

**ASSESSMENT GRIDS AS QUALITY MECHANISMS 2016-2017 2019-2020**

**St. Xavier's College, Autonomous, Mumbai**  
**ASSESSMENT OF WRITTEN ASSIGNMENT**

Dept. of PSYCHOLOGY Course Code APSY0401

DATE: 8/2/20

NAMES OF STUDENTS and UIDs and Roll Nos.

AKSHAY RAO - 181188 (227)      CHRISTABELLE FERNANDES - 181035 (184)  
JAY RAO - 181186 (226)      KYARA COELHO - 181090 (205)  
ASHLEY D'CONHA - 181033 (183)      MEINHA KHANNA - 181275 (239)  
ISHAH TAIMNI - 181043 (188)  
FLEUR TURNER - 181206 (232)

*Handwritten:*  
29/11/19  
*Blind*

**ASSIGNMENT**  
 TITLE OF WRITTEN PRESENTATION: INTERPERSONAL ATTRACTION (RECIPOCAL LIKING & SELF ESTEEM)

100 %	ASSIGNMENT	80-100% (17-20Marks)	60-80% (13- 16 Marks)	40- 60% (9/12Marks)	20-40% ( 5-8 Marks)	0-20% ( 0-4 Marks)
(12)	CONTENT	Excellent - Impression of wide reading ( research), good knowledge and comprehensive understanding. Evidence of thoughtful input. Ability to critique, Bibliography mentioned. <b>(12) / (11) / (10)</b>	Good <b>(9) / (8)</b>	Satisfactor y <b>(7) / (6)</b>	Poor <b>(5) / (4)</b>	Very Poor <b>(3) / (2) / (1)</b>
(6)	ORGANISATION	Effective Presentation, Logical Format, Clear Statement of Ideas, Relevant Details, sequence of information and ideas could be easily followed <b>(6)</b>	Few Problems <b>(5)</b>	Many problems <b>(4)</b>	Inadequate presentation, Ineffective format, Ineffective Communication of Ideas, Lack Relevant Details – But an attempt <b>(3)</b>	No Attempt to organize <b>(2)</b>
(1)	VOCABULARY	Richness of Vocabulary <b>(1)</b>	Very good range of vocabulary with some errors <b>(1)</b>	Good range of vocabulary with some errors <b>(0.5)</b>	Small range of vocabulary with errors <b>(0.5)</b>	Little or no effort to demonstrate vocabulary knowledge <b>(0.5)</b>
(1)	GRAMMAR, SPELLINGS, MECHANICS	Grammar, Spellings, Punctuations Correct. <b>(1)</b>	Very Few Errors <b>(1)</b>	Some Errors <b>(0.5)</b>	Many Errors <b>(0.5)</b>	No effort <b>(0.5)</b>

TOTAL MARKS FOR WRITTEN ASSIGNMENT: 18 OUT OF 20

NAME OF FACULTY MEMBER: Dean Fernandes SJ

*Good analysis*

SIGNATURE: *[Signature]*



## **SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY CIA 2**

### **Topic: Interpersonal Attraction**

#### **REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

The reference point from where we began to explore reciprocal liking was the study by Simon and Bernstein in 1971, where they explored the relationship between reciprocal liking and self-esteem. The research was conducted with 129 children who were in the sixth grade. At first, the children were administered the Coopersmith Self Inventory Test. Then, they were asked to list down whom they would like to be with in the 7th grade and the names of those who they think will list down their names. It was found that those with high self-esteem were more likely to believe that the people they liked also liked them and listed their names down. Thus, it was proven that an individual's liking for others and his/her perception of those who like him/her depends on self-esteem. This study referred to Heider's theory of cognitive balance, which basically conceptualises entities and relationships. Entities (p) can be people or objects, that have relationships among themselves. These entities also evaluate other entities. Positive evaluations are symbolised by L (like) and negative evaluations are symbolised by DL (dislike). An important aspect of Heider's theory is the role of the perception of p of the evaluation of the existing relationships which aids in predicting subsequent cognitive behaviour of p. Therefore, in light of our hypothesis, Heider's theory provides evidence that people tend to like those who they perceive like them, and dislike those who they perceive dislike them. In another study by Deutsch and Solomon, (Deutsch and Solomon, 1959) they found that individuals who received negative evaluations from their peers evaluated said peer as more favourable if they thought their own performance was unfavourable. In the same way, those who were given positive evaluations, rated their peers as more favourable if they perceived their own performance to be favourable than unfavourable.

Wilson and Henzlik (1986) studied Reciprocal liking following face to face encounters with attractive and unattractive others. Group of 2 subjects- male and female- were recruited separately and were told that they would help in a study related to acquaintance process. The first person was called and asked to rate the second person who is the real subject with the scale from either 3 to 6 or 7 to 9. Unknown to the first person, this was the rating for physical attractiveness of the second person. Next, the experimenter left both the subjects alone for a designated period of time where they engaged in a conversation. After the specified period, the experimenter then provided them with a rating scale where they had to rate each other on parameters based on liking. The subjects were asked to share their responses. A second rating test which was based on liking was then provided by experimenter and the subjects were assured that these ratings being more detailed and personal, the responses would be confidential. It was hypothesized that subjects who were rated high in the first test will be more likely to rate the other person favorably in the second rating test. It was also hypothesized that subjects who rated others high on physical attractiveness were more likely to rate them favorably irrespective of whether the other subject rated them positively or negatively. Results were as expected. Reciprocal liking was found most attractive and positive evaluations rather than negative attractive and positive and negative unattractive. However, the investigators do point out the fact that being excessive praises towards others doesn't down well with individuals and they may negatively evaluate others instead of positively evaluating them. This is because people tend to associate excessive pleasing with a concession they may have to have to undertake. In other words, they may like to come across as genuine and expect natural reactions instead of far stretched appraisals.

