



Summary - book "Social Psychology" - Chapter 1-4

Social Psychology (Mcgill University)

Social Psychology : Book Notes

2014-09-19

Social Psychology : *The scientific study of feelings, thoughts, and behaviours of individuals in social situations. (Basically studying people's reactions in social situations)*

CASE STUDY: Philip Zimbardo aka Stanford students prison

- 24 Stanford students (undergraduate men) put in the basement of the Psychology Department, given roles of guards or prisoners thanks to flipping a coin, guard=green fatigue uniforms and reflective sunglasses, prisoner=tunics and nylon stocking caps, study supposed to last 2 weeks but lasted 6, guards resulted to verbal abuse and physical humiliation (had prisoners wear bag over their head, strip them naked, had them stimulate sexual acts) that produced extreme stress for a lot of prisoners.
 - IV: Roles (guard or prisoner) DV: interactions or behaviour, Conclusion: Balance of power is so unequal in prison that it pushes guards to do awful things
 - Related to the Iraq prisoners' treatment scandal (Abu Ghraib prison)

□

□ Personality psychology: Difference between personality instead of situation (such as social psych)

□ Sociology : Study of behaviour of people in the collective, look at subgroups, mass movements, institutions, etc.

□

Behaviour/Actions ≠ Personality of Person

□ Arendt's theory: We are all capable of brutality (Jew that sounded a little bit like a Nazi apologist), said that the dude that created concentration camps wasn't an evil mastermind but a boring person doing his job.

□ Kurt Lewin: (Ex-physicist) Behaviour of people (like objects) is a function of the field of forces (can be physical or psychological) in which they find themselves.

- People act in different way depending on the situation.
- Actions of other people are the main situational influence on our behaviour. (Act like others want you to act to be accepted.)

□

CASE STUDY: Milgram Experiment (study of obedience)

- Fake memory test with men. Volts and everything.

- *IV: Authority/degree of physical immediacy of an authority (like they tell them to keep going, encourage them, do not show fear or regret)*
- *DV: Compliance of the participant*
- *Conclusion: Under authority, people are ready to go far.*

▮ **CASE STUDY:** *Seminarians as Samaritans*

- *Participants: students from Princeton Theological Seminary*
 - *2 types of participants: Students that were interested in faith for their personal salvation and students that were interested in faith to help others.*
- *Study: Tell the participants that they have to deliver a sermon on the topic of good Samaritan (priming) in another building.*
- *2 groups:*
 - *Control group: Were told they had plenty of time to get there*
 - *Experimental group: Were told they were already late and should hurry.*
- *IV: Time to get there/Reason of their faith*
- *On their way there, saw a man with his head down, coughing and growing and in need of help.*
- *DV: Giving help*
- *Conclusion: The reason of their faith did not help predict their behaviour, their condition did. When they were in a rush, less people helped.*

▮

▮ *So situational factors are more helpful to predict someone's behaviour than their disposition. Not recognizing the importance of internal factors lead to fundamental attribution error.*

- **Dispositions:** *Internal factors such as beliefs, values, personality traits, or abilities that guides a person's behaviour.*
- **Fundamental attribution error:** *The failure to recognize the importance of situational influences on behaviour, and the corresponding tendency to overemphasize the importance of dispositions or traits on behaviour.*

▮

□ **Channel factors:** *Certain situational circumstances that appear unimportant on the surface but that can have great consequences for behaviour, either facilitating or blocking it or guiding behaviour in a particular direction. (Introduced by Kurt Lewin, the ex-physicist guy)*

- *Can also suggest that a situation can make it easier to follow one path rather than another.*

□ **CASE STUDY:** *Health facilities*

- *Goal: Convince Yale students to get tetanus inoculations.*
- *Group 1:*
 - *Read scary texts on how people can get tetanus.*
 - *Show them pictures of people in the last stage of lockjaw.*
 - *A lot said they would get the shot, but only 3% actually went.*
- *Group 2:*
 - *Shown a map of Yale with a circle around the health facility.*
 - *Checked their weekly schedule to see when they could go and had to plan a route to take to get there.*
 - *28% went.*
- *Conclusion: Channel factor (the seemingly unimportant cause of a behaviour) was the fact that they had to shape a vague intention into a concrete plan.*

□

□ **Looking back:** *Situations are often more powerful in their influence on behaviour than we realize. Whether people are kind to others or not, whether they take action in their own best interest or not, can depend on subtle aspects of situations. We often overlook such situational factors when we try to understand our own behaviour or that of others, and we often mistakenly attribute behaviour to presumed traits or dispositions (fundamental attribution error).*

- *Basically, we think of behaviour as being affected by our personality when most often it is affected by the surrounding situation.*

□

□

Ways of Interpreting Situations

□

□ **Construal :** *People's interpretation and inference about the stimuli or situations they confront.*

- *How we interpret situations around us and the suppositions we make about them.*
- *How you think of someone will influence how you interpret their actions and therefore how you behave.*
 - *If you see someone's cause as being just then you might join.*

□

□ *Perception is not only what we see but what we assume to see too, which could lead to significant errors under some circumstances (ex. White triangle because of circles)*

- **Gestalt psychology:** *Based on the German word gestalt, meaning "form" or "figure", this approach stresses the fact that people perceive objects not by means of some automatic registering device but by active, usually unconscious interpretation of what the object represents as a whole.*
 - *ABOUT VISION, NOT JUDGEMENT*

□

□ **Prisoner's dilemma:** *A situation involving payoffs to two people who must decide whether to "cooperate" or to "defect." In the end, trust and cooperation lead to higher joint payoffs than mistrust and defection.*

- *Both deny the crime=can avoid harsh penalty*
- *One admit= lenience for the one who admitted, harsh penalty for the one who denied*
- *Both admit= prison for both*

CASE STUDY: *Stanford Dorm Community vs. Wall Street Game*

- *IV: Nature of student (competitive or cooperative)/Type of game (community game or wall street game)*
- *DV: Cooperation*
- *Conclusion: The name of the game (so the nature of the game) was what influences their cooperation not their inherent cooperative nature.*

□

□ **Schemas:** *A knowledge structure consisting of any organized body of stored information.*

- *Like how you should behave in a restaurant compared to how you should behave at the movies.*

- *Difference with construal is that construal is what you do with the given information, how you perceive it. You use schemas (structures, like how to behave somewhere).*
- *Capture the regularities of life, we know what to expect when we wake up, we don't have to rediscover the world everyday.*

▮ **CASE STUDY:** Solomon Asch, "politician" meaning

- *2 groups of undergraduates to rank various professions and one of them was "politician"*
 - *Group 1: Were told that a previous group of undergraduates ranked politician in the highest*
 - *Group 2: Were told the opposite*
 - *Conclusion: Did the same thing because they had different notion (schemas) of the "politician"*

▮ *Stereotypes are summary of people belonging to the same class.*

- *Not always/almost never positive.*

Looking back: *Although our understanding of situations often seems to be the result of a direct, unmediated registration of meaning, our comprehension of even the simplest physical stimulus is the result of construal processes that make use of well-developed knowledge structures. Such structures are called schemas when they summarize commonly encountered situations, and they are called stereotypes when they describe different people.*

- *We don't interpret everything that happens to us to understand them, we construe (interpret and infer a situation) using schemas (situations) or stereotypes (people) that tell us what is commonly the case.*

▮

▮

Mind Processing

▮

▮ *Ways the mind process information:*

- *Automatic and unconscious (often based on emotional factors)*
- *Conscious and systematic (more likely to be controlled by careful thought).*

▮

Often automatic reactions happen before conscious thoughts take over.

- *Happens with stereotypes even if we don't really hate the group we have these stereotypes.*

Unconscious processing (2):

- *"Skill acquisition" (coined by William James)*
 - *When you have overlearn a certain skill you can use it without being aware of doing so (automatic).*
 - *Like driving a car.*
- *Beliefs and behaviours are generated without us knowing the cognitive process behind them (associated with Freud).*
 - *Cannot explain the reason of your judgement.*

□

□

Conscious processing= slow / Automatic processing= fast

- *It's better that processing information is automatic and unconscious because you can remember your friend's face faster than if you had to make a conscious effort to remember each of their features*

□

□

***Looking back:** Much of our behaviour and many kinds of construal processes are carried out without our awareness, sometimes without awareness of even the stimuli to which we are responding. We tend to overestimate how accessible our mental processes are to our consciousness.*

- *A lot of our behaviour and interpretation is carried out automatically and unconsciously.*

□

□

Evolution

□

Natural selection: *An evolutionary process that melds animals and plants so that traits that enhance the probability of survival and reproduction are passed on to subsequent generations.*

- *Important for behavioural inclinations.*
- *Means that all humans share some kind of universal behaviours (human universals).*
 - *Like live in family, marriage, division of labour by age, etc.*

□

Language is prewired in humans (thanks to evolution), there are strong evidences that infants are born prewired to learn a language.

- *Helpful for group living (which is also because evolution led us to live in groups).*
- *Could learn to speak any language depending on where they are born.*

□

□ **Theory of mind:** *The understanding that other people have beliefs and desires.*

- *Evolution might have provided us with that.*
- *Children before the age of 2 understand that the way to understand people's behaviour is to understand that they have different beliefs and desires.*
- *By the age of 3-4, children can recognize when other people's beliefs are false.*

□

□ *Autism: Have a weaker or no theory of mind (no understanding of people's desires and beliefs/ and no understanding that these can be false).*

□

□ *Why are there gender roles?*

- **Parental investment:** *The evolutionary principle that costs and benefits are associated with reproduction and the nurturing of offspring. Because these costs and benefits are different for males and females, one sex (women) will normally value and invest more in each child than the other sex.*
 - *Man can walk away from the child and never see them again cause they put no effort in the conception, while that is harder for a woman cause she puts a lot of effort in the conception.*

□

□ *The theory of evolution and natural selection can lead people to think that biology is destiny, that we are biologically predisposed to do what we inevitably will do and perhaps should do.*

- **Naturalistic fallacy:** *The claim that things are the way they should be.*

Neuroscience: Tells us which areas of the brain function most when certain kind of activities are taking place, but also informs us about how the brain, the mind, and behaviour function as a unit and how social factors influence each of these components at the same time.

□

□ **Looking back:** Evolutionary theory informs our understanding of human behaviour just as it does our understanding of the physical characteristics of plants and animals. The many universals of human behaviour suggest that some of these behaviours may be prewired- especially language and theory of mind. Differential parental investment of males and females may help us understand certain differences between men and women. Although misunderstandings and misapplications of evolutionary ideas sometimes make people suspicious of it, the theory has important implications for the field of social psychology.

□

□

Difference between Cultures

□

□ **Independent (individualistic) cultures:** Cultures in which people tend to think of themselves as distinct social entities, tied to each other by voluntary bonds of affection and organizational memberships but essentially separate from other people and having attributes that exist in the absence of any connections to others.

- Western Cultures
- Prefer egalitarianism and achieved status based on accomplishments.
- Rules governing behaviours should be applied to everyone.
- Want to be unique.

□

□ **Interdependent (collectivistic) cultures:** Cultures in which people tend to define themselves as part of a collection, inextricably tied to others in their group and placing less importance on individual freedom or personal control over their lives.

- East Asian cultures, Africans, etc.
- Accept hierarchy and status based on age, group membership, etc.
- Preference for rules that take context and particular relationships into account.

