

02 -

12_Social_Psycholog

y

- [01 - 1. Attitudes](#)
- [02 - Functions of attitudes \(Katz\)](#)
- [03 - Why do attitudes change](#)
- [04 - Measuring Attitudes](#)
- [05 - Attitude behaviour correlation](#)
- [06 - 2. Self psychology](#)
- [07 - 3. Interpersonal issues](#)
- [08 - Attribution](#)
- [09 - Theory of Mind](#)
- [10 - Interpersonal relationships](#)
- [11 - Linguistics of interpersonal communication](#)
- [12 - Persuasive communication](#)
- [13 - 4. Leadership, social influence, power and ob](#)
- [14 - Conformity & obedience](#)
- [15 - Group processes](#)
- [16 - Social power](#)
- [17 - Leadership](#)
- [18 - Social Influence](#)
- [19 - 5. Intergroup behaviour](#)

- [20 - Prejudice](#)
- [21 - 6. Aggression](#)
- [22 - Stress and aggression among primates](#)
- [23 - 7. Altruism](#)

01 - 1. Attitudes

1. Attitudes

02 - Functions of attitudes (Katz)

Functions of attitudes: (Katz)

03 - Why do attitudes change

Why do attitudes change?

© SPMM Course

1. Attitudes Attitudes are “learned predispositions to respond in a consistently favourable or unfavourable way towards a given object, person or event” (Fishbein & Ajzen,1975). An attitude is a combination of beliefs and values. □ Beliefs are based on our knowledge of the world and link an object to an attribute. They are non-evaluative and objective e.g. ‘USA is a nation built on capitalism’. □ Values relate to the importance or desirability of the object. It is largely subjective and has preferential patterns attached e.g. ‘I do not like capitalism’. Values can turn beliefs to attitudes – ‘I dislike American people’. Three-component model of attitudes:
2. Affective component: what the person feels about the object (favourable/ unfavourable evaluations) – e.g. I love chocolate
3. Cognitive component: thoughts, beliefs, knowledge about the object – e.g. Chocolate keeps me active
4. Behavioural component: actual or intended responses to the object e.g. I eat chocolate every day Functions of attitudes: (Katz) □ Knowledge function: attitudes are frames of reference that simplify the world, help make quick appraisals of situations □ Value expressive function: reflect fundamental self-concepts – self-expressive and maintains personal integrity e.g. vegetarianism □ Social adjustment function: help to function in a group setting, social acceptance □ Ego-defensive function protects from character or personal deficiencies – this function makes attitudes very resistant to change Why do attitudes change?
5. Cognitive dissonance theory: (Festinger) People strive for consistency between thoughts, feelings and actions. If there is a discrepancy between different attitudes (cognitive dissonance) or between attitudes and behaviours (attitude-behaviour discrepancy), then this initiates and drives either a change in attitudes (more common) or a change in behaviours.

04 - Measuring Attitudes

Measuring Attitudes

© SPMM Course For example, in smokers, discrepancy between cognitions ('smoking is injurious') and behaviour (repeated smoking) may influence behaviour leading to a cut down, or alternatively, may alter the cognitions ('there is too little evidence available to link smoking to poor health').

1-Dollar 20-Dollar experiment: All subjects in an experiment were asked to do a very boring repetitive task for 30 minutes. The first group was a control group; the second group (called 1dollar group) was paid \$1 to say that the task was fun and interesting, the third group (called 20dollar group) was paid \$20 to say that the task was fun and interesting. All participants were asked to rate how enjoyable they had found the task. Contrary to popular belief, the group, which was paid more, did not appreciate the boring task. As they obtained a good incentive, they did not develop a dissonance. They lied about its usefulness but in fact they did not change their belief about the boring nature of this task. In contrast, the lowly paid group did experience a cognitive dissonance between the two facts - 'This task is boring' and 'I am doing this task without much incentive', hence they changed their initial attitude towards the task and, in fact, started liking the task. This highlights the processes relating to counter-attitudinal behaviours. How to reduce dissonance? Apart from modifying attitudes or behaviours, one can have selective exposure to information to avoid or prevent dissonance; to reduce a dissonance one can make a commitment after which primary attitudes get stronger e.g. after betting on a horse, the belief that the horse will win strengthens! Other methods are

1. Removal or denial of the dissonant cognition
2. Trivialising the dissonant cognition
3. Adding a new consonant cognition to counterbalance the dissonance

Self-perception theory: According to Bem, self-report of attitude after a behaviour is usually an inference of one's own behaviour and context. Dissonance cannot explain this adequately. In the 1 dollar/20 dollar experiment, the 20 dollar group made situational attribution ('I did it for money, it was boring) while 1 dollar group made dispositional attribution ('There is not much incentive, but I really liked it'). Hence, while cognitive dissonance explains both counter-attitudinal behaviour and attitude-attitude discrepancy; self-perception applies better when attitude congruent behaviour occurs, but it cannot explain attitude-attitude discrepancy. Measuring Attitudes Attitudes are largely subjective and so cannot be measured directly. Attitude measures usually rely on self-report, assume that the same statement has the same meaning for all respondents and

