

LECTURE SCHEDULE

| | |
|----------------------|---|
| Sept 26 | Introduction to social psychology: some definitions and principles of social perception |
| Sept 28, Oct 3 & 5 | Evidence, inference and the maintenance of social beliefs |
| Oct 10 & 12 | Nature and measurement of attitudes |
| Oct 17 & 29 | Theories of cognitive consistency and attitude change |
| Oct 31, Nov 2, 7 & 9 | Aggression and prejudice |
| Nov 14, 16, & 21 | The nature of good and evil |
| Nov 28, 30 | Organizational processes: Thinking about social problems and social change |

READING LIST

1. Selected readings in social psychology. Reproduced for use in this course, available at UO Bookstore. (Abbreviation: SRISP)
2. Beliefs, attitudes, and human affairs. By D. Bem. Wadsworth, 1970. (Optional -- if available used.)
3. The unresponsive bystander: Why doesn't he help?. By B. Latane & J. Darley. Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1970. (Abbreviation: UB) (Optional -- If available used.)

NOTE: Attitude paper due October 31, 1995.
Aggression/Prejudice paper due November 30, 1995.

ATTITUDES (Note: Paper on Attitudes due October 31, 1995.)

I. The nature and measurement of attitudes¹

| <u>Source</u> | <u>Title</u> | <u>Author</u> |
|---------------|---|----------------|
| SRISP | Attitudes | Allport |
| SRISP | The method of constructing an attitude scale | Likert |
| SRISP | Response biases and response sets | Guilford |
| SRISP | On the fading of social stereotypes | Karlins et al. |
| SRISP | Current stereotypes: A little fading, a little faking | Sigall & Page |
| SRISP | Attitudes vs. actions | La Piere |
| SRISP | Attitudes vs. actions vs. attitudes vs. attitudes | Schuman |
| SRISP | When actions reflect attitudes | Snyder & Swann |
| SRISP | The indirect assessment of social attitudes | Campbell |
| Bem | Beliefs, attitudes and human affairs | Bem |

2. Cognitive consistency, attitude organization, and attitude change

| | | |
|-------|--|-----------------|
| SRISP | Cognitive dynamics in the conduct of human affairs | Osgood |
| SRISP | Attitudinal consequences of induced discrepancies between cognitions and behavior | Cohen |
| SRISP | Modes of resolution of belief dilemmas | Abelson |
| SRISP | The influence of source credibility on communication effectiveness | Hovland & Weiss |
| SRISP | Assimilation and contrast effects in reactions to communication and attitude change | Hovland et al. |
| SRISP | An experimental analysis of the contrast effect and its implications for intergroup communication and the indirect assessment of attitudes | Dawes et al. |
| SRISP | Compliance, identification, and Internalization: Three processes of attitude change | Kelman |

¹Although it will not be fatal to read the various articles out of order, there is an advantage to reading them in the order listed.

AGGRESSION (Note: Paper on Aggression & Prejudice due November 30, 1995.)

| <u>Source</u> | <u>Title</u> | <u>Author</u> |
|---------------|---|--------------------------|
| SRISP | Biological factors II: Physiology, genetics and sex | Johnson |
| SRISP | The frustration-aggression hypothesis | Miller et al. |
| SRISP | The stimulating vs. cathartic effects of a vicarious aggressive activity | Fishbach |
| SRISP | Some conditions of obedience & disobedience to authority | Milgram |
| SRISP | From individual to group impressions | Rothbart et al. |
| SRISP | Recall for confirming events | Rothbart et al. |
| SRISP | Arousal for ingroup-outgroup biases by a chance win or loss | Rabbie & Horwitz |
| SRISP | Social categorization & memory for ingroup and outgroup behavior | Howard & Rothbart |
| SRISP | Social categorization and similarity in intergroup behavior | Billig & Tajfel |
| SRISP | The perception of outgroup homogeneity and levels of social categorization | Park & Rothbart |
| SRISP | Ethnic tolerance: Social & personal control | Bettelheim & Janowitz |
| SRISP | The authoritarian personality | Frankel-Brunswick et al. |
| SRISP | Racial identification & preference in Negro children | Clark & Clark |
| SRISP | Black is beautiful: A reexamination of racial preference and identification | Hraba & Grant |
| SRISP | The effect of public policy in housing projects upon interracial attitudes | Deutsch & Collins |
| SRISP | Negro platoons in white companies | Starr et al. |
| SRISP | Superordinate goals in the reduction of intergroup conflict | Sherif |
| UB | The unresponsive bystander: Why doesn't he help? | Latane & Darley |
| SRISP | Efforts of group pressure upon their modification & distortion of judgment | Asch |
| SRISP | Why war? Freud's letter to Einstein | Freud |
| SRISP | Ritualized fighting | Lorenz |
| SRISP | Moral Equivalent of War | James |

General References:

The Nature of Prejudice, by G. W. Allport. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1954.

