

Psykologisk institutt

Eksamensoppgave i PSY1014/PSYPRO4114 – Sosialpsykologi I

Faglig kontakt under eksamen: Britt-Marie Drottz Sjøberg

Tlf.: 73 59 74 85

Eksamensdato: 19. desember 2016

Eksamenstid: 09:00 – 13:00

Hjelpemiddelkode/Tillatte hjelpemidler: Ingen

Målform/språk: Bokmål

Antall sider (uten forside): 1

Informasjon om trykking av eksamensoppgave

Originalen er:

1-sidig **2-sidig**

sort/hvit **farger**

skal ha flervalgskjema

Kontrollert av:

Dato

Sign

Eksamen har to deler.

Del 1 har 4 spørsmål og 3 av dem skal besvares.

Denne delen av eksamen vektes med 60%

Del 2 har 2 spørsmål og 1 spørsmål skal besvares.

Denne delen av eksamen vektes med 40%

Hvis mindre enn 3 spørsmål har blitt besvart i del 1 eller at del 2 ikke er besvart, vil det gi stryk.

Alle svarene må være sensurert til karakter E eller bedre, for at hele eksamens skal bli sensurert til E eller bedre.

Del 1.

Kortsvarsoppgaver.

Svar på 3 av 4 spørsmål.

Opptil 1 side håndskrevet tekst eller en ½ side skrevet på datamaskin for hvert valgte spørsmål.

Vekting 60%

1. Forklar hva som er informativ konformitet og hva som er normativ konformitet. Gi så et eksempel på en sentral studie i dette forskningsfeltet.
2. Forklar meningen med den tekniske termen «tilfeldig utvalg» av de personene som velges for å delta i en spørreundersøkelse og utdyp hvorfor denne prosedyren er viktig.
3. Forskere innen fagområdet sosialpsykologi har foreslått at kontakt mellom grupper kan redusere fordommer under spesifikke forhold, gjør rede for minst 4 av de 6 forholdene som har blitt fremhevet.
4. Gjør rede for fire komponenter-av selvet og forklar hvordan skrekkhåndteringsteorien (the terror management theory) relaterer seg til en av disse komponentene.

Del 2.

Essayspørsmål.

Svar på 1 av 2 spørsmål.

Ingen begrensning på sidetall.

Vekting 40%

1. Gjør rede for a) de to sentrale typene av sosial kognisjon, og b) diskuter disse i relasjon til mentale strukturer og mentale strategier (shortcuts).
2. Gjør rede for a) to forskjellige typer av effekter på individer i nærvær av andre, og b) forklar utfallet av svekket, og av forbedret ytelse knyttet til hver av de to typene.

Sensorveiledning Sosialpsykologi I, Høst 2016 PSY1014/PSYPRO4114

Eksamen (4 timer, Desember 19, 2016) har to deler:

Del 1 har 4 spørsmål og krever at 3 av disse er besvarte; delen vektes 60%.

Del 2 har 2 drøftingsoppgaver og 1 av disse skal besvares; delen vektes 40%.

Dersom mindre enn tre oppgaver fra Del 1 er besvart, eller Del 2 ikke er besvart vil studenten ikke oppnå ståkarakter. Alle besvarte oppgaver må være bestått (E eller bedre) for at karakter E eller bedre skal kunne oppnås.

Svaret på oppgaven i Del 2 evalueres etter følgende fire dimensjoner: innhold, argumentasjon, organisering og i en viss grad stil/format. Se nærmere beskrivelse nedenfor.

1. INNHOLD (ca. 40%)

Presenterer studenten relevant teori og forskning (materiale) fra læreboken (faglitteraturen)?

Er materialet presentert korrekt?

Integrerer studenten ulike teorier og forskning?

Evaluerer studenten materialet kritisk?

Viser studenten forståelse for feltet?

2. ARGUMENTASJON (ca 35%)

Ble argumentasjonen utviklet og kritisk analysert?

Er argumentasjonen logisk konsistent?

Er det tatt hensyn til vesentlige motargumenter?

3. ORGANISERING (ca 20%)

Er det en systematisk utvikling av ideer som leder fram mot en konklusjon uten avsporinger fra temaet?

