Human relationships google doc summary

To what extent do biological, cognitive and sociocultural factors influence human relationships?

Outline and evaluate two studies per factor on their influence on human relationships.

**Attraction** can be defined as the romantic desire for a specific person for mating and it develops out of lust and commitment to another individual.

BIOLOGICAL FACTORS
**Effect of hormones and neurotransmission- The researchers found out that there are two hormones in our body that help to increase the bond between each other. The attachment of the adults may due to the release of hormones oxytocin and vasopressin. Oxytocin is a hormone that release in both men and women during touching and sex. This hormone tends to deepen and intensify feeling of attachment. Moreover, oxytocin also releases during childbirth and this help secure the bond between the mother and the infant. Another hormone that helps increase the bond is vasopressin. This hormone is important for long-term commitment and it is releases during sex. Adrenalin is a stress hormone and when the adrenalin level increase, it will result in high energy, less need for sleep and food and focused attention on the potential mate. Serotonin is another neurotransmitter that may involved in love.**
Study: Marazitti et al. (1999)
Aim: To investigate the effect of serotonin level that influences romantic love
Research Method: Observation
Participants: 60 individuals: 20 were men and women who had fallen in love in the previous six months, 20 others suffered from untreated obsessive-compulsive disorder, and the other 20 were normal, healthy individuals who were not in love (controlled group).
Result: Marazziti had analyzed the serotonin level in the blood samples from the lovers rather than the brain. He found out that serotonin levels of new lovers were equal to the low serotonin level found in people who have obsessive-compulsive disorder.
Strength: The study successfully showed that their might be a possible connection between romantic love and low levels of serotonin in the blood.
Limitation: This study had been opposed by Fisher(2004) that it is not possible to document the exact role of serotonin in romantic love.
**Evolutionary origins of attraction-All animals as well as human have showed the same behavior when they are attracted to each other. From evolutionary perspective, the purpose of attraction is to procreate and to ensure that the genes are passed down to the next generation.**

Study: Wedekind (1995)
Aim: To tested the role of genes related to the immune system especially major histocompatibility complex(MHC) in mate selection
Research Method: Lab experiment
Participants: A group of 49 women and 44 men with a wide range of MHC genes.
Procedure: Wedekind gave each man a clean t-shirt to wear for two nights and to make sure that a strong body odor; he gave them a supplies of odor-free soap and aftershave. After the men returned their t-shirt, Wedekind puts each shirt in a box with sniffing holes on top. The women were asked to return at their midpoint of menstrual cycle where their sense of smell is the best. Each woman was presented with a different set of seven boxes: 3 boxes is t-shirt from men with similar MHC gene to the woman, 3 other is t-shirt from men with dissimilar MHC gene to the woman, and the last one is an unworn t-shirt (controlled).
Finding: The result shows that the women preferred the scent from dissimilar MHC genes.
Conclusion:  The researcher concluded that MHC does not influence body odors and body preference.  Women’s preference depends on their hormonal status. This experiment was tested on mice, the researchers found out that the pregnant mice preferred similar MHC genes as them.
Strength: The experiment is standardized and is well controlled.
Limitation: The experiment lacks ecological validity since it is conducted in the lab. Also, the result can not be generalize because the female participants were the one that experiencing a menstrual cycle.

**COGNITIVE FACTOR**
Cognitive origin of attraction

* Similarity

·            **Attraction-similarity model (Morry 2007):** People tend to see friends and partners as similar to themselves

·      Empirical support

· **Markey et al. (2007):** Surveys that demonstrated that people prefer someone who is similar to themselves

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name and year of study** | **Markey et al (2007)** |
| **Aim** | To investigate the extent to which similarity is a factor in the way people choose partners |
| **Research method** | Questionnaires |
| **Procedure** | The researchers asked a large sample of young people to describe the psychological characteristics, values, and attitudes of their ideal romantic partner, without thinking of anyone in particular.Afterwards, they were asked to describe themselves |
| **Findings** | The results showed that the way the young people described themselves was similar to what their ideal partner looked like. |
| **Conclusion** | This could explain why people perceive their partner to be similar; but perception and actual behavior may not always be congruent at the end of the day |
| **Methodological strength** | The results are based on a relatively large sample- this increases the validity of the study |
| **Methodological weakness** | The study was based on questionnaires which are liable to lack some reliabilityThe sample consisted of young Americans there for it cannot be generalized to other populations |

 · **Newcomb (1961):** Roommates that were initially similar were more likely to like each other after a year.
·  **Rubin (1973):** Surveys show that married couples are similar in sociological characteristics (e.g. age, race, religion, education)
·  **Caspi & Herbener (1990):** A longitudinal study of 135 married couples found that similarity between was related to marital satisfaction
·  **Chen and Anderson (1999) :** investigation the effect of transference.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Aim | To investigate the effect of transference.**Transference** à Whenever we encounter someone new that reminds us of a significant other in the past our old schema will affect our impression of the new person |
| Observation Method | Experimental group/laboratory experiment |
| Procedure | 1.     Participants in the experimental group identified two of their significant of others –-       one that they disliked-       one that they likedprovided short descriptions of them2.     2 weeks later the participants learned about a new person with whom they were told they were to interact.-        The description of the person was rigged to resemble their descriptions of the significant others3.     When the participants of the experimental group interacted with the person their attitude towards him/her was shifted towards their attitude to the significant others compared to a control groupExample : you have  a greedy mother, then you have to go meet someone new who is greed, that makes you dislike him/her from the schema you had from your mother. |
| Result | The result was that for one experimental group, the new person resembled a liked significant other, for another experimental group, the new person resembled a disliked significant other. |
| Conclusion | When a new person resembled a significant other, he/she is like or dislike, depending on the participant’s attitude toward the significant other |
| Strengths | Corresponds to schema theoriesProves transference effect |
| Weaknesses | Currently little empirical supportMore studies are needed to validate findingsLow Ecological ValidityReplicationValidity |
| Ethical Consideration | DeceptionDebriefing |

· Evaluation
    · Sample was taken from American samples (*generalisability problem to other cultures*)
    · It is also possible that we conform our behavior in order to be liked. (*social identity theory*)
    · It is possible that we are attracted to people with complementary traits (e.g someone dominant needs someone submiss
ive) However, little research supports this idea.

    · Research is mainly based on suveys. There is little experimental research. Only correlation, not causation can be inferred.
**Sociocultural Factor**

Social Origin of Attraction

* Proximity - Physical closeness
	+ More opportunity to get to know each other.
	+ Only affect the tendency of forming relationship but doesn’t necessarily result in relationship.
	+ Nowadays proximity is more easily achieved with information technology.
* Familiarity – Frequency of contact
	+ May be the underlying reason that causes proximity to affect relationship.
	+ There are strong empirical supports for familiarity, although it doesn’t necessarily lead to relationship.

