

Psychology

Learning in Place, Phase IV

May 18 – June 5



Norfolk Public Schools
The cornerstone of a proudly diverse community

Name: _____

School: _____

Teacher: _____

Psychology Learning in Place, Phase IV

May 18-22

✓	Task	Text	Write
	What is deviance from a psychological perspective?	Passage 1 Worksheet 1	1. Read passage 1. As you are reading, highlight some main ideas for each of the three theories that explain deviant behavior. Using passage 1, carefully read worksheet 1 and circle the best answer to each scenario. There may be some scenarios that could be explained by 2 or more theories. Pick the best choice and write down why you chose that answer.
	What constitutes as being a taboo in your community?	Passage 2 Worksheet 2	2. After reading the examples of taboos, create your own list of possible taboos on worksheet 2. Ask a family member or friend to think of 3 taboos and compare them to yours. Think about the taboos you chose compared to those that your friend or family member chose. Answer all questions on worksheet 2.

May 25-29

✓	Task	Text	Write
	What can we infer about the impact of Zimbardo's Stanford Prison Experiment and Darley & Latané's study on the bystander effect?	Passage 3 & 4	1. Create a chart to compare the following factors within both Zimbardo's Experiment and Darley & Latané's Experiments <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. What was the purpose of each of the studies? b. Identify the Independent Variable (what was controlled by the experimenter?) c. Identify the Dependent Variable (what changed as a result of the IV?) d. What were the results of each study? e. What are some possible concerns/criticisms of the studies? f. What can these studies tell us about modern day human behavior?

June 1-5

✓	Task	Text	Write
	What motivates people to behave altruistically?	Passage 5	1. After reading the article on Altruism and using your prior knowledge from last week's assignments, write a 2 paragraph explanation on "helping behavior". <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Paragraph 1- identify three reasons that encourage people to volunteer and explain the reasoning for each. b. Paragraph 2- identify three reasons that deter people from volunteering and explain the reasoning for each.
	Using the variations of persuasion, how can one recruit volunteers during the Covid pandemic?	Document 6	2. Complete the graphic organizer/document on persuasive techniques. Apply each concept to how you would persuade someone to volunteer their time/skill/money etc. during this Covid Pandemic. 3. Choose ONE of the persuasive techniques and create a flyer to promote people to volunteer using that specific method of persuasion.

Passage 1

<https://www.thoughtco.com/psychological-explanations-of-deviant-behavior-3026268>

How Psychology Defines and Explains Deviant Behavior

Psychoanalytic Theory; Cognitive Development Theory; Learning Theory

By Ashley Crossman

Updated May 27, 2019

Deviant behavior is any behavior that is contrary to the dominant norms of society. There are many different theories on what causes a person to perform deviant behavior, including biological explanations, sociological explanations, as well as psychological explanations. While sociological explanations for deviant behavior focus on how social structures, forces, and relationships foster deviance, and biological explanations focus on physical and biological differences and how these might connect to deviance, psychological explanations take a different approach.

Psychological approaches to deviance all have some key things in common. First, the individual is the primary unit of analysis. This means that psychologists believe that individual human beings are solely responsible for their criminal or deviant acts. Second, an individual's personality is the major motivational element that drives behavior within individuals. Third, criminals and deviants are seen as suffering from personality deficiencies, which means that crimes result from abnormal, dysfunctional, or inappropriate mental processes within the personality of the individual. Finally, these defective or abnormal mental processes could be caused by a variety of things, including a diseased mind, inappropriate learning, improper conditioning, and the absence of appropriate role models or the strong presence and influence of inappropriate role models.

Starting from these basic assumptions, psychological explanations of deviant behavior come mainly from three theories: psychoanalytic theory, cognitive development theory, and learning theory.

How Psychoanalytic Theory Explains Deviance

Psychoanalytic theory, which was developed by Sigmund Freud, states that all humans have natural drives and urges that are repressed in the unconscious. Additionally, all humans have criminal tendencies. These tendencies are curbed, however, through the process of socialization. A child that is improperly socialized, then, could develop a personality disturbance that causes him or her to direct antisocial impulses either inward or outward. Those who direct them inward become neurotic while those that direct them outward become criminal. Freud believed that psychological dysfunction, or deviance, was caused by too much repression. In this context, the ego tries to subconsciously keep anxieties and impulses hidden away so that we aren't aware of them. If the ego is operating in overdrive, then it has failed in its role of acting as a check and balance that keeps us acting within societal norms.

How Cognitive Development Theory Explains Deviance

According to the cognitive development theory, criminal and deviant behavior results from the way in which individuals organize their thoughts around morality and the law. **Lawrence Kohlberg**, a developmental psychologist, theorized that there are three levels of moral reasoning. During the first stage, called the pre-conventional stage, which is reached during middle childhood, moral reasoning is based on obedience and avoiding punishment. The second level is called the conventional level and is reached at the end of middle childhood. During this stage, moral reasoning is based on the expectations that the child's family and significant others have for him or her. The third level of moral reasoning, the post-conventional level, is reached during early adulthood at which point individuals are able to go beyond social conventions. That is, they value the laws of the social system. People who do not progress through these stages may become stuck in their moral development and, as a result, become deviants or criminals.

