|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Theory | | | | | Theorist | Summary | Strengths | Weaknesses |
| **Theories of Personality** | Trait Theory  Categorises people by using traits, traits are assessed by rating scales, questionnaires, or unobtrusive observation. Traits are assumed to be stable across situations, predictable and stable over time, in unique levels per person  **Trait:** consistent characteristics across time and situation (emotional, cognitive, and behavioural disposition) that collectively reflect a person’s personality, can predict future, average behaviour. | | | | McCrae and Costa  1999  Supporting theorist: Helle Pullman and co (2006) | Openness-(reaction when presented with a non-routine opportunity/risk taking-cultural variance in how this is perceived):  Adventurous vs Unadventurous  Conventional vs Original  Down to earth vs Imaginative  Conscientiousness-(thinking of others): Negligent vs Conscientious  Lazy vs Hard working  Late vs Punctual  Extraversion:  Quiet vs Talkative  Passive vs Active  Reserved vs PDA  Agreeableness:  Suspicious vs Trusting  Ruthless vs Soft-hearted  Irritable vs Good natured  Neuroticism:  Calm vs Anxious  Secure vs Insecure  Unemotional vs Emotional  **Pullmann (2006) Consistency and Continuity over time (Longitudinal study)**  Found that factors remained stable from 12-18 years, and by 16 rank order stability remained constant, traits are well established by adolescence  Rank Order Stability**-**remaining high/low for a particular trait relative to peers, even as the whole group changes  Mean-Level Consistency-mean scores are constant in each trait as groups age  Individual Continuity-individual’s traits remain stable over time | Categorise observable behaviours and use objective qualitative data  Several independent trait theorists came to similar sets of traits using factor analysis (quantitative data)  There is strong correlation for aggregate behaviours | **Loehin, Willerman, and Horn (1988)** found only 50% of variations in scores were due to inherited traits, implying social factors are influential  Requires personal observations or subjective self-reports to measure  Provides the how but not the why  Does not consider how cognition, motives, and VAB influence behaviour and personality |
| Humanistic Theory  Studies the whole person, and the uniqueness of each individual. Assumes: all people are born good and strive to reach their full potential throughout their lives  To understand personality you must understand the person’s dilemmas and choices from their POV. A healthy personality it one that reaches its full potential.  Use the q-sort method developed by **Stephenson (1953)** client is given a set of personality cards (gets angry easy etc.) and sorts them into least and most like them, for themselves and for what they see as the ideal | | | | Maslow  1943 | Hierarchy of Needs  Self-Actualisation needs  Self-Actualisation  Psychological Needs  Self-esteem  Love and belonging  Physiological Needs  Safety and Security  Basic needs (food water clothing shelter)  We are all inherently good and strive to reach the top of the hierarchy, only some people make it, to progress up the levels the needs of the previous level must be met. | Shifts focus to the individual rather than unconscious mind, genes, and observable behaviour  Satisfies people’s ideas of being a human means  Qualitative data giving genuine insight to more holistic information into behaviour | Subjective concepts-cannot objectively measure self-actualisation  Does not consider the influence of the unconscious  Qualitative data is difficult to compare and cannot be generalised  Ethnocentric-biased to western culture  Too optimistic, people are a mixture of good and bad |
| Rogers  1961 | For people to “grow” they need an environment that provides genuineness (openness and self-disclosure), acceptance (being seen in an unconditional positive regard), and empathy (being listened to and understood)  Phenomenological Approach- each person has a unique perception of the world and this determines behaviour and shapes personality  **Self-Concept-usually determined through Q-sort**  Self-Image-who we think we are  Ideal Self-who we want to be  True Self-who we really are  Congruent Personality-healthy personality where the three self-concepts are closely matched  Incongruent Personality-unhealthy personality where the three self-concepts are poorly matched, often come with a defence mechanism of denial-ignoring it, and distortion, changing the meaning. Children are likely to form incongruence if they do not receive the environment needed to grow or if their parents impose conditions of worth on them. |
| Social Cognitive Theory  Personality itself doesn’t determine behaviour, it influences it but context is important  Applies principles of learning, thinking, and social influences on  behaviour  **Personality**: refers to individual differences in characteristic patterns of thinking, feeing, and behaving that make a person unique | | | | Bandura  1986 | Reciprocal Determinism-interaction between behaviour, cognitive factors and environmental factors, each influences the others. 1. Different people chose different environments partly based on personality, and this environment (i.e. school you attend and people you meet) shapes you. 2. Personality influences how we react (anxious people are more sensitive to threatening situations). 3. Personality helps create situations in which we react  Environment: we watch actions of other and the consequences (observational learning)  Cognitive factors: conscious goals and standard (VAB). **Self-efficacy:** the degree to which you are sure of your own ability to achieve, determines the activities you chose to tackle and how you perform  Personal Control: do we control the environment or does it control us? **Internal Locus of Control** I control my own destiny, these people achieve better in school, healthier, more likely to change behaviour to reach a goal or make the goal more reasonable **External Locus of control** outside forces determine fate, less likely to reach goals because they don’t take control of themselves or their behaviour. | Acknowledges human agency-that people have some control over behaviour  Focusses on cognitive process that contribute to personality development and the influence of environment and specific situations | Not a unified theory-different aspects do not tie together to form an overall explanation of behaviour  Not all social learning is directly observable  Tends to ignore maturation and developmental stages over a lifetime-not explaining how motivation or personality may change over time  Does not consider unconscious influences |
