Unit 14 – Social Psychology
Social Psychology

- How we think in relation to other people
- How other people influence not only our thinking but our actions:
- How we treat each other, relate to each other

- Conformity
- Obedience
- Group Behavior
- Prejudice
- Attraction
- Aggression
- Altruism
- Conflict and Peacemaking
Sample social psychology question: Why might students speak up in class, or hesitate to speak?

To answer this, we can study emotions, cognitions, motivations, reinforcers, and more:

- **Personality Psychologists** could study the *traits* that might make one person more likely than another to speak, and

- **Social Psychologists** might examine aspects of the classroom *situation* that would influence *any* student’s decision about speaking.
Unit Overview

• Social Thinking
Social Thinking

Topics to think about together

- Fundamental Attribution Error when thinking about the behavior of others
- Attitudes and Actions affecting each other:
- Peripheral and Central Route Persuasion
- Foot-in-the-Door Phenomenon
- Role playing affecting attitudes
- Cognitive Dissonance: Actions affecting beliefs
Social Thinking

Attribution: Identifying causes

Attribution: a conclusion about the cause of an observed behavior/event.

Attribution Theory: We explain others’ behavior with two types of attributions:

- **Situational Attribution** (factors outside the person doing the action, such as peer pressure), or
- **Dispositional Attribution** (the person’s stable, enduring traits, personality, ability, emotions)

With all that we have learned about people so far in this course, you should make pretty good guesses about the nature of other people’s behavior, right?

We, especially those raised in Western, Individualist cultures, tend to make Fundamental Attribution Error
Social Thinking:
Fundamental Attribution Error

See if you can find the error in the following comment:

“I noticed the new guy tripping and stumbling as he walked in. How clumsy can you be? Does he never watch where he’s going?”

What’s the error?
Hint: Next day...

“Hey, they need to fix this rug! I tripped on it on the way in!
Not everyone tripped? Well, not everyone had a test that day and their cell phone was buzzing.”

The Fundamental Attribution Error: When we go too far in assuming that a person’s behavior is caused by their personality.

We think a behavior demonstrates a trait.

We tend to overemphasize ______ attribution and underemphasize ______ attribution.
Social Thinking:
Fundamental Attribution Error

We make this error even when we are given the correct facts:

Williams College study: A woman was paid and told to act friendly to some students, unfriendly to others. The students felt that her behavior was part of her disposition, even when they were told that she was just obeying instructions.
Social Thinking:
Self vs. Other/Actors and Observers

- When we explain our OWN behavior, we partly reverse the fundamental attribution error: we tend to blame the situation for our failures (although we take personal credit for successes).

- This happens not just out of selfishness: it happens whenever we take the perspective of the actor in a situation, which is easiest to do for ourselves and people we know well.
Social Thinking: Cultural differences

People in **collectivist cultures** (those which emphasize group unity, allegiance, and purpose over the wishes of the individual), do not make the same kinds of attributions:

1. The behavior of others is attributed more to the situation; also,
2. Credit for successes is given more to others,
3. Blame for failures is taken on oneself.
Social Thinking
Emotional Effects of Attribution

Problematic behavior: someone cuts in front of us.

How we explain someone’s behavior affects how we react to it.

Situational attribution
"Maybe that driver is ill."
Tolerant reaction (proceed cautiously, allow driver a wide berth)

Dispositional attribution
"Crazy driver!"
Unfavorable reaction (speed up and race past the other driver, craning to give a dirty look)
Social Thinking: Political Effects of Attribution

When we see someone who is in dirty clothes and asking for money, what do we assume is the cause of the person’s behavior?

1. Too lazy or incompetent to get a job?
2. Lost home due to medical bills and now unable to get in a condition to compete for scarce jobs?

Would your assumptions change if the person were drunk? Or spoke articulately?

What solutions and policies make sense if you make the first attributions? The second?
Social Thinking:
Attitudes and Actions

**Attitude:** Feelings, ideas, and beliefs that affect how we approach and react to other people, objects, and events.

Attitudes, by definition, affect our actions; We shall see later that our actions can also influence our attitudes.
Social Thinking: Persuasion

Two cognitive pathways to affect attitudes

Central Route Persuasion
Going directly through the rational mind, influencing attitudes with evidence and logic.

"My product has been proven more effective."

Peripheral Route Persuasion
Changing attitudes by going around the rational mind and appealing to fears, desires, associations.

"People who buy my product are happy, attractive!"
Social Thinking

Attitudes affect our actions when:

1. External influences are minimal
2. The attitude is stable
3. The attitude is specific to the behavior
4. The attitude is easily recalled.

“I feel like [attitude] eating at McD’s, and I will [action];”

1. There are no nutritionists here telling me not to,
2. I’ve enjoyed their food for quite a while,
3. It’s so easy to get the food when I have a craving,
4. It’s easy to remember how good it is when I drive by that big sign every day.”
Social Thinking:

Actions affect attitudes:

If attitudes direct our actions, can it work the other way around? How can it happen that we can take an action which in turn shifts our attitude about that action?

Through three social-cognitive mechanisms:

- The Foot in the Door Phenomenon
- The Effects of Playing a Role, and
- Cognitive Dissonance
Social Thinking: Small Compliance → Large Compliance

A political campaigner asks if you would open the door just enough to pass a clipboard through. [Or a foot]

You agree to this.