05 - Attitude behaviour correlation

Attitude behaviour correlation

© SPMM Course assume that subjective attitudes can be quantified meaningfully. An alternative method of measurement is to observe behaviours, but behaviours do not always reflect attitude. □

Thurstone scale: While constructing a Thurstone scale, hundreds of statements are initially produced pertaining to a particular topic. These statements are presented to a sample (similar to a panel of judges) who is asked to score the statements on an 11 point scale. A set number of statements e.g. 10 each on both extremes (positive and negative attitude) are chosen based on the consistency of scores given by the judges. Each of these statements will carry a value, which is the average of 100 judgments on the 11 points scale. These 20 statements are clubbed together in producing an attitude scale, which is administered to the subject. The subject will then indicate what statements he agrees to. It is not often used because the method is too tedious. The 11 points (used to rate each statement) are assumed to be intervals and averages are used to obtain the value scores. This is not entirely accurate as the 11 points scale is, in fact, ordinal. □

Likert scale includes graded 'agree' to 'disagree' measures. This is one of the most popular and statistically more reliable measures. It is easy to construct, and no assumptions are made about the equality of intervals. □

Sociometry is used to measure interpersonal attitudes in a repertory grid-like fashion i.e. who like whom tables. These are called sociograms. □

Guttman introduced scalograms that include cumulative statements where accepting a statement usually means accepting all that comes below a statement, in a step-wise fashion. □

Osgood's semantic differential scale is used to measure verbally expressed attitudes. It allows different attitudes about a particular topic to be measured on the same scale. It includes various factors constituting an attitude; e.g. while expressing one's attitudes regarding a politician, one can rate him using an evaluative component (good ---- bad), activity component (active ----- inactive) and potency component (powerful ---- weak) etc. With these bipolar adjectives being the two extremes, a 7 points scale is designed, and the subject is asked to indicate a score for each factor. Osgood's semantic differential assumes that every concept can be represented in a hypothetical semantic space with two extremes.

Attitude behaviour correlation Attitudes and behaviours are not correlated in simple linear fashion. Attitudes are only predispositions; actual behaviours depend on:

1. Perceived consequences.
2. Social desirability.

© SPMM Course 3. Habitual behaviours. 4. Situational factors

If attitudes are measured with specified assessment of target, action, context and time element, however, then measured attitudes will be closer to actual behaviour e.g. if one wants to measure public attitude on the issue of abortion, simply eliciting attitudes on abortion may not be appropriate. Instead if we measure attitudes on legal abortion in a married woman after 3 months of marriage, it may provide a more accurate measure of the actual behavior of the respondents when the issue arises in their personal or family life. Single instances of behaviours are unreliable indicators of attitudes. Various attitudes aggregate to result in behaviour; also the strength of an attitude is proportional to its influence on behaviour.

06 - 2. Self psychology

2. Self psychology

© SPMM Course 2. Self psychology In self-psychology, various concepts are often used to describe the nature of self. □ Self-consciousness: Awareness of distinct self, compared to other objects in the environment. Only humans are thought to possess full self-consciousness. □ Self-image: This refers to an answer one might give for the question 'who are you?' It includes one's description of social roles (social self), personality traits and physical characters (bodily self). □ Self-esteem: This refers to a personal judgment of worthiness expressed in the attitudes one holds towards oneself. Self-image is descriptive, but self-esteem is evaluative. □ Ideal self: This represents 'what we would like ourselves to be'. One's self-esteem depends on the discrepancy between one's ideal self and self-image. We develop self-concept depending upon:

1. Reaction of others (Theory of looking glass self by Cooley suggests that like a mirror, others around us reflect our self-image)
2. Comparison with others
3. Social roles we play
4. Identification with role models Self-recognition could be demonstrated in a growing infant by using a mirror. Gallup conducted the famous 'touching the dot' experiments to demonstrate self-recognition. It is noted that only higher primates and humans older than 20 months successfully demonstrate 'touching the dot'. When a red dot is unknowingly placed on the face of a child, the child starts touching its face to explore the dot when a mirror is shown. This 'touching the dot' phenomenon does not occur less than 15 months of age. 5 to 25% infants touch the dot by 18 months while nearly 75% touch the dot by age 20 months. It is thus concluded that self-recognition rapidly develops between 18 to 20 months. Object permanence is necessary for self-recognition. Mirror recognition by primates may be a reflection of behavioural recognition i.e. 'the one in the mirror is same as me' rather than self-recognition i.e. 'the one in the mirror is me'. Autobiographical memory in humans develops around age 3 ½ to 4 ½ yrs.