Supporting Study
*Proximity*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name and year of study** | Festinger (1950) |
| **Aim** | To investigate the extent in which proximity can affect the likelihood of relationship in college students. |
| **Research method** | Survey |
| **Sample** | College students in MIT Westgate and Westgate West housing project for students. |
| **Procedure** | The researchers asked the participants and their family to do a survey asking about 3 people that they considered as close friend or individuals that they most frequently interact with, including how far they live from each other.   The participants were selected at random from the target population.  |
| **Findings** | * 65% of close friend live in the same build
* 41.2% live next door
* 22.5 % live 2 doors apart
* 16.2 % live 3 doors apart
* 10% live at the opposite end of the hall
 |
| **Conclusion** | A correlation is found between      relationship and the closeness or proximity in which the subjects live from their close friend.  The closer they are from each other the more likely for them to form relationship.    |
| **Methodological strength** | * Ecologically valid – Investigate relationships that were formed naturally before the experiment.
* Easily replicable – low cost, not time consuming
 |
| **Methodological weakness** | ·        Low generalizability – college students from MIT.·        Some participants may give false data.    |
| **Ethical considerations** | ·        Minimal stress level for participants |

*Familiarity*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name and year of study** | Zajonc (1971) |
| **Aim** | To investigate familiarity as a factor for forming relationship |
| **Research method** | Experiment  |
| **Sample** | - |
| **Procedure** | Pictures of strangers are shown to be participants then they were asked to rate each individual in the pictures. |
| **Findings** | The participants give better evaluation to the strangers, whose picture appeared more often. |
| **Conclusion** | Familiarity can positively affect liking in individuals. |
| **Methodological strength** | ·        Quantitative data gathering – less researcher’s bias. |
| **Methodological weakness** | ·        Ecological validity – forming relationship in real is not similar to numerical evaluation. |
| **Ethical considerations** | ·        Minimal stress level |

**Sociocultural Factor**

Social Origin of Attraction

* Proximity - Physical closeness
	+ More opportunity to get to know each other.
	+ Only affect the tendency of forming relationship but doesn’t necessarily result in relationship.
	+ Nowadays proximity is more easily achieved with information technology.
* Familiarity – Frequency of contact
	+ May be the underlying reason that causes proximity to affect relationship.
	+ There are strong empirical supports for familiarity, although it doesn’t necessarily lead to relationship.

Supporting Study
*Proximity*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name and year of study** | Festinger (1950) |
| **Aim** | To investigate the extent in which proximity can affect the likelihood of relationship in college students. |
| **Research method** | Survey |
| **Sample** | College students in MIT Westgate and Westgate West housing project for students. |
| **Procedure** | The researchers asked the participants and their family to do a survey asking about 3 people that they considered as close friend or individuals that they most frequently interact with, including how far they live from each other.   The participants were selected at random from the target population.  |
| **Findings** | * 65% of close friend live in the same build
* 41.2% live next door
* 22.5 % live 2 doors apart
* 16.2 % live 3 doors apart
* 10% live at the opposite end of the hall
 |
| **Conclusion** | A correlation is found between      relationship and the closeness or proximity in which the subjects live from their close friend.  The closer they are from each other the more likely for them to form relationship.    |
| **Methodological strength** | * Ecologically valid – Investigate relationships that were formed naturally before the experiment.
* Easily replicable – low cost, not time consuming
 |
| **Methodological weakness** | ·        Low generalizability – college students from MIT.·        Some participants may give false data.    |
| **Ethical considerations** | ·        Minimal stress level for participants |

*Familiarity*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name and year of study** | Zajonc (1971) |
| **Aim** | To investigate familiarity as a factor for forming relationship |
| **Research method** | Experiment  |
| **Sample** | - |
| **Procedure** | Pictures of strangers are shown to be participants then they were asked to rate each individual in the pictures. |
| **Findings** | The participants give better evaluation to the strangers, whose picture appeared more often. |
| **Conclusion** | Familiarity can positively affect liking in individuals. |
| **Methodological strength** | ·        Quantitative data gathering – less researcher’s bias. |
| **Methodological weakness** | ·        Ecological validity – forming relationship in real is not similar to numerical evaluation. |
| **Ethical considerations** | **Sociocultural Factor**Social Origin of Attraction* Proximity - Physical closeness
	+ More opportunity to get to know each other.
	+ Only affect the tendency of forming relationship but doesn’t necessarily result in relationship.
	+ Nowadays proximity is more easily achieved with information technology.
* Familiarity – Frequency of contact
	+ May be the underlying reason that causes proximity to affect relationship.
	+ There are strong empirical supports for familiarity, although it doesn’t necessarily lead to relationship.

Supporting Study*Proximity*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name and year of study** | Festinger (1950) |
| **Aim** | To investigate the extent in which proximity can affect the likelihood of relationship in college students. |
| **Research method** | Survey |
| **Sample** | College students in MIT Westgate and Westgate West housing project for students. |
| **Procedure** | The researchers asked the participants and their family to do a survey asking about 3 people that they considered as close friend or individuals that they most frequently interact with, including how far they live from each other.   The participants were selected at random from the target population.  |
| **Findings** | * 65% of close friend live in the same build
* 41.2% live next door
* 22.5 % live 2 doors apart
* 16.2 % live 3 doors apart
* 10% live at the opposite end of the hall
 |
| **Conclusion** | A correlation is found between      relationship and the closeness or proximity in which the subjects live from their close friend.  The closer they are from each other the more likely for them to form relationship.    |
| **Methodological strength** | * Ecologically valid – Investigate relationships that were formed naturally before the experiment.
* Easily replicable – low cost, not time consuming
 |
| **Methodological weakness** | ·        Low generalizability – college students from MIT.·        Some participants may give false data.    |
| **Ethical considerations** | ·        Minimal stress level for participants |

*Familiarity*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name and year of study** | Zajonc (1971) |
| **Aim** | To investigate familiarity as a factor for forming relationship |
| **Research method** | Experiment  |
| **Sample** | - |
| **Procedure** | Pictures of strangers are shown to be participants then they were asked to rate each individual in the pictures. |
| **Findings** | The participants give better evaluation to the strangers, whose picture appeared more often. |
| **Conclusion** | Familiarity can positively affect liking in individuals. |
| **Methodological strength** | ·        Quantitative data gathering – less researcher’s bias. |
| **Methodological weakness** | ·        Ecological validity – forming relationship in real is not similar to numerical evaluation. |
| **Ethical considerations** | ·        Minimal stress level |