- *Want to be part of the collective.*

□

□

CASE STUDY: *Who Am I test*

- *Participants: (1) American students, (2) University students in Kenya, (3) workers in Nairobi the capital city and (4) people from 2 traditional tribes; Masai and Samburu*
- *IV: Their category (living in an interdependent or in an independent culture)*
- *DV: The characteristics of who they are, if they are individualistic or collectivistic*
- *Conclusion: The people in contact with Western concepts (American students and Kenyan university students) were more individualistic than the workers in the capital and the tribes people.*
 - *American undergraduate, then Kenyan undergraduate, then workers in Nairobi, Masai tribes people, Sambura tribes people.*

Difference between interdependent and independent cultures in workplace.

TABLE 1.3 Independent and Interdependent Cultures on the Job

People in independent and interdependent cultures tend to have different values and beliefs about job-related matters.

Independent Cultures	Interdependent Cultures
Want to get the recognition they deserve when they do a good job	Want the employer to have a major responsibility for their health and welfare
Want to have considerable freedom to adopt their own approach to the job	Want to work in a congenial and friendly atmosphere
Want to fully use their skills and abilities on the job	Want to be completely loyal to their company
Want to work in a department that is run efficiently	Believe that knowing influential people is more important than ability
Believe that decisions made by individuals are better than those made by groups	Believe that the better managers are those who have been with the company the longest time

Gender roles:

- *Male= hunt/ female=gather plants (in pre-modern hunter-gathering cultures)*
- *Scandinavian women could also be Vikings.*
- *Monogamy and polygyny (having many wives) are the most common expectations.*
- *Gender is constructed differently in diverse society.*

□

□ Socialization depends on the subcultural

- *May be oriented more towards interdependence (women) or independence (men)*
 - *Gender*
- *Depend also of the social class*
 - *Working class= interdependent / middle class= independent*
 - *Working class= care less about uniqueness than middle class*

- Working class are better with objects given to them while middle class prefer objects they chose
- Also depends on the situation
 - Debating (independent) vs. volunteering (interdependent)

□

▮ **Looking back:** People in Western societies tend to be individualistic, or independent, whereas people in other societies are more likely to be collectivistic, or interdependent. Westerners tend to define themselves as having attributes that exist apart from their relations with other people. Non-Westerners tend to define themselves in terms of their relations with others. These differences have important implications for many of the most important phenomena of social psychology. Gender roles and sexual mores are examples of behaviours that differ widely from one culture to another. Evolution and culture each make important contributions to understanding human social behaviour: evolution predisposed us to certain behaviours, but culture determines which behaviours are like to be developed in particular situations.

2014-09-19

□ *Social psychology tries to find the reason of certain of our behaviours.*

□

□ **Hindsight bias :** *People's tendency to be overconfident about whether they could have predicted a given outcome.*

□

Looking back: *Social psychology shows us that some of our stereotypes about how people behave are mistaken; it also shows us how such beliefs about the reasons for our own behaviour can also be mistaken. Social psychological findings sometimes seem obvious, but often only after we know what they are. Hindsight bias mistakenly tells us that we knew about these findings all along.*

□

□ **Hypothesis :** *A prediction about what will happen under particular circumstances.*

□

□ **Theory:** *A body of related propositions intended to describe some aspect of the world.*

- *Have support in form of empirical data.*
 - *Ex.: theory of evolution, theory of relativity*

□

□ *Theories are more general than hypotheses and these lead to findings.*

□

Types of Study in Social Psychology

□ **Observational Research:** *Looking at a phenomenon in some reasonable systematic way with a view to understanding what is going on and coming up with hypothesis about why things are happening the way they are.*

- *Observe and come up with hypothesis to explain why are things happening like that.*

□

Participant observation: *In social psychology, involves observing someone at close range.*

CASE STUDY: *Preparation for schooling middle-class and working class families (participant observation)*

- *Shirley Brice Heath lived with the families, observing and taking part in their daily activities.*

- *Conclusion: Middle-class families read more to their children, included them in dinner conversations, used print word to guide their behaviour (recipes, game rules), taught them how to categorize objects, how to answer to "Why" questions and how to make judgments.*

Lead to theories that conclusions that need further researches to prove their validity.

Archival Research: *Look at evidence found in the archives of various kinds (report books, police records, sports statistics, newspaper articles, databases about the ethnography of people in different cultures.)*

CASE STUDY: *Nisbett & Cohen, FBI reports on homicides in North vs. South of USA*

- *There are more homicides in the South than in the North and the most common type of homicides are insult-related. The other types of murder are more common in the North.*
- *Led to the surveys and the experimental research*

□

□

Surveys: *Involves asking people questions.*

- *Can be answered through interviews or written questionnaires.*
- *Participants: Can be a small group or a large national survey.*
 - **Population:** *Group you want to know about (ex.: student population)*
 - **Random Sample:** *Taken at random from the population (every student in the country has an equal chance to be in the sample)*
 - **Convenience Sample:** *Taken from some available subgroup in the populations (ex.: students questioned as they come into the Student Union)*
 - *More chance to be biased because they students can be really similar and have similar opinions.*
 - *Cannot represent the whole population.*

□

CASE STUDY: *Nisbett & Cohen follow-up, Southerner's reason to commit more crimes than Northerner*

- *Looked at published national surveys.*

- *Southerners were more likely to agree that "an eye for an eye" is a justified retaliation but "when harms, one should turn the other cheek"*
- *S were also more likely to favour violence in response to insults, to threats, to people checking out and flirting with your girl.*
- *S were also more likely to encourage violence (spanking) in raising the children.*
- *S encourage their children to beat up their bully.*

□

□

Types of Study in Social Psychology (Correlation Research)

□

□ **Correlation Research:** *Research that does not involve random assignment to different situation, or conditions, and that psychologists conduct just to see whether there is a relationship between the variables.*

□

□ *Correlation is not causation(1→2). The cause could be...*

- **Reverse causation:** *When variable 1 is assumed to cause variable 2, yet the opposite direction of causation may be the case. (2→1)*
- **Third variable:** *When variable 1 does not cause variable 2 and variable 2 does not cause variable 1, rather some other variable exerts a causal influence on both. (1→3→2)*

□

□ *Correlational research cannot prove causation because of self-selection.*

- **Self-selection:** *A problem that arises when the participant, rather than the investigator, selects their level on each variable, bringing with this value unknown other properties that make causal interpretation of a relationship difficult.*
 - *Case with no self-selection:*
 - *IV: How many hours slept*
 - *DV: Results in a test*
 - *Case with a bit of self-selection*
 - *IV: How many hours slept*
 - *DV: Rate their mood (self-selection)*
 - *Case with self-selection*
 - *IV: Marital status (self-selection)*

- DV: Rate their happiness (self-selection)
 - LOTS OF BIAS

▫

▫ In correlational research, can look at the strength between the two relationships from -1 to 0 or 0 to +1.

- The sign determines if the correlation is positive (both increase together) or negative (when one increase, the other decrease).
- The number determines the strength of the correlation.
 - 0.20 and += slight relationship
 - 0.40 and += moderately strong relationship
 - 0.60 and += very strong relationship

▫

▫ Correlational studies cannot tell about the direction of the causality or if there is a third variable that is actually the cause of the relationship between the two variables.

- Clever analysis of correlational data can tell you a lot about the meaning of a relationship.

▫

▫ **Longitudinal Study:** A study conducted over a long period of time with the same population, which is periodically assessed regarding a particular behaviour.

- Can help prove a causality.

▫

▫ **Types of Study in Social Psychology (Experimental Research)**

▫ **Experimental Research:** In social psychology, research that randomly assigns people to different conditions, or situations, and that enables researchers to make strong inferences about how these different conditions affect people's behaviour.

▫

▫ **Independent Variable:** Variable that is manipulated; it is hypothesized to be the cause of a particular outcome (DV).

- Ex.: Number of hours slept.

▫

- **Dependent Variable:** Variable that is measured (as opposed to manipulated); it is hypothesized to be affected by manipulation of the independent variable.
 - Ex.: Results on a test.
 - Can be measured by verbal reports, behaviours, physiological measures (heart rate or stress measures such as cortisol level), or neural measures (increased activity in a brain part).

□

- **Random Assignment:** Assigning participants in experimental research to different groups randomly, such that they are as likely to be assigned to one condition as to another.
 - **Experimental Condition:** Participants who are tested on.
 - **Control Condition:** A condition comparable to the experimental condition in every way except that it lacks the one ingredient hypothesized to produce the expected effect on the dependent variable.
 - To test the efficacy of energizing drinks after an all-nighter, they would be the one that do not have energizing drinks.

- **CASE STUDY:** Nisbett & Cohen- Northerners vs. Southerners being insulted
 - **Participants:** Middle-class students of the University of Michigan; some were Southerners and other Northerners.
 - **Deception study:** Were told they were in a study on the effects of time constraints on judgments of various kinds.
 - (1) Had to fill a questionnaire and then take it down a long, narrow hallway lined with filing cabinets and leave it on the table at the end.
 - Sometimes, a confederate would be there and had to pull a file drawer (which blocked the student's path) and had to push it to let the student go. When the student was coming back, the confederate had to get out the way again so they would slam the drawer shut, pushed into the participant's shoulder and say "Asshole" (then went behind a door labelled "photo lab" to prevent confrontations).
 - (2) Participants were then asked to finish a story about a man who had made pass at another man's fiancée.

- (3) Also took the level testosterone of the participants before and after the insult.
- (4) As the participant walk back, there was a tall (6'3) and big (250 pounds) assistant that had to walk in the middle of the way so the participant had to dodge him.
- IV: Northerners vs. Southerners/ Insulted or not/ Big assistant walking toward them
- DV: (1) Immediate reaction from participants/ (2) Ending to story/ (3) Level of testosterone / (4) Distance at which the participant dodge the assistant
- Conclusion: (1) S immediate reaction was a flash of anger and N shrugged or were amused. (2) S who had been insulted had more violent ending to their stories than S who hadn't been. (3) The level of testosterone had increased in S that had been insulted but not in non-insulted S and did not change for N, insulted or not. (4) Insulted swerved at 3 foot, N at 5, non-insulted S at 9.
 - S are said to be polite (when not insulted I guess).

□

□ **Natural experiments:** Naturally occurring events or phenomena having somewhat different conditions that can be compared with almost as much rigor as in experiments where the investigator manipulates the conditions.

- Can measure people's happiness before/after they are married.

Looking back: Social psychologists study the phenomena by observational methods (though they usually do so to get an intuitive understanding with a view toward applying other methods, archival research involving records of various kinds, and surveys in which people are asked questions. The validity of surveys typically depends on using respondents who are randomly sampled from the population they represent. Correlational research, in which the investigator establishes whether there is a relationship between two variables, suffers from the problem of self-reflection: the individuals being studied have "chosen" their level on each variable rather than being assigned a level by the investigator. Experimental research manipulates an independent variable and observes the effects of the manipulation on a dependent variable.

□

□ **External Validity:** *An experimental setup that closely resembles real-life situations so that results can safely be generalized to such situations.*

- *Can still learn something from experiments with little external validity such as the Milgram's study.*

□ **CASE STUDY:** *Familiarity with a stimulus affects its attractiveness (Turkish)*

- *Present Turkish words in a headset to Americans*
- *Repeat some of the words often, others not often.*
- *IV: Repetition of the Turkish words*
- *DV: The attractiveness to Americans*
- *Conclusion: Repetition of words affect their attractiveness*
- *No external validity but it is not essential since the purpose is to clarify a general idea (that you like thing that you see and hear often)*

□

□ **Field Experiment:** *An experiment set up in the real world, usually with participants who are not aware that they are in a study of any kind.*

□ **CASE STUDY:** *Nisbett & Cohen- Letter about murder to N and S*

- *Send letters requiring an application form to N and S merchants and talk about bar fight between a man and another that had an affair with his fiancée that ended up killing the other.*
- *IV: S or N merchant / Type of crime*
- *DV: Degree of responsiveness (no response, encouraging response letter or application form)*
- *Conclusion: S businesses are more encouraging of a man committing homicide than N. But not for other crimes such as theft.*

□

□ **Internal Validity:** *In experimental research, confidence that only the manipulated variable could have produced the results.*

- *Can be made sure though random assignment.*
 - *If you had taken a group coming from a place they could have been in a mood caused by the place and not the experiment.*

- Known through **debriefing**: In preliminary versions of an experiment, asking participants straightforwardly if they understood the instructions, found the setup to be reasonable, and so forth. In later versions, debriefings are used to educate the participants about the questions being studied.

