**Exam 2 Review – Social Psychology (HSS280)**

**Social Cognition and Perception – March 22**

Social Cognition

* What is it? — How people process, store and apply information about other people and social situations.
* Three motivations that influence our choices
  + Need to be accurate
  + Need to reach closure quickly
  + Need to confirm what one already prefers to believe
* Bias
  + Bias blind spot — recognizing the impact of biases on the judgment of others but failing to see the impact of biases on one’s own judgment.
  + Confirmation bias — tendency to interpret, seek, and create information that confirms expectations
    - Example? Research for a paper may only confirm what the writer already knew about the subject
  + Egocentric bias — rely too heavily on one’s own perspective and/or have a higher opinion of oneself than reality
    - Example?
  + Negativity bias — things of a more negative nature have a greater effect on one’s psychological state and processes than neutral or positive things
    - Example? One thing that doesn’t look good on a website will make people not like the site (ex: one small bad thing in Snapchat update makes people hate the update)
  + Expectancy bias — subconscious influence that a researcher can have on the subjects of a research study.
    - Example? A researcher’s confirmation bias in a study can effect the results.
* Information to make inferences
  + Statistical information
  + Case history information
    - Which is more accurate? — Statistical information
    - Which is more influential? — Case history information

Social Perception

* What is it? — Study of how people form impressions of and make inferences about other people as sovereign personalities
* Attributions
  + Internal or dispositional attributions — when people infer that an event or person’s behavior is due to personal factors, traits, abilities, or feelings
    - Examples? Did bad on a test because you’re tired or not smart enough
  + External or situation attributions — when people infer that an event or person’s behavior is due to situational factors.
    - Examples? Did bad on a test because the teacher didn’t teach the material well enough or test was too hard
  + Kelley’s Covariation principle — High on consensus, distinctiveness, consistency = external; low distinctiveness and consensus, but high on consistency = internal
    - Consensus — How are other people reacting to the same situation?
    - Distinctiveness — Does the person react the same or differently in different situations?
    - Consistency — Is the person’s behavior consistent over time?
    - Examples?
  + Fundamental attribution error
    - What is it? — To explain other people’s behavior, we tend to overestimate the role of internal attributions, and underestimate the role of external attributions
    - Examples? — Someone fell asleep in class = lazy; you fall asleep in class = tired from an all nighter
  + Why are personal attributions automatic? — Because of perceptional biases (Meider), we focus our attention on people rather than subtle situational cues.
  + Fundamental attribution error and TV quiz show
    - Results?
  + Why does the fundamental attribution error persist?
    - Perceptual salience — Tend to overestimate the causal role of information we have available to us.
    - Study examples? Results?
  + Actor-observer effect
    - What is it? — Explaining others = personal attributions. Explaining yourself = situational attributions
    - Examples? — Did badly on a test = you didn’t study enough. Someone else does badly on a test = they aren’t smart enough
  + Self-serving bias
    - What is it? — Attribute our own success to internal factors and failures to situational factors (increases as time passes)
    - Examples? — Win a poetry contest = talent, but don’t get published = bad luck
  + Belief in a just world
    - What is it? — The need to believe that the world is fair and people get what they deserve
    - Examples? —When something bad/tragic happens, people reassure themselves that that person must have done something to provoke or cause the event (victim blaming) – car wreck = drunk driving
* Self-fulfilling prophecy
  + What is it? — Someone’s expectations about another person eventually leads the other person to behave in ways that confirm expectations
  + Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968) study with teachers
    - Design? Students are either labeled bright or dull after IQ test.
    - Results? Teachers would give special attention to those labeled bright and those students had higher IQ test score gains, while students labeled dull did not have any consistent difference.

Non-verbal behavior — Use the way a person behaves as a cue to identify their inner star and actions

* Facial expressions
  + Universal emotions – what are they? — joy, sadness, fear, anger, surprise, disgust
* Body language
  + Nonverbal behavior in sports
    - Table tennis videos
* Vocal cues
  + Using voice as nonverbal cue

Social comparison theory

* Upward social comparison — compare ourselves with those that are better off
  + Examples?
  + Ramifications?
* Downward social comparison — compare ourselves with those that are worse off
  + Examples?
  + Ramifications?

