

AI Acknowledgment

I acknowledge using Microsoft copilot on 24/02 with the prompt asking how I should structure my paragraphs for the essay by providing the AI tool with the perfoma.

Ethical and Methodological Considerations in Replicating Schachter and Singer's (1962) Research on Emotional Labelling

Schachter and Singer's (1962) study on the nature of emotional state and experiences is one of the most influential and debated studies in social psychology. The study includes empirical support for the theory that emotions arise between physiological arousal and cognitive interpretation. Their work suggests that people rely heavily on context and how they label and identify their own emotional state to understand the behaviour of others and themselves. This idea has shaped decades of research on emotion and social cognition. However, despite its historical significance, the study has been subjected to methodological critique, leading to continued discussion regarding the reliability and ethical consideration of the experiment. This essay will explain the original study and discuss key criticisms raised by researchers, while also evaluating the methodological and ethical issues involved in attempting to replicate the findings today. It will also consider how modern ethical standards and alternative research methods might be able to investigate the main ideas of Schachter and Singer's theory.

Schachter and Singer's (1962) study was designed to test their theory of emotion by how people understand physiological arousal when they lack a clear explanation of it. Participants in the experiment were told they were receiving an injection of a vitamin called "Suproxin" but some were actually given epinephrine which is a hormone that produces symptoms of increased heart rate. Some participants were correctly informed, misinformed or completely uninformed, which allowed the researchers to manipulate the experiment. After the injection, participants were placed in a room with a "stooge" who would act in either an angry or euphoric manner to provide contextual cues to influence the participants emotional response. Schachter and Singer measured participants' emotional states through observation of their behaviour and questionnaires. Schachter and Singer predicted that those who lacked

an accurate explanation for their arousal would look at the stooge's behaviour to label their emotion. Therefore, the study aimed to demonstrate that emotion is caused by not only physiological arousal but also from the cognitive interpretation of environmental cues.

In the years since the publication of Schachter and Singer's (1962) study it has been open to a wide array of critique. Reisenzein, R. (1983), argues that the empirical foundation of the theory is far weaker than its influence suggests. Furthermore, he states that there is no convincing evidence for Schachter's claim that physiological arousal is a necessary condition for an emotional state, nor the claim that emotions arise from cognitive labelling of unexplained arousal, both of which form the main idea of Schachter and Singer's theory. Reisenzein concludes that the role of the arousal in emotion has been substantially overstated and that the data supports only a weak version of the theory.

Dror (2017) has also critiqued Schachter and Singer (1962), arguing that account of its origins has been misrepresented by how the theory was actually developed. He suggests that the theory was not a straightforward cognitive theory of emotion but instead evolved from Schachter's early social-influence research, which was later reframed in cognitive terms to support his existing programme of work. Furthermore, Dror argues that the "two factors" themselves were not from a clear theoretical insight but were constructed through combining Schachter's social-psychological ideas with Singer's ideas, making the theory less coherent than it is implied. Dror ultimately challenges the belief that Schachter and Singer were pioneers of the theoretical shift towards cognition in emotion research.

The ethical problems in Schachter and Singer's (1962) study are substantial when viewed through modern research standards, and these concerns would make an ethical replication impossible today. The most serious issue is the extensive deception and lack of informed consent, as participants were misled about the nature of the injection they received

and were falsely told it was a harmless vitamin supplement rather than epinephrine, a substance known to produce significant physiological side effects such as increased heart rate. Under ethical guidelines, participants must be fully informed about any procedure that carries even minimal physical or psychological risk, meaning that withholding the true nature of the drug would be a clear violation of participants right to make an informed choice. The undisclosed use of a hormone that directly affects the sympathetic nervous system also raises concerns about physical safety, especially given that participants may have had underlying medical conditions that were unknown to the researchers, exposing them to avoidable harm.

Beyond the physical risks, the study made use of psychological deception, including the use of “stooges” who deliberately exaggerated euphoric or angry behaviours to get emotional responses from the participants. The manipulation has additional ethical issues, as it may cause distress or harm and violates modern expectations that researchers must minimise the possibility of psychological harm. Furthermore, because the participants were unaware that their emotions were being intentionally influenced, they were denied the opportunity to consent to something that current ethical guidelines would require disclosure for. The level of deception involved interferes with the debriefing process, which in the 1962 study was not described in sufficient detail to ensure that participants were fully informed afterwards about the true nature of the study, the drug, and the stooges role. These ethical from undisclosed medical risks to intentional emotional manipulation highlight why the original study would not meet today’s ethical standards and demonstrate the significant constraints that modern research ethics would place on any attempt to replicate a similar study.