| Mischel  1998 | Similar to bandura but used situation-more specific than environment. Tried to explain why people behave differently in different situations, e.g. working harder because there’s a chance of a pay raise.  Person-situation controversy both the person and the situation influence behaviour, when small chunks of behaviour are analysed there appears to be a huge variance, however large chunks reveals more consistency and personality traits appear more influential.  Personality Signatures: distinct patterns of “if x situation occurs, then y behaviour will probably result”  Self-regulation: refers to the ability to set and work towards goals  Delayed Gratification: denying oneself a reward in the present for a bigger reward in the future –**Marshmallow experiment**  Marshmallow Experiment (longitudinal) conclusions: children who had more self-control in prep were Moe successful in high school, had more positive peer relationships, and were less likely to abuse substances  People are situation processors, the kids processed/interpreted the reward of the situations in their own way, instead of behaviour being determined by the situation, people use cognitive processes to interpret the situation and behave in relation to that interpretation |
| Theories of Cognition | Memory | Multistore Memory Model | | | Atkinson & Shiffrin  1968 | **Memory:** an active system that receives information from sensors, organises, processes, and alters that information as it stores it away, and then retrieves it when needed.  Elaborated on past models of memory that described it as a computer, encoding, storing, and retrieving information. They suggested 3 stages of memory that differed in capacity, duration, and function. These systems could bother interact and work independently.   1. Sensory Memory: capacity: Large; Duration: iconic .3 seconds, echoic 3-4 seconds; Function: takes in all incoming sensory information and filters out the unimportant information, sending the rest on to short term memory. 2. Short Term Memory: Capacity: 7+-2 ‘bits’ of information’ Duration: 18-30 seconds; Function: links sensory and long term memory. It refers to the information we are aware of that is available for decision making and problem solving. **Rehearsal:** enables information to remain in STM longer, or be transferred to LTM. There is *maintenance rehearsal*; remembering for immediate use, such as a phone number while you find some paper, that won’t be transferred to LTM; and *Elaborative rehearsal;* actively processing and encoding information to transfer it to long term memory. This can be achieved by making the information more meaningful, linking it to previously learnt information and relating it to personal experience. Also chunking. 3. Long Term Memory: Capacity: Huge; Duration: forever; Function: storing for retrieval and building up networks of information to help you understand and respond to the environment. There are two types of LTM: **Procedural Memory:** the ‘how to’ of memory, memory of the procedure of things, such as riding a bike. Also referred to as *implicit memory* as it does not require conscious retrieval and is learned motor skills. It is difficult to explain these memories as they come so naturally. **Declarative Memory:** the ‘what’ of memory, allowing you to declare what happened from your point of view. Also called *explicit memory* as it requires conscious retrieval. It has two sub-types: *Episodic Memory:* memory of personal interpretations and representations of events, such as the birth of a sibling. *Semantic Memory:*  knowledge of information and facts based on understanding and interpretation |  |  |
| Working Memory | | | Baddeley & Hitch  1974 | Emphasises the active nature of short term memory. They proposed 4 sub-systems:   1. Phonological Loop: verbal memory kept active through sub-vocal rehearsal 2. Visio-spatial Sketchpad:mental imagery and spatial reasoning, remembering where an object is in the dark 3. Episodic Buffer: temporary store that integrates information from the first two with long term memory 4. Central Executive: coordinates the activities of the other three and allocates attention. Doesn’t store information. |  |  |
| Forgetting | | Forgetting | | Miscellaneous | 1. Motivated forgetting 2. Decay   Enhancing Retrieval: memory can be improved through organising an linking the information (**Bower and Clark 1969)**, paying close attention, using the information, rehearsal, having personal experience with the information, mnemonics, memory-aid tricks, contextual and emotional cues. |  |  |
| Serial Position Effect | | Murdock 1962 | In the short term memory, it is suggested we have 5-9 slots for information.  Murdock did a study with people trying to memorise lists of numbers. Good recall of items at the beginning of a list is referred to as the **Primacy Effect**, good recall at the end of the list is called the **Recency Effect**. The primacy effect occurs because items at the start of the list have been rehearsed longer than the rest, the recency effect is because these have not yet left short term memories 18-30 second window. |  |  |
| Interference | | Baddeley  1999 | Retrieval difficulty due to similar, competing information being stored or already stored.  Retroactive Interference: new information stored interferes with retrieval of old information; forgetting a previously learnt task due to learning a new task, or new memories disrupting old ones; *example; hearing two similar fishing stories and getting the details muddled up*  Proactive Interference: you cannot learn a new task because of an old task that has been learn. What we already know interferes with the learning of new information *Example, difficulties with foreign currencies or learning French after learning Spanish* |  |  |
