

Group

- two or more people who interact with one another
- key is collective influence – by interacting, groups affect their members, and the members affect their groups
 - bi-direction

Social Facilitation

- Enhance our behaviour:
 - simple tasks where the dominant or automatic response is correct
 - * overlearned
 - * instinctual
 - * automatized
 - * require no resources
 - performance heightened when person is a little anxious
- Affect our behaviour:
 - complex tasks where the answer is not obvious
 - * novel
 - * learned
 - * controlled
 - * require cognitive resources
 - performance suffers when person is a little anxious
- Playing Pool:
 - above average players did better when observed; below average players did better when NOT observed
 - the presence of others rise arousal and arousal has effect
- Why are we aroused in the presence of others?

- evaluation apprehension
 - * people perform better when partner is superior
 - * people who are evaluation sensitive are most affected by arousal
- Driven by distraction
 - * same effects are seen when flashing lights are present
- Mere presence
 - * color preferences are stronger in presence of others
 - * animals show the effect
- Real world examples:
 - exam rooms: long bench performs worse than individual desk when harder tasks
 - office buildings: isolation vs common space
 - open-concept kitchens

Social loafing

- the tendency for people to exert less effort when they pool their efforts towards a common goal than when they are individual accountable
- no evaluation apprehension = less effort
- cultural difference: collectivist < individualist
 - collective cultural far less to experience social loafing than individual cultural
- make individuals accountable
- many hands leads to each of them is doing lighter work
- puller
 - the more pullers behind ps, the less effort ps put on
- shout or clapping
 - each person made 1/3 less noise when they thought they were in a group

- people perceived themselves as making equal noise alone and in group
- when people in a group, people tends to free ride the group effort
- social loafing in children
 - children expressed dislike for those who did not contribute and were willing to give up stickers to punish them
 - kids know what is social loafing and know who is free riding and willing to take the action to prevent it in the future
- social loafing in the real world
 - sports teams
 - work groups
 - * help identify individual output
 - social loafing does not occur when
 - * task is challenging, appealing, involving
 - * group members are friends
 - * big reward for effort

Group thinking

- when good groups make bad decisions
- tendency to suppress dissent in interest of group harmony
- symptoms of groupthink
 - illusion of invulnerability: still drink even though there is proof for bacterias existence
 - rationalization of warnings
 - unquestioned belief in group's morality
 - conformity pressure: pressure from higher authority
 - illusion of unanimity: believe that everyone else thinks is ok

- self-censorship: does anyone have a different position
 - * exercising control over what one says to avoid causing disagreements in group
- mindguards: failures in passing/seeking and discussing contrary information and alternative possibilities
- stereotyped view of opponent – leading to close mindedness and sometimes pressure
- preventing groupthink
 - be impartial(公平)
 - assign a "devil's advocate": consider more options
 - subdivide the group
 - invite critiques from outsider experts
 - call a second-chance meeting to air lingering doubts

Leadership types

- task leadership: focus on achieving the team's goal
 - good organization skills
 - tends to give direct orders
 - can be motivated by challenging goals and periodic progress reports
- social leadership: focus on team building, conflict mediation and support team members
 - democratic style
 - prevent groupthink
- transactional leadership:
 - blend of task leadership and social leadership
 - aim to fulfill subordinates needs but they also maintain high expectations
 - works best when some groups members know their jobs well(social leadership), but some others do not (task leadership)

- Transformational leadership
 - motivate others to identify with and commit themselves to group's mission
- Transformational vs transactional:
 - transactional: look as how to get things done
 - transformational: look as how to motivate people to do things

Deindividuation(去个性化) & group polarization

- social facilitation: groups can arouse people
- social loafing: groups can diffuse(散漫, 淡化) responsibility
- when arousal and diffused responsibility combine: deindividuation
 - loss of self-awareness and evaluation apprehension
 - occurs in group situations that foster anonymity and draw attention away from the individual
 - e.g.
 - * people are more likely to bait a person to jump off a bridge when the crowd is large and it is dark

Deindividuation – factor

- group size
 - * the larger the group size is, the more percentage it is transgressing
- physical anonymity
 - * shocks twice longer
 - * anonymous is far more transgressing than those who are identified

Deindividuation – counteract

- increase self-awareness
 - * the presence of mirrors

- * large name tags
- * individualized closing
- * having personal goal – more motivated

Group Polarization

- discussion of a topic will strength an opinion shared by all group member
- if people already favour a decision, they will favour it even more after discussion
- if people are against a decision, they will be against it even more
- risky shift phenomenon
 - when in low risk situation, group-made decision is higher risk taking than solo decision
 - when in high risk situation, group-made decision is lower risk taking than solo decision
- why does it occur?
 - informational influence
 - normative influence
 - * pluralistic ignorance:(多数无知) a false impression of how others are thinking feeling or responding to a situation.
 - for example, if you stop yourself from helping someone in an emergency situation, because you look around and you realize that, no, 1 else is helping, you don't want to stand out from the crowd. So you don't help either. That's pluralistic. Ignorance.
 - * mere exposure(单纯曝光): with more exposure to certain things, people tend to become more positive to those things
- real world
 - schools
 - communities

- internet
- juries

Reading

- **Group:** group as two or more people who interact and influence one another.