Pre-Conventional

The pre-conventional level of moral reasoning is especially common in children, although adults can also exhibit this level of reasoning. Reasoners in the pre-conventional level judge the morality of an action by its direct consequences. The pre-conventional level consists of the first and second stages of moral development, and are purely concerned with the self in an egocentric manner.

In stage one, individuals focus on the direct consequences that their actions will have for themselves. For example, an action is perceived as morally wrong if the person who commits it gets punished. The worse the punishment for the act is, the 'worse' the act is perceived to be. In addition, there is no recognition that others' points of view are any different from one's own view. This stage may be viewed as a kind of authoritarianism.

Stage two adopts the 'what's in it for me' position, right behavior being defined by what is in one's own best interest. Stage two reasoning shows a limited interest in the needs of others, but only to a point where it might further one's own interests, such as you scratch my back, and I'll scratch yours. In stage two concern for others is not based on loyalty or intrinsic respect. Lacking a perspective of society in the pre-conventional level, this should not be confused with social contract (stage five), as all actions are performed to serve one's own needs or interests. For the stage two theorist, the perspective of the world is often seen as morally relative.

Conventional

The conventional level of moral reasoning is typical of adolescents and adults. Persons who reason in a conventional way judge the morality of actions by comparing these actions to societal views and expectations. The conventional level consists of the third and fourth stages of moral development.

In *Stage three*, the self enters society by filling social roles. Individuals are receptive of approval or disapproval from other people as it reflects society's accordance with the perceived role. They try to be a *good boy* or *good girl* to live up to these expectations, having learned that there is inherent value in doing so. Stage three reasoning may judge the morality of an action by evaluating its consequences in terms of a person's relationships, which now begin to include things like respect, gratitude and the 'golden rule'. Desire to maintain rules and authority exists

only to further support these stereotypical social roles. The intentions of actions play a more significant role in reasoning at this stage; 'they mean well..!'.

In *Stage four*, it is important to obey laws, dictums and social conventions because of their importance in maintaining a functioning society. Moral reasoning in stage four is thus beyond the need for individual approval exhibited in stage three; society must learn to transcend individual needs. A central ideal or ideals often prescribe what is right and wrong, such as in the case of fundamentalism. If one person violates a law, perhaps everyone would - thus there is an obligation and a duty to uphold laws and rules. When someone does violate a law, it is morally wrong; culpability is thus a significant factor in this stage as it separates the bad domains from the good ones.

Post-Conventional

The post-conventional level, also known as the principled level, consists of stages five and six of moral development. Realization that individuals are separate entities from society now becomes noticeable. One's own perspective should be viewed before the society's. It is due to this 'nature of self before others' that the post-conventional level, especially stage six, is sometimes mistaken for pre-conventional behaviors.

In *Stage five*, individuals are viewed as holding different opinions and values, and it is paramount that they be respected and honored impartially. Issues that are not regarded as relative like life and choice should never be withheld or inhibited. In fact, no single choice is correct or absolute - 'who are you to judge if they are or not'? Along a similar vein, laws are regarded as social contracts rather than rigid statements. Those that do not promote general social welfare should be changed when necessary to meet *the greatest good for the greatest number of people*. This is attained through majority decision, and inevitably compromise. In this way democratic government is seemingly based on stage five reasoning.

In *Stage six*, moral reasoning is based on abstract reasoning using universal ethical principles. Laws are valid only insofar as they are grounded in justice, and that a commitment to justice carries with it an obligation to disobey unjust laws. Rights are unnecessary as social contracts are not essential for moral action. Decisions are met categorically in an absolute way rather than hypothetically in a conditional way. *This can be done by imagining what one would do being in anyone's shoes, who imagined what anyone would do thinking the same*. The resulting consensus is the action taken. In this way action is never a means but always an end in itself; one acts *because* it is right, and not because it is instrumental, expected, legal or previously agreed upon. While Kohlberg insisted that stage six exists, he had difficulty finding participants who consistently used it. It appears that people rarely if ever reach stage six of Kohlberg's model.

How Learning Theory Explains Deviance

Learning theory is based on the principles of behavioral psychology, which hypothesizes that a person's behavior is learned and maintained by its consequences or rewards. Individuals thus learn deviant and criminal behavior by observing other people and witnessing the rewards or consequences that their behavior receives. For example, an individual who observes a friend shoplift an item and not get caught sees that the friend is not punished for their actions and they are rewarded by getting to keep the stolen item. That individual might be more likely to shoplift, then, if he believes that he

will be rewarded with the same outcome. According to this theory, if this is how deviant behavior is developed, then taking away the reward value of the behavior can eliminate deviant behavior.

Worksheet 1

Directions: Read each scenario and decide which theory explains the deviant actions of the characters best. Circle the theory in the corresponding bubble that supports the scenario. Then, write down a short explanation why you chose that theory.

