **Eyewitness Testimony**
2. **Other Factors that Affect Jury Decisions**

1. Eyewitness Testimony

How Persuasive Is It?

- People **believe eyewitnesses**, even if their memory is incorrect.
- Study: When there was **no eyewitness**, only **18%** voted guilty.
- With an eyewitness (even weak), **68–72%** voted guilty.
- Conclusion: **Eyewitnesses greatly influence convictions**, even if wrong.

Is Eyewitness Testimony Accurate?

- Often **inaccurate**.
- Innocent people have been **wrongly convicted** due to false identification.
- Study: 141 students saw a fake assault; **60% chose the wrong person** later.
- People are often **more confident than accurate**.

Factors That Affect Accuracy

Factor	Effect
Stress & Arousal	Helps remember the event, but not what happened before/after
Weapon Focus	People stare at the weapon, not the person
Own-Race Bias	Better at recognizing faces of your own race
Time Delay	Memory fades quickly with time
Leading Questions	Words like "smashed" vs. "hit" change memory
False Details	People may believe non-existent facts added later

Identification Methods

- **Show-ups**: One suspect shown → high error risk.
- **Simultaneous lineups**: All suspects shown at once.
- **Sequential lineups**: One-by-one → **most accurate** method.

Why Does Memory Get Altered?

Three ideas:

1. **Overwriting** – New info replaces old.
2. **Forgetting** – Memory fades.
3. **Source Confusion** – Can't tell where memory came from (real or post-event info). ←
Most supported.

How to Improve Eyewitness Accuracy

1. Train Police Interviewers

- Let the witness speak freely first.
- Ask open-ended, memory-triggering questions later.
- Help them **visualize** the crime scene.

2. Improve Lineup Instructions

- Tell witness the suspect **may or may not** be present.
- Use a "**blank**" lineup to spot false identifiers.

3. Educate Jurors

- Many jurors **ignore psychological factors** affecting memory.
- They need to understand:
 - Wording of questions matters
 - Eyewitness confidence ≠ accuracy
 - Post-event info can distort memory
 - Personal attitudes affect memory

2. Other Factors That Influence Jury Decisions

A. Physical Attractiveness

- Attractive people are:
 - Judged **less guilty**
 - Given **lighter punishments**
- Example: Less attractive defendants got **higher fines and bails**.

B. Similarity to the Jury

- Jurors are more sympathetic if defendant:
 - Shares their **race, religion, language, or gender**
 - Example: English speakers judged English-speaking defendants more kindly than those using **translated testimony**.
-

Lesson 44: Social Psychology in Clinic

1. Clinician Judgment Biases

Clinicians are human—and often fall into common cognitive traps:

Bias Type	Examples & Effects
Illusory Correlations	Clinicians may see false trait-drawing links (like "sad = big eyes") and falsely believe they exist.
Hindsight Bias	After an outcome (e.g., a suicide), it's tempting to say "I knew it all along."
Self-Confirming Diagnoses	Clinicians ask biased questions to confirm what they expect (e.g., testing introversion by asking about difficulty opening up).
Overconfidence	Despite studies showing statistical tools outperform human intuition (Meehl, 1986), clinicians often trust their "gut."

2. Faulty Thinking & Mental Health

Negative thoughts can fuel mental and physical illness—especially in:

A. Depression

- **Depressive realism:** Mildly depressed people often make more **accurate** judgments than non-depressed.
- **Negative explanatory style:** Attributing failures to internal, stable, and global causes.
- Longitudinal research shows pessimistic thinkers are far more likely to become depressed later (Alloy et al., 1999).
- Depression becomes self-perpetuating—leading to social withdrawal, strained relationships, and deeper negative thinking.

B. Loneliness

- Lonely individuals misread social cues and withdraw further.
- Men feel lonely without group interaction; women feel lonely without one-on-one intimacy.

C. Anxiety/Shyness

- Shy people over-interpret neutral social signals and believe others are judging them negatively.
- This self-focused attention fuels social withdrawal and intensified anxiety.

D. Illness Perception

- Some “epidemics” are psychosocial (e.g., 1989 auditorium incident where illness spread via suggestion).
 - **Type A personality**—anger, hostility—is linked with heart disease.
 - Pessimistic explanatory style predicts slower recovery and worse health.
 - **Stress** weakens the immune system; optimistic people tend to be healthier.
-

3. Social-Psychological Interventions

Several strategies help reverse negative patterns:

A. Behavior → Emotion

- Use techniques like **assertiveness training** (foot-in-the-door).
- Changing actions can reshape attitudes (consistent with cognitive dissonance theory).

B. Change Explanatory Styles

- Example: Students tracked daily successes and reasons behind them:
 - **Success → internal, Failure → external.**
 - After intervention, both their **self-esteem and mood improved** (Layden, 1982).

C. Social Skills Training

- Helps lonely and anxious individuals improve social competence and confidence.
- Practicing in low-risk environments builds skills and breaks negative cycles.

