

- Internal LOC – People believe the things that happen to them are largely controlled by themselves.
- People who have an internal LOC are more likely to resist social pressures to conform or obey. If a person takes personal responsibility for their actions they are more likely to base their decisions on their own beliefs and resist pressures from others.
- These people are usually self-confident, more achievement-oriented, believe in hard work rather than luck (not superstitious), independent and are more intelligent.

AO3		
Research support	Strength: Holland (1967) replicated Milgram's study. He found that 37% of internals did not continue to 450V whereas only 23% of externals did not continue. This supports the idea that resistance to SI is due to LOC.	C/A: The role of LOC may be exaggerated as it only comes into play in new situations. People who have conformed/ obeyed in the past will do so again regardless of their LOC.
Contradictory research	Limitation: Twenge et al (2004) conducted a meta- analysis of studies over 4 decades and found that, over time, people have become more external in their locus of control but also more resistant to obedience, which does not support Rotter's explanation. If resistance is linked to an internal LOC, we would expect people to have become more internal. This suggests that LOC is not a valid explanation of resistance to social influence.	
Methodological issues	Limitation: Difficult to measure obedience and conformity on the same scale. Some may conform but not obey, and may have a high internal LOC. The questionnaire to calculate LOC is also limited as it is a method of self-report so individuals' answers could vary depending on their mood. This suggests that the LOC may not be a valid explanation of resistance to social influence.	

Minority influence

- Refers to situations where one person/ a small group influences the beliefs and behaviours of other groups (opposite of conformity, where the majority convince one person).
- Minority influence is likely to lead to internalisation, due to the deeper processing it causes.

Factor	What is it?	Explanation
<u>Consistency</u>	Keeping the same beliefs over time (diachronic) and between all individuals (synchronic). <u>Synchronic consistency</u> – all the minority group are saying the same thing at the same time. <u>Diachronic consistency</u> – different people have been saying the same thing over time.	Consistency increases the amount of interest and makes others rethink their own views. Research support: Moscovici (1969) Ppts asked if 36 blue-coloured slides were green or blue. In each group there were 2 confederates who consistently said green. Group 1 – consistent (36x) – 8% agreed, 32% conformed at least once. Group 2 – inconsistent (24x) – 1.25% agreed. Group 3 – control (0x) – 0.25% were wrong.
<u>Commitment</u>	Demonstrating dedication to their position, e.g. making personal sacrifices or engaging in extreme activities. <u>Augmentation principle</u> – When majority members pay even more attention due to the risk shown by the majority.	Commitment helps gain attention to the cause and shows the minority are not working out of self-interest.
<u>Compromise</u>	<u>Flexibility</u> – accepting the possibility of compromise because relentless consistency could be counter-productive and seen as unbending and unreasonable by the majority.	The balance between consistency and flexibility is key as it reduces putting off the majority.

The 'snowball effect' and the process of change

The 3 factors make the majority think deeply about the issue. More people will switch viewpoints which increases the rate of conversion. Eventually the minority become the majority – change has occurred.