·        Minimal stress level |

    · Familiarity has been shown to be an even stronger factor than similarity. (Newcomb, 1961)
    · It seems fairly probable that similarity influences attraction, but more quantitative research may be needed in order to validate findings

* Transference

·            Whenever we encounter someone new that reminds us of a significant other in the past our old schema will affect our impression of the new person

·            Empirical support:

Chen & Anderson (1999)

·            Participants in the experimental group identified two of their significant others – one that they disliked and one that they liked and provided short descriptions of them

·            2 weeks later the participants learned about a new person with whom they were told they were to interact. The description of the person was rigged to resemble their descriptions of the significant others

·            When the participants of the experimental group interacted with the person their attitude towards him/her was shifted towards their attitude to the significant others compared to a control group

·            Evaluation

·            Currently little empirical support

·            Corresponds to schema theories

·            More studies are needed to validate findings
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Evaluate psychological research (that is, theories and/or studies) relevant to the study of human
relationships.

*Golf, Meiji*
Evaluate two theories or studies relevant to the study of human relationships

1. **Reciprocal Altruism Theory** (Trivers, 1971)

·         Individuals can be expected to behave altruistically if they think there is a chance that they can be in the same predicament in the future and will need somebody else’ help

·         The behavior is believed to have evolved because it increases the likelihood of survival of individuals in a group

Supporting Research for Reciprocal Altruism      Prisoner’s dilemma (Axelrod, 1980)      Sterelny and Griffiths (1999)

**Axelrod**

v  Two criminals have been caught, they have committed a crime but the police do not have enough evidence

v  The criminals cannot communicate with each other

v  If both of them admit to the crime, they will have to serve 10 years in prison each

v  If one admits to the crime and the other denies, the one who admits goes free and the one who denies has to serve 20 years

v  If no one admits to the crime they have to serve 1 year each

Findings

1. If participants know the game will be played more than once, they are more likely to act in a way that benefits both
2. They do this because they know that they will lose the trust of the other in the following games, if they don’t

**Sterelny and Griffiths**

v  Observed that prairie dogs in prairie dog colonies will give alarm calls when they see a predator approaching

v  This will warn other individuals in the group while putting the caller at risk

v  It was however been argued that the behavior of the calling prairie dog is not altruistic at all. Because the alarm call causes the whole group to escape, this provides a distraction for the caller and may increase his chances to escape

1. **Strong Reciprocity** (Gintis, 2000)

·         A sense of fairness which is partly inherited, and partly upheld by cultural norms

·         Times of grave danger and strong uncertainty, such as war, famine, and catastrophes, favor the survival of those that have tendency for unselfish helping

·         Individuals can be good to non-kin strangers in single interactions if there are social rules against cheating

·         Individuals are more likely to help strangers, if they have been helped by a stranger

·         Individuals are more likely to cooperate if they are treated fairly, and to punish non-cooperators

·         Some individuals have a stronger sense of fairness and tendency for strong reciprocity than others

Supporting Research for Strong Reciprocity      Rutte & Taborsky (2007)      Eckel & Grossman (1995)      De Waal & Brosnan (2003)

**Rutte and Taborsky**

v  Female rats were trained in a cooperative task (pulling a stick in order to produce food for a partner)

v  Rats pulled more often for an unknown partner after they were helped than if they had not received help before

**Eckel and Grossman**

v  Participants played the dictator game

v  In the dictator game, the first player determines a split of a reward, such as money

v  The second player, simply receives the remainder of the prize

v  Eckel & Grossman found that the first player tended to donate more of the reward to the other player, if he seemed to deserve it

v  It is possible that the participants are less fair outside the laboratory if there is no observer (*ecological validity problem*)

**De Waal and Brosnan**

v  Monkeys respond negatively when a partner receive a superior reward for completing the same task (e.g. their partner receives a grape and they receive a cucumber slice)

1. **Evaluating and Contrasting the Two Theories**

Evaluation

Ø  Strong reciprocity seems to be more valid than reciprocal altruism

Ø  Because of methodological problems we need to be careful in drawing too far reaching conclusions

Ø  The theories may have applications in economics and politics

Ø  Neither theory supports pure altruism. Either theory involves some portion of self interest

Contrast

Ø  Strong reciprocity theory has more empirical support

Ø  Reciprocal altruism theory emphasizes biological explanations and cognitive expectations whereas Strong reciprocity theory emphasizes an interaction between culture and biology

Ø  Strong reciprocity theory emphasizes individual differences in contrast to reciprocal altruism theory

Ø  Reciprocal altruism traditionally had more support from animal studies and strong reciprocity from human studies. While many of the reciprocal altruism studies on animals are criticized there is growing evidence for strong reciprocity in animals as well

Distinguish between altruism and prosocial behaviour.

Pro-social behavior: behavior that benefits another person or has positive social consequences
Definition is vague because it discusses the *outcome* but not the *motivation*
e.g. When we offer sympathy to a friend that is upset or refrain from dropping scolding a person for doing something wrong.

Altruism: when one helps another person for no reward and even at some cost to oneself. It is a type of “helping behavior”(intentionally helps or benefits the other person) and the goal is to make a difference. (it can sometimes be thought to be a ‘heroic’ act)
e.g.
1. The female bats share the blood they’ve consumed with bats that did not consume enough blood. The other party does not have to be their babies.
2. Giving money to charity
3. Helping a blind person trying to cross the road or a person who fell infront of you in the subway train.

Contrast two theories explaining altruism in humans.

Explain two theories of altruism in humans with two supporting studies for each. Identify 2-3 differences between the theories. Evaluate the theories/studies

**Kin Altruism**
(it roots from  the ‘evolutionary history’)
***Melvin Konner (kin altruism)*** – prosocial behaviors like altruism occur only to enhance reproductive success and foster the transmission of genes
i.e. more likely to help the people who are more related to us
Individual are most likely support those who are likely to contribute their genes
**Flaws:** Don’t explain why some agreed to help the ones who are not genetically related

Supporting study :
***Wilkinson et al.***
26 months between the year 1978 to 1983 investigating vampire bats on a cattle ranch in Costa Rica called Hacienda La Pacifica.
aim: to investigate whether bats feed their own relatives thus engaging in kin selection theory or if they were reciprocally exchanging food, therefore engaged in reciprocity.