Er besvarelsen godt strukturert og generelt forståelig?

4. STIL/FORMAT (ca 5%)

Formuleringsevne: språklig stil og grammatikk (men ikke enkle skrivefeil).

Evaluator's Guide. Exam in Social Psychology I, Autumn 2016 PSY1014/PSYPRO4114

The exam (4 hours, December 19th, 2016) has two parts:

Part 1 has 4 questions and 3 of these must be answered; this part is weighted 60%.

Part 2 has 2 essay questions and 1 of these must be answered; this part is weighted 40%.

If less than 3 questions in Part 1 are responded to, or Part 2 is not answered, the student will fail the exam. All answered questions must have been evaluated as "pass" (E or better) for a grade E or better to be achieved.

The answer to the chosen question in Part 2 is evaluated in accordance to the following four dimensions: contents, argumentation, organization, and to some extent style/format. See descriptions below.

1. CONTENTS (approx. 40%)

Does the student present relevant theory and research (material) from the course book (research literature)?

Is the material presented correctly?

Does the student integrate different theories and research?

Does the student critically evaluate the material?

Does the student show understanding for the field?

2. ARGUMENTATION (approx. 35%)

Was the argumentation developed and critically analyzed?

Is the argumentation logically consistent?

Are significant counter arguments considered?

3. ORGANISATION (approx. 20%)

Is there a systematic development of ideas that result in a conclusion without deviations from the theme?

Is the answer well structured and generally comprehensible?

4. STYLE/FORMAT (approx. 5%)

Ability of expression: style of language and grammar (but not simple spelling mistakes).

Part 1. Questions asking for short answers. Respond to 3 of the 4 questions. Up to 1 page handwritten text or ½ page printed text for each chosen question. (Weight 60%).

- 1. Explain what is informational conformity and what is normative conformity, then give one example of a central study in this field of research.**

(Chapter 8 and 13 in the book).

Informational (social) conformity is related to social influence and the experienced need to know or understand what is considered socially correct behavior. Thus, in situations of uncertainty or ambiguity we look for information and guidance from others on how we should behave, and we conform (or copy) such behavior assuming that others' interpretation of the situation is correct. Examples from this field of study are the early Sherif's (1930s) autokinetic effect study, "dot of light in a dark room", of estimating the movement of a light source individually or in a group. Also examples from Cialdini's studies (or Cialdini, Goldstein or Griskevicius), e.g. the reuse of bath towels to save energy, are appropriate here, as are other examples from their work.

Normative conformity is related to the need to be accepted. We conform to the group's social norms (through social influence) to become similar to and accepted by others. The result is that we display agreement with the group's norms and behavior socially, i.e. "public compliance". This does not necessarily concord with private norms or behavior. The early "line-judgment" studies by Asch and colleagues are highlighted in the book. Later research has been conducted by Cialdini and colleagues. Chapter 13 relates to this theme in the context of prejudice and mentions e. g. that normative conformity might help explain why people who hold deep prejudices may not act on them, and vice versa, why people who essentially are not prejudiced might behave in discriminatory ways.

The pass-answer is expected to differentiate between the types of conformity and give one short example or description of research (researchers' names are not necessary), note the underlining above. Very good answers provide a clear description of the differences between the two types of conformity and elaborate on the example or give several relevant examples. Similarly, correctly elaborating on "private acceptance" (genuine belief) vs. "public compliance" is a basis for a higher evaluation. For example, linking Fritz Heider's or Harold Kelley's (1950-60s) historic research contributions in the field of attribution theory to the social norm part of normative conformity is -if correctly presented- very good.

- 2. Explain the meaning of the technical term "random selection" of a survey sample and elaborate on why this procedure is important.**

(Chapter 2 in the book)

'Random selection' from a chosen/targeted population should be defined as giving everyone in that population an equal chance of being selected for participation in the sample. This is important for ensuring the representativeness of the sample, that is, to be able to generalize the results to the chosen larger population (given sufficient response rate).