07 - 3. Interpersonal issues

3. Interpersonal issues

08 - Attribution

Attribution

© SPMM Course 3. Interpersonal issues Attribution This is the process by which we make judgments about causes of behaviour. Heider (1958) was the first to propose a psychological theory of attribution - he called this "naïve" or "commonsense" psychology. In his view, people act like amateur scientists, trying to understand other people's behaviours by piecing together information until they arrive at a reasonable explanation or cause. During this process, we make a distinction between intentional vs. unintentional behaviours in others and make internal vs. external attribution of the cause of the observed behaviour. We tend to attribute behaviours to events that co-vary with those behaviours over time. e.g. if A is an event that occurs when the behaviour B is observed, then we often assume A causes B (Kelly's co-variation model). When making such covariant related observations, three elements are important to ensure validity of the inference. Consider a student X, who arrives late for a physiology lecture. Another student wants to infer the cause behind this. To make an appropriate attribution, he/she needs to consider

1. Consensus: Does everyone come late or is it only student X?
2. Distinctiveness: Does student X come late to other classes too?
3. Consistency: Does student X come late to physiology lecture every time? Consistency is most used in attribution; consensus is least used. Generally speaking if consensus is low, dispositional attribution is made (student X has a problem). If consistency is low, situational attribution is made (something must have happened to him today, perhaps, he missed his train). If distinctiveness is high, stimulus or target is considered to be at fault (the physiology class is so boring that X always comes late). Weiner developed a systematic attributional theory. Accordingly there are 3 dimensions identified in the process of attributions
4. Locus: external/internal
5. Stability: transient/permanent
6. Controllability: controllable/uncontrollable External stable and uncontrollable cause attributed to a negative event generates a sense of failure with anger.

© SPMM Course Some consistent errors (attribution bias) are noted in making attributions.

□ First impression effect: (primacy effect). Generally first impressions on people count more unless specific instruction is given to attend or repeatedly observe. A positive first impression is more likely to change than a negative first impression. Primacy is more important in strangers; recency effect plays more in evaluating friends and others who will come into repeated contacts. □ Halo effect is the tendency to perceive other persons as wholly good or bad based on few observed traits (e.g. physical attractiveness); i.e. making inferences about people using limited, superficial

information. Thus a person's positive or negative traits "spill over" from one area to influence the total perception of their personality. Investigators evaluating crime suspects are susceptible to halo effect (to be accurate - reversed halo effect or devil effect or association fallacy). For example, a policeman may conclude someone is guilty by association with attributes he has previously seen in other criminals. Mere similarity of a person to a suspect often causes the police to associate the innocent wrongly with a guilty act. Actor-observer effect: When one is involved as an agent in a specific behaviour then he/she attributes external causality to the behaviour. For the same behaviour, others who are merely observers without direct participation may invoke internal causality (intentional and dispositional). Just world hypothesis refers to the idea that 'I am a just person living in a just world; everyone here gets what they really deserve'. 'Bad things happen to bad people', leading to blaming-the-victim culture. Fundamental attribution error or correspondence bias: This refers to overestimating dispositional factors and not situational factors while attributing causes for other's behaviours. This allows a sense of predictability to be developed about the other person. It is more pronounced if the attributed behaviour is negative and undesirable. Self-serving bias (SSB): the actor observer effect is most pronounced when judging negative behaviours This may be absent or reversed for positive behaviours. Hence such self-serving bias offers selfenhancement and defense. In depression, an exception to SSB is seen - The patient takes excessive selfblame for personal failures. False consensus effect and illusion of in group homogeneity: This refers to the tendency to view other person's behaviour to be representative of a group's behaviour (culture or racial stereotypes are thus formed).