| **Learning**: results in a change of behaviour and cognitive processes that occurs during an experience; it may be active or passive, intentional or unintentional, and is relatively permanent | | | Classical Conditioning | Pavlov | Described learning as a result of responding to environmental stimuli-the stimulus-response approach.  Learning that occurred through the repeated association of two previously unrelated stimuli; when the stimulus results in a consistent response  Key Elements of Classical Conditioning: Pavlov’s Dogs   1. **Unconditioned Stimulus:** produces a particular, reflex response: Dog Food 2. **Unconditioned Response:** natural, automated response to a UC stimulus: salivating 3. **Conditioned Stimulus:** neutral at the start of the experiment, it becomes associated with the UCS and produces the UCR: Bell 4. **Conditioned Response:** produced by CS, similar to UCS but occurs when only CS is present: salivating at bell   This experiment, modifying a reflex behaviour, shows how learning takes place  Key Processes of Classical Conditioning   1. **Acquisition:** an organism making an association 2. **Extinction:** response may not be permanent if there is a decrease in consistency 3. **Spontaneous Recovery:** extinction may not be permanent, however this is usually weaker than original 4. **Stimulus Generalisation:** similar stimuli result in the CR, although weaker, for example, all bells=salivation 5. **Stimulus Discrimination:** very specific stimuli result in CR, for example, only the bell on the cage=salivation   Practical Applications for Classical Conditioning  **Aversion Therapy:** used to inhibit or discourage behaviour by associating the behaviour with a negative consequence. For example, nail biting to a bad taste, or alcohol to bile. |  |  |
| Joseph Wolpe  1958 | Systematic Desensitisation  Used in the treatment of phobias by replacing the fear and anxiety with a more appropriate response  Also known as graded exposure. |  |  |
| Operant Conditioning | Skinner | Skinner Box- box with levers and buttons that gave a reward when rats pressed them. Not learning a new skill, but increasing the frequency of the behaviour. |  |  |
| Thorndike | Instrumental learning: the individual is an active and instrumental participant in the learning process. –**Cats in Puzzle Boxes**  *Law of Effect:* a behaviour that results in a favourable consequence will be strengthened, one that results in an annoying consequence will be weakened.  Reinforcement  Consequences to increase the frequency of behaviour   1. Positive Reinforcement: adding a pleasant experience *such as giving a child pocket money for completing chores* 2. Negative Reinforcement: removing an unpleasant experience *such as removing chores if homework is completed*   Punishment  Consequences to decrease the frequency of a behaviour   1. Positive Punishment: adding an unpleasant experience *such as adding chores when the child swears* 2. Negative Punishment: removing a pleasant experience *such as no desert for talking back* |  |  |
|  | Observational Learning | Bandura | Also called modelling, observational learning occurs when a behaviour is learn or modified as a result of watching and imitating, or observing the consequences of another person’s actions. –**Bobo Doll Experiment.**  **Five Areas of Observational Learning**  Person must be:   1. Paying Attention 2. Capable of the Action 3. Motivated to perform the action 4. Reinforced externally, vicariously, or through the self for completing the action 5. Able to remember the action |  |  |
| Developmental Psychology | Cognitive Development | | | | Piaget | More concerned with *how* children learn than the distinction between right and wrong. He suggested that we build an understanding of our world and develop our thinking through active environment interaction that leads to us building **schemas:** cognitive structures to order perception and experience intellectual growth. These are moderated through Accommodation: adapting an old schema and developing a new schema that interacts with it. *E.g. an orange is round like a ball but requires a new schema for ‘fruit’ and the adaption to the ball schema, not all round things are balls.*  Assimilation: using an existing schema to deal with new info. *E.g. different shapes of balls (football, soccer ball) are assimilated into the ball schema, not all balls are round.*  Four Stages of Cognitive Development   1. **Sensori-motor Stage:** 0-2y. Develop understanding of the world through sensory and motor interaction (babies eat everything). They live in the present and do not understand *object permanence* until 8 months (*hat test, if an object is covered with his Beret, do they look for it?)* 2. **Pre-Operational Stage:** 2-7y. Child can speak, write, memorise, and imagine. But they cannot yet think logically or grasp *reverse thinking* (glass test). They are *egocentric*: aware only of themselves and their own point of view until 6 years old (3 mountains test: they can’t describe what the person opposite sees because they think everyone sees what they see.) also why some children close their eyes when they’re hiding, if they can’t see, neither can you. Imagination leads to symbolic play/representation. This means learning that traffic signs have meaning and using things like sticks for swords and blocks for phones. 3. **Concrete Operational Stage:** 7-11y. Child can think logically and carry out mental math operations if they have concrete materials to help them (those cube things). They cannot yet grasp hypothetical or abstract concepts. They learn to *classify:* group objects/events by common features; and *seriate:* order objects with respect to common properties (coins in ascending order); and *conservation:* understanding that an objects’ weight, mass, volume, or area does not change with shape (playdo and water test; and *reverse thinking*: an action can be undone or reverted to its previous state. 4. **Formal Operational Stage:** 11+y. child can think abstractly and discuss concepts such as honesty, morality, and hypothetical outcomes. They question previously accepted thoughts, ideas, and values. *Logical thought:* developing strategies to work through problems systematically (pendulum test) | While he may have had the ages wrong, the sequence is considered valid.  Used detailed observations and reporting methods  Has many practical applications  Recognised cognitive development as a biological process | He underestimated young minds; the child may have understood the concept but been unable to articulate it.  Failed to distinguish between competence and performance  Gave insufficient attention to social influences on performance (shy around strangers)  **Seagrim and Lendon** found formal schooling played a large role in Piaget’s development, making this study culturally bias. |