Schemas

* What are schemas? — A pattern of thought or behavior that organizes categories of information and the relationships among them
* Examples? — Horses -> child knows what a horse is, but may think a cow is a horse when they see a cow for the first time. First miniature horse -> may think it’s a dog
* Priming — acuteness to stimuli because of exposure to a certain event or experience
  + Graham & Lowery (2004) – Priming Bias
    - IV? — Exposed to race related words or neutral words, then read a story about hypothetical adolescent who committed a crime
    - DV? — Judgments
    - Results? — If primed with race related words, judged the child as more culpable, more likely to get into trouble later, and recommended harsher punishment
  + Bargh, Chen, & Burros (1996) – Priming politeness or rudeness
    - IV? — Unscramble sentences, primed with polite words or rude words, then have to wait in hall while experimenter had conversation with someone else
    - DV? — Will participant interrupt experimenter or wait
    - Results? — less likely to interrupt if primed with politeness.
  + Berger et al (2008) – Contextual Priming
    - IV? — Primed with images of school or not
    - DV? — Did they support a school initiative or not
    - Results? — More likely to support it if they were primed
  + Primacy effect — tendency for the first items presented in a series to be remembered better or more easily than those presented later in the series

Heuristics — mental shortcuts

* Availability heuristic — Relies on knowledge that is readily available rather than examine other alternatives or procedures
  + Examples? — News stories of home foreclosures -> think likelihood of foreclosure is greater
* False-consensus effect — People tend to overestimate the extent to which their opinions, beliefs, preferences, values, and habits are normal and typical of those of others
  + Examples? — Think other people think the same way you do (Chris and his elementaRY vs. elementARy
* Base-rate fallacy — If presented with related general information and specific information, people will ignore the general info and focus on the specific
  + Examples? — Air travel is the safest way to travel, but there was a plane crash yesterday -> people think planes are not safe
* Representation heuristic — People tend to judge the probability of an event by finding a comparable known event and assume the probabilities are the same
  + Examples? — Meet someone with a laid back attitude and long hair is Californian
* Counterfactual thinking — Tendency to create possible alternatives to life evens that have already occurred
  + Examples? — Silver medalists think they failed because they didn’t get gold, but bronze medalists think they succeeded because they felt lucky to get a medal

**Group Processes – March 29**

What is a group? — Set of individuals who have at least one of the following characteristics: direct interactions with each other over time, joint membership in a social category, or a shared common fate, identity, or set of goals.

Why join a group? — Innate need to belong, helps us accomplish things we can’t as individuals, social status/identity, you like group members

* Key features of groups: roles, norms, and cohesiveness

Social facilitation

* Triplett’s – mere presence
  + Cycling study — cycled faster when with others
  + Fishing reel study
  + Later studies found conflicting evidence
* Zanjonc solution – presence of others increases arousal
  + –Easy/Well-learned task – correct response — good performance
  + –Difficult tasks – incorrect response — bad performance
* Social facilitation among cockroaches
  + IV #1? — Simple vs. Complex maze
  + IV #2? — Alone vs. cockroach audience
  + Results? — Simple maze with an audience lead to cockroach finding dark box faster
* Why does social facilitation occur?
  + Zajonc’s Mere Presence Theory
  + Evaluation Apprehension Theory — only if others are in a position to evaluate your performance
    - Cottrell et al (1968) – IV? — Complete task alone with blindfolded confederates or with non-blindfolded confederates DV? — Task performance Results? — Blindfolded = no social facilitation
  + Distraction Conflict Theory — being distracted while working creates attentional conflict (attention is divided)

Social Loafing

* What is it? — Individual effort on easy tasks is reduced when in a group situation
* Early research
  + Ringelmann (1880s) — Individual output declines on group tasks (pulling rope)
  + Ingham et al (1974) – IV? — Pulling alone vs. in a group DV? — How hard they pulled Results? — 20% more effort when on own
* When is social loafing less likely to occur? — Identify individual effort, important task, believe individual effort necessary for success, expects to be punished for poor performance, small group, cohesive group, peer evaluations
* Why don’t people engage in social loafing?
  + Collective Effort Model
  + Social compensation