* The scientists tagged all bats in the study area with light weight bands of different colors
* During the study the scientists witnessed 110 instances of blood sharing by regurgitation in which seventy percent of it took place between a mother and her pup
* 30% involved adult females feeding the pops of the others, another adult female, and on two occasions, adult males feeding offspring
* To determine whether bats regurgitate selectively, the scientists compared the degree of relatedness between the donor and the recipient along with their roost-association index (habitat).
* Result: both relatedness and prior association are important predictors of an individual’s response to a solicitation. The bats do not share blood randomly but they prefer to share with individuals which are frequent roost-mates. Moreover, the bat recipient are often, but not always, related.
* Suggests that they want to pass down their genes

**Empathy altruism model:** Psychological explanation of behavior
- Batson et al. (1981) suggests that people can experience two types of emotions when they see someone suffering; personal distress (e.g. anxiety and fear), which leads to egoistic helping, and emphatic concern (e.g. sympathy, compassion, tenderness), which leads to altruistic behavior.
- According to the model, if you feel empathy towards another person, you will help him or her, regardless of what you may gain from it. Relieving the person’s suffering becomes the most important thing. When you do not feel empathy, you consider the costs and benefits of helping in making your decision.

Supporting study:
Batson’s experiment:
- Procedure: Students were asked to listen to tapes of an interview with a student named Carol. She talked about her car accident in which both her legs were broken. She talked about her struggles, and how far she was falling behind at school. Students were each given a letter, asking them to meet with Carol and share lecture notes with her. The experimenters varied the level of empathy, telling one group to try to focus on how Carol was feeling (high empathy level), while members of the other group were told they did not need to be concerned with her feelings (low empathy level). The experimenters also varied the cost of not helping. The high-cost group was told that Carol would be in their psychology class when she returned to school. The low-cost group believed Carol would finish the class at home.
- Findings: The results confirmed the empathy-altruism hypothesis. Those in the high-empathy group were almost equally likely to help Carol in either set of circumstances, while the low-empathy group helped out of self-interest. Thinking about seeing her in class every day probably made them feel guilty if they did not help (Aronson et al. 2005).
- Evaluation: Batson’s findings have been consistently replicated, so it appears that the theory of empathy-altruism is consistent with its predictions that helping behavior based on empathy is unselfish. However, the research has only investigated short-term altruism, and the interpretation of the results has not taken personality factors into account. This could be seen as a weakness of the explanation. Though Batson’s model makes it easier to predict behavior, it is difficult to measure one’s level of empathy. Batson argues that empathy is an innate trait in all of us, but it is not clear why we do not experience a predictable level of empathy in a given situation.

**Contrasting two theories**:
- Kin altruism focuses more on the instinctual nature of humans and animals (biological approach), while the empathy altruism model focuses more on the cognitive component (psychological approach).
- In general, humans do behave more altruistically towards their close kin than towards non-relatives. Also, we tend to help those who have helped us in the past. There are behaviors, however, like adoption, that do not benefit kin and thus cannot be explained by a purely biological model, they are explained through a psychological model.

Using one or more research studies, explain cross‑cultural differences in prosocial behaviour.

Definition of prosocial behavior:
Every behavior that benefits others or society.

Outline and evaluate two research studies on the cross-cultural differences in prosocial behavior:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Levine (1990) |  |
| Aim | Investigate differences in helping behavior in 36 American cities and 23 large cities. |
| Research Method | Field Experiments |
| Participant | Street walkers in the cities where investigation took place. |
| Strengths | +Ecological validity+Easy to replicate+Low Cost+Supporting Studies (ex. Pepitone 1999) |
| Weakness | -Generalizability-Time consuming-Uncontrolled (did not occur in a controlled environment such as the lab)-many possible confounding variables (ex. illiteracy level for the letter test)-Helping might vary due to time period |
| Ethical considerations | v Low deception (just for the study to be able to operate and for information to be collected as designed)v Participants did not give their consent to be part of this experimentv No physical or mental harm to the participantsv Participants remains anonymous and were not intruded into private places where they live to carry out the study(privacy is not violated). |
| Conclusion | v Cities have different culture of helping behaviorv Helping behavior seems to be affected by a multitude of variablesv The individualism-collectivism dimension is not a good predictor of helping behaviorv Population density is the best predictor of helping behaviorv Can provide information about helping behavior across the world |

**John and Beatrice Whiting**: reported data on nurturing and helping behaviour by children aged 3 — 11 in six countries. They found considerable difference in the level of altruism displayed by children from these countries. Kenyan, Mexican, and Filipino children scored high, whereas US children scored the lowest. Cross-cultural differences in prosocial behaviour are correlated with the children's involvement in the responsibilities of family life. Altruism was least likely in communities where the children completed school and were seldom assigned responsibilities for family farming or household chores.
**William Lambert**: Studied the level to which parents would punish aggressive behaviour by their children directed at either other children or the child's mother. (Kenya, India, Mexico, Japan, Philippines, USA). The Mexican parents were the most punitive for aggression against other children, while the American parents stand out as particularly tolerant. Lambert suggests that the differences are due to the presence or absence of close relatives in the child's play group and the level of interdependence of the extended family that leads to greater adult control over childhood control.

Examine factors influencing bystanderism.

Bystanderism: The act when individuals do not offer help in an emergency situation when help is required by another person

**Factors of Bystanderism**

**Bystander effect**

**Diffusion of responsibility:** When people observe an emergency with a lot of people around them, they seem to reason that somebody can, should, and probably will offer help. This is why people tend to help when they are the only person available to offer assistance

**Study:** ***Latane and Darley (1968)***
**Experiment type:** Laboratory
**Samples:** 59 female and 13 male introductory psychology students
**Aim:** To test the diffusion or responsibility theory in a real life emergency situation
**Procedure:** Students were told that they were going to be interviewed about living in high pressure urban environment. To preserve anonymity, the test will be interviewed over an intercom. Some were told that there are 5 others, 3 others, 2 others, or 1 other. The comments they heard from other groups are pre-recorded. At a point, one of the participants asks for help sounding like they have a seizure. The time it takes for the participant to rush to help was recorded.
**Results:** (S+victim) 85% helped, (S+V+1 other) 65%, (S+V+4 other) 31%
**Conclusion:** Study shows that believing that somebody will intervene lowers the probability of a person taking responsibility.
**Evaluation:**
- The results could be influenced because the participant did not see the victim
- Generalizability problem (only small samples)
- Deception was used (but they were debriefed later)
+ Research is more scientific
+ Have some ecological validity because these situations can happen in real life
+ Controlled, it is in the laboratory and every person in the room talks exactly alike because it is pre-recorded
+ No researcher’s bias because the data is in numbers (seconds) it takes to go
+ No Hawthrone effect because they do not know the true aim of the study

**Pluralistic ignorance:** When in a group, people often look to others to know how to react (informational social influence. When people see that others do not react in cases of emergency, they would not react either