Replicating Schachter and Singer’s (1962) research today needs careful planning to be both ethical and reliable. Instead of using deception or drugs to create arousal, researchers can use safe methods like mild exercise, public speaking, or timed tasks. Emotional situations

should be the same for all participants, for example using videos or scripted prompts, rather than stooges, so results are consistent. Emotions can be measured in different ways, including self-reports, physiological monitoring, and observing behaviour, to get a complete picture. Using larger and more diverse samples helps make the results more general. Planning the study carefully ensures the findings are strong. Finally, participants should be fully informed and debriefed, allowing researchers to study how people interpret arousal safely while still exploring the main ideas from Schachter and Singer's work.

As an alternative to the theory of emotion proposed by Schachter and Singer (1962), emotional experience can be understood through an appraisal-based framework grounded in the biopsychosocial model of challenge and threat. Rather than focusing on the labelling of arousal, this perspective emphasises how individuals evaluate situational demands in relation to their perceived coping resources, and how these appraisals shape emotional and physiological responses from there. When perceived resources exceed demands, individuals experience a challenge state associated with more adaptive cardiovascular responses, more positive affect, and enhanced performance. In contrast, when demands are appraised as exceeding available resources, a threat state emerges, often linked to increased anxiety, less efficient physiological responding, and poorer behavioural outcomes (Jamieson et al., 2018). Furthermore, research on arousal reappraisal demonstrates that teaching individuals to reinterpret physiological stress responses such as an increased heart rate as functional and performance-enhancing can lead to measurable improvements in both emotional experience and physiological functioning (Jamieson et al., 2018). This evidence suggests that appraisal processes play a key role in shaping emotional responses to stress, offering a more practical theory than that proposed by Schachter and Singer.

In conclusion, Schachter and Singer's (1962) study remains a key piece of research in understanding the link between physiological arousal and cognitive interpretation in

emotional experience. While the study provided influential insights into how people label and interpret their own emotions in social contexts, it has been subject to significant methodological and ethical critique. The use of deception, administration of epinephrine without fully informed consent, and manipulation of participants' emotional responses through stooges would not meet today's ethical standards, highlighting the substantial challenges of directly replicating the original research. Modern replications must therefore employ safe and transparent methods to induce arousal, such as mild exercise, public speaking, or timed cognitive tasks, alongside standardised emotional stimuli and rigorous measurement of both subjective and physiological responses. Additionally, larger and more diverse samples and careful statistical planning are essential for ensuring reliable and generalisable findings. Beyond methodological improvements, alternative frameworks, such as appraisal-based approaches grounded in the biopsychosocial model, offer ethically and practically applicable ways to explore the cognitive interpretation of arousal, demonstrating how perceived coping resources influence emotional and physiological states (Jamieson et al., 2018). By combining ethical safeguards, solid methodology, and theoretically informed approaches, researchers can continue to investigate and expand upon Schachter and Singer's insights while avoiding the limitations and risks inherent in the original study.

References

- Dror, O. E. (2017). Deconstructing the “two factors”: The historical origins of the Schachter–Singer theory of emotions. *Emotion Review*, 9(1), 7–16.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1754073916639663>
- Jamieson, J. P., Hangen, E. J., Lee, H. Y., & Yeager, D. S. (2018). Capitalizing on appraisal processes to improve affective responses to social stress. *Emotion Review*, 10(1), 30–39. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1754073917693085>
- Reisenzein, R. (1983). *The Schachter theory of emotion: Two decades later*. *Psychological Bulletin*, 94(2), 239–264. <https://research-ebsco-com.uwtsd.idm.oclc.org/c/onvpsy/viewer/pdf/ashxgvywiv?route=details>
- Schachter, S., & Singer, J. E. (1962). *Cognitive, social, and physiological determinants of emotional state*. *Psychological Review*, 69(5), 379–399. <https://research-ebsco-com.uwtsd.idm.oclc.org/c/onvpsy/viewer/pdf/4rose2hzen>