Deindividuation

* What is it? — Loss of a person’s sense of individuality and reduction of normal constraints against deviant behavior
* When does it occur? — Arousal, anonymity, and reduced responsibility
* Environmental cues
  + Accountability — impact cost-reward calculations
  + Attentional cues — focus awareness away from the self
* Trick or treat field experiment
  + IV? — Anonymous or not
  + DV? — How much candy they took
  + Results? — Anonymous groups were high, anonymous alone and non-anonymous groups took same, and non-anonymous alone was least
* Social identity model of deindividuation (SIDE) — Do we take on behaviors of the social groups we affiliate with?
  + Study example – KKK vs. Nurse study (uniform)
    - IV#1? — Type of clothes IV#2? — Anonymous or not DV? — Amount of electric shock given Results? — KKK had more shocks, nurse had less shocks

Social Dilemmas — A situation in which a self-interested choice by all will create the worst outcome for everyone.

* Examples? — Energy/recycling, anti-vaccinations

Group Polarization

* What is it? — Group discussion exaggerates the initial tendencies in the thinking of group members
* Why does it happen?
  + Persuasive arguments theory
  + Social comparison theory
  + Outgroup differentiation

Groupthink

* What is it? — Excessive tendency to seek agreement among group members (agreement takes priority of motivation to getting accurate information)
* Antecedents of Groupthink — Highly cohesive group, alike members, isolation, directive leadership, stressful situations
* Preventing groupthink — Avoid isolation by consulting widely with others, leaders should reduce conformity pressures, establish norm of critical review

Lost on the moon activity

* Individual scores vs. group scores
  + Gain score – average of individual score – team score
  + + did better 🡪 process gain
  + - did worse 🡪 process loss
* Explanation of differences

**Prejudice, Stereotyping, and Discrimination – April 5**

Key Terms

* Prejudice:
  + Affective
  + Definition? — Unjustified or incorrect attitude (usually negative) towards an individual based solely on the individual’s membership of a social group
* Discrimination:
  + Behavioral
  + Definition? — Behavior or actions, usually negative, towards and individual or group of people based on individual’s membership of a social group
* Stereotypes:
  + Cognitive
  + Definition? — Beliefs about people based on their membership of a social group
* Ingroup — a group we identify with/belong to
* Outgroup — a group we do not identify with

Changes in Overt Prejudice

* Modern prejudice — less obvious forms of prejudice
  + Example?
* Implicit prejudice
  + Stereotypes and prejudice can fuel discrimination without conscious intent or awareness
  + Development of explicit vs. implicit racial preference
* History of racist housing policy video clip
* Problems with explicit measures of prejudice
  + Social desirability
    - Also use implicit measures to study prejudice
      * Implicit Association Test (IAT)
        + What is it? How does it work?

Stereotype

* How stereotypes form - social categorization — classification into groups on the basis of common attributes
* Consequences
  + Outgroup homogeneity effect – what is it? — Underestimate differences WITHIN groups
  + Ingroup homogeneity effect – what is it? — Overestimate differences BETWEEN groups
* How stereotypes survive
  + Attributions
    - FAE — underestimate influence of discriminatory situations
    - How bias may affect student performance?
      * IV? — Presented history lesson to a white or black student
      * DV? — Implicit bias of teacher
      * Results? — Black students scored worse when teachers had higher levels of implicit racial bias (but not white)
        + It was the lesson, not the student aptitude
  + Subtyping — Exposed to stereotype disconfirming example, creating an “exception to the rule”
    - Example?
  + Illusory Correlation — tendency to overestimate link between variables that are only slightly or not at all correlated
    - Example?
  + Confirmation bias — tendency to interpret, seek, and create information that confirms expectations
    - Example?
    - Cartoon study
      * IV? — Race of children, one standing behind swing, and one on the ground
      * DV? — How people interpreted what happened
      * Results? — most people say Bobby (black) bushed Scott (white) off the swing, and that Chris (white) is helping Alex (black) who fell off the swing
    - Basketball study
      * IV?
      * DV?
      * Results?
  + Self-fulfilling prophecy
    - Example?
    - White male participants act as interviewers (Word, Zanna, & Cooper, 1974)
      * IV? — Race of interviewee
      * DV? — Behavior of interviewer
      * Results? — Non-white: sat further away, more speech errors, and ended interview earlier
* Controlled vs. Automatic stereotyping
  + Subliminal priming of black stereotypes
    - Study example — Priming with black stereotype relevant words
      * Results? — Participants perceived the ambiguous behavior of someone else as more aggressive and negative (stereotype consistent)
  + Automatic stereotype activation — Does automatic activation of racial stereotypes impact judgments made by police officers?
    - Shooter Bias (Correll et al., 2002)
      * Study design? —
      * Results? — More likely to accidentally shoot an unarmed black target than unarmed white target, faster to shoot armed black target than a white target
  + Language differences toward white and black drivers (Voight et al., 2017)
    - Findings?