**Study: Latane and Darley (1969)
Procedure:** Asked participants to sit in a waiting room before participating in an experiment. Then a female experimenter falls and cries out in the next room. In some groups there were confederates who did not react while in some groups they were alone.
**Results:** Participants react more quickly when they were alone that when they are sitting next to a confederate who showed no reaction. Post experiment interviews revealed that participants felt anxious when they heard the scream but since others in the experiment room appeared calm, they assume that it is not an emergency.
**Conclusion:** The participants will help only when it is clear that the person who needed help really needed the help. (it is really an emergency)
 **Cognitive:**

**The arousal-cost-reward model**

* Comes to helping, we tend to weight the costs (pain, financial lost, time) against benefits (affection, financial reward, no humiliation) : Social exchange theory
* Social exchange theory: human relationships are based on subjective cost-benefit
* We help when benefit out weights the cost
* Piliavin: Arousal-cost-reward model (emergency and non emergency cases)
* Interaction of mood and cognition in determining behavior
* Arousal: emotional response to the need or distress of others 🡪 unpleasant 🡪 bystander is motivated to reduce it
* Assessing possible costs and rewards associated with helping or not helping
* Arousal can be increased by
	+ Empathy with victim
	+ Proximity to the emergency
	+ Length of time of the emergency
* Arousal can be reduced by:
	+ Helping
	+ Seeking help from another source
	+ Leaving scene
	+ Deciding that the person does not need help
* Help : reduce unpleasant feelings of arousal
	+ Cost of not helping : self blame, others way of viewing them
	+ Cost of helping: effort, embarrassment, possible physical harm, time
	+ Reward of helping: praise from self, others and victim
	+ Reward of not helping: getting time to do what you want, no cost of helping

**Study: Piliavin et al. 1969**
**Experiment:** Field experiment in New York Subway
**Participants:** New York subway travelers 11 am-3pm
**Independent variable:** “victim” aged 25-30, 1 acting drunk and smelling like alcohol, 1 with a cane all of them dressed identically
**Dependent:** amount of people in the train, sex of helper, speed for help, verbal comments
**Procedure:** the confederate acting as a victim collapse after the train left the station for 70 seconds. If no one helps a model helper will come in and help after 70 seconds. There were 103 trials, 65 with blind, 38 with drunk.
**Results:** 93% of the time someone helped spontaneously, 60% more than one helper are involved. Cane victim has 100% people helping while drunk victim have 81% helping. Diffusion of responsibility was not involved

**Conclusion: arousal-cost-reward model**

* Drunk have less helped because cost is greater (self harm, disgust, embarrassment)
* Less cost of not helping: people won’t mind, drunk people are responsible for self
* Diffusion of responsibility not found in cane: cost of not helping is higher than helping

**Evaluation:**
+ High ecological validity (field experiment and real life situation)
+ Generalizable to a certain extent (4000 commuters in total)
+ Correspond to cognitive theory
+ No Hawthrone effect
- Fewer trials for drunk victim
- Measure of moving away or towards victim (accurate?)

**Culture:**

**Individualism and Collectivism:** In relation to individualistic and collectivistic cultures, bystanderism is presented more frequent in **an individualistic setting, because people are more concern of their personal well being as for a collectivistic setting**, bystanderism is limited as people are subjected to offer their help.

Study: 1990s Levine et all
**Aim:** to investigate the cross culture differences in helping behavior existing in 23 different countries and 36 cities across USA. Countries included Thailand Malaysia Mexico Czech Republic (Every continent)

**Experiment:** Field Experiment **Participants:** People walking on the streets
**Procedure:
Independent variable:**

* Dropping a pen: The experimenter dropped the pen on the streets. It aims to investigate how many people would call him and return back his pen
* Injured leg: The person clearly shows that his leg is injured, limping. The experimenter drops the magazine and struggled to get it.
* Blind person waiting to cross the streets: dressed up with black glasses and stopped before the street lights went green. The person did not move until someone came and offered help.

Dependent variable: how many people help in each country. Each country is counted as single subjects.

**Results:** The results for helping in the 3 scenario is relatively stable for each city, suggesting that helping someone is cross-culturally meaningful characteristic. But there are variations across the countries (depending on people)

93$ in Brazil, 40% in Malaysia.

Countries like; Malawi, Spain, Czech with small cities tends to help people in all scenarios.
Countries like Thailand (Bangkok) and Malaysia tend to help people half ot he time.
New York: 1/3 of the time you will get help as Rio De Janeiro and San Jose.

Helping someone is inversely related to the country’s economic status. The better the less help this can be because people are in a rush to work and there is no time to spare. Countries with faster pace of walking means that it is stronger economic wise.

Cities that have stronger economic productivity tend to be individualistic countries where people tend to care more about themselves. It can lead them not to help others. Countries with cultural tradition of helping others tend to help more (small cities).

**Evaluation:**+ High ecological validity, it is on the streets and participants usually encounter these things in real life
+ Generalizability: many participants from many countries
+ No Hawthrone effect
+ No researcher’s bias due to quantitative data
+ Supports the bystander theory
- Deception of the participants
- Extraneous variable such as not seeing the pen drop or Japan : blind people can cross according to sound
- Low replicability

Examine biological, psychological and social origins of attraction.

Outline the biological, psychological and social origins of attraction. Outline and evaluate two studies for each. Evaluate the extent to which these factors influence attraction

**There are 2 explanations for the biological origins of attraction:**

-          Effect of hormones and neurotransmission on bonding (oxytocin, serotonin etc.)

-          Evolutionary origins of attraction (jealousy, physical attractiveness, female/male partner preference

**Studies: Wedekind (1995) and Fischer (2003)**
**Wedekind (1995)**

-          Aim: Investigate whether body odor plays a role in attraction - tested genes that were related to the immune system in mate selection (MHC genes)

-          Participants: 49 women, 44 men  with a wide range of MHC genes

-          Procedure: Men were given clean shirt to wear for 2 nights to ensure strong body odor, they were given supplies of odor free soap, aftershave that is odor neutral. The shirts were then put in each plastic box with a hole made for sniffing. Women were then asked to come, during the midpoint of their menstrual cycle (it enhances their sense of smell). Women were asked to sniff 7 boxes with t-shirts and asked to rate the t-shirt from pleasant to unpleasant:

o   3 boxes with t-shirts from men with similar MHC genes to the woman’s own

o   3 boxes with t-shirts from men with different MHC genes to the woman’s own

o   1 control box with an unworn t-shirt

-          Result: Women tend to prefer t-shirts with scent of men with dissimilar MHC genes. But pregnant women were different for they preferred t-shirts with scent of men with similar MHC genes.