Social Facilitation

- **The Mere Presence of Others**

- the people are not competing, do not reward or punish, and in fact do nothing except be present as a passive audience or as co-actors.
- Arousal facilitates dominant responses, whether right or wrong.
 - * Increased arousal enhances performance on easy tasks
 - * the presence of others increased the number of incorrect responses on harder tasks
- Athletes, actors, and musicians perform well-practised skills, which helps explain why they often perform best when energized by the responses of a supportive audience.

- **Crowding**

- Even a supportive audience may elicit poorer performance on challenging tasks
- The effect of others' presence increases with their number
- the arousal and self-conscious attention created by a large audience interferes even with well-learned, automatic behaviours
- Being in a crowd also intensifies positive or negative reactions.
 - * When they sit close together, friendly people are liked even more, and unfriendly people are disliked even more
- Crowding enhances arousal, which facilitates dominant responses.

- **Why we have arousal**

- Evaluation apprehension: we wonder how they are evaluating us

- * the mere presence of these blindfolded people did not boost well-practised responses.
- * The enhancement of dominant responses is strongest when people think they are being evaluated.
- * self-consciousness we feel when being evaluated can also interfere with behaviours that we perform best automatically
- Driven by distraction: when people wonder how co-actors are doing or how an audience is reacting, they get distracted.
 - * conflict between paying attention to others and paying attention to the task overloads our cognitive system, causing arousal.
 - * This arousal comes not just from the presence of another person but even from a non-human distraction,
- Mere presence:
 - * mere presence of others produces some arousal even without evaluation apprehension or arousing distraction.
 - * Animals probably are not consciously worrying about how other animals are evaluating them.

Social loafing

- Many hands makes light work: the collective effort of tug-of-war teams was but half the sum of the individual efforts.
 - pulled 18 percent harder when they knew they were pulling alone than when they believed that behind them two to five people were also pulling.
 - giving feedback to the participants on their performance was effective at increasing their individual efforts.
 - the noise produced by six people shouting or clapping “as loud as you can” was less than three times that produced by one person alone.
 - * they perceived themselves as clapping the same in both situations
 - in the group condition, people were tempted to free-ride on the group effort.
 - effort decreases (loafing increases) as the size of the group increases.

- The group situation decreases evaluation apprehension.
- the social facilitation experiments increased exposure to evaluation.
- when being observed increases evaluation concerns, social facilitation occurs
- when being lost in a crowd decreases evaluation concerns, social loafing occurs
- Everyday life:
 - China and Soviet: when asking to sell/private, produce more food
 - people in collectivist cultures do less social loafing than do people in individualist cultures
 - women tend to be less individualistic than men—and to exhibit less social loafing.
- when not occurs:
 - People in groups loaf less when the task is challenging, appealing, or involving
 - Group members will work hard when convinced that high effort will bring rewards
 - Groups also loaf less when their members are friends or are identified with or indispensable to their group
 - Keeping work groups small can also help members believe that their contributions are indispensable

Deindividuation

- Group size:
 - A group has the power not only to arouse its members but also to render them unidentifiable.
 - when the crowd was small and exposed by daylight, people usually did not try to bait the person.
 - when a large crowd or the cover of night gave people anonymity, the crowd usually baited and jeered.
- Physical anonymity:

- pressed the shock button twice as long as did women who were visible and wearing large name tags
- Compared to drivers of convertibles and Jeeps with the top down, those with the top up, who were relatively anonymous, honked one-third sooner, twice as often, and for nearly twice as long.
- compared to solo children, those in groups were more than twice as likely to take extra candy.
- compared to children who had been asked their names and where they lived, those left anonymous were also more than twice as likely to transgress
- being anonymous makes one less self-conscious and more responsive to cues present in the situation, whether negative (Klan uniforms) or positive (nurses' uniforms)
- Arousing and distracting activities
 - Group shouting, chanting, clapping, or dancing serve to both hype people up and reduce self-consciousness
- Diminished Self-Awareness:
 - tend to disconnect behaviour from attitudes.
 - un-self-conscious, deindividuated people are less restrained, less self-regulated, more likely to act without thinking about their own values, and more responsive to the situation
 - Self-awareness is the opposite of deindividuation
 - deindividuation decreases in circumstances that increase self-awareness: in front of mirrors and cameras, in small towns, under bright lights, wearing large name tags, in undistracted quiet, wearing individual clothes, and living in houses

Group polarization

- group polarization phenomenon: Discussion typically strengthens the average inclination of group members.
 - like becomes more like