Then you agree to sign a petition.

Then you agree to make a small contribution. By check.

What happened here?
Social Thinking:
Small Compliance ➔ Large Compliance

The **Foot-in-the-Door Phenomenon**: the tendency to be more likely to agree to a large request after agreeing to a small one.

**Affect on attitudes**: People adjust their attitudes along with their actions, liking the people they agreed to help, disliking the people they agreed to harm.
Social Thinking: Role Playing Affects Attitudes

“No man, for any considerable period, can wear one face to himself, and another to the multitude, without finally getting bewildered as to which may be the true [face].”

-- Nathaniel Hawthorne

“Fake it till you make it.”

-- Alcoholics Anonymous slogan

When we play a role, even if we know it is just pretending, we eventually tend to adopt the attitudes that go with the role, and become the role.

- In arranged marriages, people often come to have a deep love for the person they marry.
- Actors say they “lose themselves” in roles.
- Participants in the Stanford Prison Study ended up adopting the attitudes of whatever roles they were randomly assigned to:
  - “guards” had demeaning views of “prisoners,”
  - “prisoners” had rebellious dislike of the “guards.”
The Stanford Prison Experiment
Cognitive Dissonance

If Fiona agrees to do some fundraising for her college, her attitudes about school finances might shift to resolve her cognitive dissonance.
Social Thinking: Cognitive Dissonance

Cognitive Dissonance: When our actions are not in harmony with our attitudes.

Cognitive Dissonance Theory: the observation that we tend to resolve this dissonance by changing our attitudes to fit our actions.

Origin of Cognitive Dissonance Theory

Festinger’s Study (1957): Students were paid either large or small amounts to express enjoyment of a boring activity. Then many of the students changed their attitudes about the activity. Which amount shifted attitudes?

- Getting paid more: “I was paid to say that.”
- Getting paid less: “Why would I say it was fun? Just for a dollar? Weird. Maybe it wasn’t so bad, now that I think of it.”
Unit Overview

• Social Influence
Social Influence

Topics we suggest you learn about

- Cultural Influences
- Conformity: Mimicry and Norms
- Obedience: Factors and lessons
- Group situations and group behavior:
  - Social facilitation
  - Social loafing
  - Polarization
  - Deindividuation
  - Groupthink
  - The power of individuals
Culture, the behaviors and beliefs of a group, is shared and passed on to others including the next generation of that group.

This sharing of traditions, values, and ideas is a form of social influence that helps maintain the culture.

Norms are the rules, often unspoken but commonly understood, that guide behavior in a culture. Norms are part of the culture but also part of the way social influence works to maintain the culture.

Cultures change over time; norms for marriage and divorce have changed in Western culture.
Conformity

What form of social influence is the subject of this cartoon?
Conformity refers to adjusting our behavior or thinking to fit in with a group standard.

The power of Conformity has many components and forms, including:

- Automatic Mimicry affecting behavior
- Social Norms affecting our thinking
- Normative and Informational Social Influence
Mimicry

It is not only true that birds of a feather flock together: it is also true that if we flock together, we might choose to wear the same feathers.
Some of our mimicry of other people is not by choice, but automatic:

- **Chameleon Effect**: unintentionally mirroring the body position and mood of others around us, leading to contagious yawning, contagious arm folding, hand wringing, face rubbing...

- **Empathetic** shifts in mood that fit the mood of the people around us

- Copying the actions of others, including forms of violence, hopefully forms of kindness
The Chameleon Effect: Unconscious Mimicry

In an experiment, a confederate/collaborator of the experimenter intentionally rubbed his/her face or shook a foot; this seemed to lead to a greater likelihood of the study participant doing the same behavior.
Soloman Asch's Conformity Experiment

[Diagram showing two sets of lines, one set consistent and another set varying in length with labels A, B, C]
Social Influence: Conformity
Responding to Social Norms

When we are with other people and perceive a **social norm** (a “correct” or “normal” way to behave or think in this group), our behavior may follow the norm rather than following our own judgment.

- Asch Conformity studies: About one third of people will agree with obvious mistruths to go along with the group.

  *Think this guy will conform?*

That square has 5 sides.

WT???

That square has 5 sides.
Conforming to Norms

Which comparison line looks the same as the standard line?

Take turns answering, see if a consensus develops.
Social Influence: Conformity
What makes you more likely to conform?

When...
- You are not firmly committed to one set of beliefs or style of behavior.
- The group is medium sized and unanimous.
- You admire or are attracted to the group.
- The group tries to make you feel incompetent, insecure, and closely watched.
- Your culture encourages respect for norms.
Two types of social influence

Normative Social Influence:
Going along with others in pursuit of social approval or belonging (and to avoid disapproval/rejection)
Examples: The Asch conformity studies; clothing choices.

Informational Social Influence:
Going along with others because their ideas and behavior make sense, the evidence in our social environment changes our minds.
Example: Deciding which side of the road to drive on.
Milgram Experiment

Stanley Milgram, a psychologist at Yale University, conducted the experiment focusing on the conflict between obedience to authority and personal conscience.

He examined justifications for acts of genocide offered by those accused at the World War II Criminal trials. Their defence often was based on "obedience" - that they were just following orders from their superiors.

Milgram wanted to investigate whether Germans were particularly obedient to authority figures as was the common explanation for the Nazi killings in World War II.
Obedience: Response to Commands

Milgram wanted to study the influence of direct commands on behavior.