- a. Psychoanalytic Theory**
- b. Learning Theory**
- c. Cognitive Development Theory**

Explanation:

Anna and Henry are studying for a hard test. Henry notices Anna writing clues and answers on her hand to cheat during the test. Henry knows cheating is against the rules and asks Anna why she is going to cheat. Anna says, "I've never been caught before". Henry decides to write clues and answers on his hand before the test too. What theory of deviance could this scenario fall under?

Pat is a 12 year old who started stealing cell phones and selling them in the neighborhood. Pat was taught the difference between right and wrong in elementary school but Pat's desire for money overshadowed the voice inside her head telling her that stealing is wrong. What theory of deviance might explain Pat's behavior?

- a. Psychoanalytic Theory**
- b. Learning Theory**
- c. Cognitive Development Theory**

Explanation:

- a. Psychoanalytic Theory**
- b. Learning Theory**
- c. Cognitive Development Theory**

Explanation:

Fred recently started hanging out with a new group of friends who are known for getting in trouble in school. Fred didn't have any friends before he started hanging out with this new group. Bob tells Fred to vandalize the cars in the school parking lot. Fred responds with, "I will, but what's in it for me?". Bob tells Fred if he vandalizes the cars then Fred is officially part of their friend group. What theory of deviance could this scenario fall under?

Passage 2

What Does Taboo Mean? - Definition & Examples. (2017, September 20). Retrieved from <https://study.com/academy/lesson/what-does-taboo-mean-definition-examples.html>.

When Something Is Taboo

If you turn on the TV these days, you can flip through the channels and find a wide variety of characters or subjects being discussed. On one channel you might find a reality series about a tattoo shop and its customers while another might feature a story about polygamous relationships (1 husband with multiple wives). In the 21st century, these shows wouldn't seem at all strange, but not too long ago such topics were unquestionably taboo. The classical definition of **taboo** is something that's forbidden for religious or social reasons. For instance, the Hebrew Bible identifies eating pork as taboo because pigs are unclean animals. In a modern context, however, the word taboo is less specific and often used to describe something that's considered socially unacceptable or controversial. Going back to the earlier example of modern television, certain subjects that were once considered off-limits for television because many people felt that it was inappropriate to discuss such things publicly. It's only recently that society's attitudes about these topics have changed.

Religious Taboos

Although we use the term casually these days, the classical definition of taboo (religious or social prohibitions) is still relevant in a contemporary context. In the present day, for example, many Jews continue to abstain from eating pork because it's not **kosher**, meaning that it's not permitted by Jewish biblical law. Across the different religions there are varying degrees of commitment and adherence, but many people continue to adhere to biblical law and avoid that which has been identified as taboo.

Another religious taboo with which you're probably familiar is the issue of homosexuality in the Christian religion. Many people believe that the Bible says homosexual behavior is a sin and is prohibited. As such, they not only abstain from such behavior, but they also don't support the rights of others to engage in homosexual behaviors. Although not all religious people feel this way, homosexuality is a common taboo among several religions.

Social Taboos

Due to an increased awareness and tolerance of diversity, social taboos in Western countries, like the United States, are few and far between these days; yet there was a time in the recent past when many things were considered taboo in society. For example, until about 50 or 60 years ago, ending a marriage in **divorce** was considered a social taboo because, among other things, it was perceived as undermining the family and breaking up the most valued social institution.

Although they are not expressly religious, social taboos often overlap with religion, particularly on issues of morality. If we go back to the issue of homosexuality, for example, there was a time that LGBT people were far less accepted in society than they are today. In the past, people that were opposed to gay rights might not have considered themselves to be adhering to biblical law, but their opinions about gay people were often influenced by their religious beliefs or the beliefs of the larger culture.

Legal Taboos

In a modern context, the laws of a particular culture can be considered a kind of taboo because the people within that culture have decided that, for one reason or another, certain things should be prohibited. In Germany, for example, it's illegal to use or distribute materials that feature the Nazi insignia, the **swastika**. After the fall of the Third Reich at the end of WWII, Germany has made a strong effort to ensure that something like the Holocaust won't happen again, so they have made the use of Nazi symbolism taboo in their culture.

Another good example of a social taboo in a legal context is **perjury**, which is the act of lying when you've sworn to tell the truth in court. Lying in court isn't necessarily a crime, but it becomes perjury as soon as the lie has a direct influence on the outcome of the case. For example, if you're testifying in a murder case and say that you own a unicorn, you wouldn't be charged with perjury because your lie has nothing to do with the case. However, if you told the court that the accused is innocent because on the night of the murder he was with you tending to your unicorn, you could be charged because you're attempting to influence the outcome of the case.

Lesson Summary

A **taboo** is something that is prohibited by either religion or society. The inclusion of ham in the Jewish diet, for example, is taboo because ham isn't **kosher**, or it's not permitted by Jewish biblical law. Throughout the course of history many things have been taboo, including things like **divorce**, which was taboo until about fifty or sixty years ago but is entirely acceptable by today's standards.

