Eksamensoppgave i – PSY1014/PSYPRO4114 – Sosialpsykologi I

Faglig kontakt under eksamen: Britt-Marie Drottz Sjøberg

Tlf.: 73 59 19 60

Eksamensdato: 7. juni

Eksamenstid (fra-til): 09:00-13:00

Hjelpemiddelkode/Tillatte hjelpemidler: Ingen

Målform/språk: Bokmål

Antall sider: 2

Kontrollert av:

_____

Dato   Sign

Del 1 har 4 spørsmål og krever at 3 av disse er besvart; delen vektes 60%.
Del 2 har 2 drøftingsoppgaver og 1 av disse skal besvares; delen vektes 40%.
Dersom mindre enn tre oppgaver fra Del 1 er besvart, eller Del 2 ikke er besvart vil studenten ikke oppnå ståkarakter.
Alle besvarte oppgaver må være bestått (E eller bedre) for at karakter E eller bedre skal kunne oppnås.

Del 1. Kortsvarsoppgaver. Besvar 3 av 4 spørsmål.
Inntil 1 side håndskrift eller ½ side maskinskrift per oppgave. (Vektes 60%).

1. Redegjør kort for hvilke faktorer som påvirker attraksjon mellom mennesker, og hvilke stereotypier som ofte kobles til attraktivitet.

2. Forklar hva er symptomene av "gruppetenking" og redegjør for de tre viktigste strategiene for å handtere gruppetenking.
   Gi ett eksempel for å utdype din forklaring.

3. Redegjør for tre hovedtyper av forskningsmetoder som brukes i sosialpsykologien og gi beskrivelser av noen sterke og svake sider koblet til enhver av disse tre typer metoder.

4. Bruk 'The Elaboration Likelihood Model', (ELM), til å forklare hvordan holdninger kan påvirkes eller endres?

Del 2. Drøftingsoppgaver.
Besvar 1 av 2 følgende spørsmål.
Ingen sidebegrensning. (Vektes 40%).

1. Redegjør for a) "kraften i situasjonen", d.v.s. den fundamentale attribusjonsfeilen,
   b) gi eksempler fra forskningsresultater presentert i læreboka
   og c) beskriv hvilke konsekvenser denne attribusjonsfeilen kan ha for en selv og håndteringen av fremtidige hendelser.

2. Gjør rede for a) definisjon og utvikling av teorien om kognitiv dissonans,
   b) hvordan kognitiv dissonans kan reduseres
   og c) diskuter hvilke effekter slik dissonans har på personer med høy, og personer med lav, selvaktelse (self-esteem).

Sensorveiledning Sosialpsykologi I, Vår 2016 PSY1014/PSYPRO4114

Eksamen (4 timmer, 7 juni, 2016) har to deler:
<u>Del 1</u> har 4 spørsmål og krever at 3 av disser er besvarte; delen vektes 60%.
<u>Del 2</u> har 2 drøftingsoppgaver og 1 av disse skal besvares; delen vektes 40%.
Dersom mindre enn tre ppgaver fra Del 1 er besvart, eller Del 2 ikke er besvart vil studenten ikke oppnå ståkarakter. Alle besvarte oppgaver må være bestått (E eller bedre) for at karakter E eller bedre skal kunne oppnås.

Svaret på oppgaven i Del 2 evalueres etter følgende fire dimensjoner: innhold, argumentasjon, organisering og i en viss grad stil/format. Se nærmere beskrivelse nedenfor.

1. INNHOLD (ca. 40%)
Presenterer studenten relevant teori og forskning (materiale) fra læreboken (faglitteraturen)?
Er materialet presentert korrekt?
Integrerer studenten ulike teorier og forskning?
Evaluerer studenten materialet kritisk?
Viser studenten forståelse for feltet?

2. ARGUMENTASJON (ca 35%)
Ble argumentasjonen utviklet og kritisk analysert?
Er argumentasjonen logisk konsistent?
Er det tatt hensyn til vesentlige motargumenter?

3. ORGANISERING (ca 20%)
Er det en systematisk utvikling av ideer som leder fram mot en konklusjon uten avsporinger fra temaet?
Er besvarelsen godt strukturert og generelt forståelig?

4. STIL/FORMAT (ca 5%)
Formuleringsevne: språklig stil og grammatikk (men ikke enkle skrivefeil).

Evaluator's Guide. Exam in Social Psychology I, Spring 2016
PSY1014/PSYPRO4114

The exam (4 hours, 7 June, 2016) has two parts:
<u>Part 1</u> has 4 questions and 3 of these must be answered; this part is weighted 60%.
<u>Part 2</u> has 2 essay questions and 1 of these must be answered; this part is weighted 40%.
If less than 3 questions in Part 1 are responded to, or Part 2 is not answered, the student will fail the exam. All answered questions must have been evaluated as "pass" (E or better) for a grade E or better to be achieved.

The answer to the chosen question in Part 2 is evaluated in accordance with the following four dimensions: contents, argumentation, organization, and to some extent style/format. See descriptions below.

