

Department of Psychology

Examination paper for PSY2014/PSYPRO4314 – Social Psychology II

Academic contact during examination: Ute Gabriel

Phone: 73 59 19 60

Examination date: 30. May 2017

Examination time: 09:00-13:00

Permitted examination support material: None

Language: English

Number of pages (front page excluded): 3

Number of pages enclosed: 0

Informasjon om trykking av eksamensoppgave

Originalen er:

1-sidig ☐ 2-sidig ☐

sort/hvit ☐ farger ☐

skal ha flervalgskjema ☐

Checked by:

Date

Signature

Instructions:

There are four questions in Part A. Answer **all four** (max 300 words per answer).

There are four questions in Part B. Answer **one** of them in an essay-like format.

Each part (Part A, Part B) has to be marked as "passed" (grade of E or better) for the exam to be passed.

Each part (Part A, Part B) counts 50% of your final mark.

PART A

There are four questions in Part A. Answer all four (max 300 words per answer).

Question 1.

- a) Name the three central criteria people use to evaluate social justice, and
- b) describe the contents or principles that are involved in the respective criterion.

Question 2.

Holtgraves and Kashima (2008) state "that interactants try to achieve common ground and that they actively collaborate in the creation of meaning. It is this process that plays a crucial role in the unintended consequences of language use."

Explain this statement by providing one example of such unintended consequences of language use.

Question 3.

- a) What is referred to as situation-person debate?
Give an example for
- b) Evidence that supports the situation-position.
- c) Evidence that supports the person-position.

Question 4.

How does evolutionary psychology take culture into account?

Instructions:

There are four questions in Part A. Answer **all four** (max 300 words per answer).

There are four questions in Part B. Answer **one** of them in an essay-like format.

Each part (Part A, Part B) has to be marked as “passed” (grade of E or better) for the exam to be passed.

Each part (Part A, Part B) counts 50% of your final mark.

General remarks:

Students are expected to explicitly address all sub-questions; student may - but do not have to - break their answers into sub-answers (i.e., a) b) c) ...).

Students may – but do not have to – use sub-headers when answering the PART B question.

Added after exam based on student questions:

*Question 1: More than 10 students were unsure about the term “criteria”; they were reminded that the relevant reading mentions three types of justice. Examiners should however note, that his specification was **not** given to all students!*

Question 4: More than 10 students were unsure whether the question referred to “evolutionary psychology in general” or to “evolutionary psychological perspective in a specific topic addressed in Soc Psy II”. They were informed that the question refers to EP in general.

Added after meeting with reference students (May 30):

Question 4: Students commented that the question allows for different interpretations; more specifically, the expression “takes into account” could be understood as “methodologically into account” or as “theoretically into account” or both.

PART A

There are four questions in Part A. Answer all four (max 300 words per answer).

Question 1.

- a) Name the three central criteria people use to evaluate social justice,
- b) and describe the contents or principles that are involved in the respective criterion.

The answer should include a) the concepts of distributive, procedural and retributive justice criteria and

b) a description of what contents these stand for or, more precisely, what principles or contents that are involved in the respective concepts :

Distributive: the principles people use to determine that the outcomes are fair or not fair. (This short description is enough for pass; give a better evaluation if the student mentions the two principles presented in the chapter, equality and equity; and even better evaluation if the student can correctly define and distinguish between these two principles).

Procedural: issues or evaluations of the fairness of decision-making procedures, i.e. how decisions are made. (This short description is enough for pass; give an increasingly better evaluation the more examples the student mentions, e. g. formal-informal characteristics, structural components of procedures such as setting rules, allocation of agents/involved, appeals mechanisms, processes for gathering information, safeguards, mechanisms for implementing changes, etc.)

Retributive: concerns people’s reactions to rule-breaking behavior and how to restore justice when

victimized. (This short description is enough for pass; give an better evaluation if the student remembers that "equity" (instrumental vies) may not suffice since there can be (additional) "symbolic harm" (moral view) which requires punishment. Give an increasingly better evaluation the more examples the student mentions, e. g. regarding when some form of sanction is needed, how severe it should be and what form it should take; these judgments could differ due to type of rule-breaking, e. g. harm to personal or material values.)

Pensum:

Tyler, T. R., & Smith, H. J. (1998). Social justice and social movements. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology*, Vols. 1-2, 4th ed (pp. 595–629). New York, NY, US: McGraw-Hill.

Question 2.

Holtgraves and Kashima (2008) state "that interactants try to achieve common ground and that they actively collaborate in the creation of meaning. It is this process that plays a crucial role in the unintended consequences of language use."