In some cases, societies may feel so strongly about a taboo subject that they pass laws to punish those that violate the taboo. The use of a **swastika**, or Nazi insignia, in Germany, for example; or the act of **perjury**, or the act of lying under oath in order to influence the outcome of a court case, are both taboos that have legal consequences.

Worksheet 2

Directions: Answer the first question based off the reading from passage 2. For the second question, ask a family member or friend to give you three examples of what they consider to be taboo in today's society. Write those down in the table across from your own three examples. BE SPECIFIC. Examples of possible taboo topics are listed below. Try to come up with your own. Continuing to brainstorm with your family member or friend, answer question 3 using complete sentences.

Examples of possible taboos you may see within your community:

Visible tattoos, people in power positions with piercings or bright colored hair, females trying out for wrestling or football teams, male cheerleaders, teen pregnancy, weight, talking about mental health, talking about menstrual cycle openly, walking barefoot through stores, picking your nose in public, calling a teacher by his or her first name, or choosing to not practice good hygiene.

- 1. If the definition of taboo is a prohibited, irregular, or restricted social custom, what does it mean for something to be taboo? Write a few sentences explaining what it means.**

2. Choose a friend or family member to help you fill out the table below.

List your own 3 examples of what you consider taboo	List your friend or family member's 3 examples of what he or she considers taboo
1.	1.
2.	2.
3.	3.

3. Looking at the chart you filled out in question 2, choose 3 taboo examples you or your family member/friend came up with and explain what would happen if you engaged in that taboo behavior. What would that behavior look like and how do you think the people around you would react? Write clear and concise sentences explaining your thoughts.

Passage 3

Published on *Explorable.com* (<https://explorable.com>)

[Home](#) > [Bystander Apathy Experiment](#)



Bystander Apathy Experiment [1] Explorable.com [2]149.6K reads

Kitty Genovese Murder Explained

One of the classic experiments in social psychology is the one conducted by John Darley and Bibb Latané in 1964 called Bystander Apathy Experiment. The experimenters got their inspiration and motivation to conduct this experiment from the highly publicized murder of Kitty Genovese in the same year.

The Murder of Kitty Genovese

On March 13, 1964, Kitty Genovese was murdered in front of her home. She parked her car a number of feet from her apartment when all of a sudden, a man named Winston Moseley chased her down and stabbed her in the back twice. Due to the excruciating pain, Kitty screamed for help and a neighbor responded shouting at the criminal "Let that girl alone!" Immediately after getting the attention of the criminal, Winston fled the scene and left the girl crawling towards her apartment.

Several witnesses reported to have seen Winston fled the scene with his car and returned ten minutes after the response of one of the neighbors. After seeing his prey lying on the ground almost unconscious, he stabbed the already wounded Kitty Genovese several times more. After this, he stole the money of the victim and sexually assaulted Ms Genovese. A neighbor phoned the police and an ambulance arrived but was too late to help the assaulted Kitty Genovese.

Shock to Psychology

Thirty-eight neighbors of Kitty Genovese were aware about the murder that was taking place during that time and yet all of them chose to do nothing in rescue of the assaulted girl. Why were such apathy, indifference and lack of concern observed from all the neighbors of Kitty? Two social psychologists started asking questions why the witnesses demonstrated a lack of reaction towards the victim's need for help.

Bystander Apathy Experiment

Darley and Latané thought of a social psychology experiment that will let them see through an event similar to what took place during the murder of Kitty. First, they recruited [3] university students and told them that they will be participating in a discussion about personal problems. Each participant will be talking to other participants of varying number in a discussion group but each of the participants has separate rooms. This conversation will take place over microphones and speakers just so the participants will not be able to physically see the other participants that they are talking to. The topic upon which the conversations will revolve is their college lives.

Each participant will be given two minutes to speak during their turn. All the microphones of other participants will be turned off. The subject is unaware that all the voices that he will hear are all pre-recorded voices. The number of voices that the subject will be 'talking to' depends on the treatment condition that he is in. There are five treatment conditions. First is a solo, one-on-one conversation and the last is a group of six participants (1 subject and 5 pre-recorded voices).

One of the pre-recorded voices is that of an epileptic student who is having seizures. The voice will first confess to the group that he is prone to seizures and it could be life-threatening during its first turn. During its second turn, the seizure will start.

"I'm... I'm having a fit... I... I think I'm... help me... I... I can't... Oh my God... err... if someone can just help me out here... I... I... can't breathe properly... I'm feeling... I'm going to d-d-die if..."

The real subject can only hear the event and he cannot see the actual participant who is having the seizures.

The actual response that the experimenters will be measuring during this event is the time it will take for the subject to stand up, leave the room, look for the experimenters and ask for help.

Bystander Apathy Experiment	
<u>Dependent Variable</u> [4]	Time it takes for the participant to seek help
<u>Independent Variable</u> [5]	Number of participants within a discussion group

Results of the Bystander Apathy Experiment

Only 31% of the subjects tried to seek for help. This means that most of the subjects didn't bother to look for the experimenters to help the suffering participant. Most of them were obviously anxious but the reaction was not there.

