Who proposed the three types of conformity?
- Kelman (1958)

- **Compliance** *(NORMATIVE SOCIAL INFLUENCE)*
  - When exposed to majority views, individuals engage in a process of comparison
  - They adjust their own actions in order to fit in to gain approval or avoid disapproval.
  - Fitting in is seen as desirable so this is what motivates conformity.
  - Compliance only changes the views and behaviours they express in public.

- **Internalisation** *(INFORMATIVE SOCIAL INFLUENCE)*
  - When exposed to a group's view an individual goes through a validation process
  - They examine their own beliefs and decide if they or the others are right
  - Close examination to a group's opinion may convince an individual that they are wrong, particularly if the group is trustworthy
  - This can lead to acceptance both publicly and privately

- **Identification**:
  - A combination of both compliance and internalisation
  - By adopting the groups attitudes and behaviours they feel more a part of it
  - They accept the attitudes and behaviours they are adopting as right and true (internalisation)
  - But the purpose of adopting them is to be accepted as a member of the group (compliance)
CONFORMITY TO SOCIAL ROLES

KEY STUDY: Stanford prison experiment (Haney et al)

Procedure:
- 24 most stable male student volunteers were chosen after being physically and psychologically screened
- randomly assigned a role of a prisoner or guard
- prisoners were assigned an ID number
- guards were given sunglasses, whistles, uniforms, clubs

Findings:
- got very into their roles - guards did overtime, unpaid work. Made prisoners carry out many degrading activities. Both stayed in character even when unaware they were being observed. One prisoner asked for ‘parole’ rather than to withdraw from the study
- 5 participants had to leave early because of extreme reactions (crying, raging, screaming) - symptoms that came into play after only 2 days into the experiment
- the experiment was cut short within 6 days out of the expected 2 weeks
- the guards became increasingly cruel and sadistic and the prisoners became increasingly passive

BBC prison experiment (Reicher and Haslam, 2006)

Procedure:
- 15 male participants were divided into 5 groups of 3, and were matched on key personality variables, and were randomly assigned prisoner:guard (2:1)

Findings:
- Didn’t automatically get into their roles - prisoners worked as a team to question the authority and guards found it hard to assert their authority - shift in power
RESISTANCE TO SOCIAL INFLUENCE:

SOCIAL SUPPORT + resisting conformity:

The presence of social support enables an individual to resist conformity pressure from the majority (‘the unanimity of the majority’ if one person gives a different answer to majority then so does the participant as they feel supported in that person in mutual agreement to defy the majority)

SOCIAL SUPPORT + resisting obedience:

In one of Milgram’s variations participants were put in a group of 3 teachers, 2 of which confederates, and once the other refused to give shocks so did the majority of the real participants with only 10% going the full 450v.
POST EVENT DISCUSSION:

CONFORMITY EFFECT:

• (Fionna Gabbert) 71% of those who had discussed the event went on to mistakenly recall items acquired during the discussion

REAPEAR INTERVIEWING:

• Interviewer may use leading questions and alter the individual’s memory for events
### CAREGIVER-INFANT INTERACTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reciprocity</th>
<th>Interactional Synchrony</th>
<th>Real or Pseudo-Imitation?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jaffe et al.</strong>&lt;br&gt;Infants coordinated their actions with caregivers&lt;br&gt;Move in rhythm as if taking in turns in a conversation&lt;br&gt;Brazelton&lt;br&gt;Suggested that this basic rhythm is a precursor for later communications&lt;br&gt;The caregiver has to anticipate the infants’ behaviour in order to know how to respond appropriately - this sensitivity lays a foundation in attachment</td>
<td><strong>“Inate” Andrew Meltzoff and Keith Moore</strong>&lt;br&gt;2/3 week old infants, model displayed facial expressions and hand movements, once dummy removed the infants imitated. Infants at 3 days old did still imitated behaviours - this behaviour is innate</td>
<td><strong>Jean Piaget</strong>&lt;br&gt;Believed true imitation developed towards the end of one year and anything before that was ‘response training’ from a result of operant conditioning&lt;br&gt;SUPPORT FOR MELTZOFF AND MOORE:&lt;br&gt;Murray and Trevathen:&lt;br&gt;Prerecorded video vs live video interaction of mother - infants showed acute distress to prerecorded which shows they elicit a response rather than presenting behaviours that have been rewarded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BOWLBY’S THEORY OF MATERNAL DEPRIVATION

