Level 3

**Paper 1** revision booklet

* Social influence
* Memory
* Attachment
* Psychopathology

**How to use this booklet:**

1. First (level 2 revision) Use psych205.com to listen to the audio clips and read the information packs to help you fill the revision summary sheets.
2. Complete each section by summarising theory and research in a more concise way, that you understand in your own words.
3. After completing sections, you then need to quiz yourself (level 4). Get someone to test you, use a mini whiteboard to write out everything you can and see what missing, try quizlet etc…
4. Only when you are confident in your knowledge start exam questions WITHOUT notes and then mark them against the mark schemes(level 5). There are many many questions on psych205.com.

All resources on psych205.com can be found under the tab A level course → revision by topic→ choose the topic from the options.

**Social influence**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Types of conformity** | | | | |
|  | | | | |
| Compliance | Identification | | | Internalisation |
|  |  | | |  |
| **Explanations of conformity** | | | | |
| Normative social influence | | Informational social influence | | |
|  | |  | | |
| Normative social influence can explain the results of conformity studies in unambiguous situations e.g. Asch. | | Informational social influence can explain conformity in ambiguous situations in which both public and private agreement occurs e.g. Sherif | | |
| Application | | Asch variations support i.e. difficulty of the task | | |
| **Difficulties in distinguishing between compliance (normative social influence) and internalisation (informational social influence).**  It is assumed that a person who publicly agrees with a majority yet disagrees in private must be demonstrating compliance. However it is also possible that acceptance has occurred in public yet dissipates later when in private because they have forgotten information given by the group or because they have received new information. It is also assumed that a person who agrees with the group in public and in private much have internalised the views of the groups. However it is possible that the individual may actually have been merely complying in public but as a result so self-  perception (“I agreed with the rest of the group, therefore that must be what I really believe”) they come to subsequently accept that position as their own. | | | | |
| **Individual differences**  Research shows that NSI does not affect everybody in the same way. Some people are less concerned with being liked and some are more and are called nAfilliators and have a greater need for ‘affiliation’. McChee (1967) found that students who were nAfilliators were more likely to conform. This shows that the desire to be liked underlies conformity for some  people more than others. | | | **Individual difference**  Asch found that students were less conformist (28%) than other participants (37%). Perrin and Spencer (1980) conducted a study involving science and engineering students found very little conformity which criticises informational social influence | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Research into conformity** | |
| Asch’s procedure | Asch’s findings |
| **Evaluation** | |
| Application | Cultural bias |
| Mundane realism |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variables that affect levels of conformity | | | |
| Variable | | Findings to support | |
| Group size | |  | |
| Unanimity (social support) | |  | |
| Difficulty of task | |  | |
| Evaluation | | | |
| Useful applications | Explained by informational social inf | | Implications |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Conformity to social roles-Zimbardo’s research** | |
| Procedures | Findings |
| Conclusion | |
| **Evaluation** | |
| Ethics | Reliability |
| Individual differences | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Obedience as investigated by Milgram** | |
| Aims | |
| Procedure | Findings |
|  |  |
| Conclusion | |
| **Evaluation** | |
| Validity | Reliability |
| Ethics | Application |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Explanations of obedience-situational variables** | | |
| **Proximity** | Research evidence | Fails to consider other factors |
| Location | Research evidence |
| Uniform | **Research support** of |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Explanation of obedience –Social-psychological factors** | | |
| **Agentic state** | Research evidence | **Other evaluation**  Useful applications |
| **Legitimate authority** | Research evidence | Cultural differences  A strength of legitimate authority is that it is a useful account of cultural differences in obedience. Many studies show that countries differ in the degree to which people are traditionally obedient to authority. In Australia Kilham (1974) found only a 16% obedience rate whereas in Germany Mantell (1971) found it to be 85%. This shows that in some cultures authority is more likely to be accepted as legitimate and entitled to demand obedience from individuals. So such supportive finding increase the validity of the explanation. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Dispositional explanations of obedience** | |
| Adorno (1950)-Procedures | Results |
| Conclusions | |
| **Evaluation** | |
| Supporting evidence | |
| Methodological issues  **Correlational**  **Acquiesence bias**-It is possible to get a high score by just agreeing with all the line of boxes down one side of the page so some people who agree with all of the items might just have a tendency to agree with everything and not actually be authoritarian.  Also when the participants were interviewed the researchers knew about their childhood experiences and their scores so they may have been researcher bias involved. | |
| Politically bias | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Explanations of resistance to social influence** | | |
| **Social support** | Research evidence | |
| **Locus of control** | Research evidence | Other evaluation Olliner’s research is important  Not all research supports  Correlational |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Minority influence** | |
| Consistency | |
| Flexibility | |
| Commitment | |
| **Evaluation** | |
| Research support for consistency-Moscovici  Research support for flexibility-Nemeth | General evaluation Artificial tasks  A limitation of minority influence is that the tasks involved are artificial and so far removed from how minorities attempt to change the behaviour of majorities in real life. In cases such as jury decision making and political campaigning, the outcomes are vastly more important, sometimes even literally a matter of life or death. So findings are lacking in external validity.  Limited real world applications  Real life social influence situations are much more complicated than this. There is much more involved in the difference between a minority and majority than just numbers for example majorities usually have a lot more power and status than minorities. Minorities are very committed to their causes-they have to be because they often face very hostile opposition. On the other hand, they can be tight knit groups whose members know each other very well and frequently turn to each other for support. |