1. CONTENTS (approx. 40%)
Does the student present relevant theory and research (material) from the course book (research literature)?
Is the material presented correctly?
Does the student integrate different theories and research?
Does the student critically evaluate the material?
Does the student show understanding for the field?

2. ARGUMENTATION (approx. 35%)
Was the argumentation developed and critically analyzed?
Is the argumentation logically consistent?
Are significant counter arguments considered?

3. ORGANIZATION (approx. 20%)
Is there a systematic development of ideas that result in a conclusion without deviations from the theme?
Is the answer well structured and generally comprehensible?

4. STYLE/FORMAT (approx. 5%)
Ability of expression: style of language and grammar (but not simple spelling mistakes).

Part 1. Short answers. Respond to 3 of 4 questions. Up to 1 page in handwriting or ½ typed page per question. (Weigth 60%).

1. Redegjør kort for hvilke faktorer som påvirker attraksjon mellom mennesker, og hvilke stereotypier som ofte kobles til attraktivitet. Account shortly for what factors that influence attraction between people, and which stereotypes that often are linked to attraction.

Relevant material: Mainly chapter 10.

Expected contents in the answer: 'Attraction' as in being drawn to, interested in and liking (actually not defined in the book). Central factors that could be mentioned and to some extent elaborated upon are proximity or "propinquity" (closeness, familiarity and the 'mere exposure effect'), similarity (in opinions, personality, appearance, experiences, interests, and "perceived similarity"), and reciprocal liking. Regarding stereotypes: "What is beautiful is good"-hypothesis, i.e. perceived attraction is related to positive evaluations. Better grades would include many of the mentioned factors and could include elaborations on any of the mentioned factors, differences and similarities of cultural standards of beauty or of cultural findings related to the mentioned hypothesis.

2. Forklar hva er symptomene av "gruppetenking" og redegjør for de tre viktigste strategiene for å handtere gruppetenking. Var snill å gi ett eksempel for å utdype din forklaring. Explain the symptoms of "groupthink" and describe the three most important strategies to handle groupthink. Please give an example to elaborate on your explanation.

Relevant material: Manily chapter 9.

Expected contents in the answer: "Groupthink" refers to a type of group cohesiveness in decision making where maintaining solidarity is more important than considering facts in a realistic manner, thus the group uses various pressures or techniques to maintain cohesiveness (Janis 1972, -82). Symptoms include illusion of invulnerability, belief in the moral correctness of the group, stereotyped views of the out-group, self-censorship by group members, direct pressure on dissidents to conform, illusion of unanimity, and "mindguards" where group members protect the leader from contrary viewpoints. Examples could include decision making relating to the Bay of Pigs invasion in Cuba, or the discussions related to possible groupthink before the Iraq invasion or the 2007 financial crises (where the last one is not a good example). Better grades could in addition mention preconditions that often facilitate the groupthink process: that the group is highly cohesive, ruled by a directive leader that makes his/her wishes known, high stress, isolation from contrary opinions and having poor decision making procedures. Better grades could also add the critical testing of the theory in the 2000s and the suggestions that defective group decisions are more common than the original theory assumed, that group loyalty may have other causes, or that cultural differences may influence decision making in groups. If mentioning "Spiral of Silence" that is fine but not in the text book; it would be based on extra material presented in the course (Elizabeth Noelle-Nuemann, in *A First Look at Communication Theory,* by Em Griffin, Ch. 29 year?).

3. Redegjør for tre hovedtyper av forskningsmetoder som brukes i sosialpsykologien og gi beskrivelser av nåen starke og svake sider koblet til enhver av disse tre typer metoder. Account for three main types of research methods used in social psychology and give descriptions of some strong and weak aspects related to each of these methods.

Relevant material: Mainly chapter 2.

Expected contents in the answer: Observation method (testing questions such as 'what is the nature of the phenomenon?' Including e.g. diaries, advertisement, ethnographic and archive studies). Correlation method (testing questions related to relationships between variables). The experimental method (testing questions concerned with causal relations). Examples of strengths and weaknesses could include A) the possibility to unobtrusively gain insight into 'real life events' vs. often small samples, only observation of overt behavior, the dependence on expertise and subjectivity of the observer regarding interpretations, especially related to internal factors such as thoughts, intensions, etc. B) predictions of social behavior, often by large survey studies, i.e. the ability to use large samples, often attitude studies, often attempting to generalize findings to selected populations, often testing group differences. Advantage when trying to collect more sensitive data or data on opinions, values, etc., and although trying to predict outcomes based on common variance the method cannot be used for testing causal relations, (e.g. underlying third option); sensitive to respondents ability and willingness to answer questions and questionnaires. C) involves control(s) and experimental groups where the design aims at determining causal effects (based on the manipulation of the independent variable). The importance of random assignment to groups. Strengths: determining causal relationships, weaknesses: realism and generalization (situations, persons). Good responses include many of the provided aspects. Very good responses would also include knowledge of e.g. interrater or interjudge reliability, internal and external validity, sampling, random assignment, etc. and the importance of knowing what method to use in relation to type of research question to be studied.