The question: Under what social conditions are people more likely to obey commands?

The experiment: An authority figure tells participants to administer shocks to a “learner” (actually a confederate of the researcher) when the learner gives wrong answers.

Voltages increased; how high would people go?
The MILGRAM Experiment

Behavioural study of obedience
1963
Yale University
The Design of Milgram’s Obedience Study

One layout of the study

The “Learner” (working with researchers)

Ow!

Please continue. (Give the shock.)

But...
...okay.

Shock levels in volts that participants thought they were giving

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Compliance in Milgram’s Study

- In surveys, most people predict that in such a situation they would stop administering shocks when the “learner” expressed pain.
- But in reality, even when the learner complained of a heart condition, most people complied with the experimenter’s directions:
  - “Please continue.”
  - “You must continue.”
  - “The experiment requires that you continue”...
How far did compliance go?

The majority of participants continued to obey to the end.

**Percentage of participants who obeyed experimenter**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shock levels in volts</th>
<th>Percentage of participants who obeyed experimenter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slight (15–60)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate (75–120)</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong (135–180)</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very strong (195–240)</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intense (255–300)</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extreme intensity (315–360)</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danger: severe (375–420)</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXX (435–450)</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shock levels in volts
What Factors Increase Obedience?

- When orders were given by:
  - Someone with legitimate authority
  - Someone associated with a prestigious institution
  - Someone standing close by.
- When the “learner”/victim is in another room.
- When other participants obey and/or no one disobeys (no role model for defiance)

The bad news: In war, some people at the beginning choose not to fight and kill, but after that, obedience escalates, even in killing innocent people.

The good news: Obedience can also strengthen heroism; soldiers and others risk or even sacrifice themselves, moreso when under orders.

Other Evidence of the Power of Obedience
Lessons from the Conformity and Obedience Studies

When under pressure to conform or obey, ordinary, principled people will say and do things they never would have believed they would do.

To look at a person committing harmful acts and assume that the person is cruel/evil would be to make the fundamental attribution error.

The real evil may be in the situation.
Social Influence:

Group Behavior

Besides conformity and obedience, there are other ways that our behavior changes in the presence of others, or within a group:

- Social Facilitation
- Deindividuation
- Groupthink
- Social Loafing
- Group Polarization
- Individual performance is intensified when you are observed by others.
- Experts excel, people doing simple activities show more speed and endurance in front of an audience... but novices, trying complex skills, do worse.
Social Facilitation

Why would the presence of an audience “facilitate” better performance for everyone but newcomers?

Being watched, and simply being in crowded conditions, increases one’s autonomic arousal, along with increasing **motivation** for those who are confident, and **anxiety** for those who are not confident.
Social Loafing

- Ever had a group project, with a group grade, and had someone in the group slack off?
- If so, you have experienced **Social Loafing**: the tendency of people in a group to show less effort when not held individually accountable.

Why does social loafing happen?
- When your contribution isn’t rewarded or punished, you might not care what people think.
- People may not feel their contributions are needed, that the group will be fine.
- People may feel free to “cheat” when they get an equal share of the rewards anyway.
- Note: People in collectivist cultures don’t slack off as much in groups even when they could. Why?

Examples: Riots, KKK rallies, concerts, identity-concealed online bullying.

- Happens when people are in group situations involving: 1) Anonymity and 2) Arousal.
Group Polarization

- When people of similar views form a group together, discussion within the group makes their views more extreme.
- Thus, different groups become MORE different, more polarized, in their views.

People in these groups may have only encountered ideas reinforcing the views they already held.

Liberal Blogs (blue) and conservative blogs (red) link mostly to other like-minded blogs, generating this portrait of the polarized Blogosphere.
In pursuit of social harmony (and avoidance of open disagreement), groups will make decisions without an open exchange of ideas.

Irony: Group “think” prevents thinking, prevents a realistic assessment of options.
Social Influence

The Power of Individuals

Despite all of these forces of social influence, individuals still have power:

- Some people **resist** obeying and conforming.
- Individuals can **start** social movements and **social forces**, not just get caught up in them.
- **Groupthink** can be prevented if individuals **speak up** when a group decision seems wrong.
Unit Overview

• Social Relations
Social Relations: Antisocial Relations
How antisocial behavior happens

Prejudice:
- Prevalence
- Automatic Prejudice
- Social Influences:
  - Social Inequalities,
  - Ingroup Bias
- Emotions and Prejudice:
  - Scapegoat Theory
- Cognitive Roots:
  - Forming Categories
  - Memory: vivid cases
  - Just-world fallacy

Aggression:
- Biological Influences (genetic, neural, biochemical)
- Psychological and Social-Cultural Factors:
  - Frustration-aggression
  - Reinforcement
  - Family Modeling
  - Media Models
  - Social Scripts
Prejudice: An unjustified (usually negative) attitude toward a group (and its members).

Discrimination: Unjustified behavior selectively applied to members of a group.

Stereotype: A generalized belief about a group, applied to every member of a group.

Components of Prejudice:
- Beliefs (stereotypes)
- Emotions (hostility, envy, fear)
- Predisposition to act (to discriminate)
Levels of Prejudice can Change

Graph showing support for interracial dating across generations from 1987 to 2009. The graph includes the following generations:

- Baby Boomers (Born 1946–64)
- Generation X (Born 1965–76)
- The Silent Generation (Born 1928–45)
- The Greatest Generation (Born <1928)
- Generation Y (Born 1977+)

Support for interracial dating shows an increase over time for all generations.
Attitudes about **gay marriage** have not come as far as attitudes about interracial marriage.

