ii. Study two
1. For each show computed a bias score reflecting the relative treatment of White and Black actors
2. Ps whose viewing habits exposed them to more bias were also higher in implicit race bias
   a. IAT
iii. Study 3
1. Ps randomly assigned to watch pro-White or pro-Black clips
2. P’s who watched pro-White clips had more pro-White implicit racial attitude
3. Exposing people to more bias → changes racial attitude
d. Behavioral mimicry
   i. Chartrand and Bargh
   1. Behavioral mimicry occurs without awareness
   ii. Lakin and Chartrand
   1. Subliminally primed with an affiliation goal or no goal
   2. Memorized behavior of a person in a videotape who did a lot of face touching
   3. Ps in affiliation condition touched their face more often than those in control (not aware)
iii. Tiedens and Fragale
   1. Dominance / submissiveness yields behavioral complementarity and this increases rapport
e. Summary
   i. Nonverbal behavior and perceiving others
   1. Universality, culture, deception
   ii. Nonverbal behavior and the self
   1. Power posing, transmission of attitudes, mimicry

Week 4 - Part 2

1) Heider and Simmel Demo
   a. Heider’s naïve or commonsense psychology
      i. Developing theories about how the world works simply because we’re human
      ii. Internal vs. external attribution (is behavior internally or externally caused)
b. Social brain is involved in mentalizing animate objects

2) Ordinary personology
   a. Scientific study of how ordinary people come to know about each other’s temporary states and enduring dispositions
      i. A.k.a person perception, social perception, person memory, mentalizing
      ii. Making sense of other people
   b. Attribution theory
      i. The study of how we infer the causes of other people’s behavior

3) Historical approaches: rational attribution models
   a. Heider’s naive or commonsense
   b. Jones and Davis Correspondent inference theory
   c. Kelly’s Covariation

4) Correspondent inference theory
   a. To explain each other’s behavior, we ask ourselves:
      i. Is the behavior freely chosen?
      ii. Is the behavior socially undesirable or unusual?
      iii. Does the behavior yield non-common effects (one cause only)

5) Covariation model
   a. To explain behavior we use:
      i. Consensus info
         1. Would others react the same way in this situation?
            a. Yes = high, no = low
      ii. Consistency info
         1. Does this person always act this way in this situation
            a. Yes = high, no = low
a. Ingratiation: using flatter or praise to make yourself likeable to another
b. Self-handicapping: people create obstacles and excuses for themselves so that if they do poorly on a task, they can avoid blaming themselves
   i. Behavioral (men) and reported (making excuses)
19. Summary: how do we know ourselves?
   a. Introspection
      i. Self-awareness theory
      ii. Over-reliance on causal theories
      iii. Reasons generated attitude change
   b. Observing our behavior:
      i. Self-perception theory
      ii. Intrinsic vs. extrinsic motivation
      iii. 2 factor theory of emotion

Self-justification

1) Cognitive dissonance: discomfort caused by behaving in a way that runs counter to our self-image
   a. Reducing dissonance
      i. Change behavior to bring it in line with dissonant cognition
      ii. Justify behavior by changing dissonant cognition
         1. Changing your beliefs about the actual inconsistency
         2. Why didn’t I vote? It didn’t really matter
      iii. Justify behavior by adding consonant cognitions
         1. Smoking → smoking provides an opportunity to socially bond with people
   b. Dissonance reduction involves rationalization
      i. Segregation study
      ii. Participants with pro, neutral, or anti segregation attitudes read plausible or implausible arguments that were pro or anti segregation
      iii. DV: memory for the arguments
      iv. Pro:
         a. exposed to inconsistent information
            a. remember the really weak information
            b. don’t remember the good evidence
      v. Anti:
         1. Remember bad arguments against their viewpoints, forget good
   c. Dissonance and insufficient justification
      i. Festinger
      ii. The man who was payed 20: knows the task was dull but has sufficient justification to lie
      iii. Payed one dollar: knows it was boring but does not have sufficient justification → dissonance
         1. Reduces the dissonance by changing their opinion
   iv. IV: payment for lying
   v. DV: enjoyment of task
   vi. Those who paid one dollar liked the boring task the most
   vii. Ps in both conditions had to reduce lying-related dissonance
      1. 20 condition relied on external justification
      2. 1 condition had insufficient external justification and relied on internal justification (I must have liked it)
      3. Internal → most attitude change
   d. Operant condition was the big one: motivation driven by rewards
      i. Cognitive dissonance theory said little rewards can motivate behavior even more: big controversy
2) Insufficient punishment
   a. Pre-schoolers told not to play with desirable toy or:
      i. Mild threat
      ii. Severe threat
   b. DV: how much did they like the forbidden toy
a. Reasoning areas of the brain shut down when confronting dissonance and emotional areas light up when dissonance is restored.

