

# SCLOA Learning outcomes

## General learning outcomes

**Outline principles that define the sociocultural level of analysis. (8)**

**Explain how principles that define the sociocultural level of analysis may be demonstrated in research. (8)**

**Outline (8) - Give a brief account or summary**

**Explain (8) - Detailed account including reasons or causes.**

### 1. Human beings are social animals, we feel a need to belong.

#### **Conformity**

- The yield to group pressure. The pressure can be real (involving physical presence) or imagined (pressure of social norms/expectations)
- Complying - Change in behaviour without internalising the opinion or reason
- Identification - Changes behaviour and opinion to identify with the influencing group
- Internalising - Change in behaviour and opinion

<b>Solomon Asch - Asch's Paradigm Experiment (Conformity)</b>	
[A]	Investigate the existence of conformity.
[P]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Subject was placed into a room with 6 confederates and the experimenter.</li> <li>- Subject was deceived that the 6 confederates were participants just like them.</li> <li>- The subject was placed on the second last seat so they will be the second last to give an answer.</li> <li>- The group of subject and confederates were asked to select the line on the second card that matched the line on the first card.</li> <li>- There were 18 sets of cards in total, some of which had lines that were completely different in length, others are similar in length.</li> <li>- Confederates were instructed to answer correctly on some of the cards but answer incorrectly for most.</li> </ul>
[F]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 75% conformed at least once to the wrong answer</li> <li>- 32% conformed to more than half of the wrong answers</li> <li>- 24% did not conform at all</li> </ul>
[C]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Conformity happened</li> <li>- Those who did not conform sparked further research</li> </ul>
[E]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ecological validity: Low, lab conditions.</li> <li>- Controlled environment removed confounding variables.</li> <li>- Meaningless stimuli.</li> <li>- Gender bias, only male participants were used.</li> <li>- Culture bias, only population of the US were used. Cannot be generalised to all population.</li> <li>- Ethics: Deception, but subjects were debriefed.</li> </ul>

2. Social and cultural environment affects/influences behaviour.

**Social Learning Theory (Theorist: Albert Bandura)**

- Learning by observing and imitating role models

**Social Learning Theory - ARRM**

**Attention** - Paying attention to the model.

**Retention** - Retain the behaviour of the model that was observed.

**Reproduction** - Replicate the behaviour of the learning model.

**Motivation** - Learners must want to display what they have learnt from the learning model.

<b>Albert Bandura - Bobo Doll Experiment (SLT)</b>	
[A]	To demonstrate that learning can occur through observation of role models.
[P]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 36 boys and 36 girls from age 3 to 6 were divided into groups according to their aggression evaluation from their parents and teachers.</li> <li>- Group 1 was exposed to adult models who showed aggression by beating up a Bobo Doll. Models were of both genders.</li> <li>- Group 2 observed an adult model who displayed no aggression. Models were of both genders.</li> <li>- Group 3 was a controlled group who did not see any model. (Control)</li> <li>- The children were then placed into the room with a Bobo doll after 10 minutes of watching the model.</li> </ul>
[F]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Children who observed the aggressive model showed significantly more aggression both physically and verbally.</li> <li>- Boys were more likely to imitate physical aggression.</li> <li>- Girls were more likely to imitate verbal aggression.</li> </ul>
[C]	- Social learning theory was demonstrated in the study because the children showed signs of observational learning.
[E]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ethics: Induced aggression</li> <li>- Oversimplification of the learning process</li> <li>- Ecological validity: Low, lab conditions</li> <li>- Confounding variable: children unfamiliar with doll were 5 times more likely to imitate aggressive behaviour.</li> </ul>

### 3. Humans have a social self.

#### **Social Identity Theory (Theorist: Henry Tajfel)**

- Social Categorisation
  - Grouping of different social circles based on the members' stereotypical culture and behaviour.
- Social Identity
  - Identifying yourself with a particular social group based on their in-group norms.
  - Cultural expectations
  - Belongingness
- Social Comparison
  - Comparing in-group members with out-group members, looking for benefits to be in the in-group which boosts self esteem.
- Positive Distinctiveness
  - Using verbal or non-verbal cues to make your social group more socially valued, creating an increasingly positive meaning for the group's identity.
  - Rewards as motivators.