| Moral Development | | | | Kohlberg  1981 | Suggested 6 stages of moral development based on the child’s response to a moral dilemma.  Six Stages of Moral Development  *Level 1: Preconventional*   1. **Obedience and Punishment:** behaviour driven by avoiding punishment. *Heinz should not steal because he would be punished by prison.* 2. **Individual Interest:** behaviour driven by self-interest and rewards. *Heinz should not steal because he would have the negative consequence of prison.*   *Level 2: Conventional*   1. **Interpersonal:** behaviour driven by social approval. *Heinz should not steal because he would be a criminal in the eyes of society. Heinz should steal because he will be judged if his wife dies.* 2. **Authority:** behaviour driven by obedience and conformity to social order. *Heinz should not steal because it is against the law.*   *Level 3: Post-Conventional*   1. **Social Contract:** behaviour driven by the balance of social order and human rights: *Heinz should not steal because the scientist has his own legal rights. Heinz should steal because his wife has the right to live.* 2. **Universal Ethics:** behaviour driven by internal moral principles. *Heinz should not steal because others may needs it and they have just as much of a right to it as the wife. Heinz should steal because human life trumps property rights.* | **Shaffer 1999** performed an international study that found strong correlation between development of moral reasoning and age (cross-sectional design)  **Colby et al 1983** followed Kohlberg’s original participants for 20 years and found his stages sequence was valid but there was no evidence for stage 6. | Culturally Bias  **Shweder 1991** Kohlberg’s dilemma is presented in the light of western culture and values and doesn’t consider moral reasoning from other cultures. For example a Hindu teacher who believes stealing is a sin and condemns the soul would not steal the cure, by Kohlberg he would be stage 4, but in actuality he is stage 6.  **Isawa** the differences between American and Japanese culture. An American would save his wife but a Japanese person would rather let her die with a clean soul than steal and make themselves dirty.  Gender Bias  **Gilligan 1982** |
| Gilligan  1982 | Argued that using Kohlberg’s stages, men are typically considered more morally advanced than women. As his participants were exclusively male Americans. She suggested that this was due to the differences in socialisation growing up; leading men to adopt a morality of justice, stage 4, and women a morality of care, stage 3. She argued that female’s moral reasoning is different not inferior. She then did her own study using 29 American women’s responses to an abortion dilemma.   1. **Self Interest:** women justified responses solely in terms of their own needs and wishes. 2. **Self-Sacrifice:** women argued in terms of the rights of others, referring to the wishes of their spouse and the rights of the unborn child. 3. **Care as a Universal Obligation:** tried to reach a balance between care of others and personal well-being. | Initiated the concept that moral development should be considered in the context of both care and justice. | Criticised by **Durkin 1995** argued against her findings by conducting a meta-analysis showing that Kohlberg’s techniques don’t show sex differences; but when they do it wasn’t always in men’s favour.  She used a small and exclusive sample |
| Social Development | | | | Bandura  1961 | Strongly emphasised observational learning aka modelling/imitation in his interest of how people learn social behaviours.  Modelling-the process in which information is imported by example before directly practicing the behaviour or skills. Models are more likely to imitated if they are attractive-subjective; can include familiarity, way of coming across, personality; trustworthy, capable, admired-we want to be like them; or powerful-an authority.  Elements of Observational Learning   1. **Attention:** learner must pay attention and find the model engaging 2. **Retention:** must remember the action 3. **Reproduction:** must be physically and psychologically capable of the action. 4. **Motivation:** must have the desire to repeat the action 5. **Reinforcement:** must receive a reward for completing the action.   Bobo Doll Study  **Participants:** 72 children. 24 were shown an aggressive model (12 a female and 12 a male). 24 were shown an unaggressive model (12 a female and 12 a male) and 24 were shown no model, these were the control group.  **Stage 1:** Modelling-children were put place in individual rooms to play and were exposed to either a) a model behaving aggressively towards a bobo doll; b) a model playing nonaggressively with a bobo doll; or c) were not exposed to a model at all.  **Stage 2: Aggression Arousal**-all children were subjected to mild aggression arousal. They were told certain toys were special and reserved for children other than themselves.  **Stage 3: Test for Delayed Imitation:** children taken to a room that had both aggressive and nonaggressive toys.  **Findings:** children who observed the aggressive model were more likely to behave aggressively towards the bobo doll than the other groups. | Explains how many positive/negative behaviours is learned  Aggressive acts have been linked to video games  Discovery of mirror-neurons-**biological** **support** for this theory-neurons that fire when a primate performs an action also fire when it watches another primate perform the action | Describes behaviour as nature or nurture when it is a mixture of both.  Underestimates the complexity of behaviour. It doesn’t explain all behaviour, particularly when there is no apparent role model to imitate. I.e. why doesn’t everyone behave like this? |
| Identity Development | | | | Erikson  1962 | Development over a life time as a series of conflicts that need to be resolved. Successful resolution=confident individual. Unsuccessful resolution=inadequacy and problems. It is not necessary to master each crisis but it makes the next one easier.  Eight Stages of Identity Development   1. **Trust vs Mistrust:** *Infancy.* Infant must trust caregiver to provide warmth, love, attention, and other basic needs.  Success=needs are met consistently and responsively=secure attachment and trust Failure: mistrust in others and self, lack of confidence 2. **Autonomy vs Shame/Doubt:** *Toddler:* learning independent skills (talking, walking, tying shoes)Success: caregiver encourages the child and they become successfully independent=self-control and confidence Failure: caregiver ridicules them or is over protective=child feeling shame or doubt of their own ability and competence 3. **Initiative vs Guilt:** *Early childhood:* increased social and motor skills, taking initiative and accepting punishment without guilt.Success: become secure in leadership and decision making ability. Failure: severe punishments or guilt for mistakes leads to the child feeling like a nuisance and avoiding acting with initiative, becoming followers rather than leaders. 4. **Industry vs Inferiority:** *Middle Childhood*: competence through school learning and peer and friends relationshipsSuccess: academic success=sense of competence and mastery Failure: unsuccessful at school = feelings of inferiority and inadequacy 5. **Identity vs Role Confusion:** *Adolescence:* must answer “Who am I?” with an integration of all the results of previous stages. Success: self-identity Failure: confusion, indecision, and avoidance of commitment 6. **Intimacy vs Isolation:** *Young Adult:* formation of intimate relationships (romantic or otherwise) Success: relationship, ability to care for others, share experiences, and maintain healthy relationships. Failure: isolation 7. **Generativity vs Stagnation:** *Middle Adult:* focus on work and maintenance of family relationships, guiding the next generationSuccess: sense of accomplishment and legacy Failure: self-centred, stagnation in life, feels unproductive 8. **Integrity vs Despair:** *Late Adult:* reflection on life and accomplishments.Success: satisfaction of life and feelings of fulfilment, wisdom, integrity towards the thought of death Failure: disappointment in life and unproductivity, feelings of despair towards dying |  |  |
