PSYC20009 University of Melbourne
Social and Personality Psychology Lecture Revision

Lecture 1:   Introduction to Social and Personality Psychology
                        Morality

Lecture 2 & 3:   Quantitative Methods- Correlation

Lecture 4:   Intergroup Conflict

Lecture 5:   Social Influence

Lecture 6:   Evolutionary Social Psychology

Lecture 7:   Attitudes

Lecture 8:   The Self and Self Regulation

Lecture 9:   Relationships

Lecture 10:   Introduction to Personality

Lecture 11:   Explanation of Personality

Lecture 12:   Controversies in Personality Research

Lecture 1 - Introduction into Social and Personality Psychology

Personality Psychology
- Attempts to understand the self and the social world with an emphasis on how *stable individual differences* influence behaviour, thought and feeling

Social Psychology
- Attempts to understand the self and the social world with an emphasis on how *the situation* shapes behaviour, thought and feeling

Personality psychology is interested in cross-situational stability (how a person behaves in in a similar way <u>ACROSS</u> situations) whilst social psychology is interested in how the situation changes the way people behave.

e.g Conflict
P - are certain people more prone to conflict than others?
S - are certain situational factors likely to lead to conflict?

Both are grounded in empirical research - both are broad disciplines with fuzzy boundaries (biological, cognitive, developmental).

The psychology of morality
There is variability in what people find morally right and morally wrong. Morality psychology seeks to gain understanding of this variability.

Philosophers seek to understand the linguistics of understanding of morality. Putting forward normative theories - **what IS**.
Psychologists seek to understand the neural mechanisms that underlie moral judgement and behaviour. We are biological beings, **what OUGHT** bring out a consequence.

What is morality?

Philosophy - Gert (2005) - *Code of conduct or set of rules pertaining to "right" / "good" / "wrong" / "bad" held by an individual or group.*

Psychology - there is a different approach.
- <u>It is response-dependent</u>.
- What counts as a moral is that set of phenomena to which people have "moral" responses.
- The content of what people gives us - is what psychologists are interested in. "Let's understand the mechanisms that give rise to that outcome".

The moral/conventional distinction
Turiel et al (1987) and the moral/conventional task
- Violations of rule
    - One child hits another
    - One child pushes another off the swing
    - A child wears a dress to school
    - A child talks out of tune in class

- The child is asked - is it wrong/serious? If an authority figure did it - would it still be wrong? How wrong is it?

The signature moral response (SMR)
- Turiel came up with a set of violations that produced a SMR
- Certain behaviours elicited when the nature of the event was seen as:
- Serious wrong or bad
- Punishable acts
- Authority dependent
- General in scope (universal).
- Often these responses were given to situations that appealed to harm
- Most people give the SMR when situations that involve harm

The signature conventional response (SCR)
There were other situations that evoked less serious condemnation.
These were:
- Less serious/less wrong/less bad
- Less punishable
- Authority dependent (if an authority figure says it's ok - it is)
- Local in scope
- No appeals to harm
- These typically are typically scenarios that involve harm

The key distinguishing feature of stimulus - harm or welfare (also rights and justice)
- If someone is harmed - then a SMR is often observed
- If there there no harm - it is in the realm of social convention or personal choice (and not in the moral domain).
- The moral domain includes harm and injustice (Turiel), if you see harm and injustice you get the SMR, if you don't see harm or injustice, it is out the moral domain.
- In the 90's - this theory was challenged… only harm and injustice - or are there other competing factors?

Haidt, Koller & Dias (1993)
- Non-harm violations evoke the signature moral response.
- A series of images/behaviours presented (cleaning the toilet with the American flag, a family eating their pet dog after it had been killed, and having sex with a dead chicken).
- None of these scenarios involved injustice or harm.
- These were authority independent.