□

□ **Reliability**: The degree to which the particular way the researchers measure a given variable is likely to yield/generate consistent results.

- If you take an IQ test twice do you get the same result? If yes or similar result than the way the researches measures a variable is reliable.
- Usually measured by correlations between 0 and 1.
 - Ability tests need a reliability correlations of about 0.8
 - Personality tests are expected to have a little lower
 - People's degree of agreement on someone's kindness and charisma of another person are expected to have 0.5

□

□ **Measurements Validity**: The correlation between some measure and some outcome that the measure is supposed to predict.

- IQ test validity would be measured by correlating IQ scores and grades in school and performances in jobs.
 - Basically your tool of measurement should predict an outcome and you check the correlation between the tool of measurement and its predicted outcome.

Statistical Significance: A measure of the probability that a given result could have occurred by chance.

- You want to make sure that your results are not found by chance but by correlation.
- Less than 1/20 chances that the results were found by chance mean that the research is statistically significant.
- *SS can be due to the size of the difference between groups in an experiment or the size of a relationship between variables in a correlational study.*
- *The number of cases the finding is based on.*

?

□

□ **Looking back:** External validity refers to how closely an experimental setup resembles what people find in the real world. Internal validity refers to the extent to which investigators know that only the manipulated variable could have produced the results. Reliability of measurements refers to the degree to which different instruments, or the same instrument at different times, produce the same values for a given variable. Measurement validity refers to the extent to which a measure predicts outcomes that it is supposed to measure. Statistical significance is a measure of the probability that a result could have occurred by chance.

□

□ **Basic Science:** Science concerned with trying to understand some phenomenon in its own right, with a view toward using that understanding to build valid theories about the nature of some aspect of the world.

- Tries to build theories about aspects of the world.
- Studying the effect on being hurry in helping a person.
 - Not trying to make someone more inclined to help, just try to understand the effect of situations on behaviours.

□

□ **Applied Science:** Science concerned with showing some real-world problem of importance.

- Social psychologists could try to make teens less susceptible to cigarettes advertising or convince teens to wear condoms when having sex to prevent the spread of STDs.

□

□ Basic research can give rise to theories that can lead to interventions. So basic science can fulfil applied science's role.

- **Intervention:** An effort to change people's behaviour.

□ **CASE STUDY:** Basic research on the nature of intelligence

- Carol Dweck did a basic research on intelligence and discovered that people who think that intelligence is genetic tend to work less harder than people who think that intelligence is a matter of hard work.
- Intervention: Tell people that intelligence is under their control and gave them information about how studying can change the physical nature of the brain.

Applied research can also lead to basic science.

- Applied research in WWI: how to produce effective propaganda.
- Basic science: Understand attitude change/ the effect of propaganda.

□

▮ **Looking back:** Basic science attempts to discover fundamental principles, applied science attempts to solve real-world problems. But there is an intimate relationship between two: basic science can reveal ways to solve real-world problems, and science aimed at solving real-world problems can give rise to search for basic principles that explain why the solutions work.

□

▮ **Institutional Review Board (IRB):** A university committee that examines research proposals and makes judgements about the ethical appropriateness of the research.

- If some aspects are deemed to be harmful then they would be asked to be changed.

□

▮ **Informed consent:** Participant's willingness to participate in a procedure or research study after learning all relevant aspects about the procedure or study.

- Needed in medical research and in experimental research (but they can do deception research).

□

▮ **Deception Research:** research in which the participants are misled about the purpose of the research or the meaning of something that is done to them.

□

▮ **Looking back:** Ethical concerns about research are dealt with by institutional review boards. In research not involving deception, the procedures and purposes of experiments are explained to potential participants, and their informed consent is requested. Deception and even minor harm to participants are sometimes allowed when the potential gain to knowledge is considered to be great enough.

2014-09-19

□ **Social Self:** *Our senses of who we are is forged in our interactions with others, shaping, in turn, how we interact with others and how they see themselves.*

□

□ *3 primary components of the social self:*

- **Individual Self**

- *How are we different from others?*

- *Social aspects of the self (includes **relational and collective self**)*

- *How are we connect with others?*

- *What is our role, our duties and obligations in specific relationship and groups?*

□

□ **1. Individual Self:** *Beliefs about our unique personal traits, abilities, preferences, tastes, talents, and so forth.*

- *What sets us apart form others. How are we different.*

□ **2. Relational Self:** *Beliefs about our identities in specific relationships.*

- *Ex.: See ourselves as a great romantic partner, black sheep in the family, etc.*

□

□ **3. Collective Self:** *Beliefs about our identities as members of social groups to which we belong.*

- *Ex.: See myself as a Christian, as a black person, etc.*

□

□ **CASE STUDY:** *American vs. Japanese students describing themselves*

- *Premise: Study on culture and self-beliefs, asked American and Japanese students to describe themselves.*

- *IV: American or Japanese*

- *DV: Describe themselves in term of individual or relational/collective terms*

- *Conclusion: American students described themselves primarily through personal attributes (individual self) while Japanese students were 3x more likely to use terms of their group membership and their relationships (relational and collective selves)*

□

□ **Looking back:** The notions that the self is fundamentally social has long been recognized. As the social context shifts, so too does the nature of the self. The social self can be thought of as having three primary components: the individual self, the relational self, and the collective self, which may differ in prominence across individuals.

□

□ **Self-Knowledge:** Our sense of selves, where does it come from?

- 6 possibilities explored in the book.

□

□ 1- Family and Other Socialization Agents

□

□ Socialization agents include parents, teachers, siblings, grandparents.

- People who were there to educate us as we grew up.

□

□ Socialization agents can shape our sense of self by encouraging certain behaviours and providing opportunities for certain activities. (By being like "Congrats" or by teaching you how to share, etc.) Socialization agents can influence the traits, abilities, and preferences that we come to associate ourselves.

- If you parents encourage you to be religious, it's not surprising that when you grow up you are religious.

□

□ **Symbolic Interactionist Notion:** We come to know ourselves by imagining what others think of us.

- Another way family and socialization agents can shape our sense of selves.
 - We imagine ourselves through their eyes.

□

□ **Reflected Self-Appraisals:** Beliefs about what others think of our social selves.

- Other's people reactions to us serve as a mirror of sort so that we can see ourselves.
- Can be direct or subtle appraisals.
 - Direct: Parents saying "congrats" make us feel competent.
 - Subtle: People laughing at our joke make us feel funny.

- *We internalize how we think others appraise/evaluate us, not how they actually see us.*
 - *So we think people think we are funny or negative, not necessarily the case.*
 - *Your view of yourself can lead you to perceive these reflected self-appraisal.*

□

□ **CASE STUDY:** *Pfeifer and neural system in self-view vs. reflected self-appraisal*

- *Premise: Look at the region of the brain that are active when we talk about our views or ourselves vs. when we talk about how we think others view us.*
- *IV: Talking about self-view vs. reflected self-appraisal*
- *DV: Regional activity in brain*
- *Conclusion: Adolescents (not adults) relied on reflected self-appraisals to when reporting their self view. So their vision of themselves is affected by how they think others view them.*

□

□ *2- Situationism and the Social Self*

Situationism: *Social self change in different contexts/situations.*

- *Change according to what is relevant to the current situation.*

□

□ *(1) Aspect of the self that are relevant in the social context*

□ **Working Self-Concept:** *Subset of self-knowledge that is brought to mind in a particular context.*

- *Only a subset of self-knowledge is brought to mind in a certain context, it is the most relevant one.*
- *Ex.: When you are with your parents, the working self-concept will mostly be related to the relational self as opposed to when you are hanging out with a group which is related to the collective self.*

□

□ *(2) Aspect of the self that are distinctive in the social context*

□ *Instead of the situationism self-knowledge being related to what is relevant to the situation, we think of what makes us distinctive.*

- *Only a subset of self-knowledge is brought to mind in a certain context, it is the most distinctive one.*

□ **CASE STUDY:** 6th graders at different schools describing themselves

- *Premise: Sixth graders at different school had 7 minutes to describe themselves*
- *IV: Typical or unusual student (as being shorter, being a minority)*
- *DV: How they describe themselves*
- *Conclusion: Children who were unusual were more likely to mention how they were unusual in their description.*
 - *So shorter students will mention more their height than average-sized student, minority gender will tell their gender, children born in other countries mentioned it more than students born in the USA*

□

How to reconcile our different selves?

- *The core components of our self-knowledge is always on top of our mind.*
 - *I can be shy in one context and outgoing in another but always a good listener in all contexts.*
- *A person's overall pool of self-knowledge is pretty stable over time. Providing a sense of self-continuity.*
 - *So in your working self-concept at a job interview, you might not think of how lazy you are, but you still are.*
- *The shifts of one's self according to the context is made in a predictable, stable pattern.*
 - *With your friends you are outgoing, with strangers you are shy. Seems to be contradictory but you will always be outgoing with your friends and shy with strangers, so it makes sense.*

□

□ *So self-concept change from one context to another, but stay the same across context.*

- *Different self in context A and B, but always same concept in contexts A.*

□

□ 3- Culture and the Social Self

Culture-based self-conceptions can influence numerous elements of the social self (including specific construal processes and self-esteem).

- *Independent self-construal: (Me, myself and I)*
 - *Where: Mostly West, northwestern Europe and North America*
 - *Self is an autonomous entity that is distinct and separate from others.*
 - *Imperative: Assert uniqueness and independence*
 - *Focus: Internal causes of behaviour*
 - *Lead to a conception of the self with traits that are stable across time and social context.*
- *Interdependent self-construal: (Me in We)*
 - *Where: Asian cultures, and many Mediterranean, African and South American cultures (IMMIGRANTS STAND UP!!!)*
 - *Self is fundamentally connected to other people.*
 - *Imperative: Find a place in the community and other collectives (such as family, work, etc.) and fulfill a role*
 - *Focus: Influence on social context and the situation on current behaviour*
 - *Lead to a conception where the self is embedded within social relationships, roles and duties.*

□

□

4- Gender and the Social Self

□

□

Have different self-conception according to your gender.

□

□

CASE STUDY: *Gender in the independency*

- *Premise: People of the world describe themselves*
- *IV: Gender/Nationality*
- *DV: How you describe yourself*
- *Conclusion: No matter the culture, women describe themselves in more interdependent terms than men. (Describe themselves through social characteristics and relationships./ More empathic, better judge of people's emotions.) And the opposite is also truth.*

□

□ Socialization process may be one of the reason of this difference between gender views.

- Media and parents treat genders differently, encouraging independency in boys and interdependency in women.
- Around 3, girls hang with girls, and boys hang with boys and that reinforce and amplify their difference in self-construal.
 - Boys' games involve hierarchy and competition while girl not.
- Adults, gender specific roles (like taking care of the children) amplify these differences.

□

□ Differences in social selves may also have been brought by human evolutionary history.

- Men are built physically and psychologically to hunt and violent encounters.
 - Independent self-construal is better.
- Women were tailored for caregiving and things like that.
 - Led to interdependent self-construal.

□

But there's only so much you can attribute to evolution.

- Different cultures had different gender roles, and gender roles are changing.
 - SLOWLY BUT SURELY!!!!!!!