Social learning & personality development, by A. Bandura & R. H. Walters. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1963. Contains a good analysis of aggression from a behavioristic point of view.

Frustration & conflict: Selected readings, by A. J. Yates. New York: Van Nostrand Co., Inc., 1965 (paperback). Contains some classic experiments on displaced aggression.

Aggression in man & animals, by R. N. Johnson. Philadelphia: Sanders Co., 1972.

| <u>AUTHOR</u> | <u>TITLE</u> | <u>PAGES</u> |
|--|---|--------------|
| 01) Allport | Attitudes | 1-12 |
| 02) Likert | The Method of Constructing An Attitude Scale | 13-18 |
| 03) Guilford | Response Biases and Response Sets | 19-24 |
| 04) Karlins, Coffman & Walters | On the Fading of Social Stereotypes | 25-40 |
| 05) Sigall & Page | Current Stereotypes: A Little Fading, A Little Faking | 41-50 |
| 06) La Piere | Attitudes vs. Actions | 51-56 |
| 07) Schuman | Attitudes vs. Actions vs. Attitudes vs. Attitudes | 57-62 |
| 08) Snyder & Swann | When Actions Reflect Attitudes | 63-72 |
| 09) Campbell | The Indirect Assessment of Social Attitudes | 73-90 |
| 10) Osgood | Cognitive Dynamics in the Conduct of Human Affairs | 91-106 |
| 11) Cohen | Attitudinal Consequences of Induced Discrepancies Between Cognitions and Behavior | 107-116 |
| 12) Abelson | Modes of Resolution of Belief Dilemmas | 117-124 |
| 13) Hovland & Weiss | The Influence of Source Credibility on Communication Effectiveness | 125-136 |
| 14) Hovland, Harvey & Sherif | Assimilation and Contrast Effects in Reactions to Communication and Attitude Change | 137-148 |
| 15) Dawes, Singer & Lemons | An Experimental Analysis of the Contrast Effect and Its Implications for Intergroup Communication and the Indirect Assessment of Attitude | 149-164 |
| 16) Katz | The Functional Approach to the Study of Attitudes | 165-176 |
| 17) Kelman | Compliance, Identification, and Internalization: Three Processes of Attitude Change | 177-184 |
| 18) Milgram | Some Conditions of Obedience and Disobedience to Authority | 185-204 |
| 19) Rothbart, Fulero, Jensen, Howard & Birrell | From Individual to Group Impressions | 205-214 |

| <u>AUTHOR</u> | <u>TITLE</u> | <u>PAGES</u> |
|-------------------------------|--|--------------|
| 20) Rothbart, Evans & Fulero | Recall for Confirming Events | 215-222 |
| 21) Rabbie & Horwitz | Arousal of Ingroup-Outgroup Bias By a Chance Win or Loss | 223-232 |
| 22) Billig & Tafjel | Social Categorization and Similarity in Intergroup Behavior | 233-260 |
| 23) Howard & Rothbart | Social Categorization and Memory For Ingroup and Outgroup Behavior | 261-270 |
| 24) Park & Rothbart | The Perception of Outgroup Homogeneity and Levels of Social Categorization | 271-290 |
| 25) Bettelheim & Janowitz | Ethnic Tolerance: A Function of Social and Personal Control | 291-300 |
| 26) Frankel-Brunswick et al. | The Authoritarian Personality | 301-310 |
| 27) Clark & Clark | Racial Identification and Preference in Negro Children | 311-320 |
| 28) Hraba & Grant | Black is Beautiful: A Re-Examination of Racial Preference and Identification | 321-326 |
| 29) Deutsch & Collins | The Effect of Public Policy in Housing Projects Upon Inter-Racial Housing | 327-338 |
| 30) Star, Williams & Stouffer | Negro Infantry Platoons in White Companies | 339-344 |
| 31) Sherif | Superordinate Goals in the Reduction of Intergroup Conflict | 345-354 |
| 32) Asch | Effects of Group Pressure Upon the Modification and Distortion of Judgments | 355-364 |
| 33) Johnson | Biological Factors II - Physiology, Genetics, and Sex | 365-386 |
| 34) Freud | 1) Why War? | 387-392 |
| Lorenz | 3) Ritualized Fighting | 393-400 |
| Miller et al. | 6) The Frustration-Aggression Hypothesis | 401-404 |
| Feshbach | 8) The Stimulating vs. Cathartic Effects of a Vicarious Aggressive Activity | 405-410 |
| James | 16) The Moral Equivalent of War | 411-416 |