A complete answer (including equal chance of being selected to the sample from a target population, and representativeness, or generalizability, of the results gives a high score. Very good if the student knows that "a population" refers to any targeted group and not necessarily citizens of an entire nation. Missing either of the former major aspects gives a low score.

If the answer suggests something like "choice of anyone" in the street, by phone or computer etc., or describes a selection of some kind of convenience sample this is incorrect/fail.

3. Researchers in the field of social psychology have suggested that contact between groups can reduce prejudice under certain conditions; account for at least 4 of the 6 conditions that have been highlighted.

(Chapter 13 in the book)

The conditions accounted for in the book are: mutual interdependence (the need to depend on one another to accomplish a goal), having a mutual goal (a goal that is important to both parties), equal status (relates to status and power), friendly, informal setting (a situation where in- and out-group members can interact one-to-one), out-group members must be seen as typical of their group (i. e. not seen as exceptions of the out-group) and the situation can be described as having social norms that promote and support equality among groups.

Presenting four correct conditions is adequate for C. Good presentations of at least 2 conditions are a requirement for pass. Higher grades apply if presenting more of the conditions, and/or elaborating on the conditions in ways that show good understanding. Also if the answer relates to the background of desegregating American schools, Allport's early (1954) insights and how these have been developed, e. g. exemplified with Sherif and colleagues' (1960s) boys' camp study or other work.

4. Account for four components of the self and explain how the terror management theory relates to one of the components.

(Chapter 5 in the book).

The book mentions the four components of a) knowledge about oneself (self-knowledge) i.e. expressions of and organization of what we know about ourselves, b) self-control, i.e. planning and execution of decisions, c) presentation of oneself (impression management) i.e. how one presents oneself to others, and d) self-esteem i.e. how one evaluates or feels about oneself.

The terror management theory is mentioned specifically in relation to self-esteem and high, or 'high enough', self-esteem is argued to protect against thoughts of one's own mortality. Thus, the expected answer should include an explanation related to (positive) self-esteem acting as a protective buffer against terrifying thoughts.

(Note however, reflecting students might in addition to mentioning self-esteem as the main component relevant to terror management theory also see or speculate on other connections, e.g. to (degree of) self-knowledge or self-consciousness, maybe guarding against cognitive dissonance or using self-control such as e.g. self-regulatory thought suppression. Although such connections are not discussed in the book (i.e. have attracted little interest so far), such speculations should not have a negative impact on the evaluation, but should be evaluated in accordance with the strength of the explanation and argumentation.

If the "terror management" part is weak, at least 3 of the mentioned 4 components should be mentioned for a pass evaluation. If the "terror management" part is adequate or strong it suffices to mention 2 of the components correctly for a pass grade. If two components or less are mentioned and the "terror management" explanation is weak, then it is a fail result.

Part 2. Essay questions. Answer 1 of the 2 following questions. No page limitation. (Weight 40%).

1. Account for a) the two major types of social cognition, and b) discuss these in relation to mental structures and mental strategies (shortcuts).

(Chapter 3 in the book)

The first part of the question asks for automatic and controlled social cognition. A short explanation of what these types represent is expected. For example, that the former is quick, effortless, non-voluntary and non-deliberate thinking providing a continuous analysis based on earlier experiences

and knowledge. The latter type of cognition is deliberate, well thought through reasoning based on mental effort.

The second part of the question involves two aspects, which both relate to the automatic type of social cognition: The *mental structures* aspect expects a short description of schemas, which are mental structures organizing knowledge about the social world around themes or subjects, used to understand the world and e. g. interpret new impressions. They may also “fill in the blanks” when encountering ambiguous situations, and in the automatic thinking process that helps interpretation (on the positive side) but can also influence the understanding of a situation by providing easily accessible, but incorrect - and even false - cues. They influence attention to information, thought contents and memories. The second aspect, *mental strategies or short-cuts*, refers especially to judgmental heuristics, sometimes referred to as “rules-of-thumb” in the literature. The chapter exemplifies the availability heuristic and the representativeness heuristic. The former is based on the ease with which something comes to mind. The latter short-cut has been named related to how similar something seems in relation to a (representation of) the typical case.

