**TYPES**

1 Compliance- When people change their public behaviour to go along with the majority view even if they privately don’t agree with it, this results in a temporary behaviour change (as long as they are around the group).

2 Internalisation- When people change their public and private opinions/behaviour because they accept the majority view as correct, this results in a permanent public and private change.

3 Identification- When people change their behaviour/ opinions because they value something about that group and want to be part of it/identify with it, this results in a public change even if they don’t privately agree with everything the majority agrees.

**EXPLANATIONS**

1 Normative Social Influence (NSI)- an explanation for conformity that says we agree with the majority views publically because we want to be liked and gain social approval, this can lead to compliance.

2 Informational Social Influence (ISI)- an explanation for conformity that says we change our behaviour/opinions to those of the majority because we believe they are right and want to be right too; this can lead to internalisation.

**Research Support for ISI**

Students given easy and hard maths questions. Greater conformity to incorrect answers on the harder Qs than on the easier Qs (students who thought they were bad at maths)

Shows people conform in situations when they don’t know the answer (ISI explanation)

**Research Support for NSI**

Asch found that many participants in his study went along with the obvious wrong answer because other people did, they said they felt self-conscious giving the right answer and were afraid of disapproval (NSI). When answers were written conformity fell to 12.5%.

ISI and NSI work together

Both processes may be involved. A dissenter in Asch’s study may reduce NSI (dissenter provides social support and isn’t going along with the majority) and may reduce ISI (dissenter provides another source of information)
The Stanford Prison Experiment

Aim: Zimbardo wanted to answer the question “Do prison guards behave brutally because they have sadistic personality’s or is it the situation that creates this behaviour?”

Procedure: 24 volunteer male us student ps deemed ‘emotionally stable’ by psychological tests’. A mock prison was set up in Stanford Uni basement of the psyc dept. Ps were randomly split into prisoners and guards. Prisoners were arrested by local police and delivered to the prison where they were strip searched, deloused; given a uniform and an assigned number (names weren’t used to further take away their identity). The guards had a uniform including mirrored shades, a baton, handcuffs and keys. The prisoners had a set of 16 rules they had to follow; these were enforced by the guards who worked in shifts of three. The guards were also told they could us ‘moderate physical force’ although it wasn’t specified as to what this meant.

Findings: Guards took to their rules with enthusiasm with their behaviour becoming a danger to the prisoners’ physical and mental health. The experiment was ended after 6 days instead of the intended 14. On day 2 the prisoners rebelled against the harsh treatment they received from the guards, the guards retaliated with fire extinguishers. They turned the prisoners against each other and harassed them by having middle of the night headcounts and punishing them for minor rule breaks. Prisoners became subdued and withdrawn; one prisoner had to be released after showing psychological disturbance, two more were released on day 4. One prisoner went on hunger strike and guards tried to force feed him and put him in the hole, other prisoners were encouraged to shun him by the guards which they did. Guards began to identify more and more with their roles, some of them even appeared to enjoy the power they had over the prisoners.

Conclusions: The simulation revealed the power of the situation to influence peoples’ behaviour. Guards, prisoners and researchers all identified closely with their roles. Even people who came in to perform certain roles (like a prison chaplain) found themselves behaving as if they were in a real prison and not a study.

Realism
Psychologists argued that ps were merely acting and conforming to the stereotypes of their roles. One guard said that he had based his role on that of a character out of a film.

HOWEVER Zimbardo showed that there was quantitative data to disprove this. Prisoners’ conversations were about prison life 90% of the time. One prisoner felt like the prison was a real one, run by psychologists. It therefore seems that the experiment was real to the ps giving the study high internal validity.