INTRODUCTION: Two of the most basic and enduring questions concerning the nature of social attitudes can be summarized as follows:)

1. What are we able to predict about a person when we know their attitude(s) toward some object (group, issue, nation, individual, etc.)?
2. In what ways, if any, can important social attitudes be changed?

The first paper topic requires that you address both these questions.

1. The meaning and predictive value of attitudes: Although it is possible to predict, with a high degree of accuracy, individuals' voting behavior from their previously expressed preferences for candidates (as with Gallup and Harris polls), some psychologists have been highly skeptical about the usefulness of the concept of attitude. These critics have argued that verbally expressed attitudes, such as those obtained in opinion polls and paper-and-pencil questionnaires, are often unrelated to a person's actual behavior, or even to other (logically related) attitudes that the person holds. Thus, it is possible to review the public opinion literature and find that Americans' attitudes toward the Vietnam war were "inconsistent" (supporting escalation in 1966, and supporting withdrawal in 1970), as are their racial attitudes (strong majority support for school integration and racial equality, and strong majority opposition to busing). It is evidence such as this, as well as from more controlled studies relating attitudes to behavior, that have led people to the conclusion that an individual's verbally expressed attitudes enable us neither to predict behavior, nor even their attitudes, toward similar or related topics.

Although it is possible to find some research (and personal anecdotes) that tend to support this criticism, it is your task to carefully evaluate this criticism and to answer the following question:

What are the critical factors that produce a close correspondence (good predictability) between verbal attitudes and overt behavior under some circumstances, but a poor correspondence (poor predictability) between attitude and behavior under other circumstances?

2. Attitude change: In 1906, the sociologist Sumner made the statement that "stateways cannot change folkways," in which he meant, roughly, that government-imposed regulation could not significantly alter the attitudes and values of the governed. More recently, the same principle has found popularity in the belief that "you can't legislate morality."

Re-examine Sumner's statement in the theory and research on the problems of cognitive consistency and attitude change. Consider the following questions:

While governmental legislation is often directed toward changing social attitudes (e.g., toward pornography, disadvantaged groups, drug use, physical fitness), what does the relevant research and theory in the area of cognitive consistency suggest about the prospects for such change? Obviously, Sumner believes such attempts are a "fool's errand," but your task is to consider to what degree the existing research corroborates or disconfirms Sumner's belief. According to research and theory on the problem of cognitive consistency, what are the conditions that limit the amount of attitude change that might occur through legislation?

IMPORTANT NOTE: One common source of confusion in tackling this question concerns the application of Sumner's statement to overt behavior vs. internalized beliefs. We know that within limits, government legislation can influence overt behavior (e.g., stop lights, parking restrictions, tax laws), but Sumner's statement refers to the effects of legislation on the internal mores, norms, attitudes and values held by a group (i.e., what de Tocqueville had earlier called "habits of the heart").

SUMMARY

Both of these questions refer to the general problem of consistency, where the first question refers to the degree of consistency between attitude and behavior; and the second refers to the degree of consistency between behavior change (compliance) and attitude change. In answering these questions it is important to cite the research whenever possible to strengthen your argument, but it is also worth examining the idea of consistency itself. By what standards do we determine whether two events are consistent or not? By whose standards do we decide if a person has behaved inconsistently?

After you have considered the above questions, answer them as clearly as you can, drawing extensively on the ideas and findings discussed in the readings and in lectures.