9) Counterattitudinal advocacy
   a. The smaller the external incentive, the greater the attitude change.

10) Dissonance and independent and interdependent selves
   a. US and Japanese P’s in spreading of alternatives paradigm
   b. IV: exposure to poster
   c. For Japanese, dissonance stems from threats to interdependent self
      i. Americans showed spreading of alternatives in both conditions
      ii. Japanese showed spreading of alternatives in just the poster condition

11) Alternatives to dissonance theory: **self-affirmation theory**
   a. We prevent dissonance-arousing threat by affirming aspects of self-concept that are unrelated to the field
   b. Typical self-affirmation manipulation
      i. Social life/relationships
      ii. Art/music/theater
      iii. Science/pursuit of knowledge
      iv. Politics
      v. Creativity
      vi. Business/economics
      vii. Athletics
   c. Make us more open to hearing things that are inconsistent with our views

12) Self-affirmation theory
   a. Ps received positive or negative personality feedback and then ranked 10 albums and had to decide to keep the 5th or 6th
   b. After decision, re-ranked albums
   c. Only Ps receiving negative feedback showed spreading of alternatives
      i. Why?
      ii. Those who were self-affirmed felt good about themselves, so no dissonance

13) Self-affirmation and physiological stress
   a. Students who varied in vulnerability about implications of school performance (in college, I worry people will think I’m unintelligent)
   b. Baseline sample of epinephrine
   c. IV: self-affirmation or control (administered twice in the two weeks leading up to exam)
   d. Sample of epinephrine before most important midterm
      i. Self affirmation: high vulnerability no longer self-threatening no increased in stress! (turned off stress response)

14) Application of dissonance theory
   a. Hypocrisy and condoms
   b. Commitment: manipulated delivery of persuasive videotaped speech about safe sex
   c. Mindful: manipulated reflection on own past condom failures
      i. Commitment / mindful: hypocrisy
         1. Told people how important it is to use condoms and then had to think about times they didn’t
      ii. No commitment / mindful
      iii. Commitment / not mindful
      iv. No commitment / not mindful: just look at pamphlets
   d. Ps in hypocrisy condition
      i. Most likely to buys condoms at the end of the study
      ii. Reported using more condoms several months after the study

15) Ben Franklin effect: justifying acts of kindness
   a. Doing a kind act → seeing someone as better
   b. Unwilling to do a kind act → justify by seeing them as worse

16) Conclusion
   a. Cognitive dissonance theory
      i. Rationalization
      ii. Insufficient justification
1. Attitude accessibility: strength of association between attitude object and person's evaluation of it
   a. High accessibility $\rightarrow$ spontaneous behaviors

ii. Theory of planned behavior
   1. Best predictor of behavior when people have time to contemplate how they’re going to behave, the best predictor is their intention
      a. Determined by:
         i. Their attitudes towards the specific behavior
         1. Not general
         ii. Their subjective norms
         1. Beliefs about how people they care about will view the behavior in question
         iii. Their perceived behavioral control
         1. Ease in which they believe they can perform the behavior
   2. E.g. birth control (look at text)

iii. Subliminal messaging
   1. No evidence that subliminal messaging encountered in everyday life made a difference
   2. However, experimental evidence

6. Sum
   a. Nature and function of attitude
   b. Persuasion / challenging attitudes

Conformity

1. What is conformity?
   a. Behavioral change (in accordance with other’s actions) due to real or imagined influence of others

2. Personal examples of conformity

3. Informational social influence
   a. Conformity in ambiguous situations that occurs because we use others’ behavior as a source of information
   b. Autokinetic effect experiment
      i. Illusion of movement of light in dark space
      ii. Amount of movement is ambiguous
      iii. Day 1: private estimates
      iv. Several days later: groups of 3, public estimates (saying out loud)
      v. Then asked again to judge by themselves $\rightarrow$ still conformed to the group estimate
   c. Emergence of group norms
      i. Private: all over the place
      ii. Over time, when out loud, estimate converge
      iii. Privately accepted information as true

4. Factors that facilitate informational social influence
   a. Ambiguous situations
      i. Being at a new restaurant, not knowing what silverware to use
   b. Crisis situations
      i. Being on a heavy turbulence flight $\rightarrow$ look at flight attendant
   c. Presence of experts
   d. Being motivated to get things right $\rightarrow$ more likely to conform
   e. Contagion: emotions and behavior spread rapidly through a crowd

5. Normative social influence
   a. Social norms: implicit and explicit rules for acceptable behaviors, values, and beliefs
   b. Normative social influence: conformity stemming for social approval
   c. Public compliance without private acceptance