Increased prejudice toward all **Muslims** and Arabs after 9/11 has still not subsided much.

**Women** are still judged and treated unfairly.

**Automatic**, subtle, and institutional prejudice still occurs even when people state that they have no prejudice in principle (but may have unconscious prejudiced reactions).
Automatic Prejudice

Study: People were more likely to misperceive a tool as a gun when preceded by an African-American face, when both were presented quickly followed by blank screen or “visual mask.”
Prejudice based on Gender

People may prefer a feminine face
But this preference doesn’t counteract gender prejudice:

- Preference for male babies, even abortion or infanticide of females
- Blaming women for adultery
- Seeing assertiveness or ambition as attractive in men, abrasive in women
Social Inequality, when some groups have fewer resources and opportunities than others:

- May result from prejudice, but can also make it worse...
- May be used to justify people as deserving their current position:

"Those doing well must have done something right, so: those suffering must have done something wrong."

it breeds contempt for the people better off, disrespect for people less well off."
Us vs. Them: Ingrouplets, Outgroups

Even if people are randomly assigned to groups:

- Part of our natural drive to belong to a group leads to *ingroup bias* (favoring one’s own group), misjudging other groups, and quickly categorizing strangers: “with me or against me.”
Social Relations

Emotional Roots of Prejudice

- **Scapegoat Theory:** The observation that, when bad things happen, prejudice offers an outlet for anger by finding someone to blame.

- Experiments show a link: Prejudice increases during temporary frustration (and decreases when experiencing loving support).

- Link to fear: Prejudice seems absent in people with inactive fear responses in the amygdala.
Social Relations

Cognitive Roots of Prejudice

Forming Categories:
The Other-Race Effect

The Power of Vivid Cases:
Availability heuristic ignores statistics

“Just World” Belief:
People must deserve what they get
Fed by hindsight bias, cognitive dissonance
We also are hypersensitive to difference, seeing mixed-race faces as belonging to the other group:

Which faces are 80% Chinese 20% Caucasian 60% Chinese 40% Caucasian

Other-race effect: We tend to see uniformity in the appearance of other groups, and may assume other similarities such as traits; These presumed similarities form stereotypes.
Judging Based on Vivid Cases

If we see dramatic examples of terrorism carried out by people who are Muslim, we may form a false association, when in fact:

The stereotype “Muslim = terrorist” sticks in some people’s minds even though the vast majority of Muslims do not fit this stereotype.
Social Relations: Cognitive Roots of Prejudice
Belief that the World is Just

The Just-World Fallacy: Believing that justice generally happens, that people get the benefits and punishments they deserve.

- Implication: If people are rich, privileged, they must have earned it;
- So, if people are poor, outcast, they must not deserve better.

Believing that justice happens... leads to blaming the victim.
Thinking Habits Reinforcing Prejudice

The Availability Heuristic: Stereotypes are built on vivid cases rather than statistics.

Cognitive dissonance: “My culture and family treats minorities this way, can we be wrong?”

Confirmation Bias: we are not likely to look for counterexamples to our stereotypes.

Hindsight Bias: “they should have known better,” blames victims for misfortunes.
Social Relations
Aggression

**Definition:** Behavior with the intent of harming another person.

Aggression can have many forms and purposes:

- Aggression can be physical, verbal, relational: e.g. punching, insulting, shooting, betraying.
- Aggression can be planned or reactive.
- Aggression can be driven by hostile rage or can be a coldly calculated means to an end.
There is not one genetically universal style or amount of aggressiveness in human behavior.

But there are biological factors which may explain variation in levels of aggression:

- Genetic factors (including Heredity)
- Neural factors, esp. Brain Activity
- Biochemistry, esp. hormones and alcohol
Social Relations
Genetic Influences on Aggression

There is evidence that aggression is tied to genes, even if we’re not sure which ones:

1. Aggression can be selectively bred in animals and then passed on to the next generation
2. Identical twins are more similar in their levels of aggression than fraternal twins or siblings
3. Males are more prone to aggression, and differ by a chromosome (female XX vs. male XY)
Social Relations
Biochemistry of Aggression

*The male hormone*

- Testosterone levels are correlated with irritability, assertiveness, impulsiveness, and low tolerance for frustration.
- Traits linked to testosterone levels, such as facial width, also are linked to aggressiveness.
- Violent criminal males have high testosterone levels along with low serotonin levels.
- Reducing testosterone reduces aggression, in both humans and animals.
Alcohol may chemically or psychologically make the following more likely:

- Disinhibited aggressive behavior
- Aggressive responses to frustration
- Violent crimes, especially spousal abuse
- Lack of attention to peacemaking options
- Interpreting neutral acts as provocations
Evidence of brain links to aggression:

- One monkey learned to subdue the aggression of another, by turning on an electrode implanted in an aggression-inhibiting brain area.
- A woman became rude and violent after painless stimulation of her amygdala.
- Underactive frontal lobes (which inhibit impulses) are linked to aggression, violence.
Social Relations
Psychosocial Factors and Aggression

Levels of aggression are influenced by:

- Aversive conditions and feeling frustrated;
- Getting reinforced for aggressive behavior;
- Having aggression modeled at home or in the media;
- Adopting social scripts for aggression from culture and the media.
Aversive/Unpleasant Conditions

Aggression is often a response to frustration and other aversive conditions and events.