BOWLBY’S 44 THIEVES

Procedure:
• 88 emotionally maladjusted children
• 44 had been caught stealing
• suggested some of these thieves were emotionless psychopaths

Findings:
• those diagnosed as affectionless thieves has experienced early frequent separations from mothers
• 12/14 affectionless thieves experienced early separations compared to 5/30 of the other thieves
• none of the non-thrives (control group) has experienced early separations
• suggests that early separations are linked to affectionless psychopathy
THE BEHAVIOURAL APPROACH TO TREATING PHOBIAS

- **SYSTEMATIC DESENSITISATION (SD):**

- **COUNTERCONDITIONING:**
  - Patient taught new association to the phobic stimulus i.e: relaxation

- **RELAXATION:**
  - breathing techniques, mindfulness, muscle relaxation

- **DESENSITISATION HIERARCHY**
  - Hierarchy of fears gradually building up to confrontation with phobia, don’t move up the hierarchy until relaxed at each stage

- **FLOODING:**
  - learn relaxation techniques which are applied in one session in presence of most feared situation
THE COGNITIVE APPROACH TO EXPLAINING DEPRESSION

ELLIS’ ABC MODEL

(A) Activating event
- e.g. getting fired
- e.g. they were overstaffed
- e.g. acceptance

(B) Rational belief
- e.g. depression
- e.g. they had it in for me
- e.g. getting fired

(C) Consequence:
- healthy emotion
- unhealthy emotion
- e.g. acceptance

BECK’S NEGATIVE TRIAD

(A) Activating event
- e.g. getting fired

(B) Irrational belief
- e.g. they had it in for me

(C) Consequence: 
- unhealthy emotion
- e.g. depression

MUSTURBATORY THINKING:
- I must be approved of or accepted by people i find important
- i must do well or very well, or i am worthless
- he world must give me happiness or i will die

NEGATIVE SHEMA:
Depressed people have acquired a negative schema during childhood. These negative schemas are activated during new situations that resemble the original condition where the schemas were learned.
THE ORIGINS OF PSYCHOLOGY

WILHELM WUNDT

• 1st person to call himself a psychologist

• Introspection - realised that complex mental process such as learning, language and emotions could not be studied in a strict, controlled environment. Found that these could be studied systematically with sufficient training. E.g. he studied perception by getting people to describe their response to a stimuli, which was used as an insight into the nature of mental processes.

• Empiricism: the belief that knowledge is derived from sensory experience. It is generally characterised by the use of the scientific method in psychology

• Introspection: the process by which a person gains knowledge about their own mental and emotional states as a result of the examination or observation of their conscious thoughts and feelings

• Scientific method: refers to the use of investigative methods that are objective, systematic and replicable, and the formulation, testing and modification of hypotheses based on the methods
BANDURA ET AL:

PROCEDURES:

• Children observed aggressive and non-aggressive adult models and were tested for imitative behaviour in absence of models

FINDINGS:

• Children who observed the aggressive model produced physical and verbal aggressive behaviours resembling the model’s (1/3rd were verbally aggressive in the aggressive condition compared to 0 in the other condition)

• children who observed the non-aggressive model did not exhibit any aggression towards the bobo doll
BIOPSYCHOLOGY
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>CONTROL OF VARIABLES:</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONFOUNDING VARIABLES</strong></td>
<td>Change to the DV may be due to the confounding variable rather than the IV so therefore results are meaningless (context variables i.e time of day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONTROL</strong></td>
<td>the extent to which any variable is held constant or regulated by a researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXTERNAL VALIDITY</strong></td>
<td>The degree to which a research finding can be generalised to: other settings (ecological validity) to other groups of people (population validity) over time (historical validity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VALIDITY</strong></td>
<td>Refers to whether an observed effect is a genuine one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERNAL VALIDITY</strong></td>
<td>The degree to which an observed effect was due to the experimental manipulation rather than other factors such as confounding/extraneous variables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MUNDANE REALISM</strong></td>
<td>Refers to how a study mirrors the real world</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>