Clark Doll experiments

* Design? — Black children played with white dolls over black dolls
* Findings? — Saw the white dolls as better than the black dolls

Stereotype threat – Claude Steele — Targets of negative stereotypes can confirm these stereotypes by trying to disconfirm them (outcome of self-fulfilling prophecy)

* Noticed achievement gap btw black and white students
  + Why?
* Study 1: Black and white students take a hard test
  + IV? — Diagnostic vs. Non-diagnostic test
  + DV? — Score on test
  + Results? — Diagnostic = white > black, Non-diagnostic = white=black
* Study 2: Black and white students take a hard test
  + IV? — Asked what is race/ethnicity or not (primed)
  + DV? — Score on test
  + Results? — Primed: white > black. Not primed: white=black
* Stereotype threat — Perceived vulnerability to a stereotype causes apprehension and interferes with one’s performance
  + Outcome of the self-fulfilling prophecy
  + Why? What mechanisms are involved?
    - Physiological arousal and stress
    - Drains cognitive resources
    - Activates negative thoughts
  + How can stereotype threat hamper academic achievement?
  + Stereotype threat and athletic performance – mini golf
    - IV? — Natural athletic ability vs. sports intelligence
    - DV? — Performance
    - Results? — White athletes performed worse if told it tested athletic ability
  + Threat experienced:
    - When performing in a stereotyped domain
    - When performance is being measured/judged
    - Stereotyped identity is made salient
    - When success in domain is important
  + Who does stereotype threat impact?
    - Women: math tasks
    - African-American students: achievement tasks
    - Latino students: achievement tasks
    - Older adults: memory tasks
    - Low SES students: achievement tasks
    - Men: social sensitivity tasks (compared to women)
    - White males: math task (compared to Asian males)
    - White athletes: sports ability
    - White athletes: jumping height (sports)
  + Who is vulnerable to stereotype threat?
    - Domain identification — More invested in domain, more performance is undermined under stereotype threat
    - Group identification — More identified with group, more performance is undermined under stereotype threat
  + Self-affirmation and stereotype threat
    - 7th grade students
      * IV? — Self-affirm or not
      * DV? — GPA
      * Results? — Racial achievement gap eliminated (does not effect those not under stereotype threat)

Gender

* Many things attributed to gender are culturally defined
  + Color (blue vs. pink)
  + Body hair
  + Clothing
  + Etc.
* Gender roles and stereotypes
  + Behavior expected of men and women
  + Stereotypes of men and women — men = aggressive/assertive, women = sensitive/soft
  + Gender beliefs and newborns
    - Findings? — Boys are perceived as strong, girls perceived as soft and gentle
* Do men and women act differently at work
  + Data collection
    - Tracked emails
    - Meeting schedules
    - Employees wore trackable badges that recorded:
      * Movement
      * Proximity to other badges
      * Speech
    - Results — no perceptible differences in behavior of men and women
      * Yet women weren’t advancing and men were…
* Language and power
  + Female Supreme Court Justices are interrupted 3X more than male Justices
* Gender bias among science faculty (Moss-Racusin et al., 2012)
  + Sent identical resumes to science faculty
    - IV? — Name (men or women)
    - DVs? — Hireability
    - Results? — Men more likely to be rated as more competent and hireable than identical female applicant
* Hiring a police chief
  + Identical resumes
    - IV#1? — Gender
    - IV#2? — Education
    - DVs? — Favorability
    - Results? — Participants tended to construct criteria to favor male applicant
* Orchestrating impartiality
  + Blind orchestral auditions increase the probability of women being advanced and hired
* Bechdel test
  + Findings? — Very few films pass Bechdel test (at least 2 women who talk to each other about something besides a man)