D. Psychology + Physical Health

- Changing outlook and behaviors can also improve physical health:
 - Attribution retraining helped patients manage stress and improved recovery (e.g., after surgery).
-

4. Social Support & Well-Being

The best medicine can be the people around you:

Health Effects

- Married people, or those with strong social ties, generally live longer and healthier lives.
- After spousal loss, mortality risk doubles temporarily (Kaprio et al., 1987).
- Elderly or socially isolated people have higher illness risk (Cerhan & Wallace, 1997).

Happiness Effects

- **Friends & intimate relationships** reduce stress and enhance joy.
- Being married—or in supportive relationships—is consistently linked to greater life satisfaction.
- Collectivist cultures—with tight-knit communities—often show better overall health and lower loneliness.

Lesson 45: Final Review

Course Structure

Sections:

1. **Overview of Social Psychology**
2. **Thinking About the Self and Others**
3. **Evaluating People and Relationships**
4. **Social Interactions**
5. **Applied Social Psychology**

Section I: Overview of Social Psychology

Definition

Social Psychology studies how people's thoughts, feelings, and behaviors are influenced by others—whether they are present or not. (*Gordon Allport, 1985*)

Influences on Behavior

- **Group-level:** Culture, evolution
- **Individual-level:** Personality, past experiences
- **Internal factors:** Traits, attitudes

Related Fields

- Sociology
- Biology
- Personality Psychology

Career Paths

- PhD: Teaching & research (universities)
- MSc: Applied roles (e.g., marketing, HR, law)

Research in Social Psychology

- Scientific method:
 1. Ask question
 2. Review literature
 3. Make hypothesis
 4. Define variables
 5. Choose design
 6. Consider ethics
 7. Collect & analyze data
 8. Report results

Research Methods

- **Observation**
- **Correlational**
- **Experimental**
- Others:
 - Meta-analysis
 - Internet-based research
 - Brain imaging
 - Virtual reality

Section II: Thinking About the Self and Others

Self-Concept

- “I” = active self (actor), “Me” = known self (traits, roles)
- Influenced by family, culture, society

Knowing the Self

- Self-reflection
- Feedback from others
- Comparing to others

Understanding Others

- **Nonverbal cues** (facial expressions, gestures)
- **Verbal cues** (tone, speech)
- **Impression formation:**
 - Traits (central vs. peripheral)
 - First & last impressions
 - Halo effect
- **Attribution:** Explaining why people behave as they do
 - Locus (internal/external)
 - Stability (permanent/temporary)
 - Control (controllable/uncontrollable)

Attribution Biases

- Fundamental Attribution Error
- Actor-Observer Bias
- Self-Serving Bias
- False Consensus Effect
- Ultimate Attribution Error

Social Thinking

- **Schemas & Categories:** Mental shortcuts
- **Heuristics:** Mental rules (availability, representativeness)
- **Biases:**
 - Hindsight bias
 - Confirmation bias
 - Self-fulfilling prophecy
 - Just-world belief
 - Learned helplessness

Section III: Evaluating Persons and Relationships

Attitudes

- ABC model: Affective, Behavioral, Cognitive
- **Formed by:**
 - Repeated exposure
 - Conditioning
 - Self-perception
 - Feedback from facial/posture
- **Attitude Change:**
 - Cognitive dissonance
 - Persuasion (message, audience, communicator)

Prejudice & Discrimination

- **Sources:**
 - Cognitive (stereotyping)
 - Emotional (scapegoating, authoritarianism)
 - Social (group competition, identity)
- **Reducing Prejudice:**
 - Contact hypothesis
 - Recategorization

Attraction & Relationships

- **Attraction factors:**
 - Proximity, familiarity, similarity, physical appeal
- **Close relationships:**
 - Attachment styles: Secure, preoccupied, dismissing, fearful

Section IV: Social Interactions

Social Influence

- **Conformity**

- **Obedience**
- **Compliance**

Aggression

- Influenced by:
 - Gender, personality
 - Biology, frustration, learned behavior
- **Reducing Aggression:**
 - Punishment
 - Teach alternatives
 - Reduce anger/frustration

Helping (Pro-Social Behavior)

- **Why?**
 - Empathy, mood, social norms
- **When?**
 - Clear need, low cost, fewer people around
- **Who helps?**
 - Depends on personality, mood, gender
- **Theories:**
 - Bystander model
 - Cost-reward analysis

Groups

- Group effects:
 - Social facilitation
 - Social loafing
 - Deindividuation
- **Group Decision-making:**
 - Groupthink
- **Leadership:**
 - Types of leadership
 - Leadership styles
 - How leaders influence others

Section V: Applied Social Psychology

Real-world Applications

- In **Court:**
 - Eyewitness testimony
 - Jury decisions
- In **Clinics:**
 - Therapy, behavior change