|  |
| --- |
| The role of social influence processes in social change |
| Outline the process of social change. In your summary include all of the following ( think of this like a flow diagram - these are not in order):   * Minority influence 3 factors * Cognitive conflict * Social cryptoamnesia * Snowball effect |
| **Evaluation** |
| What is the argument about minorities actually not being likely to cause social change and in fact it is more likely to come from majorities? Who argues this – what do they say? |
| What is the evidence that Majority influence has caused social change. |
| Why is knowing about the process of social change useful for future minority groups? |

**Memory**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Research studies | STM | LTM | Sensory |
| **Capacity**  Procedure-  Findings  (+ two evaluation points) |  |  |  |
| Coding  Procedure-  Findings  (+ two evaluation points) |  |  |  |
| Duration  Procedure-  Findings  (+ two evaluation points) |  |  |  |

Draw the Multi-store model

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Draw the Multistore model  What are its main assumptions about memory?   * Memory is L\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ * To make a long term memory E or P\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_R\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ is needed * U\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ S\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ | | |
| Strength - Evidence of Rehearsal comes from? | Issue – It can’t explain? | We don’t always need rehears – what evidence? |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Draw the Working memory model  Try turning your drawing into sentences to describe it | | |
| Strength – What evidence is there to support it and what does it show? | Weakness - Issue – do we fully understand the CE? Why – what is the case study that shows that we don’t | Strength - Application – Which children in schools is it good for explaining? Why and how can the model benefit them? |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Episodic** | **Procedural** | **Semantic** |
| D  E  S  C  R  I  B  E |  |  |  |
| Links  To brain |  |  |  |
| Supporting evidence  P:  E:  E:  L: | | | |
| Challenging evidence  P:  E:  E:  L: | | | |
| Applications  P:  E:  E:  L: | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Interference theory** | | **Cue-dependent forgetting** | |
|  | **General description of whole theory** | | **General description of whole theory** | |
|  | Pro-active interference | Retro-active interference | Context dependent forgetting | State dependent forgetting |
| **D**  **E**  **S**  **C**  **R**  **I**  **B**  **E** |  |  |  |  |
| **S**  **U**  **P**  **P**  **O**  **R**  **T**  **I**  **N**  **G** |  |  |  |  |
| **F**  **A**  **I**  **L**  **S**  **T**  **O**  **E**  **X**  **P**  **L**  **A**  **I**  **n** |  |  |  |  |
| **A**  **P**  **P**  **L**  **y** |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Misleading information | | Anxiety |
| **R**  **E**  **S**  **E**  **A**  **R C H** | Leading questions | Post-event discussion |  |
| **E**  **V**  **A**  **L**  **U**  **A**  **T**  **I**  **O**  **N** |  |  |  |
| **concl** |  |  |  |
| |  | | --- | | If asked a general question about the accuracy of EWT you must be able to give a general conclusion also. | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Cognitive interview | | | |
|  | (RO) | (RE) | (CP) | (RC) |
| **D**  **E**  **S**  **C**  **R**  **I**  **B**  **e** |  |  |  |  |
| **H**  **O**  **W**  **Is**  **It**  **Done?** |  |  |  |  |
| Supporting evidence | | | | |
| Economic impact | | | | |