-          Evaluation: Study shows human biology/genes has an influence on mate selection

Study is well controlled – lab. Selection of male and female in study increases generalizability, but could be better if Wedekind has studied the opposite (men smell women). There is a high degree of ecological validity; smelling opposite sex when choosing partner. However, study ignores other personal differences in mate selection – personal preference of an odor. There is a supported replication done on rats, where results show that pregnant mice prefer odor of mates with similar genes.

**Fischer (2003)**

-          Aim: Investigate the blood flown in the brains (using fMRI) of lovers who were madly in love.

-          Participant: 20 men and women who were madly in love

-          Procedure: Participants were asked to look at photographs of their lover or of a neutral person (the nature of photos was the independent variable). Before the fMRI scan, they were asked to fill out a questionnaire – passion love scale – with a statement relating to how they felt about their relationship. Then they were asked to look at photographs of their beloved for 30 seconds while their brains were scanned. Followed by a distracting task before being asked to look at a neutral photograph again for 30 seconds while their brains were scanned.  This was repeated for 6 more times.

-          Result: The questionnaires filled by participants were correlated with the results of the brain scan. There is a brain reward system of the participants that is activated by the pleasant stimulus while looking at the picture of their lover. The more passionate they rate their relationship; the more active was their brain reward system.

-          Evaluations: Study shows our biology’s reaction to attraction. Testing in a lab, especially with fMRI is well controlled. Generalizability is increased with mixed gender participants. But usage of fMRI is not common in everyday life and decreases ecological validity. And study ignores other factors for causing excitement, such as having to go through fMRI. Study does not investigate other types of attraction, such as between friends and family.

**Evaluation of biological origins of attraction:**
The studies are very supportive, and reflect how biology plays a role in attraction/mate selection. Other theories previously defined, such as Darwin’s Natural Selection theory also suggest that the origin of attraction is due to evolution and the strive for survival – one selects their mate based on their mate’s ability to survive (survival of the fittest) and their ability to pass on the best survival traits. It is true that humans tend to select healthy partners over the weak (In Buss 1994 study, Nigeria ranked good health as an important factor in a potential partner), thus humans too definitely show natural selection. All of which show our biology as an important origin of attraction.

**Explanations for the Sociocultural origins of attraction**

-          People who live close to one another, are likely similar and have the same social and cultural norms of what is attractive in a partner. People are attracted to these whom they have a positive interaction with.

-          Familarity: The more they interact with each other, or often see each other they would like each other more.

Two supporting Studies
Festinger (1950)

-          Aim: To investigate the extent in which proximity can affect the likelihood of relationship in college students.

Participant: College students in MIT Westgate and Westgate West housing project for students.

-          Procedure: The researchers asked the participants and their family to do a survey asking about 3 people that they considered as close friend or individuals that they most frequently interact with, including how far they live from each other.   The participants were selected at random from the target population.

-          Findings: showed that the closer the person’s room with it to them the more they are considered to be close, or best friends. (65% of close friend live in the same build, 41.2 % live next door, 22.5 live 2 doors apart, 16.2% live 3 doors apart, 10% live at the opposite end of the hall)

-          Evaluation:

o   Strengths

§  Ecologically valid: Investigate relationships that were formed naturally before the experiment.

§  Easily replicable: low cost, not time consuming

§  Ethical considerations: minimal stress level for participants

o   Weaknesses

§  Low generalizability: college students from MIT

§  Some participants may give false data

Zajonc (1971)

-          Aim: To investigate familiarity as a factor for forming relationship

-          Procedure: Pictures of strangers are shown to be participants then they were asked to rate each individual in the pictures.

-          Findings: The participants give better evaluation to the strangers, whose picture appeared more often. Familiarity can positively affect liking in individuals.

-          Evaluation:

o   Strengths

§  Quantitative data gathering: less researcher’s bias

§  Ethical considerations: minimal stress level

o   Weaknesses

§  Ecological Validity: forming relationship in real is not similar to numerical evaluation

Evaluation of the theory
The theory of the sociocultural origins of attractions, is well supported by the experiments and researches done about it. The theory is able to explain why people would more likely like one another. The theory explains that if we are more familiar or interact with someone, the more we would like that person, due to the reason people live close to one another their social and cultural norms would be similar. The theory could not explain why do relationships change, or why do some last longer than other. There are also some flaws in the reasearches and experiments done to support it, which could lead to wrong conclusions made.

**Explanations for psychological origins of attraction**

* Similarity - people tend to see friends and partners as similar to themselves
* Childhood experiences
	+ We have a need of forming attachments to our caregivers as children (*Bowlby*)
	+ A romantic relationship involves attachment that resembles experiences             of attachments from childhood (*Hazan & Shaver*)
	+ Whenever we encounter someone new that reminds us of a significant other in         the past we may be attracted to this person (*Transference:* when we meet             someone new that reminds us of a significant other in the past, we tend to retreat         to the old schema of that person which affects the impression of the stranger)
	+ Past experiences form a “love map”: our idea/schema of an ideal partner

**Supporting Studies**

*Chen and Anderson (1999)*

* Aim: To investigate the effects of Transference on attraction.
* Participants: 1 experimented group and 1 control group
* Procedures: Before the experiment, participants were asked to identify two of their significant others: one that they liked and one that they disliked, providing a short description for each of the two. 2 weeks later, the participants learned about a new person that they were told to interact with. The description of the person was rigged to resemble their descriptions of the significant others.
* Results: The experiment showed that the attitude that the participants had towards their new acquaintances shifted towards that they had towards their significant others, compared to the control group.
* Strengths: Corresponds with the widely accepted schema theory. Real-life settings, higher ecological validity.
* Weaknesses: There is a possibility that the participants might have guessed the aim of the experiment based on the circumstances. The participants were Americans which makes it hard to generalize the findings.

*Markey et al (2007) Pt. I*

* Aim: To investigate the effects of Similarity on attraction.
* Participants: Young people
* Procedures: A group of young people were asked to give a description of their ‘ideal’ romantic partner in terms of psychological characteristics, values and attitudes without thinking of anyone in particular. Then, they were asked to describe themselves.
* Results: The experiment showed that the participants’ descriptions of their ideal partners are similar to that of themselves.

*Markey et al (2007) Pt. II, follow-up study*

* Aim: To investigate the effects of Similarity on attraction.
* Participants: 206 young couples who had been together for a year
* Procedures: The participants were asked to fill out a questionnaire about their partner’s characteristics.
* Results: The same as the first part.
* Strengths: The results were derived from a large sample size which increases validity.
* Weaknesses: Based on questionnaires, this reduces the reliability of the study because participants might have not given the most honest answers. Participants were American which reduces the generalizability of the results.

