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The Dialectic Between the Environment and Behavior

\[ \text{E} \rightarrow \text{B} \]

Three Dialectics in Social Behavior
Social Psychology as the Psychology of Social Influence

• Social Behavior (F. Allport, 1924)
  – Behavior that Occurs in Response to the Stimulus of Another’s Behavior
  – Behavior that Serves as a Stimulus to Another’s Response

• Social Influence (G. Allport, 1954)
  – “[H]ow the thought, feeling and behavior of individuals are influenced by the actual, imagined, or implied presence of other human beings”
Conformity Experiment
Asch (1956, 1958)

• Perceptual Task
  – Identify Line Whose Length Matches Standard
  • Some Trials Easy, Others Difficult

(A) Standard line

(1) (2) (3) Comparison lines
Conformity Experiment
Asch (1955)

• Conditions of Testing
  – Isolation vs. Group of
• Group Composed of Confederates
  – Some Trials, Unanimously Opposed to Subject
• How Does the Subject’s Judgment Vary?
Group Size and Conformity

Asch (1955)

% Conforming Responses vs. Size of Unanimous Group
Conformity Experiment
Asch (1956, 1958)

• Conditions of Testing
  – Isolation vs. Group of 7

• Group Composed of Confederates
  – Some Trials, Unanimously Opposed to Subject
  – Other trials, Single Dissenter with Subject

• How Does the Subject’s Judgment Vary?
Conformity
Asch (1956)
Minority Size and Conformity
Nemeth et al. (1977)

• Judgments of Color
  – Blue vs. Blue-Green

• Group composition
  – 6 Naïve Subjects (Usually Judged “Blue”)
  – 1-4 Confederates (Wrongly Judged “Blue-Green”)

• Adoption of Erroneous Minority Judgment
Adoption of Minority Judgment
Nemeth et al. (1977)
“Mere Presence” Effects on Behavior
Zajonc (1965); Guerin (1986)

• Social Facilitation (Triplett, 1898; Allport, 1920)
  – Simple Tasks
  – Automatic Processes
  – Experts

• Social Inhibition (Zajonc, 1965)
  – Difficult Tasks
  – Controlled Processes
  – Novices
Social Loafing
Latane et al. (1979), after Ringelmann (1913)
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Ambient Temperature and Violent Crime
Anderson, 1989

Murder and Rape Combined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season</th>
<th>% of Yearly Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Winter Spring Summer Fall
The Frustration-Aggression Hypothesis
Dollard et al. (1939); Miller (1941)

- Aggression is a Reflexive Response to Frustration
- Frustration Defined
  - Any Obstacle to Goal-Completion
- Other People Can Be Obstacles to Goals
The Revised Frustration-Aggression Hypothesis
Berkowitz (1989, 1993)

• Broaden Definition of Frustration
  – Any Aversive Event
    • Construed as Intentionally Harmful

• Aggression not a Reflexive Response
  – Mediated by Anger
    • Elevated Emotional Arousal
    • Thoughts of Attack
  – Presence of Situational Cues
Anger, Weapons, and Aggression
Berkowitz & LePage (1967)

• Subject, Confederate Work Together on Problems
  – Evaluate Each Other’s Performance
    • Deliver 1-10 Shocks
• Confederate Evaluates Subject First
  – Delivers 1 vs. 7 Shocks
  – Induces Anger in Subject
• Subject Evaluates Confederate
  – Opportunity to Retaliate Against Confederate
• Objects in the Room
  – Guns vs. Badminton Equipment
    • Belong to Confederate or Someone Else
The Weapon Effect
Berkowitz & LePage (1967)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th># of Shocks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Angered</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Object in Room:
- Badminton
- No Object
- Other's Weapon
- Partner's Weapon

Graph showing the number of shocks under different conditions with objects in the room.
Altruism Experiment
Darley & Latane (1968); Latane & Darley (1970)

- Subjects Recruited for Experiment
- Sit in Room, Fill Out Questionnaires
  - Seated Alone or With Others
- Experimenter Departs
- Staged Emergency
  - Smoke through Ventilator
  - Fall in Next Room
Helping Behavior
Darley & Latane (1968); Latane & Darley (1970)

![Bar chart showing helping behavior in two experiments: Smoke and Foot. The chart compares the percentage of people seeking help when alone versus in a group. In the Smoke experiment, more people seek help alone than in a group. In the Foot experiment, a similar trend is observed.]
Modeling Effects on Altruism
Bryan & Test (1967)

• Female College Student with Flat Tire
  – Model 1/4 Mile Previously

• Salvation Army Christmas Kettle
  – Model Donates
Modeling Effects on Altruism
Bryan & Test (1967)
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More Social Influences on Behavior

• Conformity
  – Real or Imagined Social Pressure
    • At the Level of Behavior
    • At the Level of Belief

• Obedience
  – Unequal Power Relationship

• Compliance
  – Response to Explicit Requests
The Psychosocial Law

\[ SI = sN^t, \]
where \( t < 1 \)

- **Social Impact** of “Many on One”
  - Grows More Slowly than the Number of Sources

- **Social Impact** of “One on Many”
  - Total Impact is Diffused Across Many Targets

\[ SI = f(SIN) \]
Salience
Immediacy
Number

Figure 1. Multiplication of impact: \( I = f(SIN) \).

Figure 5. Division of impact: \( I = f(1/SIN) \).
Automaticity of Social Behavior

- Inevitable Evocation
- Incorrigible Completion
  - Efficient Execution
  - Parallel Processing
Interruptions of Experimenter
Bargh et al. (1996), Experiment 1

• Cover Task: Scrambled sentences
  – “Rude” Primes
    • aggressively, rude, bother, disturb, intrude
  – “Polite” Primes
    • respect, honor, considerate, appreciate, patiently
  – “Neutral” Primes
    • exercising, flawlessly, occasionally, rapidly, gleefully

• Experimenter Engaged with Confederate
  – Ignores Waiting Subject

• Interruptions During 10-Minute Waiting Period
Interruptions of Experimenter

Bargh et al. (1996), Experiment 1
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The Inevitable Automaticity of Being
Bargh & Chartrand (1999)

“[M]ost of a person’s everyday life is determined not by their conscious intentions and deliberate choices but by mental processes that are put into motion by features of the environment and that operate outside of conscious awareness and guidance.”
The Dialectic Between the Environment and Behavior

Three Dialectics in Social Behavior
Behavior Changes the Situation

- Instrumental or Operant Behavior
  - Operates on the Environment
    - Changes It In Some Way
- Person as Part of the Situation
  - Individual Behavior Changes Situation
    - For Others in that Situation
    - For Him- or Herself
  - Behavior of Others Also Changes Situation
Helping Experiment
Darley & Latane (1968); Latane & Darley (1970)

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{chart.png}
\caption{Percentage of participants seeking help in Smoke and Foot experiments.}
\end{figure}
Pluralistic Ignorance
Darley & Latane (1968); Latane & Darley (1970)

• Diffusion of Responsibility
• Situation Ambiguous
  – Natural to Wait for Clarification
  – Look to Others to Resolve Ambiguity
• Others’ Lack of Action
  – Defines Situation as Non-Emergency for Subject
• Subject’s Lack of Action
  – Defines Situation as Non-Emergency for Others