09 - Theory of Mind

Theory of Mind

© SPMM Course □ The term Barnum effect or Forer effect refers to the widespread predisposition to believe that general and vague personality descriptions or predictions (often given by astrologers, horoscopes, and palmistry) have specific relevance to certain individuals. This effect has frequently contaminated research on personality assessment. □ Hawthorne effect refers to a short-term improvement caused by observing worker performance. □ Pygmalion effect or Rosenthal effect is a form of self-fulfilling prophecy wherein students with poor expectations from their teachers internalize their negative label and perform poorly, and those with positive expectations internalise their positive labels and succeed academically. Theory of Mind Theory of Mind (ToM) develops around age 3 ½ to 4 years. ToM refers to the understanding that other persons do have mental processes similar to self; in this context it forms an essential part of the social attribution process. Lack of development of the theory of mind (trait related) could explain the apparent lack of empathy seen in autism. In acute psychosis, state related deficits in ToM are noted i.e. the deficit is not pervasive but seen only when relapsing into positive symptoms. Poor ToM in association with reduced empathic ability is also demonstrated in conduct disorder and in antisocial personality disorder. First-order false belief tasks These tasks relate to the understanding that other people can have their own thoughts about a given situation. First-order tests involve inferring one person's mental state e.g. What Jim thinks. Wimmer and Perner (1983) noted that three-year-olds tend to fail whereas four-year-olds tend to succeed a false-belief task called Sally-Anne Test. Children are first shown the picture of Sally, leaving a chocolate on the counter before departing the scene. Anne later comes in and moves the object from the counter to a box. The children are then asked to predict where Sally will look for the chocolate when she returns to the room. Children aged 4 and above generally grasp the notion that Sally will hold a false belief and look at the place where she left the chocolate initially. 3-year-olds fail to ascribe this false belief to Sally. In the deceptive container task, a child is shown a closed candy container and is asked, "What's in here?" When the child answers 'candy', the container is opened, revealing a pencil. Later when the child is asked what she originally thought was in the container when she was first asked, Three-year-olds incorrectly answer "a pencil," demonstrating a lack of false belief whereas 4year-olds correctly say "candy."

10 - Interpersonal relationships

Interpersonal relationships

© SPMM Course Flavell et al. (1986) noted that children older than 4 years old distinguish appearance from reality and show an ability to discuss objects that have misleading appearances ('it looks like an apple but it is really a ball'). Note that when task demands are reduced, even 15-month old show some signs of ToM. Furthermore, many children with autism and Asperger's syndrome, can pass first order tests albeit at a developmentally later age (average 5.5 years according to Happe et al., 1995)

Second-order false belief tasks These tasks relate to the understanding that other people (a second person) can have their own thoughts about another (third) person's state of mind. Second-order tests involve inferring one person's thoughts about another person's mental state e.g. What Jim thinks that Varun thinks. These tests are usually passed by the age of 6 years in typically developing children. Children with autistic spectrum disorders may never pass second-order false belief tasks or pass only by teenagers. Key neural regions for normal ToM are considered to be the amygdala, orbitofrontal cortex, inferior parietal and medial frontal cortex.

Interpersonal relationships Following factors influence relationships:

1. Proximity: minimal requirement for most relationships.
2. Exposure refers to reciprocal disclosure - this may enhance the relationship. Females do more self-disclosure than males.
3. Similarity - may increase self-esteem in a relationship as one gets validation for similar interests.
4. Complementarity - not so important initially but increases in importance as a longterm relationship develops.
5. Compatibility is proportional to both similarity and complementarity. Types of love: □ Companionate love: True or conjugal love where intimacy and commitment seen; passion is not high. □ Passionate love: intimate and passionate but not much commitment - obsessive, romantic and infatuated. □ Consummate love: intimacy, passion and commitment all well mixed.

11 - Linguistics of interpersonal communication

Linguistics of interpersonal
communication

12 - Persuasive communication

Persuasive communication

© SPMM Course □ Fatuous love: passion and commitment but no intimacy seen. According to SVR theory, - relationships proceed from Stimulus (external attributes) to Values to Role stage.

Linguistics of interpersonal communication Some linguists view language as a “system of signs that have been developed to serve the communicative needs of people living in a social context”. Thus language is a product of sociocultural evolution. In this context, language serves 3 functions:

1. Ideational Function: enable people thinking with language to interpret experience.
2. Interpersonal Function: enable people acting with language to communicate experience and thoughts
3. Textual Function: enable people organise of a message with language.

Fields of enquiry in linguistics • Phonology: The study of sound structure • Morphology: The study of sound structure • Syntax: The study of sentence structure • Phonetics: The study of physical act of speaking • Semantics: The study of the connection of language to meanings. Semanticists consider that meanings are inherent in sentences; while communication-intentionists consider that meaning is not inherent but comes from something that people do when using language • Pragmatics: The study of the connection of context to meanings. • Sociolinguistics: The study of the connection of language to social situations • Semiotics: The study of signs and symbols in relation to their form and content Whorfian hypothesis or Sapir-Whorf linguistic relativity hypothesis states that the semantics of a language can affect the way in which its speakers perceive and conceptualize the world. Language determines the basic categories of thought and that, as a consequence, speakers of different languages think differently. This extreme position is also called linguistic determinism. Noam Chomsky argues against this stance (see Language Development section in the notes on Human Development).