4. Bruk 'The Elaboration Likelihood Model', (ELM), til å forklare hvordan holdninger kan påvirkes eller endres. Use 'The Elaboration Likelihood Model' (ELM) to explain how attitudes can be influenced or changed.

Relevant material: Mainly chapter 7.

Expected contents in the answer: ELM suggests that when a person encounters some form of communication, they can process this communication with varying levels of thought (elaboration), ranging from a low degree of thought (low elaboration) to a high degree of thought (high elaboration). The suggested two ways in which persuasive communication can cause attitude change: Central and peripheral route to persuasion, involving high- and low-elaboration of thoughts respectively. Key words are motivation (to pay attention, cf. personal relevance) and ability. One of the main assumptions of the ELM is that the attitudes formed through the central route rather than the peripheral route are stronger and more difficult to change, whereas when the peripheral route is taken (based on heuristics or shortcuts to establish an attitude) short-term attitude change is more likely to occur. Experiments (Petty, Cacioppo & Goldman, 1981) have shown that when subjects experience high personal relevance of a communication they use time to elaborate on the contents of arguments, thus utilizing the central route. When not experiencing personal relevance they were instead more influenced by (in this experiment) the 'high-expertise source' than the quality of the argument. Very good answers may include this example from the book, and those could mention Petty and Cacioppo's research from the 1980s. Such answers could also reflect on the usefulness of the two routes in the suggested model in a person's life. For example, an individual intent on forming long-lasting beliefs on topics should find the central route advantageous by the fact that arguments are

scrutinized intensely and that information is unlikely to be overlooked. On the other hand, this route uses a considerable amount of energy, time, and mental effort and may not be optimal in all kinds of decisions or choice situations.

Part 2. Essay questions. Answer 1 of 2. No page limitation. (Weight 40%).

1. Redegjør for a) "kraften i situasjonen", d.v.s. den fundamentale attribusjonsfeilen, b) gi eksempler fra forskningsresultater presentert i læreboka og c) beskriv hvilke konsekvenser denne attribusjonsfeilen kan ha for en selv og handteringen av fremtidlige hendelser. Account for a) "the power of the situation", i.e. the fundamental attribution error, b) give examples from the research field presented in the course book and c) describe what consequences this attribution error may have for oneself and the handling of future events.

Relevant material: Mainly chapters 1 and 4.

Expected contents in the answer: a) To provide a correct description of the phenomenon, i.e. the tendency to overestimate the extent to which people's behavior is due to internal, dispositional factors and to underestimate the role of situational factors. That this tendency creates a false sense of safety, i.e. it cannot happen to me. It also involves the illusion that I, or we, would not participate in various negative behaviors that we can observe in others. B) Examples from the book include Ross et al.'s experiments (in the 1970-90s), the Ross et al.'s 2004 experiment when changing the title of a game (Wall street game or Community game), reading an essay on Castro under stated conditions of a given or self-selected theme (Jones & Harris, 1967), assessments of causal behavior of an actor viewed from different angles (Taylor & Fiske, 1975), or video recordings of police questioning (Lassiter et al., 2007). C) The simplification of the reading of social situations reduces the understanding of the actually influencing factors resulting in certain behaviors, which in turn reduces our ability to understand (and predict) the causes to human behavior. This error may therefore increase personal vulnerability to future negative social influences because it is deceptive (of the power of the situation) and undermines own vigilance. Good answers give a correct definition, can refer to and describe at least two experimental results from the book, and has understood the reasons to personal vulnerability based on this error.

2. Gjør rede for a) definisjon og utvikkling av teorien om kognitiv dissonans, b) hvordan kognitiv dissonans kan reduseres og c) diskuter hvilke effekter slik dissonans har på personer med høy, og personer med lav, selfaktelse (self-esteem). Account for a) the definition and development of the theory of cognitive dissonance, b) how cognitive dissonance can be reduced, and c) discuss which effects such dissonance have on persons with high, and persons with low, self-esteem.

Relevant material: Mainly chapter 6.
Expected contents in the answer: A) Cognitive dissonance produces a drive or feeling of discomfort which one tries to reduce. It was originally defined as caused by holding two or more inconsistent cognitions (Festinger, 1957). It has subsequently been redefined as being caused by performing an action that is discrepant from one's customary, typical, positive self-conception. Thus, the later approach to this phenomenon is related to behavior, not solely discrepant cognitions, and relates explicitly to self-concept. B) Cognitive dissonance is said possible to reduce using three basic ways: i. By changing our behavior to bring it in line with the dissonant cognition. ii. By attempting to justify

our behavior through changing one of the dissonant cognitions, or iii. By attempting to justify our behavior by adding new cognitions. C) Related to dissonance and self-esteem it is stated that persons with high self-esteem experience more dissonance when they behave in ways that are contrary to their high opinion of themselves, and that they will work harder to reduce it than those with low self-esteem. The reasoning is that doing something stupid or negative is consistent with having low self-esteem. An example of card playing students in an experiment studying effects of induced level of self-esteem, i.e. cheating or not, could be mentioned here. Also, it is higher quality if the answer involves a good and more general discussion of the potential in developing self-affirming situations for children and generally regarding the value of up-holding individuals' self-respect.