However, the significant finding of this experiment lies on the results of the first treatment condition. In a one-on-one conversation, 85% of the subjects actually asked for help. This means that if the subjects think that they are the only one who knows about the incident, there is a higher probability that they will ask for help. On the contrary, the bigger groups displayed fewer reactions to the incident.

Analysis and Conclusion

The significantly higher percentage of subjects who asked for help in the first treatment condition entails that people react more if there is less number of people around an emergency or an event. On the other hand, the significantly lower percentage of subjects who helped in the other treatment conditions entails that individuals are less likely to help in an emergency when other people are present.

Two reasons were offered to explain the bystander apathy effect. First is diffusion of responsibility. This occurs when other people think that another person will intervene and as a result, they feel less responsible. The second explanation is pluralistic ignorance. This refers to the mentality that since everyone else is not reacting to the emergency; my personal help is not needed. Seeing the inaction of others will lead to the thought that the emergency is not that serious as compared to perception when he is alone.

Criticisms

- Individuals may be lead to thinking that other observers are more qualified to help. In times of medical emergencies, people might think that maybe a doctor is present in the scene and the patient will be better off with the help of the doctor.
- Some people may be too self-conscious that they don't want to give off negative images to other bystanders. For them to avoid this occurrence, these individuals simply do not respond to the emergency.
- Fears associated to perception can also be an explanation of bystander effect. Such fears include being outranked by a superior helper, or being rejected when offering one's help, or having to deal with legal consequences of offering inferior or even worsening assistance.

Passage 4

Stanford Prison Experiment

Aim of the Study: To investigate how readily people would conform to the roles of guard and prisoner in a role-playing exercise that simulated prison life.

Zimbardo (1973) was interested in finding out whether the brutality reported among guards in American prisons was due to the sadistic personalities of the guards (i.e. dispositional) or had more to do with the prison environment (i.e. situational). For example, prisoner and guards may have personalities which make conflict inevitable, with prisoners lacking respect for law and order and guards being domineering and aggressive. Alternatively, prisoners and guards may behave in a hostile manner due to the rigid power structure of the social environment in prisons. If the prisoners and guards behaved in a non-aggressive manner this would support the dispositional hypothesis, or if they behave the same way as people do in real prisons this would support the situational explanation.

Procedure: To study the roles people play in prison situations, Zimbardo converted a basement of the Stanford University psychology building into a mock prison. He advertised for students to play the roles of prisoners and guards for a fortnight. More than 70 applicants answered the ad and were given diagnostic interviews and personality tests to eliminate candidates with psychological problems, medical disabilities, or a history of crime or drug abuse. The study comprised 24 male college students (chosen from 75 volunteers) who were paid \$15 per day to take part in the experiment.

Participants were randomly assigned to either the role of prisoner or guard in a simulated prison environment. There were 2 reserves and one dropped out, finally leaving 10 prisoners and 11 guards. The guards worked in sets of 3 (being replaced after an 8 hour shift), and the prisoners were housed 3 to a room. There was also a solitary confinement cell for prisoners who 'misbehaved'. The prison simulation was kept as "real life" as possible.

Prisoners were treated like every other criminal, being arrested at their own homes, without warning, and taken to the local police station. They were fingerprinted, photographed and 'booked'. Then they were blindfolded and driven to the psychology department of Stanford University, where Zimbardo had had the basement set out as a prison, with barred doors and windows, bare walls and small cells. Here the deindividuation process began.

When the prisoners arrived at the prison they were stripped naked, deloused, had all their personal possessions removed and locked away, and were given prison clothes and bedding. They were issued a uniform, and referred to by their number only. The use of ID numbers was a way to make prisoners feel anonymous. Each prisoner had to be called only by his ID number and could only refer to himself and the other prisoners by number. Their clothes comprised a smock with their number written on it, but no underclothes. They also had a tight nylon cap to cover their hair, and a locked chain around one ankle.

All guards were dressed in identical uniforms of khaki, and they carried a whistle around their neck and a billy club borrowed from the police. Guards also wore special sunglasses, to make eye contact with prisoners impossible. Three guards worked shifts of eight hours each (the other guards remained on call). Guards were instructed to do whatever they thought was necessary to maintain law and order in the prison and to command the respect of the prisoners. No physical violence was permitted.

Zimbardo observed the behavior of the prisoners and guards (as a researcher), and also acted as a prison warden.

Findings: Within a very short time both guards and prisoners were settling into their new roles, with the guards adopting theirs quickly and easily.

Within hours of beginning the experiment some guards began to harass prisoners. They behaved in a brutal and sadistic manner, apparently enjoying it. Other guards joined in, and other prisoners were also tormented. The prisoners were taunted with insults and petty orders, they were given pointless and boring tasks to accomplish, and they were generally dehumanized. Push-ups were a common form of physical punishment imposed by the guards.