*Hazan & Shaver (1987)*

* Aim: To investigate the effects of childhood experiences on relationships during adulthood, a theory proposed by Bowlby.
* Participants: Newspaper survey on “community members” and on college students.
* Procedures: Developed a questionnaire to study to association between individual differences in adult attachment and their perception of their early relationships with their parents.
* Results: Hazan and Shaver found an association between adult attachment and childhood attachment.
* Strengths: The findings are supported by Bowlby’s theory. More than 50 studies have followed up Hazan and Shaver’s (1987) findings by examining attachment-related variations in parental representations with results that are consistent with the original study.
* Weaknesses: Similar problems with Markey, the study is based on self-reports that have credibility issues. The participants are also American which leads to generelizability issues since Asian cultures may have a very different perception about their parents and their roles.

**Evaluation on the psychological origins**
The psychological origins of attraction corresponds with the schema theory (especially Chen and Anderson) which are widely accepted among psychologists. Although, despite the correspondence with the schema theory, there are, as of now, little empirical support for the psychological origins. With that said, more studies are required to validate the findings.

Discuss the role of communication in maintaining relationships.

Outline two factors in communication that can affect the quality of relationships. Outline and evaluate two studies for each. Evaluate how important these factors are for maintaining relationships
Communication is one of most important factors for a well functioning relationship

**Communication Factors Influencing the Quality of a Relationship**

- Communication of attribution
- Self disclosure
- Individual and Cultural differences in communication

**Communication of Attribution**

- **Fundamental attribution error:** The tendency to overestimate dispositional factors and to underestimate situational factors of behavior

Evaluation:

- **Bradbury & Fincham (1990):** Conducted a meta-analysis of research studies on attributions made by couples on each others behavior. Poor marital quality was related to attributing negative behaviors to dispositional factors.

Evaluation:

- **Bradbury & Fincham (1993):** A 12-month longitudinal study showed that the kind of attributions married couples made predicted marital satisfaction at the end of the study.

Evaluation:

**Self Disclosure**
- **Social penetration theory (Altman & Taylor, 1973):** Relationships are formed by a gradual process of self-disclosure; the sharing of personal facts, inner thoughts and feelings

- **Collins & Miller (1994):** A meta analysis showed that people who disclose intimate information about themselves are more liked than people who don’t

**Individual and cultural differences in communicationTannen (1990):** In observational studies, she found gender differences in how men and women have conversations. Men interrupt more, women use more language tags, women prefer emotional support whereas men tend to have a problem solving approach to problems**Reis (1986):** Women self disclose more than men. Women also disclose more to other women than men to other men.

Explain the role that culture plays in the formation and maintenance of relationships.

Outline and evaluate two studies on the effect of culture on the formation of relationships
Outline and evaluate two studies on the effect of culture on the maintenance of relationships

Analyse why relationships may change or end.

**Lee’s Sequences of Separation Model (1984)**
Based on a survey on 112 romantic break ups of premarital couples, Lee identified the following stages:
•Dissatisfaction-Recognising there is a problem
•Exposure- Problem brought out into open.
•Negotiation- Discussion about issue raised
•Resolution Attempts-Each partner attempts to problem solve.
•Termination-Resolution attempts are unsuccessful.

**Duck’s Model of Dissolution (1999)**
Duck supposed there were five stages
which could be triggered by a threshold.
1.Breakdown-Dissatisfaction leads to crisis. Repair strategy: correct own faults
2.Intra-psychic phase-Thinking about relationship in private, then with close friend. Repair strategy- re-establish liking for partner.
3.Dyadic phase- Deciding to break up/repair: repair strategy- recalculate rules for future.
4.Social phase. Include others in your argument i.e. take your side. Repair strategy outsiders encourage reunion.
5.Grave Dressing- Public & private dissection of relationship. Repair strategy- Try to salvage friendship and agree upon acceptable version of events.

Evaluation
- These models show that dissolution is not a sudden step but a process
- They identify stages where things start to go wrong

Lee (1984)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Aim | To examine romantic breakups of premarital couples |
| Procedure | 112 breakups of premarital couples were investigated through self-reports |
| Method | Survey |
| Evaluation | The study can be generalized only to a certain extent. Although there were many couples in the investigation, only premarital couples were included, and the commitment level to their partner would be lower than married couples. Also, due to the lack of controlled variables and a laboratory setting, surveying real couples that broke up makes the study high in ecological validity. The downside of this would be possible uncontrolled confounding variables during the survey (i.e. are the participants giving out all true information?). The study is also difficult to replicate due to the difficulty of finding 112 breakups that are willing to participate. The model is also simplistic and reductionistic, one stage proceeds to the next stage, and in reality there should be more possibilities in each stage. |
| Conclusion | There are stages that couples go through as their relationship changes, if the couples stop at any stage, the relationship is only likely to change, but if none of the stages work, the relationship will end in the termination stage. The stages areSequence of Separation Model•       Dissatisfaction-Recognising there is a problem•       Exposure- Problem brought out into open.•       Negotiation- Discussion about issue raised•       Resolution Attempts-Each partner attempts to problem solve.•       Termination-Resolution attempts are unsuccessful. |

Evaluate sociocultural explanations of the origins of violence.

One explanation of violence from the sociocultural level of analysis can be seen through the *deindividuation theory*. The psychological state of deindividuation is aroused when individuals join crowds or large groups. The state is characterizes by diminished awareness of self and individuality. Being in a large group provides a degree of anonymity, which allows an individual to avoid responsibility for his or her actions, thus shaking odd the usual social controls and becoming more impulsive, irrational, aggressive, and even violent.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name of Study | Diener et al (1976) |
| Research Method | Naturalistic Observation |
| Aim | To establish if deindividuation had an effect on a child’s behavior – in this case, how many pieces of candy the child would take as a trick or treater. |
| Independent Variable | Individuation – whether or not their identity was highlighted |
| Procedure | Children in one group were asked for their names and address whereas those in another group were notThe children were encouraged to take a single sweet. |
| Findings | Those who were individuate (by asking for their personal details) took more than the single sweet in 8% of cases.Those who were deindividuated (by virtue of being dressed up in haloween costumes and not being asked for details) took more than one sweet in 80% of cases |
| Conclusion | The results indicates the importance of deindividuation on self – consciousness and feelings of responsibility |

*Agency Theory*: Milgram argues that people may enter an “agentic state” where they choose not to take responsibility of their actions and become the tool of an authority. This agentic state may lead to violent behavior. This is a situational approach

Zimbardo (1969)
Female undergraduates were asked to deliver electric shocks to another student to “aid” learning. Half the participants wore bulky lab coats and hoods that hid their faces. They were spoken to in groups of four and never referred to by name. They could also see each other (dimly) when they were seated at the shock machines. Both sets of participants could see the student being shocked.
All the participants were told something about the learner prior to each experiment: either “she is honest, sincere, and warm”, or “she is conceited and critical”
Findings: Hooded participants delivered twice as many shocked and the amount of shock did not vary depending on the description of the learner. Participants wearing name-tags related the amount of shock to the description given.
Conclusion: The results indicate that those whose identity had been obscured were more likely to deliver a harsher punishment.