- Violence increases during hot years, hot days.
- Also aversive: pain, heat, crowding, foul odors.

Frustration-Aggression Principle:

*After repeated frustrating events, Anger can build, and find a target, and then: Aggression can erupt*, possibly against someone who was not the initial cause of the frustration.
Reinforced/Rewarded Aggression

- Sometimes aggression works! Bullies win control and obedience, Robbers gain wealth, tacklers who injure receivers get bonuses.

  Aggression, like any behavior, increases in frequency and intensity after it is reinforced.

- Parents and Aggression-Replacement Training can guide youth by rewarding other, prosocial behaviors that still meet personal needs.
Family, Cultural Models for Aggression

- Parents dislike aggressive behavior in their children, but unfortunately: *They may have modeled that behavior*, such as yelling, as their kids watched them handle frustration.
- Some cultures model aggression and violence as a solution to personal and societal injustice.
- Models for aggression are also conveyed through media, in the form of *social scripts*. 
Aggression in Media: Social Scripts

- Aggression portrayed in video, music, books, and other media, follows and teaches a script.
- When confronted with new situations, we may rely on social scripts to guide our responses. Many scripts proscribe aggression.

Social Scripts: Culturally constructed directions on how to act, downloaded from media as a “file” or “program” in the mind.

Effects of Social Scripts

- Watchers of TV crime see the world as more threatening (needing a aggressive defense?)
- Randomly assigned to watch explicit pornography, study participants suggested shorter sentences for rapists and accepted the myth that victims may have enjoyed the rape.

Studies: Exposure to one aggressive story increases other forms of aggressive behavior.
More Media Effects on Aggression

- Exposure to violence in media, especially in pornography, seems to increase, rather than release, male aggressive impulses.
- Media can portray minorities, women, the poor, and others with less power as being weak, stupid, submissive, and less human, and thus deserving their victimhood.

Video Games and Aggression

- People randomly assigned to play ultraviolent video games showed increases in hostility
- People playing a game helping characters, showed increased real-life helping
- People have acted out violent acts from video games; People playing the most violent games tended to be the most aggressive; but what came first, aggressiveness or games?
The Many Origins of Aggression

Biological influences:
- genetic influences
- biochemical influences, such as testosterone and alcohol
- neural influences, such as a severe head injury

Psychological influences:
- dominating behavior (which boosts testosterone levels in the blood)
- believing you’ve drunk alcohol (whether you actually have or not)
- frustration
- aggressive role models
- rewards for aggressive behavior

Social-cultural influences:
- deindividuation from being in a crowd
- challenging environmental factors, such as crowding, heat, and direct provocations
- parental models of aggression
- minimal father involvement
- being rejected from a group
- exposure to violent media
Prosocial Relations

Ways that we all can get along

Attraction

The Psychology of Attraction:
- Proximity and familiarity
- Physical attractiveness
- Averageness, similarity

Romantic Love:
- Passionate Love
- Compassionate Love

Altruism

- Bystander Intervention
- The Norms for Helping

Conflicts, Peacemaking

Factors to address to make peace:
- Social Traps
- Enemy Perceptions

Peacemaking activities:
- Contact, Cooperation, Communication, Conciliation
What factors make two people feel attraction, wanting to be together?

- Psychological factors bringing people together: Proximity, Exposure/Familiarity, Attractiveness

- What can develop next: Romantic Love, with: Passion, Compassion, Self-Disclosure, Positive Interactions, and Support
Proximity/Exposure and Attraction

- Encounters once depended on proximity, working or living near the other person, but the key factor here is exposure.
- The Mere Exposure Effect: Merely seeing someone’s face and name makes them more likeable. You are more likely to develop attraction to someone you’ve seen a lot.
  - This effect probably helped our ancestors survive: What was familiar was more trustworthy, safe.
  - In the modern age, thanks to mirrors and photos, the face we are most familiar with is our own; so we are now attracted to people that look like us.

Study: Voters preferred a candidate whose picture incorporated the voter’s features.
Physical Attractiveness

People who are rated as physically attractive:

1. Become the objects of emotional attraction.
2. Are seen as healthy, happy, successfully, and socially skilled, though not necessarily caring.
3. Are not any happier than the average person,
4. Do not have higher self-esteem, in fact mistrust praise as being about their looks.

Who is rated as physically attractive?

- Standards differ from culture to culture about what facial and body features are desirable.
- Across cultures (suggesting evolutionary influence):
  - Men seek apparent youth and fertility
  - Women seek maturity, masculinity, affluence
  - Both like facial symmetry and averageness
- Also attractive: Nice people, and loved ones.
Similarity and Attraction

Opposites Attract? Not usually.