6. Asch line study
   a. Going along with the group on 37 percent of trials
   b. With a partner, yielding drops to only 5 percent (but deny they played a role)
   c. Writing answers: conformity drops by 2/3's
iii. Groupthink
1. Challenger explosion
   a. Exploded 76 seconds after liftoff because of leak in rocket booster field joint
   b. Launch occurred in unusually cold weather
   c. Concern about whether O rings could withstand temperature
   d. How did such a large, talented group make such a bad decision
2. When: cohesive group, isolated from contrary opinion, directive leader with known wishes, poor decisions making procedures, under stress
3. Symptoms: illusion of invulnerability, belief in moral correctness, self-censorship, conformity pressure, mind-guards
4. Consequences: defective decision making, poor information search, failure to develop contingency plan

iv. Avoiding groupthink
1. Leader remains impartial
2. Solicit outside opinions
3. Subgroup discussions before the big discussion
4. Secret ballots
5. Devil’s advocate

c. Conclusions
i. Group influence on individual and collective behavior
   1. Social facilitation
   2. Social loafing
   3. De-individualization
ii. Group polarization: the tendency for groups to make decisions that are more extreme than the initial inclination of its members

4. What makes a leader?
a. Leadership and personality
   i. Weak relationships
b. Leadership styles
   i. Short term and longer term → be a work together

5. Leadership: the glass ceiling
a. Only 16.3 women in US Congress → less than 2 percent women CEO’s
b. Is good leadership a manly business?
   i. Men
      1. Agentic
         a. Confident
         b. Assertive
         c. Independent
         d. Decisive
   ii. Women
      1. Communal
         a. Kind
         b. Helpful
         c. Sympathetic
         d. Concerned for others
   iii. Good leadership is described with masculine attributes → masculine attributes thought necessary to being a successful leader
   iv. Women are also more likely to be put in charge of high risk units

c. Role incongruity
   i. “either a professional women or a caring hostess…” → Clinton
   ii. Sandberg → Lean In
d. Gorilla test (selective attention test)
e. Implicit association test
f. Studies
i. Resume studies
   1. Men are more likely to get called back than women
   2. When women are all good, but there’s not a superstar
ii. Letters of rec
   1. Men: independence, research
   2. Women: more likely to talk about how caring
iii. Reactions to leaders
   1. Competent women not seen as warm, and vice versa
iv. Stereotypes emerge more strongly when assessed implicitly
v. Role models and gender leadership stereotypes
   1. To test if women’s implicit gender/leadership stereotypes changed over time as a function of whether they attend a women’s or coed college
   2. Recruited female Ps from women’s college and coed college early in 1st year. Tracked both groups for 3 semesters
   3. At two time periods, assessed: implicit beliefs about women’s leadership qualities relative to men
      a. Sex of professors
      b. Coed on top
      c. Both held stereotypes on average that saw men as more leaders, no significant difference after first year
d. 2nd year: more divergence
   i. Coed colleges: stereotypes increase
   ii. Women’s college: decreasing
vi. Stereotypic images and seeing oneself as a leader
   1. Exposed Ps to gender-stereotypic or control TV commercials
   2. Exposure undermined female participants leadership aspirations
vii. Solutions for dilemma
   1. Role models
   2. Changing stereotypes of women
   3. Changing stereotypes of leaders

Liking
1. Closeness
   a. Propinquity / proximity
      i. The people you see / interact with most are most likely to become friends / lovers
      ii. Apartment study: best friends almost always next door
      iii. People who sat next to each other most likely to be friends
      iv. Why?
         1. Functional distance: aspects of design that determine who you cross paths with the most
         2. Cautions about unfamiliar (evolution)
         3. Mere exposure effect
            a. Except when we do not like that person—then we like them less
   v. Our close friends are similar to us
b. Why do we like similar others?
   i. We think they will like us
   ii. Similar others validate our beliefs (we’re right!)
   iii. Disagreement on important issues → repulsion
   iv. Cognitive consistency (balance theory)
      1. Balanced or consistent mental states
      2. You are your enemy have different attitudes: balanced (you and attitude + / enemy and attitude -)
      3. You and your friend have the same attitude: balanced (three plusses)
3. Trivializes your identity
   b. Dual identity approach
      i. Recognizing that we belong to multiple groups while still talking about common attributes
   c. Positive contact increases complacency with the status quo

6. Irony of harmony
   a. Made on group high and one low status by giving them a lot of credits in a game
      i. Told to talk about things group has in common
         1. How much do you expect the high status group to share?
            a. Expected a lot
         2. Received: low amount (About the same)
      ii. Told to talk about things group is different in
         1. Expected what they got (same as received in other condition)
      iii. Perhaps blind us to inequalities

5. Summary
   a. Encourage superordinate goals
   b. Common ingroup identity
      i. Prejudice reduction vs social change
   c. Jigsaw classroom