Explain this statement by providing one example of such unintended consequences of language use.

Holtgraves and Kashima discuss such unintended consequences split by whether they affect the speaker, the listener or a group (collective effects).

Examples provided by Holtgraves and Kashima are: For effects on the speaker – verbalisation changes inner representation, e.g., verbalisation and decision making, verbalisation of emotions, construction of inner representation by story-telling, "saying-is-believing", for effects on the listener/recipient – impacts listener's representations, e.g. (implicit) semantics, linguistic abstractness, participant instructions; for collective effects – Linguistic Intergroup Bias.

A good answer contains both, a description of a relevant example and a description of Holtgraves and Kashima's assumptions. Better answers link the notions of "unintended consequences" and "creation of meaning" to the example chosen.

Pensum:

Holtgraves, T. M., & Kashima, Y. (2008). Language, Meaning, and Social Cognition. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 12(1), 73 –94. doi:10.1177/1088868307309605

Question 3.

a) What is referred to as situation-person debate?

Give an example for

b) Evidence that supports the situation-position.

c) Evidence that supports the person-position.

a) The situation-person debate refers to the question of whether the person or the situation is more influential in determining a person's behavior.

Fleeson (2004) describes the situation-person debate along the following questions:

What is the central cause of behavior: Person or Situation?

Are multiple behaviors of one individual similar or variable?

Is describing an individual's way of acting useful or not useful?

What is the appropriate focus of study, structure of differences between people or reactions

to situations?

b) Evidence that highlights cross-situational variability / within person variability: Fleeson (2004) presents a figure (Fig. 2, based on Fleeson, 2001) on within-and between-person variability in behavior and affect: The typical person's behavior differs as much from occasion to occasion as does his or her emotion, and more than the amount people differ from each other on average.

c) Evidence that highlights temporal stability and cross-situational stability (between person variability): Fleeson (2004) presents a figure (Fig. 3) that illustrates participants' average level of extraversion in two different weeks: How participants acted in one week was highly similar to how they acted in the other week.

Pensum:

Fleeson, W. (2004). Moving Personality Beyond the Person-Situation Debate The Challenge and the Opportunity of Within-Person Variability. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 13(2), 83–87.

Question 4.

How does evolutionary psychology take culture into account?

Culture is not viewed an autonomous causal agent that creates the content of the human mind / psychology. The general term “culture” can refer to at least two distinct concepts: (a) Evoked culture, and (b) transmitted culture. Evoked culture refers to “differential output elicited by variable between-group circumstances *operating as input* to a universal human cognitive architecture (p.118).” *Evoked culture* expresses itself differently according to local conditions. E.g., mate preferences for physical appearance are assumed to vary according to local levels of pathogen prevalence because parasites degrade physical appearance. Findings suggest that ecological variation in parasite prevalence accounts for the majority of cultural variation in the importance places on physical variance in a potential partner (and not level of gender empowerment as suggested by Eagly & Wood). *Transmitted culture* are the subset of ideas, values, and representations that initially exist in at least one mind that come to existence in other minds through observation or interaction. These may include beliefs about the afterlife, local moral related to food (some types of meat should not be eaten), the content of certain stereotypes about outgroup members, and information transmitted through gossip. Satisfying explanations of transmitted culture will involve some of these elements: (a) psychological adaptations in the *individuals* designed to selectively transmit ideas, beliefs, or representations to others, (b) psychological adaptations in *receivers* designed to selectively accept some ideas from among the available pool of ideas, and (c) psychological adaptations designed to discount or reject other ideas from the available cultural pool due to source credibility and conflict of fitness interests. As said by a famous social psychologist (Allport): “Rumor is set into motion and continues to travel based on its appeal to the strong personal interest of the individual involved in the transmission.” The essential message is: What is culturally transmitted is NOT a random process.

Relevant course material:

Confer, J.C., Easton, J.A., Fleisherman, D.S., Goetz, C.D., Lewis, D.M.G., Perilloux, C., et al. (2010). Evolutionary psychology: Controversies, questions, prospects, and limitations. *American Psychologist* 65, 110-126.

PART B

There are four questions in Part B. Answer one of them in an essay-like format.

Students have been provided with the following evaluation scheme by the course coordinator via NTNU's web-based learning platform (itslearning):

The essay exam question will be used to evaluate the learning outcome (Study Handbook):

The student is able to present and use central ideas and theories within the area as well as able to independently reflect on individual's and group's behaviors and the behaviors' developments and origins.

In the Part B question you are expected to **present** material, to formulate a **thesis** that answers the question and to **argue** for your thesis.