□

□

5- Social Comparison

□

□ **Social Comparison Theory:** The hypothesis that people compare themselves to other people in order to obtain an accurate assessment of their own opinions, abilities, and internal states.

- Can do so especially if there are no objective standard.
 - Like you don't need a standard to be "honest" but can use one; however, you need a standard to be "smart" (smarter than whom?)

2 types of comparison:

- Downward social comparison- super common
- Upward social comparison

□

(1) Downward Comparison

People don't compare themselves with pros or novices but with people similar to themselves.

- But usually you compare yourself to someone slightly worse, so you can feel better about yourself.

□

□ Downward comparisons make you feel better and boost your self-esteem.

□

□ **CASE STUDY:** Breast cancer

- Premise: Breast cancer patients compare themselves with other patients.
- Conclusion: Gain emotional benefits from any comparison
 - Downward comparison: "I'm better than her."
 - Upward comparison: "She seems in good spirit, I'll ask her over lunch how she does it."

□

(2) Upward Comparison

□ You compare yourself with someone better when you want to be better than them or you want to improve a certain skill.

□

□ **CASE STUDY:** Students comparing themselves with people better

- Participants: Group of 9th graders
- Conclusion: Compare their grades with better students probably in the hope of one day get better grade than that person

□

□

□ Given that different ability domains (intelligence vs. athleticism) and different motives (feeling good about yourself vs. self-improvement), it could be hard to always find a person to compare yourself to.

- That's why most people compare themselves to people close to them.
- Through repetitively comparing yourself to the same person, it becomes an automatic process.

CASE STUDY: Evaluating a celebrity vs. yourself on a series of attributes

- *Premise: Ask participants to either evaluate a celebrity on some attribute or themselves. Then asked to identify if letter strings were words or not, one of these letter strings was their best friend name that they had identified earlier.*
- *IV: Evaluating a celebrity or not*
- *DV: Time it takes to identify their best friend's name as a word*
- *Conclusion: Those who had evaluate themselves recognize their bff's name faster which subjects that when evaluating oneself, you think of your comparison target (bff).*

□

?

□

6- Narratives about the Social Self

□

□

We understand ourselves by constructing stories about our lives.

□

□

We all have self-narratives.

- *Story about our social selves as we live our lives.*
- *Tell them to people surrounding us (parents, friends).*
 - *Tell them to integrate our many goals (so to share our goals in life), to make sense of conflict (to understand a conflict that happened) and to try to explain how we change over time.*

□

□

More vivid and engaging self-narratives enable people to feel happy and fulfilled as they age.

□

Basically you know who you are to telling the story of your life.

?

CASE STUDY: *Self-narratives change from one culture to another*

- *Premise: Ask Canadian and Asian students to tell a story of an embarrassing moment in their lives.*
- *IV: Canadian (white) or Asian*
- *DV: How they tell their story.*

- *Conclusion: Canadians tell the story from their point of view, so experience and recall events from inside out. Asians tell the story from a third person view. Experience and recall events from outside in, from social world looking back at themselves as the object of attention.*

?

- *How does one do that? I'm not sure I understand Eastern students.*

□

□ **Looking back:** *The social self originates from a variety of sources. Parents and other socializing agents- by virtue of what they teach us, what they encourage in us, how they react to us- help define who we are. The current situation matters as well: the social self shifts from one context to another. A person's culture of origin shapes the social self in profound ways: people from Western cultures –especially men in these cultures- define the self in independent terms, emphasizing uniqueness and autonomy; people from East Asian cultures, and women in many cultures, define the self in interdependent terms, emphasizing connection to others. Finally, the social self is shaped by comparing ourselves to others and constructing stories about our lives.*

□

□ **Organization of Self-Knowledge**

□

□ **CASE STUDY:** *Short memory only dude who created identities for people*

- *Story of the man who was in a hospital and thought his doctor was a customer, then his friend (when the doctor corrected him), then the butcher next door (when the doctor corrected him again and he saw the white lab coat).*
- *Construct identities for the doctor that seem to have plausibility at the moment but that is loosely connected to memories that he have of other people.*

Social self depends on our ability to remember who we and other people are. The knowledge that make our social self is stored in our memory and is capable of being retrieved and influence our thoughts, feelings and behaviours.

- *Self-knowledge is thought to be organized around self-schemas.*

□ **Self-schemas:** *Cognitive structures, derived from past experience, that represent a person's beliefs and feelings about the self in particular domains.*

- *Past experience at the movies tell me that I am a silent viewer, that gives me a self-schema of myself as a calm moviegoer.*
- *Your view of yourself in a domain in accordance with past experiences.*
 - *Domain: characteristics, qualities*
 - *Ex.: Family support, academic success, competition, social approval, virtue, patience, kindness, etc.*

?

▪ *Can domains be flaws? And if yes, why are you basing your self-worth on that, or are you not basing your self-worth on every domain that characterize your self.*

□

□ *When you see yourself very high in one domain (ex.: patience) your self-schema contains more memories of you excelling in that domain and contain a more elaborate definition of does it mean to be high or low in that domain.*

- *You can not have a self-schema in a domain- if you think you lack of it.*

□

Thanks to self-schemas we can organise information that we are bombarded with everyday.

- *Our social knowledge (attitudes, stereotypes, expectations) organises the way we understand and interpret the world.*

CASE STUDY: *Schematic vs. Aschematic on Independence or Dependence*

- *Premise:*
 - *Ask people to rate themselves on their dependent-independent dimension (Differentiate between independent/dependent (schematic) and people who don't identify as either (aschematic)).*

- (1) Then are asked to come back 3-4 weeks later and do a trait test on a computer where they classify a trait as true or not true for them.
- (3) Make inference about their future independence-related or dependence-related behaviours
- Hypothesis: Schematic people should...
 - (1) Process information in that domain more quickly
 - (2) Retrieve evidence consisting with that schema more quickly
 - (3) Readily make predictions about their likelihood of engaging in schema-related behaviours.
 - (4) Interpret information that contradicts the schema in a biased, negative fashion
- IV: Schematic vs. Aschematic/ Positive vs. Negative feedback
- DV:
 - (1) How fast they can classify traits related to their self-schema.
 - (2) What kind of behaviour they generated (related to their self-schema or not)
 - (3) Can they make predictions about their behaviour concerning that statement
 - (4) How schematics react to feedback that go against their self-schema from the computer
- Conclusion: Hypothesis was true. People are more attuned to information that maps on a self-schema so they can classify these traits faster. Also they showed behaviour related to these self-schemas which suggested that past experiences that support their self-schema were in their memories and came readily in mind (memories prove that their self-schema is true and these memories are very accessible.) They challenge information that goes against their self-schema, so self-schemas influence our interpretation of incoming information.

□

□ **Self-Reference Effect:** The tendency for information that is related to the self to be more thoroughly processed and integrated with existing self-knowledge, thereby making it more memorable.

- *Self-schema helps us remember new information because we tend to remember information related to us (in reference to us) easier.*

CASE STUDY: *Self-reference with adjectives traits*

- *Premise: Participants are presented with 40 traits adjectives and they have to answer things about each set of 10 adjectives. After few filler tasks, they were asked to recall the 40 adjectives.*
 - *For the first 10= Answered structural questions (like if the font is big or not)*
 - *Following 10= Answered phonemic questions (if one adj. rhyme with the another adj.)*
 - *Following 10= Answered semantic questions (if each adj. is synonym or antonym of another adj.)*
 - *Last 10= Answered personal questions (whether the adj. described them or not.*
- *IV: Set of adjectives.*
- *DV: Which one they can remember.*
- *Conclusion: Information that was processed with reference to the self was better memorized.*
 - *If you personalized how you learn new things (how it is related to you) than you are more likely to think about and remember that information.*

□

□ *People have many self-schemas but some people seem to have fewer than others, like those who are so obsessed with one aspect of their life and define themselves through that aspect.*

- *Like people obsessed with becoming a doctor define themselves by this goal and their self-schemas are related to that.*

□

□ *Self-Complexity Theory*

□ *That affects our life because (according to Patricia Linville) the number of self-defining domains a person has (kind, patient, athletic, etc.) as well as the degree of overlap between different domains (kind and patient seem to overlap) matters.*

- **Self-complexity:** *The tendency to define the self in terms of multiple domains that are relatively distinct from one another in content.*

□

□ *When you are high in self-complexity, you define yourself through multiple, distinct domains.*

- *When you are low in self-complexity, you define yourself through fewer domains and they tend to overlap.*
 - *Like if you think of your meticulousness self-schema and your student schema and you think that you procrastinate a lot, it will be stored in both schema (cause you cannot be meticulous and procrastinate and procrastination is a big part in student life), so all these schemas overlap.*

□

□ *It is better to be high in self-complexity, because when you are low you are very sensible to feedback on your domains.*

- *Like if your schemas all relate to your dream of becoming a doctor and you don't enter med school, then it will affect your self-esteem more than for a student that don't define themselves solely in terms of doctor-related schemas.*

Looking back: *Self-knowledge is stored in memory in an organized fashion. Self-schemas, the most basic organizational units, are cognitive structures that affect how we process and remember information, as well as how we make judgements about ourselves and the social world. Self-complexity is defined by the number and degree of overlap among a person's self-schemas. High self-complexity, which refers to having a relatively large number of non-overlapping self-schemas, can serve a buffering function when people face a threat to one domain of the self.*

□

Self-Esteem

□

Self-Esteem: *The positive or negative overall evaluation that each person has of himself or herself.*

People with low self-esteem are less satisfied with life, more hopeless, and more depressed, and they are less able to cope with life's challenges, such as the social and academic demands of college. They tend to disengage from tasks following failure and they are more prone to antisocial behaviour and delinquency.

- Basically when you have lower self-esteem you are more disengage in life and react to failure harshly. Also more likely to be delinquent or have antisocial behaviour.

□

2 types of self-esteem:

- Trait
- State

□

□

Trait Self-Esteem: Person's enduring level of self-regard across time.

- How you feel about yourself in general.
- Pretty stable
 - If at one point in life you report high trait self-esteem, later in life you will likely report high trait self-esteem again. Same thing for the low trait self-esteem.

State Self-Esteem: Refers to someone's dynamic, changeable self-evaluations that are experienced as momentary feelings about the self.

- Rise and fall according to your mood and specific construal processes that arise in different situation.
 - When you are happy, you shift your self-esteem up and when you experience a drawback, you shift your self-esteem down (and it is worst for people with low self-esteem from the start).
 - When you are doing better than others (you are the best in your class with 85%) your self-esteem go up comparing to when you are in a classroom with nerds (where your 85% seems average).

Self-esteem also shifts throughout our development.

- Men = from early adolescence (14) to early adulthood (23), self-esteem tends to rise.

- *Opposite for women.*

So your self-esteem is composed of trait self-esteem (perception of yourself that never changes) and state self-esteem (perception of yourself that changes depending of your mood and the situation).

Contingencies of Self-Worth

Contingencies of Self-Worth: *An account of self-esteem that maintains that self-esteem is contingent on (depends on) successes and failures in domains on which a person has based his or her self-worth.*

- *So your self-esteem depends on whether you are succeeding or failing in domains that define your self-worth.*
- *Proposed by Jennifer Crocker who did the study too.*

You can measure contingencies with statements like "I feel better when I receive a good grade" (Domain: Academic success), "I cannot respect myself if others don't respect me" (Domain: Social approval).

The domains that are important vary from one person to another, on subculture to another, one culture to another.