**Prejudice, Stereotyping, and Discrimination – April 12**

Sexual prejudice

* What is it? — Prejudice based on sexual orientation or preference
* How have attitudes changed?
  + Same-sex marriage acceptance
* Legal changes
  + Sodomy laws — against the law until 2003
  + Same-sex marriage legalized in 2015
* Gay pride and spare change study
  + IV? — Gay pride or blank T-shirt
  + DV? — Asking for spare change for parking
  + Results? — More likely to get change if wearing blank T-shirt
* Resume study
  + Sent resumes out in response to 1,800 job postings
    - IV? — Listed volunteering for gay rights organizations or not
    - DV? — Invited back to interview
    - Results? — 40% less likely to be invited back

Ageism

* Demographic shifts - growing population of older adults
* What is ageism? — Prejudice or discrimination towards an age group
* Prevalence? — Can exist across the lifespan, from children to older adults
* Media portrayals?
  + Examples?
* Why study ageism?
  + Understudied
  + Unique — prejudice is towards your future self, who you will become
  + Most common prejudice?
* Consequences of ageism?
  + Workplace discrimination — hard getting/keeping a job, and doing a good job
  + Elder abuse
  + Medical care
  + Health consequences
    - Examples? — Earlier cardiovascular events, fewer preventative health behaviors, increased cortisol levels, higher risk of Alzheimer’s, die 7.5 years earlier

Reducing prejudice

* Empathy
  + Jane Elliot – blue eyes/brown eyes
  + Intergroup contact — The more contact you have with others from an outgroup, the less prejudiced you will be
    - Evidence?
  + Jigsaw puzzle — cooperative learning method used to reduce racial prejudice through interaction in group efforts
  + Shared identities
    - Ingroup identity model — Decategorization – pay less attention to categories and intergroup boundaries; Recategorization – change conceptions of group so more inclusive
  + Exerting self-control — More successful at controlling prejudice when internally motivated to do so
  + Changing, cognitions, cultures and motivations
    - Thinking of examples that counter stereotypes
    - Taking the perspective of others
    - Learning that race is more ambiguous and socially determined than simply a genetic, fixed category
    - Taking a multicultural or polycultural approach rather than colorblind approach to intergroup relations

**Pro-Social Behavior**What is prosocial behavior? — Behavior that has positive social consequences

What is helping?

1.Why do people help?

* Kin selection theory — More likely to help blood relatives in difficult situations because this increases the odds their genes will be transmitted to subsequent generations
  + Evidence?
* Reciprocal Altruism — Returning a favor, or a favor will be returned
* Cost-Reward Model — Help when the rewards > cost
* Negative State Relief Model — Help to increase self esteem
* Empathic Joy Hypothesis — Help because you are in a good mood
* Competitive Altruism Approach — Help as a resume or application booster
* Empathy
  + What is it? — Understanding another individuals perspective and feeling sympathetic towards that individual
  + Measurement?
* Similarity (Batson et al., 1983) — \*shocking confederates and asking if participant will switch places, IV: similarity to victim; DV: likelihood of helping; Results: more likely to help if you feel similar to the victim
* Batson’s Empathy Altruism Hypothesis — Empathy promotes pro-social behavior
  + Empathy involves
    - Perspective taking — seeing world through someone else’s eyes
    - Empathetic concern — motivated by desire to help rather than if it’s in your self interest
  + Egoistic vs. Altruistic motives — egoistic = increase YOUR welfare, altruistic = increase ANOTHER’S welfare
    - Helping experiment – paired with confederate Elaine
      * IV#1? — Similar values or not (empathetic concern)
      * IV#2? — 2 shocks or 10 (ease of escape)
      * Results? — Egoistic helping= helping because you are uncomfortable [more shocks = more likely to help; similarity is most likely to help, regardless of ease of escape]

2.When do we help?