| Relational Influences | Solutions to Resolve Conflict | | | | Follett  1940 | **Imposed Solution:** dictated, sometimes occurs when party is stronger or when a third party steps in. it leads to only one party winning and therefore to dissatisfaction of one party. Underlying conflicts remained unresolved.  **Distributive solutions:** a compromise/mutual concession. Focusses more on addressing demands rather than underlying values and motives.  **Integrative solution:** win-win solution Involves understanding both parties underlying motives, values and goal rather than just the demands,  The difference between an integrative and a distributive solution is explained in the following scenario;  Two sisters want an orange, they decide to cut it in half (distributive solution). However one sister only wanted the juice to drink, the other only wanted the rind for a cake; an integrative solution would have been to give all the rind to one and all the juice to the other. |  |  |
| Negotiation | | | | Thompson and Hastie  1990 | Did a study in which students and car dealers had to come to an agreement or something. They found that negotiators enter into a negotiating expecting opposition. The sooner they realised they had joint interest, the more likely they were to reach an integrative solution. However many failed to do so. |  |  |
| Parenting Styles | | | | Baumrind  1971 | **Socialisation:** the process of acquiring the beliefs, values, and behaviours that are thought to be important and appropriate to function effectively as a member of society.  Two aspects of parenting found to be important to a child’s development are **responsiveness**-level of support and encouragement-, and **control**-extent parent supervises and regulates child’s behaviour.  The Four Styles of Parenting   1. **Authoritarian**:high control, low responsiveness. Demand obedience and rely on coercive techniques (physical/verbal threats) to discipline. Little verbal exchange, firm limits without explanation (“because I’m the boss”), and no interest in hearing the alternate viewpoint of their child. Child can then become more aggressive and dependent, anxious about social comparison, and develop a less advanced moral reasoning because their parent’s never explained their actions. 2. **Authoritative:** high control, high responsiveness. Set limits using reasoning (“no, because you have a game tomorrow”) expect age appropriate maturity and behaviour, involve teen in decision making, and listen to their viewpoint. Child then becomes self-reliant and confidence, seeing adults as helpful people. 3. **Permissive**:low control, high responsiveness. Few limits on behaviour or expectations of maturity, non-directive and lenient, allows child to make major routine decisions. Child then becomes spoilt and dependent, with low self-control and an expectation to always get their own way 4. **Uninvolved:** low control, low responsiveness. Neglectful, often occurs when the parent rejects the child or is too stressed to deal with them.   **Baumrind** found that authoritarian parenting produced the best results, with their children being more academically orientated and having better social and problem solving skills. By adolescence they were relatively confident, and generally steered clear of substance abuse. |  |  |
| Attachment: an emotional bond that endures over time and space and is a complex, ongoing, two-way process that requires closeness and responsiveness from both.  Attachment theory: the belief that strong affectionate ties influence a baby’s mental, social, and emotional development | | | Attachment in Monkeys | Harlow  1959 | Before this study, it was thought that attachment depended on food.  In this study, 8 newborn rhesus monkeys were separated from mum at birth and reared by ‘surrogate mothers’; 2 in each cage a wire one and a cloth one. In half, the wire mother provided food; in the other half the cloth mother provided food. Regardless of which provided food, the baby monkeys spent more time clinging to the cloth mother.  It was thus concluded that contact comfort id more important that food in the formation of infant-mother bonds. This was then generalised to humans. |  |  |
| Attachment in Humans | Bowlby  1969 | Believed there was a ‘sensitive’ period of about 12 months after birth when infants became imprinted (attached to) on their mothers. He believed both mum and child are biologically predisposed to form attachment and equipped with behaviours to gain and maintain positive attention.  An inability to form a close and reciprocal attachment was termed maternal deprivation and can have long-lasting negative consequences  Internal Working Model  A child’s attachment relationship with their caregiver leads to the development of their internal working model. This is a cognitive framework comprising mental representations for understanding the world, self, and others. It guides interaction. The caregiver provides a prototype for this.  Three main features: 1. Others as trustworthy; 2. The self as valuable; 3. The self as effective when interacting with others.  Stages of Attachment   1. **Pre-Attachment**: birth-6weeks, infants innate signals attract mother and mother remains close by when infant responds positively 2. **Attachment in the Making**: 6w-8m. Infant develops a sense of trust (or lack thereof) that mother will respond consistently when signalled and responds more positively to familiar faces. Infant does not protest when separated from mother 3. **Clear-Cut Attachment:** 8m-18m. infant develops separation anxiety and protests when mother leaves 4. **Formations of reciprocal Relationships:** 18m-2y. infant understands that mum will return   Factors Affecting Early Attachment   1. **Quality of Caregiving:** overall sensitivity to infants basic needs (food, stimulations, soothing), responsiveness to specific signals, play to encourage development 2. **Infant Characteristics:** temperament, special needs, prematurity, illness 3. **Family Circumstance:** stress can undermine attachment (financial, emotional, divorce, death etc.) 4. **Parent’s Internal Working Model:** parent’s own attachment experience and ability to accept the past. | Supported by **Harlow’s Monkeys** who grew up to be aggressive and struggled to interact socially with other monkeys | **Rutter 1972** Bowlby does not distinguish between maternal deprivation, and maternal privation; losing an attachment vs never forming one at all |