Outline two sociocultural explanations of violence. Support with two studies for each. Evaluate the studies and the extent the factors contribute to violence

Discuss the relative effectiveness of two strategies for reducing violence.

**Violence:** the intentional use of physical force or power, threatened or actual, against oneself, another person, or against a group or community that either results in or has a high likelihood of resulting in injury, death, psychological harm, maldevelopment, or deprivation.

**Examples of violence:** suicide, terrorism, child abuse, rape, and bullying.

1. Change social and cultural norms that promote or glorify violence towards others.
- Studies show that such norms can increase the incidence of violence.
- Example: American south is considered to have a “culture of honor”, which means that men do not accept insults from others or accept improper conducts against them, and are willing to resort to violent retribution in order to maintain their reputation. It also has a higher level of violence than the American north. May be due to economic differences and prevalence of guns, but if those factors are controlled for, violence is still more prevalent in the south.

Study:

-       In the field experiment by Cohen and Nisbett, employers were sent letters from job applicants who had allegedly killed someone in an honor-related conflict. The findings show that southern and western companies were more likely than northern companies to respond in an understanding and cooperative way.

A way to change social and cultural norms of violence is through education. One program aimed at preventing adolescent dating violence is Safe Dates.

**Study**: Foshee

**Aim**: to evaluate the effectiveness of the program

**Participants**: fourteen schools in a rural county in the United States were randomly allocated to treatment conditions.

**Procedure**: The participants’ attitudes toward adolescent dating violence were measured through the questionnaires, before and after the program.

**Findings**: Less psychological abuse and sexual violence was reported in the treatment than the control group. Most of these effects were explained by changes in dating violence norms, gender stereotyping and awareness of services. Even though one should be cautious of drawing too far reached conclusions of the results, as the measure was based on self report, and not actual behavior, the reduction of adolescent dating violence through education seems promising.

2. Improve social skills and enhance life opportunities for children.

Outline two strategies for reducing bullying. Support with two studies for each. Evaluate the studies and the effectiveness of the strategies
Discuss the effects of short‑term and long‑term exposure to violence.

Outline the effect of short term exposure to bullying. Support with two studies. Evaluate the studies and to which extent there are short term effects of bullying.

Outline the effect of long term exposure to bullying. Support with two studies. Evaluate the studies and to which extent there are long term effects of bullying.

Bully: A person who use strength or power to harm or intimidate those who are weaker.
Long term effects:
- Miss many school days
- Lower achievements
- Age 23 or above tend to go into depression
- Poorer self esteem

Fekkes, Piipers, and Verloove- Vanhorick (2004)
Aim: To investigate the long term effect of bullying
Method: Cross-sectional study
Procedure: Questionnaire for participants to answer
Results: Victims of bullied had significantly higher chances of depression and psychosomatic symptoms including, headaches, sleeping difficulties, abdominal pain, bed wetting, and feeling tired.
Ethical Considerations: Consent form, privacy
Strength: Supports the theory of long term memory.
Limitation: Ecological validity, replication, and generalizability

Kidscape (1999)

Kidscape children’s charity had conducted the first ever retrospective survey of adults to discover if bullying at school affects people in later life. The survey shows that being bullied continuously as a child has a dramatic, negative effect throughout life.

Participants: 1000 Adults

Method: Suvey

Results: Bullying affect self esteem, ability to make friends, ability to be successful in education, work and social relationship during adulthood. 46% who were bullied considered suicide compared to 7% who were not bullied.

Evaluation
The study uses surveys as the method. This makes it fairly high in ecological validity. The population is 1000 adults, which is a large sample, making it more generalizable to other adults. Students cannot be involved in the study, as they are not considered to have experienced effects from bullying that is long term. The participants can give false experiences about bullying, affecting the validity of the study.

Short term effects of bullying
Definition: Bullying is usually defined as a form of aggression in which one or more children intend to harm or disturb another child who is perceived to be unable to defend themselves (Glew, Rivara and Feudther, 2000)
Short Term effects of bullying: Acts moody, sullen, or withdraws from family interactions. Thus, becomes depressed and angry, high rates of illness, loses interest in school work which leads to lower grades. Loses appetite and has difficulty sleeping. Busted lips and bruises, ask for extra allowance, wants to carry a protection item (knife).
Study 1: Delville (2002)
This study observed effects of bullying on health and brain development of adolescent hamsters. Adolescent male hamsters were placed for an hour a day for 2 weeks in an adult hamster’s cage. The adult bit and chased the adolescent hamsters.
A)    Control Group: Adolescent male hamsters were placed in an empty, unfamiliar cage.
Results: Stress hormone cortisol was at a high level in both groups of hamsters on the first day. But the cortisol level remained high for the entire two weeks for the hamsters who were bullied.
Study 2:  Snyder (2003)
Longitudinal study observing 266 kindergarten elementary school kids on the playground
Results: researchers recorded aggressive actions and people being victims and found that boys experienced bullying became depressed and showed anti social behavior, thus anti social behavior made girls targets for short term and long term bullying.
Evaluation and Conclusion: There are certainly short term effects of bullying. Though the definition of short term may vary with each victim (for instance, one may argue that a victim suffering from the consequences of feeling unsafe and keeping a weapon at hand may not get over their problem as quickly as a victim who merely acts out by demanding extra allowance) Studies investigating these trends are often more adept at recording instances of bullying and displays of distress through brain studies. For this, animals are often studied to investigate bio-psychological impacts, raising concern about generalizability to human subjects. Despite its generalizability weakness, the Deville study is time consuming too. Similarly, the Snyder study is time consuming and observing can invade participants privacy, which is an ethical consideration.  Furthermore, most short term symptoms of bullying are external as opposed to psychological. This is due to the fact that psychological trauma is longer lasting. Efforts to deal with short term effects of bullying are taking preventative measures, and encouraging potential victims to stand up for themselves. This would empower them with a sense of agency, thus reducing feelings of insecurity and powerlessness.