**Attachment**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Reciprocity** | | **Interactional synchrony** | |
| Define |  | |  | |
| Example |  | |  | |
| How do they overlap? |  | | | |
| Supporting evidence + grounding | Meltzoff and Moore | Belsky | |  |
| Studies are well carried out-valid and reliable |  | | | |
| Not universal |  | | | |
| Practical applications |  | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Schaffer’s stages of attachment** | | | | | | | |
| Pre-attach | Birth-3 months |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | |  | |  | |  | |
| **Evaluation** | | | | | | | |
| P-The stages are based on longitudinal research evidence which strengths support for the stages as not based on subjective opinion BUT | | | | | | | |
| E-Method | | | | Findings | | | |
| **L- BUT the stages are based on evidence of only 60 babies from Glasgow and so questions whether the stages really do generalise to all children around the world.** | | | | | | | |
| **Not universal** | | | | | | | |
| **Pre attachment stage may be wrong** | | | | | | | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Role of the father** |  |
| **Summary of key research findings** | |
| Are fathers different to mothers- | |
| Can fathers be as sensitive as mothers? | |
| How important are they in secondary caregivers? | |
| **Evaluation** | |
| Not enough research to make a firm conclusion | |
| Maybe Dad’s aren’t that important then? | |
| Socially sensitive | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Animal studies** | | | | | |
| **Harlow** | | | **Lorenz** | | |
| **Problems of extrapolation** | | | **Difference in nature and complexity of bond** | | |
| **Imprinting not permanent** | | | | | |
| **Ethics** | | | | | |
| **Explanations of attachment-** | | | |
| **Bowlby’s Monotropic theory** | | **Learning theory** | |
| Evaluation | | | |
| Supported by Harlow | | Contradicted by Harlow | |
| Overemphasises nature and nurture | | | |
| Socially sensitive | | Too simplistic (link to above) can’t explain reciprocity etc so need to look at alternative explanations | |
| **Types of attachment and Ainsworth’s strange situation** | | | | | | | |
| Secure | | | Insecure-avoidant | | Insecure-resistant | | |
|  | | |  | |  | | |
| **Ainsworth’s strange situation** | | | | | | | |
| **Method**(all 8 stages)  **Findings** | | | | | | | |
| **Secure** | | | **Avoidant** | | **Resistant** | | |
| **Evaluation** | | | | | | | |
| Validity | | | | | | | |
| Reliability | | | | | | | |
| Cultural bound | | | | | | | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Cultural variations in attachment-Van izendoorn and Kroonenberg (1988)** | |
| Procedures | Findings |
| Conclusion | |
| **Evaluation** | |
| There are more similarities than differences especially in security | |
| **Issues with meta analysis** | |
|  | |
| **Culture bound** | |
|  | |
| **Bowlby’s maternal deprivation hypothesis** | | | |
|  | | | |
| **Evaluation** | | | |
| Deprivation confused with privation | | | |
| Issues with the 44 thieves study that he based the hypothesis on **that reduce support for the hypothesis** | | | |
| Application to real life. | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Romanian orphans: Effects of institutionalisation** | | |  | |
| Rutter –(aims, methods, findings and conclusions)  O’connor (2000)  Summary of the effects of institutionalisation | | | | |
| Kumasta (2010) | Cognitive | Emotional | | Physical |
| **Evaluation** | | | | |
| Reliability, Longitudinal studies, positive | | | | |
| Natural and extraneous variables | | | | |
| Application | | | | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| The influence of early attachment on childhood and adult relationships, including internal working | |
| **IWM-** | |
| **Prototype/continuity** | **Revisionist** |
| **Findings of a childhood study** | |
| Findings of one adult study | |
| **Evaluation** | |
| Retrospective data | |
| Causation and low correlations | |
| Too simplisitic | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Deviation from social norms** | **Deviation from ideal mental health** | **Statistical infrequency** | **Failure to function adequately** |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Evaluation (you need at least 1 strength and 1 weakness)** | | | |
|  |  |  |  |

**Psychopathology**

**Definitions of abnormality**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Clinical characteristics (ao1)** | | |
| **Phobias** | **depression** | **OCD** |
| **Behavioural** | | |
|  |  |  |
| **Emotional** | | |
|  |  |  |
| **Cognitive** | | |
|  |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Behavioural explanations of phobias** | **Cognitive explanation of depression** | **Biological explanation of OCD** |
| Classical Conditioning:  Operant conditioning: | Ellis – ABC  Beck – Cognitive Triad | Genetics  Neurotransmitters Serotonin / dopamine  Worry Circuit |
| **Evaluation of the explanations** | | |
| Research:  Issue / debates:  Application: | Research:  Issue / debates:  Application: | Research:  Issue / debates:  Application: |
| **Behavioural treatments of phobias** | **Cognitive treatment of phobias** | **Biological explanations of OCD** |
| Describe how S\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ D\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ works and How / why it treats symptoms  Describe how F\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ works and How / why it treats symptoms | Describe how CBT words and how/ why it treats symptoms | Describe how SSRI’s work and how / why they treat symptoms |
| **Evaluation- remember APPROPRIATENESS AND EFFECTIVENESS – You need 3 PEEL’s for each treatment** | | |
| Effectiveness evidence –  Appropriateness? | Effectiveness evidence –  Appropriateness? | Effectiveness evidence –  Appropriateness? |