- We already have seen: We like those who share our features.
- We also enjoy being around people who have similar attitudes, beliefs, humor, interests, intelligence, age, education, and income.
- We like those who have similar feelings, especially if they like us back.
Romantic Love

- Often starts with attraction, or friendship
- Then often has a phase of Passionate Love
- Grows into Compassionate Love
- Held together by positive interaction, support
- Made closer by Equity and Self-Disclosure
Passionate Love
A state of strong attraction, interest, excitement, felt so strongly that people are absorbed in each other

Components of Passionate Love
- Physiological arousal (sweating, heart pounding)
- Flattering appraisal of the other
- Intense desire for the others’ presence

Compassionate Love
Deep, caring, affectionate attachment/commitment

- Commitment: a plan to stay together even when not feeling passionate attraction
- Attachment is now more than just desire to be together: *a feeling that lives are intertwined.*
Keys to a Lasting Love Relationship

- **Equity**: Both giving and receiving, sharing responsibilities, with a sense of partnership
- **Self-Disclosure**: Sharing self in conversation increases intimacy
- **Positive Interactions and Support**: Offering sympathy, concern, laughs, hugs
Altruism

Unselfish regard for the welfare of other people;
Helping and protecting others without need for personal gain, doing it because it is the right thing to do, often despite personal risk or sacrifice.

The Psychology of Altruism

Under what conditions do people help others?
How do bystanders make a decision about helping?
What cultural norms reinforce the motive to help others?

Subway hero Wesley Autrey: “I don’t feel like I did something spectacular; I just saw someone who needed help.”
Social Relations: Altruism/Helping
Bystander Intervention

When there is someone apparently suffering or otherwise in need of help, how do people make a decision to help?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attention:</th>
<th>Appraisal:</th>
<th>Social Role:</th>
<th>Taking Action:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Notices incident?</td>
<td>Interprets incident as emergency?</td>
<td>Assumes responsibility</td>
<td>Attempts to help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No help</td>
<td>No help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Decision Tree:
- If attention is not noticed, no help is given.
- If the incident is interpreted as an emergency, then the next step is to consider the social role.
- If the social role is assumed, attempts to help are made.
- If any step is bypassed with a 'No', no help is provided.
Social Relations: Altruism/Helping

Bystander Action: Social factors

Why are there sometimes crowds of people near a suffering person and no one is helping?

- Because of the [Multiple] Bystander Effect: Fewer people help when others are available.

Why does the presence of others reduce the likelihood that any one person will help?

1. Because of diffusion of responsibility: The role of helper does not fall just on one person.

2. People in a crowd follow the example of others; which means everyone waiting for someone else to help first.

3. After a while, people rationalize inaction: "if no one is helping, they must know he’s dangerous or faking it."
Bystanders are most likely to help when:

The person we might help:
- appears to be in need, deserving of assistance.
- is a woman, and/or is similar to us in some way.
- is in a small town or rural area.

Meanwhile, upon encountering this person:
- We are feeling some guilt, and/or just saw someone else trying to help.
- We are not in a hurry, and/or not preoccupied.
- Strongest predictor: We are in a good mood.
Utilitarianism: seeking the greatest good for the greatest number of people.

Social responsibility: Others depend on us to help, to go first; it’s the right thing to do.

Social Exchange: We help if it brings more benefit (social approval, reduced guilt) than cost (risk, inconvenience).

Reciprocity: We help those who have helped us... Although someone must go first.
Conflict

Social dilemmas
Conflict

- A perceived incompatibility of actions or goals
- Conflict occurs when one party decides that the way things are is not okay and seeks change, but that change is not agreed to by the other party.
Social Relations: Conflict and Peacemaking

Social and Psych processes that make conflicts likely, and worse:

- **Social Traps**: Situations in which pursuing self-interest makes things worse for everyone: e.g. an arms race, or overfishing [Flip side: these are situations in which cooperation pays off.]

- **Mirror Image Perceptions of an Enemy**: Both sides assuming the worst in the other person, “they’ll just reject me” or “they don’t want peace.” [Solution: take the first step in trusting]
Social Trap: The Cheater’s Game

**Rules:**
If you both choose A (‘compromise’), you both win a little; If just one chooses B (‘cheat’), that person wins a lot; if both choose B, no one wins anything.

**Challenge:**
Trying to arrange to cooperate.
According to Erik Erikson's theory of psychosocial development, a conflict is a turning point during which an individual struggles to attain some psychological quality. Sometimes referred to as a psychosocial crisis, this can be a time of both vulnerability and strength, as the individual works toward success or failure.
For example:- Erikson's first stage of psychosocial development the conflict centres on **trust versus mistrust**.

In the earliest stages of a child's life, they are learning whether they can trust the people around them.
Types of Conflict

- **Approach-approach conflict**: occurs when you must choose between two desirable outcomes.
- **Avoidance-avoidance conflict**: occurs when you must choose between two unattractive outcomes.
- **Approach-avoidance**: exists when ONE event or goal has both attractive and unattractive features.
- **Multiple approach-avoidance conflicts**: here you must choose between two or more things, each of which has both desirable and undesirable features.
Levels of conflict

- **Interpersonal conflict**: occurs when two people have incompatible needs, goals, or approaches in their relationship.

- **Role conflict**: involves very real differences in role definitions, expectations or responsibilities between individuals who are interdependent in a social system.
- **Intergroup conflict** - occurs between collections of people such as ethnic or racial groups, departments or levels of decision making in the same organization, and union and management.

- **Multi-Party conflict** - occurs in societies when different interest groups and organizations have varying priorities over resource management and policy development.

