

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

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

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

Cognitive conflict

Social cryptoamnesia

Snowball effect

Minority influence 7 factors

Evaluation

Snowball helps us to understand how minority and majority influence work together to bring about social change

Research evidence to support the role of majority influence

Research to support sociocryptoamnesia