This paper is to be typed (double-spaced) and no longer than 10 to 15 pages. Since this will be your first paper for this course, you should seriously consider the following recommendations:

1. This paper is not an essay in which the student pontificates for 15 pages, serving up paragraph after paragraph of unsubstantiated opinion. In a way, the first paper will be a test of your ability to produce a scholarly document. By this I mean a document in which you support your arguments with references to the readings (with standard bibliographic citations), cite empirical evidence whenever possible, and present your ideas in a well-organized, logical progression. Since the nature of the paper topic will require you to do some careful, critical thinking on your own, we do expect you to present your own point of view (and therefore your "opinion"). Your own point of view, however, should be substantiated by evidence whenever possible. Basically, this assignment is designed to see how well you understand and can think about the readings in this course, and how well you can express your ideas in written form.
2. There is obviously no one correct "answer" to the above set of questions, nor is there any single optimum way of approaching the paper topic. Every student is expected to see the problem in a slightly different perspective, and is accordingly expected to structure her/his paper in a unique manner. There are a great variety of ways in which the above question can be attacked.
3. The problem of listing: As a substitute for thinking, many students are in the habit of listing every relevant theory, experiment, or idea that they can think of in the hope that they have "hit" the correct answer. This probability model for writing term papers is not very satisfactory. As a substitute for the listing procedure, it is recommended that the student attempt to organize her/his thinking before writing the paper, and try to present a limited set of arguments as persuasively as possible; i.e., with as much clear thinking and documented evidence as s/he is able. In short, do not try to say everything; say a few important things persuasively.

Term Paper #2: Due November 30, 1995
Alternate Choice I
Aggression and Prejudice

Analyze the role of physical differences in the development and maintenance of intergroup hostility. Consider how differences in skin color, eye color, physiognomy, etc., affect the establishment of prejudicial attitudes and examine the possible role that such differences play in the maintenance and/or reduction of prejudice.

COMMENTS:

1. While your success in dealing with the problem will depend on the kinds of questions that you generate about the role of physical differences, it may be profitable to ask yourself the following questions:

"If I had to formulate a general theory of prejudice, how much importance would I assign to physical differences between the antagonistic groups?"

"Do such differences play a central or peripheral role in the establishment and maintenance of prejudice?"

2. Again, you are asked to document your arguments by references to the readings. By necessity, you are going to have to make many assumptions that cannot be supported directly by research findings. There is certainly nothing wrong with this, but you are encouraged to cite evidence whenever possible.

Term Paper #2: Due November 30, 1995
Alternate Choice II

Assume that you are one of those timeless Martian voyeurs who scrutinizes the habits of earthlings from the safety and serenity of your flying saucer. You have been particularly interested in the development of one specific collection of individuals who experienced the following social evolution:

Developmental Stage I

A cruise ship, carrying a group of travelers that were homogeneous with respect to gene type and cultural heritage, struck a coral reef in the central Pacific and sank. There were four survivors who made their way to an uninhabited island that was bisected by a high mountain range. One female and one male reached the west end of the island, and independently, one male and one female reached the east end of the island. Strangely enough, the only genetic differences among the four individuals was that the two west islanders were both homozygous for brown eyes (hereafter to be called 'browns') and the two east islanders were both homozygous for hazel eyes (hereafter to be called 'hazels'). As is the case following most traumatic events, all four shipwreck victims experienced considerable retrograde amnesia to the extent that they forgot virtually all of their cultural background.

Both the browns and the hazels successfully built shelters, cultivated food, and produced offspring prodigiously.

Developmental Stage II

After returning to the island approximately ten generations after the shipwreck survivors first landed, you observe that the browns and the hazels have developed somewhat "parallel" societies, but the mountain range has still not been penetrated, and the two groups are still unaware of each other's existence. Each society has advanced at a fairly rapid rate with the concomitant social institutions: legal codes, token economies, division of labor, etc.

Developmental Stage III

Upon returning after ten more generations, you discover that the two societies have "discovered" each other; in fact, it is clear that the browns are now in political control of both sides of the island. By almost every indicator imaginable, the hazels suffer the burden of an inferior class: inferior housing, inadequate education, poorer educational opportunities, greater evidence of poverty, fewer hazels in positions of meaningful economic and/or political power, etc.

In light of your knowledge of the available research on aggression and prejudice, please consider the following set of questions. (Note: Any attempt to answer the following questions should be characterized by the inclusion of supporting evidence whenever possible. Obviously, you are going to have to make "best guesses" in many instances, but these guesses should themselves be based on available evidence.

1. How do you account for the outcome in Stage III? Was the outcome evidenced in Stage III inevitable once the two groups came into contact with each other? Why? Under what conditions, if any, could these events have been avoided? Justify.
2. What are the probable attitudes of the browns toward the hazels? What possible events, if any, could cause the browns to modify their attitudes and/or behavior toward the hazels?
3. What are the probable attitudes of the hazels toward themselves? What events, if any, might modify this self-image?
4. Will the hazels continue to be an "inferior" group indefinitely? If yes, justify. If no, what conditions would be most likely to bring about a change in status?