Persuasive communication Techniques of persuasive communication (e.g. used by sales representatives) include

1. Ingratiation: eliciting likeableness

© SPMM Course 2. Reciprocity: doing a favour first, making one indebted. 3. Arousal of guilt 4. Scarcity: ‘offers valid only till stocks last; so hurry!’ 5. Social validation: ‘everyone is going to

Argos? What about you?' 6. Multiple requests

1. Foot in the door technique: if one agrees to small request this increases the likelihood of saying yes again.
2. Door in the face technique (concession effect): when a larger request is turned down initially this increases the likelihood of agreeing to a smaller subsequent request.
3. Low-ball tactic: hiding the costs and disadvantages initially but revealing after an agreement is reached. When attempting to persuade others, one-sided arguments may strengthen existing beliefs but two-sided arguments more effective in changing beliefs/attitudes. Similarly, highly fear-inducing messages may increase anxiety but may not result in behaviour change (Jansis & Feshback 1953); while moderately fear-inducing messages can produce greater behaviour change in some instances. Thus, an inverted U-shaped curve relates fear and attitude/behaviour change. Feeling vulnerable also increases behaviour change. The credibility of a perceived message has been found to be a key factor affecting persuasive communication (Hovland & Weiss, 1951); if we read a report about health in a professional medical journal, we are more easily persuaded than if we read it from a tabloid. Propaganda refers to mass suggestion or influence via emotional manipulation of an individual. While educating an individual about an issue gives independence for making a judgment, propaganda over an issue provides ready-made judgments to be adopted by the individual. This may be done using
4. Induction of stereotypes
5. Substitution of names to facilitate scapegoating and scaremongering
6. Selected facts presentation
7. Repeating same messages in various forms
8. Presenting assertions instead of rational arguments
9. Pinpointing an enemy

13 - 4. Leadership, social
influence, power and ob

4. Leadership, social
influence, power and
obedience

14 - Conformity & obedience

Conformity & obedience

© SPMM Course 4. Leadership, social influence, power and obedience
Conformity & obedience
Conformity is a process where no explicit requirement is made to do a certain task, but peer influence, and the need for acceptance pushes one to carry out the task. Obedience refers to conditions where the individual is explicitly asked to do a task, and this instruction comes from an authority. Conformity can be either true internalisation of values or compliance externally without changing one's private beliefs. Men conform less than women; people with lower intelligence, poorer ego strength, poor leadership abilities and having inferiority feelings conform more often. Sherif used an autokinetic effect (the apparent, false perception of movement of a pinpoint of light in a dark room, aka Phi Phenomenon) to study conformity. Individuals initially provided idiosyncratic responses (individual norms) when asked about the distance moved by the light source. But when subjects were grouped together, individuals compromised on their assessments and gave modified answers, so as to conform to the rest (group norms emerged). Asch used an unambiguous paradigm (length assessment test) to study conformity. It was noted that the size of group majority up to 3 to 5 people influenced conformity; a much larger majority did not influence individual decisions. Further, the more unanimous/consistent the majority was, the more the conformity of the rest. Giving opinions privately reduced conformity. Collectivist cultures showed more conformity than nuclear cultures. Can minorities effectively influence the majority? This is possible if the minority is consistent, perceived to be autonomous and having real interest in the issue at hand, appear to have CONFORMITY OBEDIENCE No explicit instruction given Instructed explicitly Peer influence is the source Authorities are the source of pressure Mutually a subject can influence Mutuality absent as it is one Need for acceptance Need for compliance Done by 'example' Done by 'directions.' Factors increasing obedience Factors reducing obedience Authority figure providing instructions Administering by proxy Relieving the subject from responsibility for actions Achieving 'agentic state.' Authoritarian personality of subjects (they obey more!)

Proximity to shocked victim Remoteness of authority Peer rebellion against instructions Increased sense of responsibility for plight of the victim

15 - Group processes

Group processes

16 - Social power

Social power

© SPMM Course balanced flexibility, and if the minority appeared to have some similarity to the rest of the group. Milgram's experiments on obedience: Subjects were recruited by an authoritative university faculty and were asked to administer electric shock to victims kept in a different room by pressing buttons. The sham victim would make crying sounds in pain on increasing the dose of electricity.

Group processes There are various processes that influence individuals when making decisions as a part of a group. The group can make more risky decisions than what an individual him/herself can. This is called risky shift. A group discussion process can strengthen average individual inclinations and polarise the group in the direction where most individuals were heading already. This is called group polarisation. While making extreme decisions, the desire to agree with other members of a group can override rational judgment applicable in individual decision-making. This is called groupthink. Group processes, especially polarization, are considered to be due to three underlying phenomena:

- Normative influence: People have a need not to appear odd or 'stick out' like a sore thumb. So they say yes to what others in the group say.
- Informational influence: Having more information after group discussion can facilitate decision-making
- Social identity: A group norm is established soon after a group is formed. This creates a social identity and pressure to conform to maintain the belongingness.

Robert Bales made observations around small group communication in early 1950s. In small groups, discussion initially tended to shift back and forth quickly between a task and its relevance to the group members. This helped to balance task completion and group cohesion. Later a linear phase emerged – the discussion moved from a mere exchange of opinions to evaluating values underlying a decision and then to making a decision. He also noted that no matter how large the group, the most talkative member spoke for 40-50% of the time, and second most talkative 23-30% of the time – dominating the conversation to the detriment of the others.