| Types of Attachment | Ainsworth  1970 | Expanded on Bowlby’s work with her ‘Strange Situation’  **Participants:** 100 middle class American families with an infant between 12 and 18 months  **Procedure:** seven, three minute episodes in which the infant’s behaviour was observed.   1. Parent and infant 2. Stranger enters 3. Parent leaves 4. Parent returns/stranger leaves 5. Parent leaves 6. Stranger returns 7. Parent returns stranger leaves   Types of Attachment  **Secure Attachment:** used parent as a secure base from which to explore the room. Distressed when parent leaves, easily comforted by parent upon return.  **Insecure Avoidant:** show insecurity by ignoring parent, shows no distress when parent leaves or interest upon return, plays normally when alone with stranger  **Insecure resistant:** shows insecurity by resisting parent-clinging and resisting. Intense distress when parent leaves, approach parent upon return but resists contact. Avoids stranger.  **Disorganised:** confused, infant shows inconsistent behaviour, a mix of 2 and 3.  Type of attachment depends on how sensitive and responsive parent is to infants signals and this is revealed in the infant’s response to stress in the strange situation. | **Van Ijzendoorn & Kroonenberg (1988)** studied 32 samples of 8 different countries and found evidence of all three types of attachment. There were greater differences within cultures than between cultures; secure is most common in all countries, insecure avoidant in western Europe, and insecure resistant in Japan and Israel.  **Sagi & Co 1994** differences due to child rearing practices. Found that infants who slept with parents had higher percentage of secure than those in the collective arrangements in a traditional kibbutz that has a rotation of women-meaning infants needs are not consistently met | This is a strange situation so children may react differently than normal.  Extraneous variables such as whether the child attends day-care or not can affect the child’s level of distress and response.  **Durkin 1995** Japanese children rarely leave their mothers and are often carried, and so may be more distressed in the strange situation than western European children who are used to day-care. |
| Social Psychology | Conformity  **Conformity:** changing behaviour in response to group pressure | | | | Asch | Asch’s Conformity Study  In groups of 8-10 in which only one was a genuine participant, the rest were confederates who purposely got the answer wrong on 12/18 trials. They were given 2 cards and had to match the line on the first card with one line out of three on the second card, answering the experimenter one by one.  **Findings:** 75% agreed with the obviously wrong answer at least once, 50% at least 6 times. Compared to participants tested alone that got less than 1% error.  Factors Affecting Conformity   1. **Group Size** 2. **Unanimity** |  |  |
| Obedience  **Obedience:** following the commands on someone in authority or the rules/laws of society with the expectation that disobedience=negative consequences  **Compliance:** changing one’s behaviour when requested to do so-not necessarily by an authority | | | | Milgram | Milgram’s Obedience Study  Initial study in 1962 with 40 Males aged 20-50. They were “randomly” assigned the role of ‘teacher’ or ‘learner’. L had to learn lists of pairs of words and T was to shock them with increasing voltage (15V to 450V) when they made mistakes. L were actually actors in a separate room. T were in a room with an experimenter who encouraged them on if T hesitated when L made sounds of distress. The V meter had labels from slight to DANGER to XXX and still around 70% of participants delivered the maximum voltage and no one walked out of the experiment. **Concluded** that if people believe someone giving orders has authority and they are not responsible for any harm done then they are likely to obey.  Factors Affecting Obedience  **Social Proximity:** less likely to obey if closer to the learner or further from the experimenter  **Legitimacy of Authority:** more likely to obey if authority is perceived as legit and having power (i.e. lab coat)  **Group Pressure:** more likely to obey if everyone else is and there is little or no support for disobeying,  Cross-Cultural Studies  Found complete obedience was over 90% in Spain and Netherlands, over 80% in Italy, Germany, and Austria, but only 40% in Australian men and 16% in Australian women.  Applications: trying to explain the atrocious acts in WW2 and addressed the tendency for people to obey orders without thinking about it and its consequences for others. Some medication errors in hospitals can be attributed to nurses obeying orders despite thinking a mistake has been made. | Real life applications that explains aspects of human behaviour | **Ethics:** Informed consent and deception: the true nature of the experiment was not explained and therefore they could not give their informed consent.  Withdrawal Rights: although told they were free to leave, they were not clearly told they could leave whenever they wanted.  This experiment is considered unethical as justification for the experiment did not outweigh the risk factor-past trauma of patients  Even with a full debrief and assurance that their response was normal, T could be traumatised by their own behaviour and develop psychological issues |