Depending on the specific question there might be no right answers, but more or less persuasive answers. The persuasiveness of your argument depends on the clarity of the thesis, the evidence provided and the clarity in presentation.

Your answer should be made up of an introduction, a main part and a conclusion.

The Part B answer will be evaluated on four dimensions, namely content, argument, organization and style/format. The questions below are given as a guideline. As a general rule, more emphasis will be put on content (ca. 40%) and argument (ca. 30%) than on organization (ca. 25%) and style/format (ca. 5%) when assigning the grade.

1. CONTENT

Does the student present relevant material selected from the course literature?

Is the material presented correctly?

In general, students are expected to identify central theories, concepts, methodological approaches, results and authors.

Does the student integrate the material?

Does the student critically evaluate the material?

Does the student demonstrate an understanding of the topic area?

2. ARGUMENT

Was an argument developed and critically analyzed?

Is the argument logically consistent?

Are major counter arguments taken into account?

3. ORGANIZATION

Is there a systematic exposition of ideas, not straying from the topic and leading to a conclusion?

Is the answer well structured and understandable?

4. STYLE/FORMAT

(Intelligibility of expression, literacy and grammar)

Evaluation of style/format should mainly focus on intelligibility of expression.

Question 5.

Bishop Desmond Tutu, Secretary South African Council of Churches and Nobel Peace Prize Winner 1984, stated: 'Sport does have a meaningful and powerful role to play in the social transformation of society if care is taken to provide the necessary conditions for success.'

Based on social psychological theories and findings (presented in Social Psychology II) discuss and evaluate the idea to use team sports to improve intergroup relations.

For CONTENT:

*Students are expected to discuss the notion of team sports (building a team vs. competing against another team) from the perspective of the **social identity approach** (social categorization, social identity, social comparison, social distinctiveness - positive distinctiveness, ingroup favouritism).*

*Students are expected to present Allport's **contact hypothesis** and **conditions for optimal contact** (equal status, common goal, intergroup cooperation, support of authorities, law, custom); and to make suggestions for how to establish these in the context of team sports.*

*Students might present Ramiah and Hewstone's (2013) criteria for **application in conflict resolution interventions** (Allport's conditions for optimal contact, participants who are sufficiently typical of their group, contact of a personalized nature, contact should be repeated and prolonged, group membership made salient without making it threatening) and link these to team sports.*

*Students might present the **mechanisms** by which contact reduces prejudice (Intergroup anxiety / Empathy / Knowledge).*

*Students are expected to **describe team sports within the theoretical framework of social identity and the contact hypothesis / intergroup contact.***

Relevant from course material:

Hornsey, M. J. (2008). Social identity theory and self-categorization theory: A historical review. Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 2, 204-222

Ramiah, A., & Hewstone, M. (2013). Intergroup contact as a tool for reducing, resolving, and preventing intergroup conflict: Evidence, limitations, and potential. American Psychologist, 68(7), 527-542. doi:10.1037/a0032603

Question 6.

The World Health Organization (WHO) states on their homepage that "Condoms, when used correctly and consistently, are highly effective in preventing HIV and other sexually transmitted infections (STIs). A large body of scientific evidence shows that male latex condoms have an 80% or greater protective effect against the sexual transmission of HIV and other STIs." Perceiving condoms as a key component of comprehensive HIV prevention, the WHO promotes condom use.

Based on readings from Social Psychology II: suggest three different interventions to promote condom use and explain for each of the suggested interventions how and why it will work. Discuss the strengths and limitations of your suggestions.

For CONTENT:

Students can select from any of the following options:

Students can suggest three interventions based on the Theory of Planned Behaviour (Ajzen, 2012), targeting attitudes, social norms and perceived behavioural control (as well as actual behavioural control).

Students can approach the topic from the perspective of the Associative-Propositional Evaluation Model (APE, Gawronski & Bodenhausen, 2007), suggesting interventions that target association activation/affective reactions, propositional reasoning/evaluative judgment and strategies to achieve consistency)

Students can suggest interventions based on the principles of social influence presented by Cialdini and Griskevicius (2014) (reciprocity – consistency – social proof/validation – liking – authority – scarcity).

Students are expected present one of these theoretical approaches and to suggest interventions that are based on different theoretical concepts/variables. Students are expected to explain how the intervention should work in close connection to the theoretical approach chosen and to argue for the intervention based on the theoretical approach chosen.

Relevant from course material:

Ajzen, I. (2012). The Theory of Planned Behavior, in : Lange, Paul, A.M. Van, and Kruglanski, Arie W.. Handbook of Theories of Social Psychology, Volume 1. London, GBR: SAGE, 2011. ProQuest ebrary. Web. 7 October 2014. Pp. 438-459

Gawronski, B., & Bodenhausen, G. V. (2014). The Associative-Propositional Evaluation Model. In J.

