

Types and Explanations of Conformity	Kelman- 3 types of conformity. Internalisation (genuinely changing your behaviour), identification (conforming to a group you identify with), compliance (temporary change in public behaviour).	Evaluation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research support for ISI- Lucas et al, maths students. Conformity increased as difficulty increased. Individual differences in NSI- some individuals have a need for affiliation, and they're more likely to conform (McGhee and Teevan) ISI and NSI work together- not necessarily two separate processes. 	Obedience: Milgram's Research	40 male participants responded to newspaper ads. Range of ages and jobs. \$4.50 to take part in experiment. Fixed lottery- given role of teacher. Deceived-learning experiment. Shocked learner if they got the word list wrong, increasing by 15v each time, up to 450v. 4 prods to keep participants going if they tried to withdraw. 100% shocked up to 300v. Learner stopped responding after 315v. 65% shocked all the way to 450v.	Evaluation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Biased sample- gender and culture bias Ethical issues- deception, psychological harm, right to withdraw Internal reliability- standardized procedure, e.g. prods Supporting replications- Hofling et al- nurses
	Deutsch & Gerard- two process theory, explanations of conformity. Informational social influence (desire to be right) and normative social influence (desire to be liked).				
Conformity: Asch's Research	Aimed to investigate conformity in an unambiguous task. 123 American male undergraduates completed trials with 6-8 confederates, where they had to match up a standard line to one of three comparison lines. <i>Overall conformity- 37%. 75% conformed at least once. Demonstrates the role of ISI</i>	Evaluation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A child of its time- Perrin and Spencer replicated with engineering students. Only one conformed. The 1950s were a particularly conformist time. Lacks temporal validity. Artificial situation and task- lack of mundane realism, possible demand characteristics. Lowers internal validity. Biased sample- gender bias and culture bias. Lack of population validity. Ethical issues- deception 	Explanations for Obedience: Situational Variables	Proximity Teacher and learner in same room- 40% Teacher forces learner hand on plate- 30% Orders given over phone- 20.5% <i>The closer we are to our consequence, the less obedient we are.</i> <i>The further we are from authority, the less obedient we are.</i>	Evaluation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research support- Bickman. Suit and tie, milkman uniform, security guard uniform. More obedience for security guard. Orne and Holland- unrealistic set up. Participants would have figured out the uniform variation as fake. Miranda et al- 90% obedience among Spanish students. Results are relevant across cultures.
	Variations <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Group size- three confederates make the most difference Unanimity- presence of dissenting confederate reduced conformity Task difficulty- lines closer in length, conformity increased (ISI) 			Location Change to a run-down office- 47.5%	
Conformity to Social Roles: Zimbardo's Research	Mock prison in basement of psychology department at Stanford University. 12 male undergraduates volunteered to participate, tested for emotional stability. Randomly assigned roles of prisoner (stripped of identity, arrested at home), or guard (given uniform, given 16 rules to enforce, worked 8hr shifts in groups of 3). Slow start, but participants strongly conformed to their roles. Experiment ended early.	Evaluation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Control- Zimbardo had good level of control over variables (e.g. emotional stability). Increases internal validity. Lack of realism- participants conformed to stereotypes, rather than their own roles. Ethical issues- psychological harm, violated right to withdraw Biased sample- gender/culture bias 	Explanations for Obedience: Social-Psychological Factors	Agentic State <i>Agentic state-</i> act as an agent for someone else. No responsibility for your actions. <i>Agentic shift-</i> change from autonomous (acting for yourself) to agentic state.	Evaluation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research support- Blass and Schmitt showed students Milgram's study, and students identified the experimenter as responsible rather than the participants. Limited explanation- agentic shift cannot explain why some do not obey Real life examples- destructive authority shown throughout history
				Legitimacy of Authority We obey those who are above us in social hierarchy. <i>Destructive authority-</i> people may use their authority for destructive purposes	

Social Influence Knowledge Organiser

<p>Explanations for Obedience: Dispositional Explanations</p>	<p>The Authoritarian Personality Adorno et al- investigated 2000+ American white middle class males, using the F-scale. Found that authoritarian people identified with 'strong' people and were contemptuous of the weak. They were conscious of social status- obedient to superiors. Extreme respect to authority. Few 'grey areas'- everything is either right or wrong. Adorno believes this originates in harsh parenting & conditional love.</p>	<p>Evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research support- Milgram & Elms found that the most obedient people scored highly on the F scale • Limited explanation- cannot account for every obedient soldier in Nazi Germany. Social identity theory is an alternative explanation. • Political bias- F scale measures tendencies towards right-wing ideology (Christie & Jahoda). • Biased sample- gender/culture bias 	<p>Social Influence & Social Change</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Drawing attention</i>- make people aware of your cause 2. <i>Consistency</i>- synchronic and diachronic 3. <i>Deeper processing</i>- people begin to question their beliefs 4. <i>Augmentation principle</i>- extreme act to show dedication to cause 5. <i>Snowball effect</i>- gradually a minority becomes a majority 6. <i>Social cryptomnesia</i>- people know a change has happened, but can't remember exactly how. <p>Zimbardo suggested obedience can be used to create social change through process of <i>gradual commitment</i>. Start off with small instructions, move on to larger ones.</p>	<p>Evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research support for normative influences- Nolan et al. Encouraged people to reduce their energy, more successful when people believed that others were doing it. • Minority influence only indirectly effective- Nemeth. Minority influence is mostly indirect, change isn't seen for a long time. • Role of deeper processing- Mackie argues we will only question our beliefs if challenged by a majority, not a minority. • Real life examples- e.g. civil rights movement, legalization of same-sex marriage
<p>Resistance to Social Influence</p>	<p>Social Support <i>Conformity</i>- presence of someone not conforming allows others to resist conforming. E.g. Asch's unanimity variation. <i>Obedience</i>- presence of someone disobeying allows others to disobey. E.g. Milgram variation- disobedient confederate. Obedience dropped to 10%.</p>	<p>Evaluation- Social Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research support- conformity. Allen & Levine- Asch style study with a confederate wearing thick glasses. Conformity dropped. <p>Evaluation- Locus of Control</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research support. Holland- repeated Milgram's study but measured LOC. 37% internals disobeyed, 23% externals disobeyed • Contradictory research- Twenge et al. Over time people are becoming more external, but also more resistant to social influence. 			
<p>Minority Influence</p>	<p><i>Consistency</i>- synchronic (minority all consistent) and diachronic (over time). <i>Commitment</i>- augmentation principle (extreme act to show dedication to cause). <i>Flexibility</i>- Nemeth- need to strike a balance between being consistent & being flexible. Ability to compromise. <i>Process of change</i>- allow for deeper processing. Snowball effect.</p>	<p>Evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for consistency- Moscovici et al. Blue-green slide study. 8.42% conformity to an incorrect but consistent minority. HOWEVER, artificial task. • Limited real-life applications- difficult to distinguish between majority & minority- not just about numbers (consider influence etc.) 			