| Obedience & Conformity  Power & Status  **Power**: an individual’s/ groups’ ability to control or influence the thoughts, feelings, or behaviour of another person/group  **Status:** the importance of an individual’s position in the group as perceived by members of that group  **Role:** the behaviour adopted by an individual or assigned to them that influences the way in which they functions or act in different situations or in life (temporary: coach, student; permanent: father, son)  **Role Expectations:** an expectation by other group members that the individual will behave in a way that is consistent with their role | | | | Zimbardo  1973 | Stanford Prison Experiment  **Aim**: to investigate how readily people would conform to the roles of guard and prisoner in a role-playing exercise that simulated prison life.  **Participants**: Twenty-one volunteer male college students paid $15 a day and screened for psychological normality.  **Procedure**: took place in the basement of the Stanford University Psychology building-set up to imitate a prison environment. Participants were randomly assigned as guard or prisoner. To make it as real life as possible, P were arrested from their own homes without warning and taken to a real police station where they were treated like any other criminal and were finger printed, photographed, and ‘booked’. They were then blindfolded and taken to the ‘prison’. Here, the **deindividuation** process began-stripped naked, deloused, all personal possessions confiscated, dressed in prison uniform (a smock with no underclothes), a tight nylon cap, and a chain around one ankle, and referred to only by a number. This **deindividuated and humiliated** them. The guards were given khaki uniforms, handcuffs, a whistle, and dark glasses that prevented eye contact-**deindividuation.**  **Findings:** within a very short time both groups settled into their roles, the guards very quickly. Within hours the some guards began the harassment. Prisons were taunted, given insults and petty orders and pointless and boring tasks, and generally **dehumanised**. They soon adopted prison-like behaviour, becoming submissive and sucking up to the guards to try escape their torment. As they became more dependent on the guards, the guards became more derisive, as their contempt grew so did the prisoner’s submissiveness, as this grew the guards became more aggressive and assertive and so on. One prison was released after 36 hours due to emotional/nervous breakdown, three others also had to leave within the next few days after showing signs of emotional disorder that could have lasting consequences. It was shut down on the 6th day after Zimbardo’s gf made him realise what was happening (as he was acting prison warden he, too, was consumed by the experiment and unable to see it was going too far) as there was real danger someone might be physically or mentally damaged. They were all given a follow up debrief.  **Conclusion:** the roles people play can shape their behaviour and attitudes. | Shows important aspect of human behaviour and the influence of groups and role expectation  Can be related to domestic violence, explaining why people don’t leave or stand up to the abuser, it’s because they both have adopted a role | Went into the experiment not fully understanding or knowing what might happen  **Ethics**: this was a hugely unethical experiment.  Informed consent was not possible as Zimbardo didn’t know what would happen in the experiment.  The participants were not protected from psychological and physical harm.  The level of humiliation and distress experienced by the prisoners.  Not justified. |
| The Bystander Effect  **Definition:** the more people present in an emergency, the less likely that each person will try to help  **Diffusion of Responsibility:** if a person is alone, they accept responsibility, if several people are present, each assumes that the other will do something and so they do not need to take responsibility. | | | | Darley & Latane  1968 | In new York in 1964 there was a brutal, drawn out murder of Kitty Genovese (more than 30 minutes and she screamed for help several times). 38 people reported hearing her scream but none called the police, this was taken up and studied by Darley and Latane.  **Darley and Latane (1968)** placed individual students in small rooms and told them they were to take part in a discussion using microphone and headphones. Some were told they were in discussion with one other person, others with a small group. One “student”-an accomplice-told the participant that he was epileptic. Suddenly he made noises as though he was having a fit. D and L wanted to see how many students would try to get help for him.  **Findings**: the percentage of participants who went for help depending on the perceived group size they were in. all the participants who thought they were the only person in the group went for help, with 85% in the first 80 seconds. By contrast, 62% who thought there were 6 people in the group went for help, with only 31% going quickly. **Conclusion** the more people present in an emergency, the less likely it is that each person will try to help. (diffusion of responsibility) |  |  |
| Social Facilitation  &  Social Inhibition  **Simple Task:** familiar, automatic and speedy  **Complex Task:** unfamiliar, require more concentration, stressful with an audience  **Arousal:** level of enthusiasm and attention?? | | | | Triplett  (facilitation) | **Social Facilitation:** a boost in performance due to the presence of others  **Triplett** noticed that cyclists rode faster when against other people rather than against the clock and the same went for winding reel.  However it has since been found that this only works for simple tasks |  |  |
| Yerkes & Dodson  (Inhibition) | **Social Inhibition**: the presence of others reduces performance on a task.  When doing a complex task the presence of other participants to an audience can reduce performance.  **Found** that people generally perform best at moderate levels of arousal but this depends on the task. Simple tasks work best at high levels, complex at low levels. |  |  |
| Attribution Theory  Making a decision about a behaviour, believing the decision is based on the perceived cause of behaviour  *E.g. High crime rate attributed to drug use; implies a correlation* | | | | Heider  1958  Supporting:  Jones & Harris  1967 | People are trying to make sense of the social world. They tend to see a cause and effect relationship even where there is none.  Based on 3 Principles   1. We tend to look for causes and reasons for other people’s behaviour in order to discover their *motives* 2. We tend to look for stable and enduring properties of the world around us so we can *predict and control* the environment 3. We distinguish between personal factors (dispositional/internal attribution) and environmental factors (environmental/external attribution)   The ability to predict and understand the behaviours of others makes us feel more secure  **Internal Attribution:** something about the person-their attitude, personality etc. is responsible for their behaviour.  **External Attribution:** some external cause-peer pressure, threats-is responsible for their behaviour  *For example; if you meet someone at a party and they are aloof and distant, is it because they are a rude person (internal) or because they are not enjoying the party (external)?*  Fundamental Attribution Error  The tendency for observers to underestimate situational (external) influences and overestimate the impact of personal characteristics (internal)  **Scherer (1978)** found people made assumptions about the personality of a complete stranger based on a voice over the phone  **Jones and Harris (1967)** provided strong support for the attribution bias in a series of experiments that asked students to judge the true attitude of a person after reading limited info presented in either an essay or a speech by them on a controversial topic. In one study, the students judged them based on their (assigned) stance in a school debate. Despite knowing they were assigned positions, they still suggested that the person held an attitude similar to the argument they were debating. Therefore we see that the dispositional/internal attribution was stronger than the situational/external one.  **Crick and Dodge (1994)** looked at attributes when studying aggressive behaviour. They differentiate between reactive aggression-an angry response to frustration or provocation, and proactive aggression-a deliberate attempt to get a desired goal. They found that children showing reactive aggression are likely to show attribution bias and interpret situations as hostile when they aren’t. *For Example: Toby and Jonas run around a corner and bump into each other, based on previous experience, Toby has developed a hostile attribution bias so he thinks that Jonas is a horrible person who deliberately tried to hurt him and so reacts violently.*  Self-Serving Bias  **De Michele and Co (1998)**  We make eternal attributions to maintain our self-esteem. *E.g. I failed because the test was hard not because I’m stupid.* |  | Doesn’t explain why information such as stereotypes affect the intake of information we use to make attributions  Doesn’t explain why some people prefer simple causal explanations over taking into account all of the possible factors |
| Covariant Model of Attribution | | | | Kelley | Identified two parties involved in attribution: **actors**: person whose action are being appraised; and **observers:** those who make the attributions  Covariant Model of Attribution  Whether or not someone makes and internal or external attribution depends on: *example: john gets 100% on a psych test*  **Consensus:** the degree to which other people’s behaviour is similar to that of the actor *everyone/nobody else got high/100% scores*  **Consistency:** the degree to which the behaviour is the same across time (more specific) *john often/never gets high scores in psychology*  **Distinctiveness:** the extent to which similar stimuli draw the same behaviours from the actor (more general) *john often/never gets high scores in tests at school*  Each of these factors are rated as high or low as determined by the following questions:   1. Do others engage in the same behaviour? (consensus)   If yes, consensus is high; if no consensus is low   1. Does \_\_ always behave in this way when \_\_this situation\_\_   If yes, consistency is high, if no, consistency is low   1. Does \_\_person\_\_ tend to \_\_behaviour\_\_   If yes, distinctiveness is low, if no, distinctiveness is high |  |
| Cognitive Dissonance  **Definition:**  psychological tension when we hold 2 beliefs that are in conflict or when we behave in a way that is inconsistent with our beliefs (Zimbardo) | | | | Festinger  1957 | **Festinger** stated that we dislike inconsistency and seek a way to reduce it and find evidence that supports our own view. Something must change to reduce or eliminate the dissonance. The greater the dissonance, the stronger the attempt to reduce it.  **Festinger’s Study:**  Participants were asked to complete a boring task and then given either $1 or $20 to tell the next person it was very interesting. They were then asked to rate the task. Those paid $1 rated the task interesting as they had to justify completing the task and telling someone it was interesting. Those paid $20 rated in uninteresting, they did not feel the need to justify their completion of the task as their $20 reward did that for them  Ways to Reduce Cognitive Dissonance  Using the example of a student who usually does well in psychology but totally bombs out on a test and fails (dissonance)   1. **Changing Behaviour** increasing/altering study habits 2. **Changing Attitude:** maybe I’m not as good as I think I am at this subject 3. **Reducing the Importance of the Belief/Behaviour:** the test was only worth 5% 4. **Look for supporting Evidence:** I’ve done well on every other test I’m still a good student |  |  |
|  | McMillan-Chavis Model of Community | | | | McMillan & Chavis | Four Main Elements of Community:  Membership, influence, integration and fulfilment of needs, shared emotional connection.  **Five Main Components of Membership**: 1. Belonging (role of identification) 2. Boundaries (physical and otherwise, in-group/outgroup) 3.Safety (emotional) 4. Personal investment (earning ones way and investing time and effort) 5. Common Symbol (means of identification)  **Influence:** the feeling that you have influence on the community and the community has influence on you  **Integration and fulfilment of needs:** the needs of the people and the community are met simultaneously  **Seven Features of Shared Emotional Connection:** 1. Contact hypothesis-the more they interact the closer they become. 2. Quality of interaction-the more positive the interaction the closer. 3. Closure to events-supporting each other and completing tasks. 4. Shared event hypothesis-sharing a crisis strengthens bonds (e.g. natural disaster) 5. Investment-time, energy, and effort a good community makes. 6. Spiritual bond-intangible connection  Features that Build a Sense of Community   * Working together/cooperation (e.g. rebuilding a town after a natural disaster **M**: safety among each other **I:** feel like they’ve made an important contribution (influence/importance) **S:** supported and survived through a shared negative experience=emotional bond **I:** the needs of individuals (houses) are met as well as the towns (town buildings) * Common interests * Inclusivity and acceptance-communication skills, invitation (there by choice), role assignments-everyone feels important and like they have influence   Factors that Destroy a Sense of Community   * Social Loafing * Intragroup Competition * Deindividuation (leads to anti-social behaviour) * Community not feeling safe leads to division and paranoia (Salem witch trials) |  |  |