W. Sherman, B. Gawronski, & Y. Trope (Eds.), Dual-process theories of the social mind (pp. 188–203). New York, NY, US: Guilford.

Cialdini, R.B. & Griskevicius, V. (2010). Social influence. In: Baumeister, Roy F., and Finkel, Eli J.. Advanced Social Psychology : The State of the Science. Cary, NC, USA: Oxford University Press, USA, 2010. ProQuest ebrary. Web. 7 October 2014. 394-426

Question 7. Immigrants - “illegal” or “undocumented”?

The appendix (“The student government of a California university ...”) provides an excerpt from a report on a student government that has committed itself to no longer use the term “illegal immigrant” when referring to foreign nationals who reside in a country illegally. Based on social psychological theory and findings, discuss and evaluate this commitment.

For CONTENT:

Students are expected to discuss the terms “illegal” vs. “undocumented” within the framework that producing and comprehending language can (significantly) alter speakers’ and recipients’ individual mental representations (e.g. Holtgraves & Kashima, 2008, p.76 and p. 78) as well as collective representations (p. 81). This may happen unintentionally; people may not even be aware of it.

Students are expected to present empirical evidence for these claims – e.g. the study by Rhodes,

Leslie and Tworek (2012) on how the use of generic language contributes to the transmission of stereotypes. Holtgraves and Kashima (2008) provide further examples.

Students are expected to provide arguments for/against reflected language use in general and to sketch the potential and limitations of collective commitments concerning the use of specific terms. (With reference to the latter, students may incorporate course material on social influence, attitude change, etc.)

Relevant from course material:

Holtgraves, T. M., & Kashima, Y. (2008). Language, Meaning, and Social Cognition. Personality and Social Psychology Review, 12(1), 73 –94. doi:10.1177/1088868307309605

Rhodes, M., Leslie, S.-J., & Tworek, C. M. (2012). Cultural transmission of social essentialism. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 109(34), 13526–13531. doi:10.1073/pnas.1208951109

Question 8. On jealousy

Briefly describe David Buss' argument for jealousy as a basic emotion. Discuss how sex differences in jealousy may have evolved and what methodological and relationship factors may affect sex differences in jealousy responses.

For content:

Students are expected to present Buss' definition of jealousy: "a complex emotional state activated when there is a threat to a values social relationship." Different from the basic emotions describes by Ekman, jealousy does not have a distinctive facial expression that can be recognized universally, and it does not appear in Plutchik's list of primary emotions although jealousy is assumed to be functional in helping organisms solve adaptive problems of *reproduction* if not *survival*. The latter is one of Plutchik's three criteria, but probably too narrow for inclusion according to Buss who claim that jealousy *solved several key adaptive problems of mating*, and hence essential for reproductive success

Despite obvious costs to the organism, jealousy is hypothesized have evolved through selection. In their discussion of evolved sex differences in jealousy responses, students are expected to present fairly detailed the selection processes at work, and what recurrent adaptive problems our ancestral mothers and fathers faced in their environment with regard to mating (and identify that these were different for the two sexes). Given internal female fertilization and gestation and considerable paternal investment in humans to ensure offspring survival, potential cost in investing time and resources in an unrelated offspring (cuckoldry) would be recurrent adaptive problems (threats) for men. Similarly, partial or complete loss of investment (her husband is having an affair, he departures for another women, or he invests to a larger degree in other wives and their children) would be recurrent adaptive problems (threats) for women. Organisms (men and women) reacting adequately to these threats (displayed as cues or signals) are hypothesized to leave more surviving offspring, and hence selected for.

Students are expected to discuss methodological and relationship factors the students with reference to the relevant empirical work of Bendixen et al.(2015). The two main paradigms for measuring jealousy needs to be outlined (forced choice and continuous measures) and differentiated. Most studies find that the use of forced choice produce stronger

sex differences (relative to women, men are more upset/jealous imagining their partner having sex rather than falling in love with someone else). Bendixen et al found equally strong, and large sex effects regardless of methodology. This needs to be discussed. Bendixen et al. used directly comparable samples, the various versions of the questionnaire was randomly distributed, and multiple items for measuring jealousy were applied). Students should also discuss how the reactions of singles differed from those of partnered respondents in the forced choice and continuous measures paradigms. Any additional discussion of the strong sex differences in jealousy responses found in Nordic samples with references to Buss vs. Eagly & Wood is beneficial, but not strictly necessary.