The prisoners soon adopted prisoner-like behavior too. They talked about prison issues a great deal of the time. They 'told tales' on each other to the guards. They started taking the prison rules very seriously, as though they were there for the prisoners' benefit and infringement would spell disaster for all of them. Some even began siding with the guards against prisoners who did not obey the rules.

Over the next few days the relationships between the guards and the prisoners changed, with a change in one leading to a change in the other. Remember that the guards were firmly in control and the prisoners were totally dependent on them.

As the prisoners became more dependent, the guards became more derisive towards them. They held the prisoners in contempt and let the prisoners know it. As the guards' contempt for them grew, the prisoners became more submissive. As the prisoners became more submissive, the guards became more aggressive and assertive. They demanded ever greater obedience from the prisoners. The prisoners were dependent on the guards for everything so tried to find ways to please the guards, such as telling tales on fellow prisoners.

During the second day of the experiment the prisoners removed their stocking caps, ripped off their numbers, and barricaded themselves inside the cells by putting their beds against the door. The guards retaliated by using a fire extinguisher which shot a stream of skin-chilling carbon dioxide, and they forced the prisoners away from the doors. Next, the guards broke into each cell, stripped the prisoners naked and took the beds out. The ringleaders of the prisoner rebellion were placed into solitary confinement. After this the guards generally began to harass and intimidate the prisoners.

Prisoner#8612 had to be released after 36 hours because of uncontrollable bursts of screaming, crying and anger. His thinking became disorganized and he appeared to be entering the early stages of a deep depression. Within the next few days three others also had to leave after showing signs of emotional disorder that could have had lasting consequences. (These were people who had been pronounced stable and normal a short while before).

Zimbardo (1973) had intended that the experiment should run for a fortnight, but on the sixth day it was terminated. Christina Maslach, a recent Stanford Ph.D. brought in to conduct interviews with the guards and prisoners, strongly objected when she saw the prisoners being abused by the guards. Filled with outrage, she said, "It's terrible what you are doing to these boys!" Out of 50 or more outsiders who had seen our prison, she was the only one who ever questioned its morality.

Zimbardo (2008) later noted, "It wasn't until much later that I realized how far into my prison role I was at that point -- that I was thinking like a prison superintendent rather than a research psychologist".

Conclusion: People will readily conform to the social roles they are expected to play, especially if the roles are as strongly stereotyped as those of the prison guards. The "prison" environment was an important factor in creating the guards' brutal behavior (none of the participants who acted as guards showed sadistic tendencies before the study). Therefore, the findings support the situational explanation of behavior rather than the dispositional one.

Zimbardo proposed that two processes can explain the prisoner's 'final submission'. Deindividuation may also help to explain the behavior of the participants; especially the guards. This is a state when you become so immersed in the norms of the group that you lose your sense of identity and

personal responsibility. The guards may have been so sadistic because they did not feel what happened was down to them personally – it was a group norm. They also may have lost their sense of personal identity because of the uniform they wore. Also, learned helplessness could explain the prisoner's submission to the guards. The prisoners learnt that whatever they did had little effect on what happened to them. In the mock prison the unpredictable decisions of the guards led the prisoners to give up responding.

After the prison experiment was terminated Zimbardo interviewed the participants. Here's an excerpt:

'Most of the participants said they had felt involved and committed. The research had felt "real" to them. One guard said, "I was surprised at myself. I made them call each other names and clean the toilets out with their bare hands. I practically considered the prisoners cattle and I kept thinking I had to watch out for them in case they tried something." Another guard said "Acting authoritatively can be fun. Power can be a great pleasure." And another: "... during the inspection I went to Cell Two to mess up a bed which a prisoner had just made and he grabbed me, screaming that he had just made it and that he was not going to let me mess it up. He grabbed me by the throat and although he was laughing I was pretty scared. I lashed out with my stick and hit him on the chin although not very hard, and when I freed myself I became angry.'"

Most of the guards found it difficult to believe that they had behaved in the brutalizing ways that they had. Many said they hadn't known this side of them existed or that they were capable of such things. The prisoners, too, couldn't believe that they had responded in the submissive, cowering, dependent way they had. Several claimed to be assertive types normally. When asked about the guards, they described the usual three stereotypes that can be found in any prison: some guards were good, some were tough but fair, and some were cruel.

Critical Evaluation: Demand characteristics could explain the findings of the study. Most of the guards later claimed they were simply acting. Because the guards and prisoners were playing a role their behavior may not be influenced by the same factors which affect behavior in real life. This means the study's findings cannot be reasonably generalized to real life, such as prison settings. i.e the study has low ecological validity.

However, there is considerable evidence that the participants did react to the situation as though it was real. For example 90% of the prisoners' private conversations, which were monitored by the researchers, were on the prison conditions, and only 10% of the time were their conversations about life outside of the prison. The guards, too, rarely exchanged personal information during their relaxation breaks - they either talked about 'problem prisoners', other prison topics, or did not talk at all. The guards were always on time and even worked overtime for no extra pay. When the prisoners were introduced to a priest, they referred to themselves by their prison number, rather than their first name. Some even asked him to get a lawyer to help get them out.

