

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	
<p>Difficulties in distinguishing between compliance (normative social influence) and internalisation (informational social influence).</p> <p>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.</p>		

<p>Individual differences</p> <p>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 nAffiliators and have a greater need for 'affiliation'. McChee (1967) found that students who were nAffiliators were more likely to conform. This shows that the desire to be liked underlies conformity for some people more than others.</p>	<p>Individual difference</p> <p>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</p>
--	---

Research into conformity

<p>Asch's procedure</p>	<p>Asch's findings</p>
-------------------------	------------------------

Evaluation

<p>Application</p>	<p>Cultural bias</p>
<p>Mundane realism</p>	

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

Acquiescence 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

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.

Research support for flexibility-Nemeth

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

<p>Strength – What evidence is there to support it and what does it show?</p>	<p>Weakness - Issue – do we fully understand the CE? Why – what is the case study that shows that we don't</p>	<p>Strength - Application – Which children in schools is it good for explaining? Why and how can the model benefit them?</p>
---	--	--

	Episodic	Procedural	Semantic
<p>D E S C R I B E</p>			
<p>Links To brain</p>			
<p>Supporting evidence P: E: E: L:</p>			
<p>Challenging evidence P: E: E: L:</p>			
<p>Applications P: E: E: L:</p>			

		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			
C O N C I			
<p>If asked a general question about the accuracy of EWT you must be able to give a general conclusion also.</p>			

Cognitive interview

	(RO)	(RE)	(CP)	(RC)
D E S C R I B E				
H O W I s I t D o n e ?				

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 simplistic

Psychopathology

Definitions of abnormality

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)			

Clinical characteristics (ao1)

Phobias

depression

OCD

Behavioural

-
-
-

-
-
-

-
-
-

Emotional

-
-
-

-
-
-

-
-
-

Cognitive

-
-
-

-
-
-

-
-
-