Social power French and Raven identified 6 sources of social (or organizational) power. They used the term Bases of Social Power to describe these factors.

17 - Leadership

Leadership

18 - Social Influence

Social Influence

© SPMM Course

1. Reward Power - based on the perceived ability to give positive consequences or remove negative ones
2. Coercive Power - the perceived ability to punish those who not conform with your ideas or demands
3. Legitimate Power - based on the perception that someone has the right to prescribe behaviour due to election or appointment to a position of responsibility
4. Referent Power - through association with others who possess power
5. Expert Power - based on having distinctive knowledge, expertness, ability or skills
6. Information Power (Similar to 5) - based on controlling the information Leadership Lewin (1939) identified the following leadership styles. □ Autocratic - leader's decision-making occurs without consultation from the others and causes the most discontent. It works if no need for input on decision i.e. that motivation would not be affected by not being consulted. □ Democratic - leader's decision-making involves others though the decision may ultimately made by the leader having facilitated group discussion and discussed opinions. It is a well-regarded process but can be time-consuming. □ Laissez-Faire - leader's involvement in decision-making is minimal, so others make their own decision. It works well if those involved are capable and motivated, and no need for central coordination. Social Influence Kelman described three psychological factors that underlie the process of influence of one person on the other in social settings. □ Compliance - responding favourably to a request (implicit or explicit) from another. It is a change of behavior rather than a change in attitude (i.e. one can hold private objections but still comply). Satisfaction from compliance is due to the positive social effect (i.e. reward or avoid punishment). □ Identification - change in attitude/behavior due to the influence of someone that is liked e.g. celebrity endorsement. A resultant desired relationship the identifier relates is the reward. □ Internalisation - process of acceptance of a set of norms established by a person/group influential to the individual. The content of the influence is intrinsically rewarding.

19 - 5. Intergroup behaviour

5. Intergroup behaviour

20 - Prejudice

Prejudice

© SPMM Course 5. Intergroup behaviour Prejudice Prejudice is essentially an attitude. It has

1. Cognitive component - stereotypes
2. Affective component - hostility
3. Behavioural component - which according to Allport can be a. anti-locution b. avoidance c. discrimination d. physical attack or e. extermination in terms of increasing severity.

Prejudice can be positive or neutral as well as negative though the term is mostly used to describe negative prejudice. Theories of prejudice □ Adorno's authoritarian personality theory: Authoritarians are prejudiced in a generalised manner; difficult upbringing and disciplinarian rules in childhood may lead to a projection of difficulties on minorities. But this theory does not explain the sudden surges of prejudice that occur in history. It has no experimental proof either. An allied theory says that ideological dogmatism in rigid, authoritarian people can explain prejudice. □ Scapegoating theory: It is related to the frustration-aggression model of Dollard. In situations of extreme frustration when the source of such frustration is too powerful, we may tend to displace aggression towards a soft target - the scapegoat. The choice of scapegoat depends on the prevailing social mood. Hence, the society provides the content of one's prejudice though one's personality may predispose to such prejudice according to Adorno. □ Relative deprivation theory: This supplements scapegoating theory. The discrepancy between actual attainments and expectations of a society is called relative deprivation. Any acute changes can cause a sudden substantial relative deprivation, leading to unrest and scapegoating follows. Note that the relative deprivation is subjective to individuals in a group, and the competition may be within individuals (egoistic) or between groups (fraternalistic). □ Realistic conflict theory: This asserts that the mere suggestion of competition is enough to trigger prejudices. Famous Robber's Cove experiments by Sherif supported this theory. The mere perception of another group's existence can spark discrimination. At a summer camp at Robber's Cove, two groups were created from unrelated individuals. Even when

© SPMM Course these groups were allowed to interact freely, they developed strong in-group preferences and anti out-group ideas. When a competition was introduced, the groups exhibited a high degree of aggression and hatred against each other. Sherif concluded that mere competition is sufficient to create conflicts, and no real lack of resources or acute deprivation is necessary. □ Social identity theory: An individual's positive self-image depends on both personal and social identities. So each individual strives to improve his group's success to foster his own image. This leads to prejudice against other groups. How to reduce prejudice? □ Blue eyes and brown eyes experiment (Elliott): Prejudice exhibited by a person could be lesser when he/she himself

experienced such prejudice in the past. In a class room, blue-eyed children were initially treated badly by instructing brown-eyed pupils that blue eyes stood for inferiority and weakness. When the roles were reversed later, and opposite information was now provided, supporting the supremacy of blue-eyed children, the amount of aggression shown was lesser. This suggested that when one experiences prejudice first hand, his own discriminatory behaviour reduces later. □ Contact hypothesis (Allport): When contact occurs between opposite group members under equal status and in pursuit of common goals, this can reduce prejudice. Personal friendship is not needed though. Due to lack of knowledge about what happens in the other group a degree of autistic hostility exists. This reinforces negative stereotypes as mirror image phenomenon i.e. 'we are right, so they are wrong', etc. Also, one group starts believing that the members of the opposite groups all are alike - illusion of out-group homogeneity.