<b>Henry Tajfel - Intergroup discrimination Experiment (SIT)</b>	
[A]	To test the Social Identity Theory
[P]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 48 boys were assigned at random to 2 groups based on their preference between <i>Klee</i> or <i>Kandinsky's</i> art work.</li> <li>- Asked to rate in-group and out-group based on traits e.g. like-ability.</li> </ul>
[F]	Tajfel found that the out-group was rated less likeable, but never actually disliked.
[C]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There seems to be a preference of the in-group over out-group, however it is not clear that they make social comparisons to enhance either self-esteem.</li> <li>- Later research - Social identity does not account for intergroup conflict. In the absence of competition, social comparison can be positive.</li> </ul>
[E]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Supports Social Identity Theory</li> <li>- Showed the formation and the features of SIT</li> <li>- Ecological validity: Low, lab conditions</li> <li>- Meaningless groups</li> <li>- Controlled environment removed confounding variables.</li> </ul>

4. People's view on the world are resistant to change.

**Attributions**

- Situational attributions
  - Attributing to situational or external factors (e.g. Weather)
- Dispositional attributions
  - Attributing to personal or internal factors (e.g. Intelligence)

**Errors in attributions**

- Fundamental Attribution Error
  - When the role of disposition is overestimated and the affect of the situation is underestimated.

<b>Lee et al. - Audience and Game show experiment (FAE)</b>	
[A]	Demonstrate the Fundamental Attributional Error (FAE).
[P]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Subjects were split into groups of <b>hosts</b>, <b>audiences</b> and <b>contestants</b>, randomly.</li> <li>- <b>Hosts</b> were asked to design their own questions.</li> <li>- <b>Audiences</b> watched the show.</li> <li>- After the game show the <b>audience</b> were asked to rank the intelligence of people taken part.</li> </ul>
[F]	- Audience consistently rated the hosts smarter.
[C]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- They failed to attribute the role to the person's situation (random assignment of role).</li> <li>- Instead attributed the person's performance to dispositional factors.</li> </ul>
[E]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Only student participants were used.</li> <li>- University students spend their days listening to professors - authority figures who ask questions and give answers and is a learned response rather than attribution error.</li> </ul>

**Discuss how and why particular research methods are used at the sociocultural level of analysis (for example, participant/naturalistic observation, interviews, case studies). (22)**

**Discuss (22) - A considered and balanced review, including a range of arguments, factors or hypothesis. Opinions and conclusions presented clearly supported by appropriate evidence.**

Research methods

**Research method: Experiments**

How are experiments used?

<b>Solomon Asch - Asch's Paradigm Experiment (Conformity)</b>	
[A]	Investigate the existence of conformity.
[P]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Subject was placed into a room with 6 confederates and the experimenter.</li> <li>- Subject was deceived that the 6 confederates were participants just like them.</li> <li>- The subject was placed on the second last seat so they will be the second last to give an answer.</li> <li>- The group of subject and confederates were asked to select the line on the second card that matched the line on the first card.</li> <li>- There were 18 sets of cards in total, some of which had lines that were completely different in length, others are similar in length.</li> <li>- Confederates were instructed to answer correctly on some of the cards but answer incorrectly for most.</li> </ul>
[F]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 75% conformed at least once to the wrong answer</li> <li>- 32% conformed to more than half of the wrong answers</li> <li>- 24% did not conform at all</li> </ul>
[C]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Conformity happened</li> <li>- Those who did not conform sparked further research</li> </ul>
[E]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ecological validity: Low, lab conditions.</li> <li>- Controlled environment removed confounding variables.</li> <li>- Meaningless stimuli.</li> <li>- Gender bias, only male participants were used.</li> <li>- Culture bias, only population of the US were used. Cannot be generalised to all population.</li> <li>- Ethics: Deception, but subjects were debriefed.</li> </ul>

<b>Philip Zimbardo - Stanford Prison Experiment (Conformity/SIT)</b>	
[A]	Prove that situational factors can affect behaviour.
[P]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 22 male subjects were selected through personality assessment based on their mental stability, maturity and social ability.</li> <li>- Randomly assigned the role of either prisoner or warden.</li> <li>- <b>"Prisoners"</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Signed a consent document that some of their human rights will be suspended for the experiment and that all subjects would receive \$15 a day up to 2 weeks.</li> <li>- "Arrested" by surprise by real police from their house, taken to a real police station for standard procedures.</li> <li>- Driven blindfolded to a prison (set, not a real prison) where they were stripped naked, delouse, and dressed in prisoner uniform.</li> <li>- Stayed in the prison for 24 hours a day, followed a schedule of work, rest and meal.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- <b>"Wardens"</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Put on warden costumes with the correct props. They worked 8 hours a day, and were given no specific instructions.</li> <li>- Asked to keep a reasonable degree of order and were prohibited against any means of physical violence.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
[F]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Experiment was terminated in 6 days, instead of the intended 14 days due to abnormal reactions shown by both prisoners and wardens.</li> <li>- <b>"Prisoners"</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Displayed passivity and dependence. Half the prisoners showed signs of depression, crying, fits of rage, acute anxiety.</li> <li>- Due to this reason, they were released early.</li> <li>- All but two prisoners would forfeit the money if they could be released early.</li> <li>- Experimenters proposed that these behaviours were results of the loss of personal identity, dependency and learned helplessness.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- <b>"Wardens"</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Displayed huge enjoyment of power at their disposal, leading towards abusive use of power, dehumanizing the prisoners.</li> <li>- Some wardens worked extra time with no extra pay and were disappointed that the experiment was over.</li> <li>- They punished the prisoners for no apparent justifications (abusive use of power).</li> <li>- Not all wardens displayed aggression, but none opposed other's use of it.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
[C]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The situation (prison environment) affected all participant's behaviour.</li> <li>- Arguable that the environment of a prison is what causes prisoners to act violently.</li> <li>- Supports SIT             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Displayed the categorisation and development of identity in both groups</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