- *For African-American, religious values are more important than for European-Americans or Asian-Americans.*

CASE STUDY: *Potential graduate student's self-esteem after letter from grad school accepting or rejecting them*

- *Premise: University of Michigan students applying to graduate school are asked to fill a questionnaire online measuring their self-esteem whenever they receive a letter no matter if they are accepted or rejected.*
- *IV: Accepted or Rejected from Grad School*
- *DV: Level of self-esteem*
- *Conclusion: One the days they were accepted, these students had higher self-esteem than on the day they were rejected.*
 - *Students that put a lot of their self-worth on the domain of academic competence were more affected by rejection letters.*

□

□

Results seem to suggest two things:

- *1. It is better to cultivate high self-esteem by placing your contingencies of self-worth in domains that you excel in.*
- *2. (Self-complexity theory) It is better to base your sense of self-worth on performance in many domains.*
 - *So failure does not affect your self-esteem that much.*

□

□

To Crocker and Park (Crocker did the study with the graduate and came with the self-contingencies of self-worth account of self-esteem), it is costly to pursue self-esteem in any domain. If having a high self-esteem is your goal in life, then... (4)

- *You lose the feeling of autonomy since you are controlled by your self-esteem needs.*
 - *Always think of doing things for better self-esteem, so you are a slave to these needs.*
- *You are less receptive to feedback.*
 - *Don't want to hear bad things because it will reduce your self-esteem so you just don't listen (and accept) feedback.*
- *You threaten your relationships.*
 - *More interested in your self-esteem needs than your partner's needs.*
- *You heighten your anxiety and stress.*
 - *You put so much importance on self-esteem, so you really don't want to fail.*

□

□

Solution: Don't put that much importance on self-esteem goals, accord also importance to goals that include other things than yourself (like others or contributing to yourself).

- *So like think of your significant other and volunteer, try to do something instead of just obsessing over feeling good about yourself.*

□

□

□ Social Acceptance and Self-Esteem

□ **Sociometer Hypothesis:** *a hypothesis that maintains that self-esteem is an internal, subjective index or marker of the extent to which a person is included or looked on favourably by others.*

- *Your self-esteem depends on whether you feel accepted/included by others.*
 - *So 100% based on social approval.*

□

□ *Things that make us feel better about ourselves (that improve our self-esteem) are the things that make others acceptant of us.*

- *Like virtue, appearance, kindness that make us feel good about ourselves are things that make others accept us.*
- *Anger does not make us feel about ourselves, and it doesn't make other include/accept us.*

□

□ *So high self-esteem means that we are accepted a lot, that we are thriving in our relationships.*

- *Then low self-esteem is not something that we have to avoid at all cost, it tells you when you have to concentrate on one relationship and try to strengthen it.*

□

□ **CASE STUDY:** *Describe themselves and were in a group (included) or not (rejected).*

- *Premise: Deception study.*
 - *Ask people to describe themselves and what kind of people they want to work with.*
 - *Give the essays to another group (in another location) and are asked to choose with whom they want to work.*
 - *Researchers actually randomly assigned people in groups*
 - *Some were led to believe that they had been chosen.*
 - *Others were left alone and were led to believe that no one had chosen them.*
- *IV: In group or not*
- *DV: Their self-esteem*
- *Conclusion: People who felt that no one had chosen them (so those who were rejected) had lowered self-esteem*

□

□ So our momentary feelings of self-worth depends on the extent to which others approve us and include us.



- **How other actually accept and include us or how we feel other accept and include us?**

□ Culture and Self-Esteem

□ Self-Esteem differs across cultures, East Asian languages (except Japanese that has a Japanese version of the English words) do not have a word that express the idea of self-esteem (value of the individual).

- So self-esteem as in feeling good about oneself is a Western idea.

□

□ Independent cultures have people with higher self-esteem than interdependent cultures.

- Westerners care more about evaluating the self.
- Asians and non-Westerners have other ways of feeling good about themselves through self-improvement and commitment to collective goals.
 - Westerner want to feel good about themselves, Others want to self-improve and contribute to the collective.
- But as interdependent culture gains exposure to the West, that notion of self-esteem rubs on them and their self-esteem rises.

Why the differences between cultures in self-esteem?

- *Situationism*: Western cultures create situations that enhance self-esteem, while in everyday life of Japanese (for example) experience situations that do not encourage high self-esteem.
 - Ex.: Japanese math teachers and sushi chefs are put in situation where they criticize their peers.
 - Not really good for self-esteem but good for self-improvement.
 - Ex.: Americans are more praised for their achievements than Japanese.
 - Lead to higher self-esteem.

□

□ The cultural differences (promoting self-esteem vs. promoting self-improvement) creates a difference between the reaction to failure.

- **CASE STUDY:** Canadians vs. Japanese react to fake failure
 - Premise: Canadians and Japanese students were asked to do a creativity test and then received false feedback about their work.
 - For some they were told they performed well, for others they were told they failed.
 - Then they were asked to do a similar second task.
 - IV: Cultural Background (Can vs. Japan) / Success or Failure
 - DV: How long they work on the second task
 - Conclusion: Canadians worked longer in the second task if they had succeeded (bask in their glory since they are sure they are going to succeed again) while Japanese worked longer if they had failed (take feedback and want to improve).
 - Canadians don't like to be reminded of failure while Japanese use the occasion to improve.

□

□ High Self-Esteem: Good or Bad?

□

□ High self-esteem people:

- PRO
 - React to negative feedback better than low self-esteem people
 - High self-esteem in adolescence can lead to positive outcomes later in life (like graduating from college, getting a job as opposed to low self-esteem people that can lead to poorer mental and physical health, criminal behaviour and worse economic prospect)
 - Proved through a longitudinal study of 11 years.
- CON
 - Negative feedback leads them to define themselves in more independent ways (emphasize their unique traits, goals and accomplishments) which is detrimental to interpersonal relationships
 - **How does one lead to the other? Slippery slope?**

?

?

- After they received negative feedback (and rethink of themselves in independent ways), they were perceived as more arrogant by new acquaintances that had briefly interact with them compare to low self-esteem people.
 - I guess when they fail, they comfort themselves by thinking of how they excel in other domains and appear to be arrogant.
- Some positive outcomes of high self-esteem might actual be the cause of high self-esteem
 - So instead of HSE leading to doing well in school (since you're confident in your abilities), it might be that doing well in school leads you to having HSE.
- Baumeister: High self-esteem can lead to narcissism.
 - Controversial position.

□ Problem: These pro/cons compare people with HSE to LSE while there are many kind of HSE and LSE.

□

□ People with narcissism (inflated egotism):

- PRO
 - NONE (well they feel good about themselves)
- CON
 - More sensible to insults or threats.
 - React violently to threat to their self-esteem, use violence to reassert their superiority and dominance over those who challenge them.
 - Like a psycho might kill you if you assert that you are better than them at anything!!!!
 - Psychopaths have inflated views of their self-worth.

□

□ Baumeister: The cult of HSE is bad because...

- Alcohol increase people's self-esteem along with likelihood to violence
- Members of youth gangs who have HSE tend to be more violent to assert their dominance when they feel disrespect or threatened.

- *Westerners' cult of HSE lead to sense of superiority and dominance AND sensible ego, which led to*
 - *Genocide*
 - *Slavery*
 - *Terrorism*

So promoting certain form of high self-esteem (inflated egos) lead to serious risks.

Looking back: *Self-esteem represents people's overall evaluation of their traits, abilities, successes and failures. Trait self-esteem is fairly stable , whereas state self-esteem fluctuates across different situations. People have different contingencies of self-worth: some people are more invested in intellectual ability, others in religious orientations, still others in sociability. According to sociometer theory, self-esteem is a gauge of a person's level of acceptance or rejection by others. People of non-Western cultures are less concerned with feeling positively about their attributes than are modern Westerners, and non-Westerners are more likely to seek out opportunities for self-improvement. Although high self-esteem may be largely beneficial, some types of elevated self-regard are associated with troublesome behaviour tendencies.*

□ **Motives Driving Self-Evaluation**

□ Self-Enhancement

Self-Enhancement: *People's desire to maintain, increase, or protect their self-esteem or self-views.*

1.USING SELF-SERVING CONSTRUALS

People (particularly Westerners) tend to think positively of themselves and have a high self-esteem. When asked to compare themselves to others in general on various traits and characteristics, people tend to think they are better than the average.

- **Better-than-Average Effect:** *The finding that most people think they are above average on various trait and ability dimensions.*

- *Ex.: Even drivers that are hospitalized for being in a car accident characterize their driving skills closer to "expert" than "poor".*

To pursue self-enhancement, people use self-serving construals.

- *They interpret the trait or ability in a way that make them better than average. So they end-up being better than the average.*
 - *Ex.: If you ask people to characterize their driving, careful drivers will give more importance to carefulness in driving, while skilful drivers will give more weight to their skills.*

□

□ *When traits are ambiguous (athletic, artistic, sympathetic...), the better-than-average effect is observed; while for unambiguous traits (tall, muscular, strong...) the better-than-average effect is less observed.*

- *And if you give instructions about how ambiguous traits should be interpreted (athletic means you can run a marathon in a certain time) then the better-than-average effect decreases dramatically.*

□

□ *Also, when comparing themselves to others, people tend to think of themselves at their best and others at their worst, so obviously they're better than average.*

□

□ **2. USING COMPARISON OR REFLECTION**

□ *People compare downward as a mean to self-enhancement.*

□

□ *What happens when the only comparison target is superior to us? Can we use self-enhancement? YES!*

- **Self-Evaluation Maintenance (SEM) Model:** *A model that maintains that people are motivated to view themselves in a favourable light and that they do so through two processes: reflection and social comparison.*

□

□ *Reflection is used in areas that are not really relevant to our self-definition and we self-enhance by associating ourselves with other's accomplishment.*

- *If you don't care about one area to define yourself, then you don't care about being bad at it, you just associate yourself with someone better.*
 - *Like I suck at hockey and I don't care about hockey abilities to define myself, so I associate myself with a great hockey team when I think of hockey abilities so their successes become mine.*
- *The closer you are to the person, the better is the glory.*
 - *If your friend score the winning goal, you feel better about yourself than if it your favourite hockey player.*

□

□

Comparison is used when the domain is relevant to our self-definition.

- *You can compare downward when you are superior than the others you are comparing to.*
- *When you compare upward with someone close, to have self-enhancement you either...*
 - *Reflect in your friend's glory if their superiority is meaningless (like winning in a friendly game)*
 - *If the superiority mean something (like that one is better at the skill than the other), you can...*
 - *Sabotage the other's performance or nicely put, you close the gap between you and the other.*
 - *Reduce the closeness to the person that outsmart you, so it hurts less.*
 - *Decrease the relevance of the domain.*
 - *Then you can use reflection as a mean of self-enhancement and reduce the sting when they beat you.*

□

□

CASE STUDY: *Upward comparison stranger vs. friends*

- *By Tesser and Smith, Tesser came up with the SEM model*

- *Premise: 1 pair of friend vs. 1 pair of strangers (that are friends with each others) sit in 4 individual boots. They have to guess a word based on 3 clues provided by the others (one clue each). Each person has a card with the possible clues categorized by level of difficulty. Once the person chose their clue, they let the experimenter know it somehow and the experimenter tells the clues. So the person receiving the clue doesn't know which clue their friend chose.*
 - *2 groups: One in which the game is playful and the other in which the game is said to measure their verbal skills*
- *Hypothesis: When the game is playful, you give your friend easy clues so you can bask in their glory (reflection), when the game is highly relevant, you give your friends hard clues because you don't want to appear inferior to them.*
- *IV: Low-relevance or High-relevance situation*
- *DV: Difficulty of the clue given*
- *Conclusion: Hypothesis was right, gave clues as hard to their friends as to strangers when the situation was said to be relevant.*

□

□

3.PRO and CONS of self-enhancement

Self-enhancement (basically illusions about ourselves), yes or no?