- dislike becomes more dislike
- experiments:
 - 72 percent reinvested money they would seldom have invested if they were considering it as a new investment on its own merits. When making the same decision in groups, 94 percent opted for reinvestment.
 - found that the discussions among like-minded students did, indeed, increase the initial gap between the two groups
- polarization in real life:
 - unsupervised peer groups are the strongest predictor of a neighbourhood's crime victimization rate
 - leading to increased extremity and avoidance of counter-attitudinal information
 - the most effective anti-terrorist policy is one that inhibits potential recruits from joining in the first place
- Explaining – informational influence
 - when people hear relevant arguments without learning the specific stands that other people assume, they still shift their positions
 - Active participation in discussion produces more attitude change than does passive listening
 - The more group members repeat one another's ideas, the more they rehearse and validate them
 - we can change our attitudes without hearing an argument at all. Simply knowing that people in a group have an opinion influences ours.
- Explaining – normative influence
 - pluralistic ignorance: They don't realize how strongly others support the socially preferred tendency.
 - * you want to do something, but fear of being reject, so you wait and watch others

- * you do not realize if other people want to do the same things as you do
- This polarization from mere social comparison is usually less than that produced by a lively discussion.
- persuasive arguments predominate on issues that have a factual element

Group thinking

- symptoms:
 - overestimate their group' s might and right:
 - * An illusion of invulnerability: believe that nothing bad will happen to them
 - * Unquestioned belief in the group' s morality: inherent morality of their group and ignore ethical and moral issues
 - Group members also become closed-minded:
 - * Rationalization: The group discounts challenges by collectively justifying its decisions.
 - * Stereotyped view of opponent: ignore the warnings from other opponent.
 - the group suffers from pressures toward uniformity
 - * Conformity pressure: Group members rebuff those who raise doubts about the group' s assumptions and plans
 - * Self-censorship: members often withhold or discount their misgivings as disagreements are often uncomfortable and the group seems to be in consensus
 - * Illusion of unanimity: Self-censorship and pressure not to puncture(刺伤, 毁坏) the consensus(一致性) create an illusion of unanimity.
 - The absence of dissent(不一致) created the illusion of unanimity.
 - * Mindguards: members protect the group from information that would call into question the effectiveness or the morality of its decisions
- Critiquing group think
 - Directive leadership is indeed associated with poorer decisions because subordinates sometimes feel too weak or insecure to speak up
 - Groups that make smart decisions have widely distributed conversation

- Groups do prefer supporting over challenging information
- When members look to a group for acceptance, approval, and social identity, they may suppress disagreeable thoughts
- Groups with diverse perspectives outperform groups of like-minded experts
- information that is shared by group members does tend to dominate and crowd out unshared information
- friendships need not breed groupthink. In a secure, highly cohesive group (say, a family), committed members will often care enough to voice disagreement
- Preventing Groupthink
 - Be impartial: do not endorse any position
 - Encourage critical evaluation; assign a “devil” s advocate
 - subdivide the group, and then reunite to air differences
 - Welcome critiques from outside experts and associates.
 - call a “second-chance” meeting to air any lingering doubts.
- Group Problem-Solving
 - if two members of a six-person group are initially correct, two-thirds of the time they convince all the others
 - when given tricky logic problems, three, four, or five heads are better than two
 - People feel more productive when generating ideas in groups, people working alone generate more good ideas
 - Large brainstorming groups are especially inefficient.
 - Creative work teams tend to be small and to alternate working alone, working in pairs, and meeting as a circle
 - writing down ideas, and sharing ideas via electronic means, may enhance the positive effects of brainstorming
 - examples:
 - * Weather forecasting

- * Google.
 - * Game shows
 - * The “crowd within.”
 - * Prediction markets.
- when information from many diverse people is combined, all of us together can become smarter than almost any of us alone.

leadership

- task leadership: organizing work, setting standards, and focusing on goal attainment.
- social leadership: building teamwork, mediating conflicts, and being supportive.
 - delegates authority, welcomes input from team members, and, as we have seen, helps prevent groupthink
 - Group members usually feel more satisfied when they participate in making decisions
 - Given control over their tasks, workers also become more motivated to achieve
- transactional leadership: focus on getting to know their subordinates and listening carefully.
 - fulfill the subordinates’ needs but maintain high expectations for how subordinates will perform
- Transformational leadership: motivates others to identify with and commit themselves to the group’ s mission.

Individual influence

- consistency: More influential than a minority that wavers is a minority that sticks to its position.
 - if a minority consistently judges blue slides as green, members of the majority will occasionally agree
 - if the minority wavers, saying “blue” to one-third of the blue slides and “green” to the rest, virtually no one in the majority will ever agree with “green.”

- minority slowness effect—a tendency for people with minority views to express them less quickly than people in the majority
- People may attribute your dissent to psychological peculiarities
- minority influence stimulates a deeper processing of arguments, often with increased creativity
- With dissent from within one's own group, people take in more information, think about the issue in new ways, and often make better decisions
- Being the centre of conversation allows one to contribute a disproportionate number of arguments.
- Talkative group members are usually influential
- Self-Confidence: Consistency and persistence
 - any behaviour by a minority that conveys self-confidence tends to raise self-doubts among the majority
- Defections from the Majority: A persistent minority punctures any illusion of unanimity
 - majority members become freer to express their own doubts and may even switch to the minority position.
 - minority person who had defected from the majority was more persuasive than a consistent minority voice.
 - Informational and normative influence fuels both group polarization and minority influence.
 - Minorities have less influence than majorities simply because they are smaller.
- the idea that the minority could sway(摇动) the majority was itself a minority view in social psychology