Although it might facilitate the structuring of the answer, the a) and b) part of the question are used to clearly delineate the expected contents but do not have to be followed in the response.

Major challenges posed by this question involve making a correct description and distinction between automatic and controlled social cognition (or “thinking”). The next challenge is to correctly present and distinguish between mental structures and mental strategies within the large domain of automatic thinking; the former being schemas and the latter mental rules of thumb related to making choices or decisions using mental resource-saving strategies. The chapter is not very good at outlining and explaining these differences precisely because examples dominate the text and tend to conceal the central theses. For example, the term *accessibility* of contents is presented related to schemas (and priming) whereas the term *availability* is presented as a judgmental strategy. To an ordinary person these terms have the same meaning and could be used as synonyms. It is expected that some students will confuse these aspects and they should not be punished for wrong terminology if the explanations otherwise are correct. Thus, it requires a very alert and reflective student to actually understand the challenges of this task and those should be given high grades.

It is also the case that very much can be said about schemas, e.g. the chapter takes care outlining “self-fulfilling prophecies”, presents cultural differences related to cultural determinants of schemas, holistic vs. analytic thinking before an extremely short account of “controlled social cognition”; the reason the latter type is not in focus here. If students’ responses involve presentations of such themes in addition to responding to the question the answers should be evaluated for their correctness.

However, if the main question is not adequately responded to, other materials *cannot* compensate in the evaluation.

2. Account for the concepts of a) social facilitation and social loafing, and b) discuss these concepts in relation to high and low achievement.

(Chapter 9 in the book)

The two parts of the question are interlinked and there is no expected manner to respond. The a) and b) part of the question are used to clearly delineate the expected contents but do not have to be followed in the response.

The first part of the question expects a presentation of the meaning of the concepts social facilitation and social loafing. Both are related to performance. *Social facilitation* is commonly described as

related to when the presence of others gives energy and facilitates performance, but the core meaning relates to the tendency to perform differently when in the presence of others than when alone, i.e. perform better on simple or well-rehearsed tasks when in the presence of others and worse on complex or new tasks.

The latter concept, *social loafing*, mainly relates to being more relaxed regarding the own effort or contribution in a group context; sometimes used to describe to “surf” on others’ efforts. An example in the text is that individuals pull harder on a rope in an individual competition than in a rope pulling competition between groups. Thus, social loafing is the phenomenon of a person exerting less effort to achieve a goal when working in a group than when working alone.

The above type of content is the framework of the expected answer. If an answer contains these explanations it is sufficient for at least the grade C. However, high achievers may also elaborate on related aspects included in the chapter, e. g. go into how or why arousal stimulates or disturbs specific types of performance, why or when the presence of others results in certain levels of arousal, or why working alone helps performing complex tasks. The book also considers gender and cultural differences (essentially interpreting research finding in terms of more social loafing by those low on relational interdependence, i.e. more often men compared to women and Western cultures compared to Asian cultures). Such elaborations from students, in addition to having included the major aspects, should increase the grade given adequate understanding and general presentation merits.

However, and *for the evaluator* to keep in mind, it should be noted that the text book is quite unclear in its presentation of the central phenomena. For example, regarding social facilitation, the chapter exemplifies the different circumstances when “presence of others” involve working or being together with others as well as performing in front of others – two different types of situations - instead of making the distinction between working in a group and alone. Thus, unfortunately, the text book does not differentiate between the concepts of social facilitation and social inhibition (e.g. “stage fright”; decreased individual performance in the presence of others related to the possibility of a negative evaluation or of others disapproving). The figure 9.4 in the chapter is very confusing. The authors combine social facilitation effects with social inhibition effects (decreased individual performance in the presence of others) under the label “social facilitation”; neither do they mention social compensation effects (e.g. Köhler effect), i.e. individuals work harder to compensate for others.

Therefore, if a student’s answer shows actual comprehension of the concepts in the question, in spite of the unclear presentation in the book, that should render a higher grade. And if a student confuses social facilitation and social inhibition characteristics (or e.g. copies the figure 9.4 from memory) the confusion should be disregarded and the answer evaluated on its overall merits.