- *YES*
 - *Shelley Taylor and Jonathan Brown (controversial): These illusions are beneficial to the well-being.*
 - *Studies have showed that people who are well adjusted (HSE and happy) are more prone to illusions about themselves (self-enhancement) compared to LSE and unhappy people*
 - *When face with laboratory-held stress-inducing tasks, high self-enhancers have a healthier set of coping response than low self-enhancers.*
 - *Lower baseline levels of cortisol (hormone associated with a stress response)*
 - *Less automatic arousals during stressful tasks.*

- *Students who entered college with self-enhancing beliefs about their academic abilities had higher average and better well-being.*
- **NO**
 - *Humanistic movement of Abraham Maslow and Carl Rogers: Accept your weakness and flaws. Don't try to illusion yourself.*
 - *Other researchers say that accurate self-beliefs lead to well-being and other positive outcomes.*
People who self-enhance are perceived as being more narcissistic by others compared with others who hold relatively realistic views of themselves who are judged more positively.

□

□ *Self-enhancement across cultures show that positive illusions do not always enhance well-being.*

- **Western Cultures**
 - *Self-enhancement leads to well-being because positive view of the self is a cherished cultural value.*
- **East Asian Cultures**
 - *Less likely to have positive illusions about the self than Westerners because well-being is more closely tied to interdependent values.*
 - *Japanese are less likely to think of themselves as academically better than the average.*
 - *Well-being is more dependent on fulfilling their social roles and expectations.*
 - *So well-being is not about me being seen as superior but about me helping others through fulfilling a role and meet expectations.*

□

□ *So self-enhancing is good in short term, but its benefits erode over time. It's good to have positive illusions about yourself, but don't go too far.*

□

□ *Self-Verification*

□

□ *Self-enhancement is not our only self-evaluative motive. We also use the truth (well our version of the truth) to evaluate ourselves.*

□

□ **Self-Verification Theory:** *A theory that holds that people strive for stable, subjectively accurate beliefs about the self because such beliefs give them a sense of coherence and predictability to ourselves and others, which helps interactions with others go more smoothly?*

?

• *How does self-verification give us predictability to ourselves and others and help interactions with others go more smoothly?*

- *We use others to confirm or infirm views that we held about ourselves.*
 - *Subjective truth.*
 - *Use even for negative views.*

□

□ *1. To use self-verification, you can recall information that matches with your self-view and you can hang out with people that validate this view.*

- *So to make sure you are introvert, you think of all the times you acted like one.*
 - *Subjective because you only think of those time and you are the one thinking you are introvert, maybe others don't see it like that.*

□

□ *2. Another method of self-verification is to create self-confirmatory social environments through your behaviour.*

- *You wear things, have a certain posture, have a certain haircut that signal to others facets of your personality and lead others to believe you are someway.*
 - *So their impression of you will validate your self-view.*
 - *Ex.: You wear blue spiked hair to lead people to believe that you are punk. People see this hairstyle as you saying you are punk. You create a social environment where it is only possible to verify/validate your self-view.*

□

□ *3. Another method of self-verification is to enter in relationships with people that see yourself like you want to be seen.*

- *Even if you have negative views of yourself.*
- *In a study, it was shown that partners who see each other like the other one wanted them to see them (so partners that validate your self-view) are more committed to the relationship even if the views are negative.*

□

□ *For the process of self-evaluation: both self-enhancement and self-verification is useful.*

- *Self-enhancement is more relevant to our emotional responses to feedback about the self (your illusions are a response to feedbacks) while self-verification check the validity of these feedbacks.*

□

□ **CASE STUDY:** *Positive/Negative Feedback effects of Self-Evaluation*

- *Premise: Gave participants with positive/negative self-views positive/negative feedback, then the participant had to evaluate the accuracy and the competence (the quality) of the feedback.*
- *Conclusion: Self-verification prevailed, people with positive self-views considered positive feedback more accurate and diagnostic and the opposite for people with negative views. But everyone felt good about positive feedbacks and bad about negative ones.*
 - *So our quest to verify our sense of ourselves (self-verification) guides us on rating the validity of self-relevant information while our quest to think favourably about ourselves (self-enhancement) guides our emotional reaction (prefer when we receive positive feedback).*

□

□ **Looking Back:** *Self-evaluative activities such as seeking out evaluative feedback about the self can be driven by different motives, such as self-enhancement and self-verification. Self-enhancement strategies include self-serving construals and shifting back and forth between reflection and comparison processes depending on the self-relevance of the domain. When self-verification is our priority, we seek out appraisals and relationship partners that confirm our pre-existing self-views, and we display cues that increase the likelihood that others will see us as we see ourselves.*

□

□ **Self-Regulation: Motivating and Controlling the Self**

□

Self-Regulation: Processes that people use to initiate, alter, and control their behaviour in the pursuit of goals, including the ability to resist short-term awards that thwart (stop) the attainment of long-term goals.

- Ex.: Goal is doing well in school, you cut on watching TV (behaviour) even if it makes you feel happy (awards) just so you can study and have good grades.
- So self-regulation is people's capacity to delay gratification.

□ Possible Selves

One way to self-regulate comes in the notion of possible selves.

- **Possible Selves:** Hypothetical selves that a person aspires to be in the future.

□

□ They serve as standards that can motivate us right now.

- See yourself as a future doctor, so right now you study and regulate so you get where you want to be.

People who have rich ideas about possible selves are more optimistic and energetic and have less chances to get depression.

- You're heading towards something.

□

□ Possible selves must be attainable to serve as motivation.

- Ex.: Poor students that want to become college-educated that see their path full of obstacles, then their possible selves won't really be motivational since it seems unattainable.

□ Self-Discrepancy Theory

□ Another way to get motivation and guide productive actions is

- **Self-Discrepancy Theory:** A theory that behaviour is motivated by standards reflecting ideal (who we would like to be) and ought (who we should be). Falling short of these standards produces specific emotions- dejection-related emotions for actual-ideal discrepancies, and agitation-related emotions for actual-ought discrepancies.
 - We get sad when we don't act like the person we would like to be, and we get agitated when we don't act like the person we should be.

People hold on to ideas of what they are like (actual self) along with what they would ideally like to be (ideal self) and who they ought to be (ought self).

- **Actual Self:** The self that people believe they are.
- **Ideal Self:** The self that embodies people's wishes and aspirations as held by themselves and by other people for them.
- **Ought Self:** The self that is concerned with the duties, obligations, and external demands people feel they are compelled to honour.

Ideal and ought self serves as self-guides, pushing people to reduce the discrepancy/difference between their actual selves and these selves.

- When people feel like they are failing and that there's a huge gap between these self-guides and their actual selves, there are predictable emotional consequences.
 - We get sad when there's a gap between the person we are and the person we would like to be, and we get agitated when we don't act like the person we should be.
 - Ex.: When our ideal self is a rock star and we are told we cannot sing (actual self), we feel dejection-related feelings such as shame and sadness.
 - When we scream on someone for a small mistake (actual self) instead of being patient (ought self), we get agitation-related feelings such as guilt and anxiety.

□

□ When people regulate their behaviour in order to be like their ideal self, they have a promotion focus.

- **Promotion Focus:** *Regulating behaviour with respect to ideal self standards, entailing a focus on attaining positive outcomes and approach-related behaviours.*
 - *You do things to achieve your ideal self.*

□ *When people regulate their behaviour in order to be like their ought self, they tend to have a prevention focus.*

- **Prevention Focus:** *Regulating behaviour with respect to ought standards, entailing a focus on avoiding negative outcomes and avoidance-related behaviours.*
 - *You don't do things so you can achieve your ought self.*

□

□ Ego Depletion

□

To live up to our ideal and ought selves, we have to exercise a lot of self-regulation and it can be tired. Can lead to ego depletion.

- **Ego Depletion:** *A state, produced by acts of self-control, in which people lack the energy or resources to engage in further acts of self-control.*
 - *Based on the idea that self-control draws on a limited resource.*
 - *When we exercise self-control, then there's less resource left to exercise further act of self-control.*

□

□ **CASE STUDY:** *Self-control watching an evocative movie and then squeeze hand grip for a period of time*

- *Premise: Two groups, one is asked to rein in (slow down/bring down) their emotions while watching an evocative film clip, the other is the control group. Then they go and squeeze a hand grip for as long as they can.*
- *Conclusion: Experimental group used its self-control on the evocative film, so had less resource left and squeeze for less time.*

CASE STUDY: *Eating radishes vs. cookies and the do a puzzle*

- *Premise: One group had to exercise self-control while eating radishes instead of the cookies next to them, and the other group could eat cookies. Then did a puzzle.*
- *Conclusion: Experimental group gave up first.*

Solution to ego depletion:

- *Receiving money or other things can motivate you for the second activity.*
- *Being in a good mood. Positive emotions energize you.*
- *Glucose*
 - *Think that when we exert self-control, the blood glucose level drops.*

□ **CASE STUDY:** *Glucose to cure ego depletion*

- *Premise: 2 groups of participants participate in a self-control task, then drink Kool-Aid (one group with sugar so glucose, the other one with splenda). Then they participate in another self-control task.*
- *IV: Glucose or not*
- *DV: Ego depletion effect*
- *Conclusion: Participants who didn't have glucose show the standard ego depletion, while participants who had glucose did not.*

Exerting self—control might be ego depleting, but most situations do not wipe our resources of self-control.

- *Ego depletion can be override with external (receiving money or other) and internal (mood, glucose) inducement.*

□ Automatic Self-Control Strategies

Although self-control strategies can be conscious, others can be automatic.

- *Example: You might start to associate temptation with your long term goal which motivates you to resist temptation.*

- *Like whenever you see a cookie (temptation) instead of thinking of immediate gratification, your mind automatically think of your diet (long term goal) and you don't feel like eating the cookie.*

Also thinking of the goals in themselves can reduce the thoughts of temptation.

- *So being faced with temptations remind us of our goal, and thinking of our goal pushes temptations out of our mind.*
 - *Only work with people that see the goal in itself as being of high importance.*
 - *And with people that had success resisting goal-interfering temptations.*
 - *So people who have been able to resist temptations that come in their goal's way.*

□

□ **CASE STUDY:** *How automatic self-control strategies affect behaviour as well as thoughts.*

- *Premise: People had to push/pull lever while they were faced with temptation-related or goals-related words.*
- *IV: Pull/push, Temptation-related/Goals-related words*
- *DV: How fast they push/pull in response to these words*
- *Conclusion: Pull (bring closer to the self) faster when words were goals-related and pushed faster when it was temptation-related.*
 - *Mainly for people who had successfully regulated themselves in the past.*
 - *Worked mostly when the temptations were really attractive.*
 - *Which is what you need, your mind to automatically reject highly attractive temptations.*

Looking Back: *Self-regulation refers to how people go about initiating, changing, and controlling their behaviour in the pursuit of goals. Goal-directed actions can be motivated by standards in the form of possible selves, such as ideal and ought selves. Such actions can be either promotion- or prevention-focused. People tend to experience dejection-related emotions when they fall short of their ideal standards, and agitation-related feelings when they fail to meet their ought standards. Acts of self-regulation can be depleting, such that an initial act of self-control diminishes self-control ability on a subsequent task requiring self-control. Ego depletion effects can be counteracted by external and internal factors, including the ingestion of glucose. People may also have unintentional self-control strategies, such as automatic behavioural tendencies to approach goals and avoid temptations.*

▮ **Self-Presentation**

Our social self is often a dramatic performance in which we try to project a public self. The public self is created through our social interactions and is shaped by other's perceptions of us.