The study may also lack population validity as the sample comprised US male students. The study's findings cannot be applied to female prisons or those from other countries. For example, America is an individualist culture (where people are generally less conforming) and the results may be different in collectivist cultures (such as Asian countries).

A strength of the study is that it has altered the way US prisons are run. For example, juveniles accused of federal crimes are no longer housed before trial with adult prisoners (due to the risk of violence against them).

Another strength of the study is that the harmful treatment of participant led to the formal recognition of ethical guidelines by the American Psychological Association. Studies must now undergo an extensive review by an institutional review board (US) or ethics committee (UK) before they are implemented. A review of research plans by a panel is required by most institutions such as universities, hospitals and government agencies. These boards review whether the potential benefits of the research are justifiable in the light of possible risk of physical or psychological harm. These boards may request researchers make changes to the study's design or procedure, or in extreme cases deny approval of the study altogether.

Concerns with Ethical Issues: The study has received many ethical criticisms, including lack of fully informed consent by participants as Zimbardo himself did not know what would happen in the experiment (it was unpredictable). Also, the prisoners did not consent to being 'arrested' at home. The prisoners were not told partly because final approval from the police wasn't given until minutes before the participants decided to participate, and partly because the researchers wanted the arrests to come as a surprise. However this was a breach of the ethics of Zimbardo's own contract that all of the participants had signed.

Also, participants playing the role of prisoners were not protected from psychological harm, experiencing incidents of humiliation and distress. For example, one prisoner had to be released after 36 hours because of uncontrollable bursts of screaming, crying and anger.

However, in Zimbardo's defense the emotional distress experienced by the prisoners could not have been predicted from the outset. Approval for the study was given from the Office of Naval Research, the Psychology Department and the University Committee of Human Experimentation. This Committee also did not anticipate the prisoners' extreme reactions that were to follow. Alternative methodologies were looked at which would cause less distress to the participants but at the same time give the desired information, but nothing suitable could be found.

Extensive group and individual debriefing sessions were held and all participants returned post-experimental questionnaires several weeks, then several months later, then at yearly intervals. Zimbardo concluded there were no lasting negative effects.

Zimbardo also strongly argues that the benefits gained about our understanding of human behavior and how we can improve society should out balance the distress caused by the study. However it has been suggested that the US Navy was not so much interested in making prisons more human and were in fact more interested in using the study to train people in the armed services to cope with the stresses of captivity.

Passage 5

Solidarity: How the coronavirus makes us more willing to help

Author: Julia Vergin

31.03.2020

https://www.dw.com/en/solidarity-how-the-coronavirus-makes-us-more-willing-to-help/a-52968633?fbclid=IwAR09c6orwwNmS6_PzyA7H_OHxTk-bCpCv4ynY-PeZQsuEnz8BbKdONSjUU

Panic buying and corona parties: SARS-CoV-2 triggers fear and selfish behavior. But solidarity, helpfulness and empathy are also side effects of crises. And there are many good reasons for that.



Lena was inspired by the desire to help while out shopping. She saw an elderly man standing in front of an empty shelf that once held canned food. He stood there for a while, only to leave without finishing his grocery shopping.

"This man probably had to go to several shops to get all the things he needed. That really got me thinking," says Lena, a student.

That's one human characteristic the novel SARS-CoV-2 makes clearly visible: selfishness. "Me first" seems to be a common mindset. Despite numerous official appeals to the effect that that panic buying is neither necessary nor socially acceptable, in many places it is difficult to get hold of toilet paper, flour or canned tomatoes.

Older people, in particular, are being urged to stay at home and avoid contact with potentially infected persons.

To connect those who want to help with those who need help, Lena and her friend Ana started the Facebook group Corona Hilfe Bonn in mid-March. "Within four hours, the group had 400 members," the two young women say. Now, more than 1,100 people have joined the group.

Willingness to help

In the crisis caused by the coronavirus, another human characteristic is also evident: helpfulness. Whether digitally on Facebook or in analogue form on a noticeboard — the range of help available is diverse: from assistance with shopping to help walking the dog and volunteer work in hospitals.

So is the crisis separating our society into egoists and altruists? Into good supportive people and bad panic buyers?

"Reality is much more complex," says psychologist Anne Böckler-Raettig, whose research at the University of Würzburg is focusing on so-called prosocial behavior. This also includes the willingness to help that is visible in the current crisis.

"Prosocial behaviour has many faces and each person has his or her own repertoire. We are all sometimes very selfish. And we are all sometimes very fair, cooperative and prosocial," says Böckler-Raettig.

The diversity of the prosocial

"Many group members contribute their own experiences and set individual priorities," Lena confirms. Some of them want to do something for the homeless, others for the farmers, and some of them want to support caregivers.

"One member offered to talk on the phone to people who have difficulty coping with isolation," says Ana. "That really touched me."

The motivations behind the willingness to help are almost as varied as the offers of help themselves. The reasons we give other people time, energy, information or money can be very different.