* Bystander effect — presence of others inhibits helping (someone else will help)
  + Kitty Genovese case — got stabbed in front of her apartment, reported that 38 people heard her cries for help, and could have helped, in reality it was 6
  + Latane & Darley – Bystander apathy
    - Participant hears another “participant” have a seizure over an intercom
    - IV? — Number of bystanders
    - DV? — Time it took to get help
    - Results? — Number of bystanders decreased helping
* Pluralistic ignorance – what is it? — Belief that your thoughts, feelings, and behavior are different from what everyone else in the group is thinking/feeling/doing
* Diffusion of responsibility – what is it? — Belief that others will/should help (Anonymity)
* 5 factors that determine whether people will help
  + Notice that something unusual is happening
  + Interpret the event as an emergency
  + Accept personal responsibility
  + Determine the help needed and decide if you have those skills/knowledge
  + Make the decision to help (cost/benefit analysis)
* Latane & Darley (1970) – 5 steps to helping in an emergency
* Factors that influence whether we will help
  + Liking, attraction, or similarity
  + External attribution
  + Observe others engaging in pro-social behavior
  + City size
* Darley & Batson’s Good Samaritan Study
  + Seminary students
  + IV #1? — Time (you are early, on time, or late)
  + IV #2? — Talk subject (seminary job/good Samaritan)
  + DV? — Whether they help or not
  + Results? — Late: 10% helped, On Time: 45% helped; Early: 63% helped -> if you’re in a hurry, you won’t likely stop to help

3.Who is likely to help?

* Some evidence of individual differences in helping tendencies.
  + Tendency may be relatively stable over time
  + Differences are in part genetically based

4.Who do people help?

* Physically attractive people
* Friendly individuals
* Charismatic people
* Those who are similar
* Ingroup members
  + Evidence?

Wesley – subway hero – why did he help? — He was returning the favor, he felt that God helped him, and that he was saved for this reason -> he already accepted responsibility for helping him when he helped him before he fell on the tracks.

**Aggression – April 19**

What is aggression?

* Definition? — Intentional action aimed at doing harm or causing pain (physical or verbal)
* Examples? — Kicking a vending machine for eating your dollar

Language of aggression

* Violence? — Extreme acts of aggression
* Anger — Strong feelings of displeasure in response to a perceived threat
* Hostility? — Negative, antagonistic attitude toward another person or group
* Instrumental vs. Hostile aggression? — Hostile- act of aggression stemming from feelings of anger, Instrumental- intention to hurt the other person, but the hurting takes place as a means to some goal other than causing pain
  + Examples? — Instrumental = doctor giving shot, hostile = kicking vending machine for eating money

Aggression in other animals — Innate vs. Learned –chimps are aggressive, bonobos are not

Non aggressive chimps became alpha males, and created a change in aggression over time

Cultural argument

* Depends on circumstances and culture — optional strategy
* Changes in aggression over time
* Aggression and Southern Culture (results?)
* Gender and types of aggression (Card et al., 2008)? — Women more likely to be indirectly or verbally aggressive, men more likely to be physically aggressive

Origins of Aggression - innate or learned?

* Nature?
  + Finger-length ratio and military branch (Tamiya et al., 2012) — lower ratios (smaller fingers) associated with more prenatal exposure to testosterone -> marines lowest ratio, army highest ratio
  + Brain functioning and aggression (Raine, 2008)
* Nurture?
  + Aggressive behavior influenced by learning
    - Positive and negative reinforcement
  + Social Learning — People learn by observing others – learn specific aggressive behaviors and develop more positive attitudes towards aggression by observing behaviors of adults
  + Bandura’s bobo doll experiment
    - Results? — Kids who were shown live or recorded aggression from adult or who saw cartoon aggression were more likely to display novel forms of aggression
  + Social learning of aggression in hockey (Gee & Leith, 2007)
    - Results? — North American hockey players were more likely to get aggressive penalties than European hockey players. -> Crowd wants a fight