Relevant course material:

Buss, D.M. (2013). Sexual jealousy. *Psychological Topics* 22, 155-182.

Bendixen, M., Kennair, L.E.O., and Buss, D.M. (2015). Jealousy: Evidence of strong sex differences using both forced choice and continuous measure paradigms. *Personality and Individual Differences* 86, 212-216. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2015.05.035.

Eagly, A.H., and Wood, W. (1999). The origins of sex differences in human behavior. *American Psychologist* 54, 408-423.

APPENDIX

Excerpt from:

The student government of a California university vowed to drop the term “illegal immigrant” last week (http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/09/03/ucla-illegal-immigrant_n_3862671.html; published in September 2013)

The Undergraduate Students Association at the University of California at Los Angeles unanimously passed a resolution last week endorsing the “Drop the I-Word” campaign launched by [...].

“[T]he racially derogatory I-Word endangers basic human rights including the presumption of innocence and the right to due process guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution,” the resolution reads. It continues: “Human beings need to be central in immigration discussions in order to move toward a more civilized and humane tone in public discourse and policies on immigration.”

The decision was influenced in part by the campus’ diversity and out of respect to the school’s undocumented students, according to the college newspaper Daily Bruin. [...]

The Associated Press removed the term “illegal immigrant” from its style guide in April, marking a major shift in how the U.S. news media writes about the undocumented. The National Association of Hispanic Journalists and immigrant rights activists have long contended that the term is inaccurate and offensive because it criminalizes the people described rather than their actions.

Many media companies, particularly those that serve heavily Hispanic markets, including the Miami Herald, Univision and the San Antonio Express-News, had eschewed the term long ago. The Huffington Post uses the term “undocumented immigrants” to refer to people residing without authorization in the United States.

PART B

There are four questions in Part B. Answer one of them in an essay-like format.

Question 5. Team sports

Bishop Desmond Tutu, Secretary South African Council of Churches and Nobel Peace Prize Winner 1984, stated: 'Sport does have a meaningful and powerful role to play in the social transformation of society if care is taken to provide the necessary conditions for success.' Based on social psychological theories and findings (presented in Social Psychology II) discuss and evaluate the idea to use team sports to improve intergroup relations.

Question 6. Condom use

The World Health Organization (WHO) states on their homepage that "Condoms, when used correctly and consistently, are highly effective in preventing HIV and other sexually transmitted infections (STIs). A large body of scientific evidence shows that male latex condoms have an 80% or greater protective effect against the sexual transmission of HIV and other STIs." Perceiving condoms as a key component of comprehensive HIV prevention, the WHO promotes condom use.

Based on readings from Social Psychology II: suggest three different interventions to promote condom use and explain for each of the suggested interventions how and why it will work. Discuss the strengths and limitations of your suggestions.

Question 7. Immigrants - "illegal" or "undocumented"?

The appendix ("The student government of a California university ...") provides an excerpt from a report on a student government that has committed itself to no longer use the term "illegal immigrant" when referring to foreign nationals who reside in a country illegally. Based on social psychological theory and findings (presented in Social Psychology II), discuss and evaluate this commitment.

Question 8. On jealousy

Briefly describe David Buss' argument for jealousy as a basic emotion. Discuss how sex differences in jealousy may have evolved and what methodological and relationship factors may affect sex differences in jealousy responses.

APPENDIX

Excerpt from:

The student government of a California university vowed to drop the term “illegal immigrant” last week (http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/09/03/ucla-illegal-immigrant_n_3862671.html; published in September 2013)

The Undergraduate Students Association at the University of California at Los Angeles unanimously passed a resolution last week endorsing the “Drop the I-Word” campaign launched by [...].

“[T]he racially derogatory I-Word endangers basic human rights including the presumption of innocence and the right to due process guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution,” the resolution reads. It continues: “Human beings need to be central in immigration discussions in order to move toward a more civilized and humane tone in public discourse and policies on immigration.”

The decision was influenced in part by the campus’ diversity and out of respect to the school’s undocumented students, according to the college newspaper Daily Bruin. [...]

The Associated Press removed the term “illegal immigrant” from its style guide in April, marking a major shift in how the U.S. news media writes about the undocumented. The National Association of Hispanic Journalists and immigrant rights activists have long contended that the term is inaccurate and offensive because it criminalizes the people described rather than their actions.

Many media companies, particularly those that serve heavily Hispanic markets, including the Miami Herald, Univision and the San Antonio Express-News, had eschewed the term long ago. The Huffington Post uses the term “undocumented immigrants” to refer to people residing without authorization in the United States.