- Concerned with **Self-Presentation:** *Presenting the person that we would like others to believe we are.*
 - *Can also be referred to as **impression management:** attempt to control the impressions other people form on us.*

Linguistic acts (like "Oops") help us re-establish social order when we have violated the rules of self-presentation and show how committed we are to the public self.

▮

▮ *Goffman: (The dude that said the linguistic thing too) Have a dramaturgic approach on the social self: social interaction can be thought of as a drama of self-presentation, in which we attempt to create and maintain an impression of ourselves in the mind of others.*

- *Our lives is a play where the role we play is our self-presentation. It's how you want people to see/perceive you.*
- *Important aspect of this drama is the face: the public image of ourselves we want others to believe.*

?

• **What is the difference between face and self-presentation?**

We depend on others to honour our desired social identities and they depend on us to do the same.

- We need others believe in our face/self-presentation.

□

□ Goffman's insight on self-presentation led to the notion of self-monitoring:

- **Self-monitoring:** The tendency for people to monitor their behaviour in such a way that it fits situational demands (the current situation).

□

□ People with high self-monitoring analyze the present situation and change their behaviour to fit with their self-presentation.

- Like you want to be seen as a helpful person, in a situation where you are walking on the street you see an old lady coming and she's having troubles, you might want to help her to keep your image.

?

- **Does self-monitoring suggest that we don't want to actually do that, we just do it to maintain an image? Then what happens in the case where we actually want to do what we are doing? Is this a conscious process?**

- Like people who are faking an identity.

□

□ Low self-monitors act in accordance of their internal inclinations, impulses and dispositions no matter the context.

So high self-monitors are like actors changing their behaviour depending on the situation, while low self-monitors act in accordance with their traits and preferences, they are more candid and honest.

- People in psychiatric hospital score low in self-monitoring suggesting that effective social functioning requires that we participate in some strategic self-presentation.
 - If you want to function well in society, you need to participate in some strategic self-presentation so you seem ok.

□

□ Protecting Your Own Face: Self-Handicapping

You keep your self-representation intact (so you live up to your self-presentation) by engaging in self-protective behaviours.

- *One of them being **self-handicapping**: People's tendency to engage in self-defeating behaviour in order to have a ready excuse should they perform poorly or fail.*

□

So people cannot criticise our bad performances. It provides an explanation for possible failure, so it does not affect your self-presentation.

- *Ex.: Students don't really study so when they fail they can blame it on that and not them not understanding the subject or being bad at it.*
- *Athletes can drink a lot the night before the big game so they can blame their loss on that and not their poor athletic abilities.*

□

□

Some people invent self-handicap so they cannot be criticised.

- *So people will say "I haven't studied for that exam." When they have so if they fail they can blame the failure on lack of studying and not their own fault.*
 - *Called "sneaky bookers" in Dartmouth College*
 - *Are we elementary school students? What the fuck is that term.*

CASE STUDY: *Test on self-handicap*

- *Premise: Male students that were about to take a test were led to believe they would succeed/fail it. Then were offered two pills: one that enhance their performance and another that impair it.*
- *IV: Believe they will succeed/fail the test*
- *DV: Choice of pill*
- *Conclusion: People who were led to believe they were going to fail took the impairing pill.*
 - *Would rather have a reason for failure, then try to succeed and fail.*

□

□

Protecting Other's Face: On-Record vs. Off-Record Communications

To preserve your self-presentation, you might resort to "white lies."

- Like you want to present yourself as a great supportive friend and your friend show you her music. You don't think it's good but you don't say it cause you don't want to contradict your self-presentation as a good friend.
- Honest, direct statements (especially critiques) threaten the public self that the individual (the friend) is trying to project and it makes the honest speaker (you) come across as impolite and rude.
 - You are going against your friend's self-presentation.

□

□ For these reasons, linguists Penelope Brown and Steven Levinson propose that there are two level of communication.

- On-record communication
 - Statements that people make that are intended to be understood literally.
 - Honest communication: direct, relevant, straightforward and sincere.
 - What your friend doesn't want to hear
- Off-record communication
 - Used when you don't want to threaten yours or someone else's self-presentation
 - Indirect and ambiguous
 - You can hint at ideas that are not implicit
 - So it hurts less.
 - Suggest alternative interpretations of what is being said.
 - With the friend's example:
 - Exaggeration "You're the next Beyoncé."
 - Vagueness "Some lyrics are very interesting."
 - Jokey "You would be a big star in Estonia."

□

□ So because of self-representation, we cannot allow ourselves to be 100% honest. We cannot have sincere communication.

Looking Back: *Self-presentation involves people's efforts to get others to form particular desired impressions of them. Self-presentational efforts are more characteristic of high-monitors, people who change their behaviour based on the situation in which they find themselves. Low self-monitors attend more to their own preferences and dispositions, with little regard for the situation or what others think. People may self-handicap, or engage in self-defeating behaviours to "save face"- in other words, to have excuses available should they fail. Finally, people may engage in off-record communication, merely hinting at disagreement or disapproval, to save other people's face.*

2014-09-19

□ Chapter talks about **social-cognition** (study of how people think about the social world and arrive at judgements that help them interpret the past, understand the present and predict the future) and sources of error of judgement about the social world.

□

□ Aspects of social judgement

- 1. Judgement is only effective based on the quality of the information we get to make the judgement.
 - Information we get in everyday life is not always accurate or complete.
- 2. The way the information is presented influences our judgements.
 - The way includes the order in which they are presented or how it is presented/framed
- 3. Since we seek out information (they don't just come to us), we can have a bias in our search of information and that will influence/ can distort the conclusions we make.
 - Ex.: Want to know if someone has a girlfriend, actively search for this information. See him hug a girl, assumes it's his girlfriend when it's just a close friend. (Our bias information-seeking strategy led us to distorted conclusion.)
- 4. Our pre-existing knowledge, expectations and mental habits can influence the construal (understanding and interpretation) of new information, which can influence our judgement.
- 5. Intuition and reason underline social cognition and their interplay/relation defines the judgement we make.

□

□ **Challenges to Achieving an Accurate Understanding of Others**

1. Have minimal information
2. Information available is misleading
3. The way to obtain the information influenced our judgement

□

1. Minimal Information: Inferring Personality from Physical Appearance

□

Snap Judgement: Judgement we make about people based on few glances, so their appearances

□

□

CASE STUDY: *Snap judgement vs. all the time to make a judgement*

- *Premise: Showed participants people's faces and asked them to rate them based on trustworthiness, competence, likeability, aggressiveness, attractiveness.*
 - *Some participants have all the time to make judgements (control group), others have a second, a fifth of a second or a tenth of a second.*
- *Conclusion: There's a strong correlation between all of their judgements, which means that people make their judgements in the first few glances they take of a person.*
 - *Whether you have a second or a minute you make the same judgement about a person based on their appearance.*

Perceiving trust and dominance:

- *People perceived baby-like faces as more trustworthy but more naïve, weak, and submissive.*
 - *Opposite for the more adult, masculine faces that are less seen as trustworthy but more dominant.*
 - *Baby faced people receive favourable treatment as defendant in courts but they are seen as inappropriate for "adult" jobs like banking.*
- *Mammals have wired reactions to baby faces that leads them to want to protect them (like you would protect a young child).*

□

□

Accuracy of snap judgements:

- *Could be possible that other's perception of us leads us to act like they see us (they see baby-faced as naïve, so that leads baby-faced people to be naïve).*
- *When you compare people's snap judgements with self-reports about how approachable, extraverted and powerful they are, there is a moderately high correlation.*
 - *But if you compare based on self-reports of agreeableness and conscientiousness there is no correlation.*
 - *And there are no correlation between snap judgements and actual behaviour.*

- *People's snap judgements are accurate in predicting how the majority of people will also judge the person.*
 - *Research that shows that people's snap judgement of the competence of a politician can predict the winner.*
 - *Might not actually be competent but that's how people see her.*

Other research: People are shown short clips (3 ten seconds silent videos) of teachers and are asked to evaluate them on many traits (competence, warm, anxiety, etc.).

- *High correlation between their ratings and actual students' ratings.*

□

□ 2. Misleading Firsthand Information: Pluralistic Ignorance

Firsthand information can be misleading because...

□

- *(A) We are inattentive to information about events that occur before our eyes and we misconstrue such events.*
 - *You just use partial information to make judgements. Often use people's behaviour (which can go against what they really believe).*
 - *Ex.: You are in a class and teacher ask if anyone has a question and you have one but no one else raise their hands so you assume you are the only one who doesn't understand and you don't want to look stupid when it might be the case that none of you understand but you all assume everyone understand.*
 - *An illusion is create that lead people to misconstrue the situation/ misconstrue group norm.*
 - *Ex.: Gang members that are against brutal initiation processes and the lack of concern for human life don't say anything cause they don't want to be ridiculed by their peers when a lot of them might think like that.*

- *Ex.: Students from different ethnicities don't talk to each other. One does not talk to the other because they think they are going to be rejected but assume that the reason the other doesn't talk to them is not because of fear of rejection too but of lack of interest of having a friend from a different ethnicity.*

- **Pluralistic Ignorance:** *Misperception of a group norm that results from observing people who are acting at variance with their private beliefs out of a concern for the social consequences- actions that reinforce the erroneous group norm.*
- *(B) We use our experience to make assessment but our experience is unrepresentative.*
 - *Ex.: Use the student you met at the Campus tour to make assessments about the student population.*
 - *Ex.: Make statements about the people of a country based on the few you met at the hotel, restaurant, etc.*

3. Misleading Second-Hand Information (Way Information is Found)

Factors that influence the accuracy of second-hand information

- *(A.) Ideological Distortions*
- *(B.) Distortions in the Service of Entertainment: Overemphasis on Bad News*
- *(C.) Effects of the Bad-News Bias*
- *(D.) Differential Attention to Positive and Negative Information*

(A.) Ideological Distortions

- *The person relaying the message to you often has an ideological agenda – they want you have certain beliefs and certain behaviours - so they will emphasize on some things and omit other things.*
 - *Can be innocent: Not done on purpose, they just don't want to talk about details that will distract from the impact of the information.*

- *Ex.: Friends tell you about how her mom screamed at her for 10 minutes and how irrational that is, might omit the fact that she ignored her mother when she talked to her.*

Can be done on purpose of being misleading: want to prove they are right so purposely don't tell you other details that might make you doubt their accounts.