21 - 6. Aggression

6. Aggression

© SPMM Course 6. Aggression There are several types of aggression as outlined below. □ Hostile aggression: aimed solely at hurting someone. □ Instrumental aggression: used as a means to an end - may be self-defense or to attain something. Instrumental aggression is carried out for the purpose of achieving a particular goal e.g. kidnapping for ransom. Hence, it is often planned and not impulsive. Hostile (also called angry or affective) aggression is motivated by the need to express negative feelings, such as anger. □ Positive aggression: combating prejudice, self-defense. □ Pathological aggression: violence for the sake of being violent- may be associated with pathological personality. □ Overt aggression: This is readily observable, either reactive & impulsive or proactive, planned aggression. □ Covert aggression is much more subtle, e.g. telling lies, spreading rumours, excluding a child from a group of friends, etc. It is seen more in girls than boys. Hydraulic or build up models □ Psychoanalysis Theory: Human aggression is due the death instinct Thanatos - an instinctive biological destructive death related urge that gradually builds up in everyone and must at some point be released. □ Evolutionary Theory: Through the process of natural selection, aggression ensures survival of the aggressor's genes passing from one generation to the other. It helps in the fight for the survival of the fittest. □ Lorenz studied animal aggression and proposed that features such as territorial imperative are linked to the survival benefits of aggression. According to him aggression is a fixed action pattern elicited by specific sign stimuli. But he found non-human aggression to be mostly constructive. Ritualisation refers to a series of stereotyped fight scenes, carried out by animals without actual physical harm to both the victor and the vanquished. Appeasement rituals or gestures form a part of such ritualisations in which certain behaviours (e.g., lying down, dropping and tucking one's tail) can reduce aggression expression.

Non-hydraulic models These models refute the notion of 'building up' and 'release'.

© SPMM Course □ Genetic theory: It is controversial whether aggression is inherited; it is often the case in animal species. But in humans however, people may not necessarily inherit the tendency to be aggressive; instead they may inherit certain temperaments, such as impulsiveness, that in turn make aggression more likely (Baron and Richardson, 1994). □ Social learning theory: Bandura's 'Bobo Doll' experiments provide impressive demonstrations of the power of observational learning. When children observe an aggressive model, they often reproduce many of the model's acts precisely, especially if the model's aggression was rewarded. Vicarious conditioning refers to a kind of observational learning where learning is influenced by seeing or hearing about the consequences of others' behaviour. Observational learning can occur even when there are no vicarious effects of reinforcement, but the performance of an aggressive behaviour is more likely if vicarious reinforcement was observed instead of just seeing behaviour in isolation without knowing

its consequences. □ The frustration-aggression hypothesis was originally proposed by Dollard et al. (1939). It holds that frustration always results in aggression and conversely aggression will not occur unless a person is frustrated. But this is not true as sometimes frustration produces depression or withdrawal instead of aggression. The modified frustration-aggression hypothesis considers aggression to be one of the many possible products of frustration. In a meta-analysis including 49 studies, Marcus-Newhall et al. (2000) found consistent evidence that frustrated individuals show displacement of aggression from the source of the frustration onto a less powerful or more accessible target. □ Berkowitz (1993) later modified Dollard's proposal. This is called aggressive cue theory or weapons effect: Frustration produces not aggression but a readiness to respond aggressively; once this readiness exists, cues in the environment (e.g. knives, guns, etc.) will often lead a frustrated person to behave aggressively; neither frustration nor cues alone can trigger the aggressive behaviour. □ Generalised arousal theory maintains that arousal (e.g. physiological) from one source may energise some other response. This is called transferred excitation (Zillman). □ Festinger's deindividuation theory: According to this, people in-group context act uncharacteristically more aggressive as a sense of identity and belongingness and diffusion of responsibility occurs in groups. Similarly, uniforms can reduce individuality, promoting expression of aggression (hence its use in Police and military forces). But deindividuation does not always cause aggression. Media influences on aggressive behaviour: TV can influence through modelling effects. In a natural experiment at St Helena Island when TV was first introduced, some increase in prosocial behaviour was recorded, surprisingly. Media influence is mediated via

22 - Stress and aggression among primates

Stress and aggression among primates

© SPMM Course

1. High arousal
2. Disinhibition - 'this is happening everywhere; it is not uncommon.'
3. Imitation: e.g. copycat crimes and suicides - Shannon Matthews incident in UK (2008) is speculated to be akin to a channel 4 drama episode (Shameless).
4. Desensitisation: due to repeated showing
5. Priming- enhancing automatic associations of certain stimuli with a crime.