Media influences

* Exposure? — 58% of TV programs contain violence, 40% of violent acts initiated by hero, average US child sees 8000 murders and > 100000 acts of violence
* Correlation between media violence and real-world aggression? — +0.3
* Does watching violence on TV increase aggressive behavior?
  + IV? — Violent TV or non-violent sporting event
  + DV? — Aggressive behavior
  + Results? — Violent TV lead to more aggressive behavior
* Long-term effects of media violence (Huesmann et al, 2003)
  + Longitudinal study (15 years)
  + Results? — Exposure at 6-9 years old is positively correlated to more aggressive behavior as adults
* WHY?
  + Numbing effect — less aroused by aggression, more tolerant of it
  + Desensitization hypothesis
* Violent videogames and brain activation (Matthews et al., 2006)
  + IV? — Violent vs. non-violent video game (30 min)
  + DV? — How different emotional stimuli were measured in the brain by fMRI
  + Results?
* Violent video games as rick factors for several outcomes (Anderson et al., 2010; Anderson & Prot, 2011)
  + Results? — Aggressive behavior/cognition/affect and physiological arousal were positively correlated to violent video games, and pro-social behavior and empathy/desensitization are negatively correlated with violent video games

Influences of aggression

* Heat — Aggression spikes in summer months
  + Evidence?

How can we reduce aggression? — Build empathy; make it more difficult to commit aggression

**Social Psychology and the Law**Eyewitness testimony — most compelling but also least accurate

* + Role of memory in
    - Encoding — initial experience
      * Emotional state — more anxious, less likely to correctly identify someone
      * Weapon-focus effect — hyper focus on the weapon
      * Cross-race identification bias — more prone to miss identify someone of an outgroup (different race or ethnicity)
    - Storage
      * Memory distorted by post-event information
      * Loftus research — info learned after event can become integrated into your own memory (whether it’s true or false)
        + Car smash vs. contact

Results? — Smashed-40mph; collided-38mph; bumped-37; hit-35; contacted-33

* + - * + Yield vs. stop sign study

Results? — Asked yield or stop sign, 41% were mislead to report yield sign

* + - Retrieval
      * Lineup construction — similarity of foils
      * Lineup instructions — don’t lead them to believe suspect in lineup
      * Lineup format — simultaneous or sequential

Implications?

* How has this research been incorporated into police departments?
  + Examples? — Double blind line-ups, unbiased instructions, sequential line-up formats, immediate assessment of witness confidence

Interrogations

* What is the point of an interrogation? — To get a confession
* Nine steps of interrogation — confront suspect with assertions of guilt, develop themes to justify or excuse crime, interrupt all statements of innocence or denial, overcome all suspects objections, keep increasingly passive suspect from tuning out, show sympathy and understanding, offer face-saving explanation for guilty actions, get suspect to recount details of crime, and convert statement into full written confession.
* Tactics used to obtain confessions
  + Evidence that people confess to crimes they didn’t commit
    - WHY? — To get out of the interrogation room, not thinking about long term
  + Example of false confession
    - Central Park Five — Coerced into confessing, lead to believe confessing would let them go home, confessions all pointed to the others in the group, no one confessed to raping the woman
  + False confession research
    - Kassin & Kiechel (1996) – asked to press keys, told ALT key was faulty (would crash computer)
      * Design? — Computer rigged to crash, experimenter blamed participant
      * Results? — 25% confessed to hitting ALT key when they didn’t
    - Follow-up study – inclusion of a confederate
      * Results?
    - The lie, the bluff and false confessions (Perillo & Kassin, 2011)
      * Completed academic test (helped confederate cheat or not)
        + IV? — Bluff (have a hidden camera) or not
        + Results? — 50% more likely to falsely confess
  + Implications - 240 individuals have been exonerated by DNA evidence.
    - Between 15-20% cases of these involved false confessions to serious crimes (Gudjonsson & Pearse, 2011)