- *Ex.: Republicans mislead all statistics to make Democrats look bad and vice-versa.*

□

□ (B.) *Distortions in the Service of Entertainment: Overemphasis on Bad News*

- *Distort stories just to entertain.*
 - *Can be small scale*
 - *Ex.: You are telling how you were stuck for an hour with 20 people in the elevator, when it was in fact 6 people for 20 minutes.*
 - *Can be larger scale- mostly the news*
 - *Tendency to report bad/violent crimes because it attracts more viewers.*
 - *Seems like the world is made of violent crimes, when in fact on 20% of crimes are violent.*
 - *Also do not reflect actual crime rate, they report the same amount of crimes whether the crime rate is declining or not.*
 - *Distorted view of reality.*

□

□ (C.) *Effects of the Bad-News Bias*

- *Fear that the bad/violent focus of News can lead to a fear of victimization by people.*
 - *Believe they are more in danger than they actually are.*
- *Surveys report that people who watch a lot of TV tend to victimize themselves more (positive correlation).*
 - *Other researches try to take into account income, gender, race (basically what type of people watch TV a lot)*

□ **Looking Back:** *The quality of people's judgements derives in part from the quality of the information on which their judgements are based. Sometimes we have very little information at our disposal, as when we must make snap judgements about other people based only on their physical appearance and the tiniest samples of their behaviour. Research indicates that the snap judgements people make show remarkable agreement in one another. The information available to us for closer examination may contain a number of potential biases. Even firsthand information can be biased, as when people behave in ways that do not reflect their true attitudes. Information received second-hand can also lead to errors, as when communicators distort information in the interest of profit or ideology. We are inclined to attend more to threatening stimuli than unthreatening stimuli, and this bias may account for the media's over reporting of negative, violent, and sensational stories.*

□

□ **How Information is Presented**

□

□ *To have a successful marketing, what information needs to be presented, how to present it and when?*

- *Cause that has an effect on people.*

□

□ Order Effects

□

□ *The order in which items are presented have a big effect on judgement. Can have two effects.*

- **Primacy Effect:** *The disproportionate influence on judgement of information presented first in a body of evidence.*
 - *First impressions are crucial, tell you how you are going to interpret everything else.*
 - **CASE STUDY:** *Solomon Asch's study describing someone*
 - *Premise: Give a list of adjective describing a person and the participants have to rate the individual.*
 - *"intelligent, industrious (hard working), impulsive, critical, stubborn, envious"*
 - *IV: Whether they had the list in that order or opposite order*

- *Conclusion: People who had the list in that order considered the person more favourable than people who had the list in the opposite direction*
 - *The first words dictated how they interpret the rest of the words.*
 - *First case, the intelligent man is stubborn as in determined.*
 - *Second case, the envious and stubborn man just happens to be intelligent*
 - *Can happen because of information processing limitation*
 - *Pay greater attention to stimuli shown first and then lose focus as things go on.*
- **Recency Effect:** *The disproportionate influence on judgement of information presented last in a body of evidence.*
 - *Most often happens when the last information is easier to recall.*
 - *And information that you can recall weight in more in your judgement than information you have forgotten.*

□

□ Framing Effects

□

□ **Framing Effect:** *The influence on judgement resulting from the way information is presented, such as the order of presentation and how it is worded.*

- *How you present information influence how we process and understand it.*

□

□ *Order is a "pure" framing effect because the content is the same in the frame of reference, just the other changed.*

□

□ *Other framing effects ("less pure" framing) include:*

- *Spin framing*
- *Positive and Negative framing*

Spin Framing

- *Change the content*

- *Emphasizes on one aspect so you can create the effect you want*
 - *Ex.: If a company is good at releasing quality products, they will emphasize the issue on quality*
- *Use words that suggest your point of view*
 - *Ex.: "Pro-life" vs. "Right to life"*
 - *"Terrorists" vs. "Freedom fighters"*
 - *"War Department" vs. "Defense Department"*

Positive and Negative Framing

- *Changing the focus on the information, making the information looks more positive.*
 - *Ex.: Condom with 90% success rate compared to condom with 10% failure rate.*
- *Negative information tends to have more impact than positive information so information framed in negative context elicit stronger responses.*
- *People hate to lose things much more than to never had had it.*
 - *You'd rather never have a 20\$ buck than losing it.*
 - *Same results though, you don't have 20\$ now.*

Temporal Framing

Construal Level Theory: *A theory that outlines the relationship between psychological distance and the concreteness versus abstraction of thought. Psychologically distant actions and events are thought about in abstract terms; actions and events that are close at hand are thought about in concrete terms.*

- *We are more likely to agree to participate in events in the future than events closer to us because events in the future seem vague and far and you don't think of them in concrete term.*
 - *Like you don't think "In a month I have to wake up early, take the bus, go to the train station, etc. instead you just think in a month I'll go to grandmas house."*
 - *Concrete terms vs. abstract term*
 - *"Chewing food" vs. "Eating out"*

- *"Help you friend carry her table" vs. "Help your friend move out"*

□

□

Abstract vs. Concrete Terms can lead to inconsistent preferences

- *Better in abstract than concrete terms*
 - *"Camping" vs. "Fighting off mosquitoes, sleeping in a cold tent, no external entertainment, etc."*
- *Better in concrete than abstract terms*
 - *"Sampling various options at a buffet" vs. abstract thought of "Pigging out"*

□

□

Temporal framing also take into account of space framing (a place close to where you are or far from you) or account of social framing (happens to you vs. happens to a stranger).

- *Space framing: Example of "climbing a tree"*
 - *Abstract: "Getting a good view" when it happens miles away on the West Coast*
 - *Concrete: "Holding unto branches" when it happens close to them*
- *Social framing: "Going to the dentist"*
 - *Abstract: "Protecting one's teeth" when the person is socially far from you, like a stranger*
 - *Concrete: "Getting a cavity fill" when the person is socially close to you.*

□

□ **Looking Back:** *The way information is presented, including the order in which it is presented, can affect judgment. Primacy effects occur when information presented first has more impact than information presented later, often because the initial information influence the way later information is construed. Recency effect occurs when information presented later has more impact, especially when later information is easier to remember than earlier information. People are susceptible to many framing effects in information presentation. Sometimes communicators deliberately spin information so as to influence our judgement by changing the frame of reference. The temporal framing of an event- whether it will occur soon or far in the future- also influences how we think of it; far-off events are construed in more abstract terms, and imminent events are constructed more concretely.*

□

□ **How We Seek Information**

□

□ Confirmation Bias

□

□ **Confirmation Bias:** *The tendency to test a proposition by searching for evidence that will support it.*

- *We start with the assumption that the proposition is true and search for information that proves that instead of information that would contradict it.*
- *Not aware that we start with a bias.*

□

□ **CASE STUDY:** *Research information that agrees with them*

- *Premise: Ask 2 groups whether a tennis player working out the day before the match make them more likely to win/lose. Then gave them 4 types of information.*
 - *1. Number of players in a sample who worked out the day before and won*
 - *2. Number of players in a sample who didn't worked out the day before and won*
 - *3. Number of players in a sample who worked out the day before and lost*

- 4. Number of players in a sample who didn't worked out the day before and lost
- What they should have done is calculate the success rate of people who work out the day before compared to those who didn't work
 - To see if working out is that beneficial
- IV: If they were told that working out before made the player win or lose
- DV: What kind of information they look at
- Conclusion: They only looked at one type of information, the one that confirmed their questions.

Danger: If you only look for one type of evidence instead of comparing, then you are more likely to find information that confirm it.

- *If you compare info that confirms your hypothesis and info that go against it, you could see whether your proposition is false or not.*

□

□ *To find confirmation bias, people often ask questions that shape the answers they get.*

CASE STUDY: *Determine whether someone interviewed is introverted are extroverted*

- *Premise: Asked participants to determine whether a person is introverted or not and gave them a set of questions and they could choose which ones they would ask.*
- *IV: If they have to discover whether the interviewed one is extrovert or introvert.*
- *DV: What kind of questions they asked.*
- *Conclusion: Tend to ask questions that suggest sociability when trying to identify the person as extrovert and questions that suggest social withdrawal when trying to identify the person as an introvert or not.*
- *THEN the researchers take out the questions and just kept the answers and showed the videos to another set of participants and asked them to rate the outgoingness of the people.*

- People that were questioned to discover if they were extrovert were considered more outgoing.

□

□ Motivated Confirmation Bias

□

□ When people deliberately search for examples that confirm their propositions.

- People will search for information that confirms their propositions.
 - Would readily accept information that agree with them.
 - Would be suspicious of information that disagrees with them.

□

□ **CASE STUDY:** For or Against Death Penalty proofs

- Premise: People for or against capital punishment read articles that suggest that
 - States that have death penalty compared to states that do not have it have similar crimes rate (so DP do not decrease crime rate) and crimes rates decreasing in the state
 - So external comparison (state-by-state) and internal comparison (before-and-after)
 - Other situation showed the opposite
- Conclusion: Depending on their opinion, people saw the articles as proving it. They were also suspicious of the studies that go against their belief so they jumped on problems associated with those studies but did not do the same with studies that agreed with their opinions.

Looking Back: People's efforts to acquire needed information are often tainted by two pronounced types of confirmation bias. One type occurs when we look for evidence consistent with propositions or hypotheses we wish to evaluate. To evaluate propositions satisfactorily, however, it is necessary to examine evidence both for it or against it. The other type of confirmation bias occurs when we want a given proposition to be true, so we seek out evidence that confirms our beliefs or preferences and explain away evidence that contradicts them.

□ **Top-Down Processing: Using Schemas to Understand New Information**

□ **Bottom-Up Processes:** "Data-driven" mental processing, in which an individual forms conclusions based on the stimuli encountered through experience.

□

□

□ **Top-Down Processes:** "Theory-driven" mental processing, in which an individual filters and interprets new information in light of pre-existing knowledge and expectations.

- Ex.: Text about laundry on page 124.
 - It seems vague at first but when you use pre-existing knowledge it makes sense.

□

?

□ Not sure I understand the difference between both.

□

□ **The Influence of Schemas**

□

Schemas affect our judgement by directing our attention, structuring our memories and influencing our construals.

- Schemas can lead to mischaracterization of the world.

□

□ **Attention**

- Attention is selective; since we cannot focus on everything the knowledge we bring to the situation direct us attention at the most important elements and ignore the rest.
 - Ex.: You go to a basketball match, you know you cannot look at every players so you concentrate on the ball since you know that it is the most important part of the match. You might miss what is happening in the bleachers right in front of you.
 - **CASE STUDY:** "Count how many passes the players in white shirts do." But you missed the random gorilla costume.

□

□ **Memory**

- "Attention in the past tense" We only remember things we made attention to.
 - Schemas are also important for judgements since judgements are based from memories.
- **CASE STUDY:** Waitress vs. Librarian
 - Premise: Students watch a video of a couple having a romantic diner, first group is told she's a waitress, the other group is told she's a librarian. Then they take a quiz that check their memories on what they just saw.
 - Hypothesis: The stereotypes will push them to remember waitress or librarian-related schemas.
 - Conclusion: It was indeed the case.
- Information that fits in a pre-existing schema are more easy to recall.

□

□ **Encoding:** Filing information away in memory based on what information is attended to and the initial interpretation of the information.

- Schemas affect that by influencing what people pay attention to.

□

□ **Retrieval:** The extraction of information from memory.

- Schemas might affect retrieval (but not as much as encoding) by suggesting a schema after the relevant information has been collected.

□

□ So schemas influence memory through their effect on both encoding and retrieval but it affects encoding more.

□

□ Construal

□

□ Schemas (pre-existing ideas) affect how we construe (understand and interpret) that information.

□

□ **CASE STUDY:** Prime people with "adventurous" vs. "reckless" (as a part of a "perception" test) and then tell the story of Donald and they have to rate him on a series of traits.

- *Premise: Deception study, participants thought the 2 studies were unrelated.*
- *Conclusion: People primed with words "adventurous" saw Donald as adventurous, opposite is also true.*

□ □ Behaviour

□ □ Schemas also affect behaviour.

- *People act a certain way when a stimuli in the environment bring to mind*

□ □ **CASE STUDY:** *Words associated with old people make participants act like old people*

- *Premise: 2 part experiment. Prime a group with words related to old people and other group was neutral by pretending to have a "language proficiency" test, they were given 30 sets of 5 words, had to make sentences using 4 of the 5 words.*
 - *Then timed the time it took for them to go from the door to the elevator.*
- *Conclusion: Participants primed with words related to elderly walked slower (associating old people with slowness).*

2014-09-19

- *Are intentions potential behaviour?*
- *If they are actual behaviour what is the difference between intention and reason (wants and beliefs)?*
 -

2014-09-19

□ *Not sure I understand emotions as social goals.*

□

□ *Don't understand core-relational themes. (how they are in relation with emotions and appraisal processes).*

□

□ *Study page 212 with Hispanics and movement mocking interviewers????*

□

2014-09-19

□
□

2014-09-19

□
□

2014-09-19

□
□

2014-09-19

□
□

2014-09-19

□