Family background and aggression: Aggressive children tend to commit violent and non-violent offences in adulthood. Antisocial behavior is much more common in men. Harsh and inconsistent discipline and an absence of positive parenting may be an aetiological factor in aggression. Note that cultural differences exist in expression of aggression; it is said to be much more common in individualist than in collectivist cultures (Oatley, 1993)

Stress and aggression among primates □ In most species, dominance ranks influence the extent of sustaining stressors. It is too simplistic to say higher / lower ranking individuals have the highest stress or aggression levels. The actual amount of stress and aggression depends very much on group's social structure and dynamics. □ Ability to avoid confronting dominant individuals will reduce stress levels. When this is lost in captivity (artificial environments) the subordinates show high-stress hormones. For example dominant wolves have more cortisol in the wild; subordinates have higher levels in captivity. □ The most frequent context in which aggression is seen is in defense of status. But the best fighter does not become the highest-ranking individual in a group all the time (ability to form coalition and source social support are important). □ In some species, aggression is a primary cause of mortality. □ The most important modulating influence on aggression is social dominance; once it is established the rate of aggression drops substantially. □ Aggressive encounters are highest among adolescent males during group migrations. Aggression is also higher under conditions of crowding. □ Males are generally more aggressive than females, but once dominance is stabilized, males have a substantial drop leading to females showing higher aggression than or as high as males. □ Mating competition can increase male-to-male aggression. The presence of children can act as

agonistic buffers to reduce aggression among both males and females in some species.

© SPMM Course □ Socially living primates learn social cues of aggression and restraint from the early period of development by observing their parents and older individuals; they later practice these skills with their peers. In fact, parental control is essential for the development of cortical areas involved in impulse control. □ Coping outlets for stress include social support (grooming, coalition formation and physical contact). Reconciliative behaviour immediately after a competition may help the loser to cope. Poor availability of this support with low presence of kin will increase stress among subordinates.

23 - 7. Altruism

7. Altruism

© SPMM Course 7. Altruism Any action that is intended to help others is called Prosocial Behaviour in psychology. Altruism is often considered to be a motivation behind people's prosocial acts. Altruism refers to the wish to help others with no expectation of reward. Bystander apathy: When alone, individuals will typically intervene if another person is in need of help: this is called bystander intervention. But intervention becomes less likely to an extent that no single person will intervene from a crowd or group of observers when someone is in need of help. This is called bystander apathy or Genovese effect. Pluralistic ignorance: This refers to members of a crowd looking at each other for signs of distress but remaining calm themselves, leading to misappraisal of the situation being safe leading to lack of intervention. Bystander competence is usually not required for intervention except in ambiguous situations where technical help is required e.g. blood at the scene. According to arousal/cost-reward model, emotional arousal on seeing a victim increases motivation to act. But a cognitive appraisal of costs and rewards occurs before an intervention is carried out. If the cost of helping is high, the bystander undertakes a cognitive reinterpretation - calling the situation as non-urgent, blaming the victim or diffusing or dissolving responsibility. Diffusion of responsibility: Similar to social loafing - 'I have some responsibility, but so do others; let someone else help.' Dissolution of responsibility: Not knowing what others are doing, rationalizes that someone would have helped the victim. Males show higher agentic help and intervention while females show higher communal help and empathy. Social loafing: This is also called Ringelmann's effect. It is seen in games such as tug-of-war and in clapping hands after a performance. The larger a group is, the less the individual performance

- as one thinks the others will do the job

© SPMM Course Notes prepared using excerpts from □ Sapolsky, R. (2005) The Influence of Social Hierarchy on Primate Health Science, 648-652 □ Thambirajah, MS. Psychological Basis of Psychiatry, Elsevier 2005 □ Gross, R. Psychology: The Science of Mind and Behaviour, Hodder Education; 6th Revised edition □ Wolff, P., & Holmes, K. J. (2011). Linguistic relativity. Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Cognitive Science, 2(3), 253-265. □ Baron-Cohen, S., Leslie, A. M., & Frith, U. (1985). Does the autistic child have a "theory of mind"?. Cognition, 21(1), 37-46. □ J. French and B. Raven, The bases of social power in D. Cartwright and A. Zander (eds.), Group dynamics (pp. 607-623). New York: Harper and Row, 1960 DISCLAIMER: This material is developed from various revision notes assembled while preparing for MRCPsych exams. The content is periodically updated with excerpts from various published sources including peer-reviewed journals, websites, patient information leaflets and books. These sources are cited and acknowledged wherever possible; due to the structure of this material, acknowledgments have not been possible for every passage/fact that is common knowledge in psychiatry. We do not check the accuracy of drug-related information using external sources; no part of these notes should be used

as prescribing information