Altruism and empathy

"The first thing we think about when we are ready to help is: We want someone else to be better off and we want to reduce their suffering," says Böckler-Raettig. "That's what we call altruistic motivation."

But altruism is one of those things: Whether the purely altruistic willingness to help — which has the other person's well-being in mind — exists at all is a matter of controversy. Böckler-Raettig summarizes under altruism all motives that "have the intention to do good to others."

When Lena saw the elderly gentleman standing in front of the empty shelf in the supermarket, she tried to put herself in his place: What would I hope for in such a situation?

"Empathy and compassion are very important motivations for prosocial behaviour," says Charlotte Grosse Wiesmann, neuroscientist and developmental psychologist at the Max Planck Institute for Human Cognitive and Brain Sciences in Leipzig. In her work, the scientist is focusing on the development of social skills in childhood.

Born to help

"Helping behavior is a fundamental behavior," says Grosse Wiesmann. "Children of only one year of age show a spontaneous willingness to help and, for example, will pick something up from the floor to give it back to an adult who has dropped it." Children are very good at recognizing another person's goals at a very early age.

The child's helpfulness has little to do with altruism at first. Rather, it rather deepens social bonds. As the child recognizes the goal of the other person and tries to help, joint action becomes possible. "We can only lift a big table together," says Grosse Wiesmann about the importance of this developmental step.

"Developmental psychologist Michael Tomasello supports the theory that people are mainly characterized by cooperation and that recognizing the goals of others and helping them is an important step in their development," says Grosse Wiesmann. Even a nasty virus is better fought by all of us together.

At about two years of age, little ones develop an empathetic willingness to help. "They begin to recognize the emotions of others and react to them — for example by trying to comfort someone who is sad," explains Grosse Wiesmann.

If you help me, I help you

That, too, probably has less to do with altruism than we would like to think. Instead, reciprocity is another important motivation of helpful people: Whoever gives comfort increases her or his chance of being comforted in return when needed.

Thus, Lena and Ana were not only motivated by the completely selfless desire to do something good for others. Their hope is that helping hands will also be reached out to them or their families should they ever need them.

In this way, reciprocity could trigger a kind of domino effect of helpfulness, so that more and more people support each other. Indeed, Lena and Ana's conclusion is: There is no longer any lack of willingness to help, but there is also a willingness to accept help.

Too much of a good thing

Böckler-Raettig is not too surprised at this. Of course, helpfulness can also have its downsides: "Sometimes you can prevent someone from helping themselves by helping too much," she explains.

As a result, people could become dependent on the people who help, which in the long term makes them weaker rather than stronger.

"But if people only knew how prosocial it is to accept help!" says the psychologist with a laugh. "Helping and being generous also rewards the helpers themselves. So the person who accepts help also does something good."

Solidarity straw fire?

Of course, we don't know whether the willingness to help has come with the coronavirus crisis and will depart with it as well. But Böckler-Raettig is optimistic.

"The more often we show prosocial behaviour and notice how good it feels — whether within society, in our circle of friends or even on a personal level — the more we repeat this behavior, too."

Which brings us back to reciprocity. Lena and Ana are currently in quarantine. There was no lack of toilet paper and noodles so far, but of chocolate. So they used their self-created network to look for help.

Within a short period of time, 11 people offered themselves as chocolate suppliers and provided Lena and Ana with several bars. Prosocial behaviour often shows itself in very modest dress.

But it is not worth any less for that: The chocolate made Lena and Ana very happy. Psychologist Anne Böckler-Raettig is convinced: "Every single gesture counts."

Document 6

For each of the persuasive techniques, create an example of how you would use each to persuade someone to volunteer themselves during the Covid Pandemic. Then, pick ONE of the persuasive techniques to create a promotional flyer to encourage others to volunteer during the current turn of events.

Technique	Definition/explanation	Example to get you to buy a brand of toilet paper	Your example to persuade others to volunteer
Central Route of Persuasion	Using facts to persuade	This brand of TP has the highest rating of biodegradability	
Peripheral Route of Persuasion	Using opinions or emotions to persuade	Our TP will make you feel like a million bucks	
Principle of Reciprocation	obligation to behave since others did for you	If you buy our TP, we'll promote your restaurant	
Principle of Scarcity	lack of supply	Get it now, while it lasts	
Principle of Authority	professional opinion	4 out of 5 Plumbers recommend our TP	
Principle of Consensus	general opinion/popularity	9 out of 10 customers love our TP	
Framing Effect	reforming a statement to make it sound more positive	Only 50% of flushes clogged after using our TP	
Mere Exposure Effect	increased liking for a stimulus resulting from repeated presentation	The more you use our TP, the more you'll learn to love it	
Foot-in-the-door Effect	starting with a small request then gradually increasing	Here's a sample of our TP. If you like it, we'll start an order for you.	
Door-in-the-face Effect	starting with a high request with the assumption that you'll compromise at a smaller one	You need toilet paper? \$50 a case... no? Fine, \$20	