- **International conflict** - occurs between states at the global level.
Causes of Conflict

- Competition
- Perceived Injustice
- Misperception
Causes of Conflict

- There is a perceived breach of faith and trust between individuals
- There is unresolved disagreement that has escalated to an emotional level
- There is miscommunication leading to unclear expectations
- There are personality clashes
- There are differences in acquired values
- There is underlying stress and tension
- There are ego problems
- There are combinations of the above
In Muzaffer Sherif’s (1996) experiment, win-lose competition had produced intense conflict, negative images of the outgroup, and strong ingroup cohesiveness and pride.
Perceived Injustice

- “That’s unfair!” “What a ripoff!” “We deserve better!”
- Such comments typify conflicts bred by perceived injustice
- But what is Justice?
  - People perceive justice as equity—the distribution of rewards in proportion to individuals’ contributions (Walster & others, 1978).

\[
\text{My outcomes} \quad \frac{\text{My inputs}}{\text{Your outcomes}} \quad \frac{\text{Your inputs}}{=}
\]
Misperception

- Many conflicts contain but a small core of truly incompatible goals;
- The bigger problem is the misperceptions of the other’s motives and goals.
Seeds of Misperception

**Self-serving bias**
- Leads individuals and groups to accept credit for their good deeds and shirk responsibility for bad deeds

**Self-justify**
- Inclines people to deny the wrong of their evil acts that cannot be shucked off

**Fundamental attribution error**
- Each side sees the other's hostility as reflecting an evil disposition

**Preconceptions**
- One then filters the information and interprets it to fit one's preconceptions

**Polarize**
- Groups polarize these self-serving, self-justifying, biasing tendencies

**Groupthink**
- One symptom of groupthink is the tendency to perceive one's own group as moral and strong, the opposition as evil and week

**Ingroup bias**
- The mere fact of being in a group triggers an ingroup bias

**Stereotype**
- Negative stereotypes, once formed, are often resistant to contradictory evidence
Misperception

MIRROR-IMAGE PERCEPTION
- refer to the reciprocal views of one another often held by parties in conflict; for example, each may view itself as moral and peace-loving and the other as evil and aggressive.

SHIFTING PERCEPTIONS
- If misperceptions accompany conflict, then they should appear and disappear as conflicts wax and wane
- The same process that create the enemy’s image can reverse that image when the enemy becomes an ally.
Breach of faith and trust

- When one puts faith and trust in another, and that confidence is broken, it can create an emotional response that elevates to conflict.
- To trust someone is to place a high confidence level that the relationship will not be compromised in any way...that I can expect you to do what you say.
- A trusting relationship leads to feelings of confidence and security.
- A breach of trust unleashes our strongest emotions that frequently lead to conflict.
Disagreements are normal.
When they are left unresolved, however, the associated feelings and emotions will remain in force, at least at some level.
When another situation brings this disagreement back to the forefront, these suppressed emotions can erupt with force, usually far in excess of those associated with the original disagreement.
Therefore, it is critically important to resolve disagreements as soon as possible and not let them fester.
Miscommunication

- The ability to communicate is one of our most commonly used skills.
- We use to communicate don't always clearly state the picture in our minds.
- When this occurs, errors often result that lead to frustration.
- Depending on a multitude of factors (stress level for one), the error sometimes results in conflict if neither person is willing to accept responsibility for it.
Personality clashes

- These natural sets of differences are some of our greatest strengths as individuals and teams; however, they are also sources of conflict.
- If I, for example, prefer to look at only the "big picture," then I may become frustrated by your attempts to discuss details.
- You, on the other hand, may see me as irresponsible for not doing the analysis.
- Result: potential conflict.
Values are the beliefs we hold that help us to make decisions about what is right or wrong, good or bad. Our values come from parents, siblings, friends, mentors, coaches, teachers, books, churches, movies, television, and music...life in general.

No two people ever have the same life experience, so we ultimately have different sets of values and beliefs that guide our decisions and behavior.

People struggle over religion, politics, race, humanitarian issues, ethics and morals, abortion, sex, and more.

In extreme cases, some people will, literally, die for their beliefs.
Underlying stress and tension

- Our lives today place enormous demands on our time and energy.
- But frequently those demands exceed our capacity to deal with them.
- Too often, however, this underlying stress surfaces at the slightest provocation, and we find ourselves in conflict.
Ego problems

- Ego is another strong driver of our behavior and decisions.
- Ego wants us to be "right," and moves us into defending our position, sometimes unreasonably.
Conflict and Peacemaking

Conflict: A perceived incompatibility in goals, ideas, and actions between people or groups.

What factors worsen or reduce conflict?
Four Cs of Peacemaking

- Contact
- Cooperation
- Communication
- Conciliation
Desegregation - is the process of ending the separation of two groups usually referring to races.
Cooperation

Common External Threat

Superordinate Goals

Cooperative Learning

Having a common enemy unifies groups of competing boys in Sherif’s camping experiments—and in many subsequent experiments (Dion, 1979).

Superordinate Goals—goals that compel all in a group and require cooperative effort.

In Sherrif’s experiment, he introduced such goals. After working together to achieve the goal, the boys ate together and enjoyed themselves around a campfire.

With cooperative learning in Aronson’s (19678, 1979, 200) experiment, students learn not only the material given but other lessons as well. Cross-racial friendships also begin to blossom.

John McConahay (1981) wrote the cooperative learning is the most effective practice for improving race relations.
**Communication**

Seeking an agreement through direct negotiations between parties.

**Bargaining**

An attempt by a neutral third party to resolve a conflict by facilitating communications and offering suggestions.

**Mediation**

Resolution of a conflict by a neutral third party who studies both sides and imposes a settlement.

**Arbitration**
Conciliation

GRIT (Graduated and reciprocated initiatives in tension reduction)

The basic idea is that disputant can initiate de-escalation by making a small, unilateral (one-sided) concession to the other side, and at the same time, communicating a desire or even an expectation that this gesture will be matched with an equal response from the opponent. If the opponent does respond positively, the first party can make a second concession, and a "peace spiral" is begun.

One approach to de-escalation is GRIT, an approach developed by Charles Osgood.
Definition

Slides
Attribution Theory

= the theory that we explain someone’s behavior by crediting either the situation or the person’s disposition.
Fundamental Attribution Error

= the tendency for observers, when analyzing another’s behavior, to underestimate the impact of the situation and to overestimate the impact of personal disposition.
Attitude

= feelings, often influenced by our beliefs, that predispose us to respond in a particular way to objects, people, and events.
Central Route Persuasion

= attitude change path in which interested people focus on the arguments and respond with favorable thoughts.
Peripheral Route Persuasion

= attitude change path in which people are influenced by incidental cues, such as a speaker’s attractiveness.
Foot-in-the-Door Phenomenon

= the tendency for people who have first agreed to a small request to comply later with a larger request.
Role

= a set of expectations (norms) about a social position, defining how those in the position ought to behave.
Cognitive Dissonance Theory

= the theory that we act to reduce the discomfort (dissonance) we feel when two of our thoughts (cognitions) are inconsistent. For example, when our awareness of our attitudes and our actions clash, we can reduce the resulting dissonance by changing our attitudes.
Conformity

= adjusting one’s behavior or thinking to coincide with a group standard.
Normative Social Influence

= influence resulting from a person’s desire to gain approval or avoid disapproval.
Informational Social Influence

= influence resulting from one’s willingness to accept other’s opinions about reality.
Social Facilitation

= stronger responses on simple or well-learned tasks in the presence of others.
Social Loafing

= the tendency for people in a group to exert less effort when pooling their efforts toward attaining a common goal than when individually accountable.
Deindividuation

= the loss of self-awareness and self-restraint occurring in group situations that foster arousal and anonymity.
Group Polarization

= the enhancement of a group’s prevailing inclinations through discussion with the groups.
Groupthink

= the mode of thinking that occurs when the desire for harmony in a decision-making group overrides a realistic appraisal of alternatives.
Culture

= the enduring behaviors, ideas, attitudes, values, and traditions shared by a group of people and transmitted from one generation to the next.
Norm

= an understood rule for accepted and expected behavior. Norms prescribe “proper” behavior.
Personal Space

= the buffer zone we like to maintain around our bodies.
Prejudice

= an unjustifiable (and usually negative) attitude toward a group and its members. Prejudice generally involves stereotyped beliefs, negative feelings, and a predisposition to discriminatory action.
Stereotype

= a generalized (sometimes accurate but often overgeneralized) belief about a group of people.
Discrimination

= unjustifiable negative behavior toward a group and its members.
Ingroup

= “Us” – people with whom we share a common identity.
Outgroup

= “Them” – those perceived as different or apart from our ingroup.
Ingroup Bias

= the tendency to favor our own group.
Scapegoat Theory

= the theory that prejudice offers an outlet for anger by providing someone to blame.
Other-race Effect

= the tendency to recall faces of one’s own race more accurately than faces of other races. Also called the cross-race effect and the own-race bias.
Just-World Phenomenon

= the tendency for people to believe the world is just and that people therefore get what they deserve and deserve what they get.
Aggression

= any physical or verbal behavior intended to hurt or destroy.
Frustration-aggression Principle

= the principle that frustration – the blocking of an attempt to achieve some goal – creates anger, which can generate aggression.
Mere Exposure Effect

= the phenomenon the repeated exposure to novel stimuli increases liking of them.
Passionate Love

= an aroused state of intense positive absorption in another, usually present at the beginning of a love relationship.
Companionate Love

= the deep affectionate attachment we feel for those with whom our lives are intertwined.
Equity

= a condition in which people receive from a relationship in proportion to what they give to it.
Self-Disclosure

= revealing intimate aspects of oneself to others.
Altruism

= unselfish regard for the welfare of others.
Bystander Effect

= the tendency for any given bystander to be less likely to give aid if other bystanders are present.
Social Exchange Theory

= the theory that our social behavior is an exchange process, the aim of which is to maximize benefits and minimize costs.
Reciprocity Norm

= an expectation that people will help, not hurt those who have helped them.
Social-Responsibility Norm

= an expectation that people will help those dependent upon them.
Conflict

= a perceived incompatibility of actions, goals, or ideas.
Social Trap

= a situation in which the conflicting parties, by each rationally pursuing their self-interest, become caught in mutually destructive behavior.
Mirror-Image Perceptions

= mutual views often held by conflicting people, as when each side sees itself as ethical and peaceful and views the other side as evil and aggressive.
Self-Fulfilling Prophecy

= a belief that leads to its own fulfillment.
Superordinate Goals

= shared goals that override differences among people and require their cooperation.
GRIT

= Graduated and Reciprocated Initiatives in Tension-Reduction – a strategy designed to decrease international tensions.