[E]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ecological validity: Low, lab environment, overt observation</li> <li>- Prohibition of physical violence limited the generalising ability of the experiment             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Experimenters argue that..</li> <li>- The functional equivalent of the prison system (setting, costumes etc.) were implemented.</li> <li>- Reactions and behaviours of the subjects exceeded the level of "role play".</li> <li>- Calling each other by ID number in private, wardens showed aggression even when they thought they were not being watched.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Reliability: Experiment was not repeated until years after, subjects did not act as predicted.</li> <li>- Culture bias: only studied subjects from the US</li> <li>- Ethical considerations and issues             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Participants signed consent forms, but they had no clear idea of the procedure of the experiment.</li> <li>- Induced aggression in subjects.</li> <li>- Created discrimination and violence.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Gender bias: only male subjects were used</li> </ul>
-----	---

Why are experiments used?

Strengths of Experiments

- Can be repeated, results tend to be more reliable
- Controlled environment, removes confounding variable
- Isolation of IV and DV give a clear cause and effect relationship
- Can always be generalised to a certain extent
- Data easily measured

Weaknesses of Experiments

- Lab environment, low in ecological validity
- May break ethical guidelines
- Lower generalising potential
- [Natural experiment] No control over variables, unpredictable
- Possibility of Demand characteristics

**Research method: Observations**

How are observations used?

Covert observation - Subjects **do not know** they are being observed

<b>Leon Festinger - When Prophecy Fails (Self Fulfilling Prophecy)</b>	
[A]	Investigate the existence of self Fulfilling Prophecy
[P]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Experimenters found a group of superstitious people in Chicago believing that the world would end on December 21st.</li> <li>- They became part of the group to observe their behaviour when the world didn't actually come to an end.</li> <li>- Experimenters needed to be part of the group because the group isolated themselves from all non-believers.</li> </ul>
[F]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The group of people explained to themselves that God did not destroy the world because of their prayers.</li> <li>- Caused cognitive dissonance (discomfort caused by conflicting cognitions i.e. ideas, beliefs)</li> <li>- This is to protect there own group self esteem</li> </ul>
[C]	- Self Fulfilling Prophecy was apparent as the believers made up a reason when their believe did not come true
[E]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ecological validity: High, naturalistic observation</li> <li>- Culture bias: only one superstitious group were studied locally</li> </ul>

<b>Charlton et al. - St Helena TV violence study (SLT, covert observation)</b>	
[A]	Investigate the effect of the introduction of television on aggression in children.
[P]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TV was introduced to St Helena Island, violent content shown on TV was equal to the UK.</li> <li>- Cameras were set up in playgrounds of two primary schools.</li> </ul>
[F]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- After 5 years, aggression of children did not increase.</li> <li>- Good behaviour evident prior the introduction of TV were maintained.</li> </ul>
[C]	- Without correct and complete SLT process, ARRM, Social Learning cannot be achieved.



Why are observations used?

Strengths of Observation

- High in ecological validity
- Higher generalising potential
- Qualitative data
- Natural environment

Weaknesses of Observation

- Cannot be repeated, but large sample size compensates for the reliability
- Data is not standardised, makes it difficult to measure
- Confounding variable might affect the results of observations

**Discuss ethical considerations related to research studies at the sociocultural level of analysis. (22)**

**Discuss (22) - A considered and balanced review, including a range of arguments, factors or hypothesis. Opinions and conclusions presented clearly supported by appropriate evidence.**

**Ethical guidelines**

- Informed consent
- Right to withdraw
- Deception
- Debriefing
- Confidentiality/Privacy
- Protection of participants (from mental and/or physical harm)

**The need to break guidelines**

- For research purposes, where there are no other feasible methods
- Demand characteristics (mostly with Deception)
  - Cues in an experiment that tells participants what behaviour is expected

<b>John Watson - Little Albert (SLT/Classical conditioning)</b>	
[A]	Investigating the classical conditioning method.
[P]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A baby, under his parent's consent, was asked to participate in the classical conditioning experiment.</li> <li>- Experimenter exposed Little Albert to a series of white fluffy objects e.g. rats, white rabbits, santa masks etc. as a baseline test.                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Little Albert showed neutral responses to these stimuli.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Little Albert was then placed into a room with some lab rats, his response was neutral.                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- He started playing with the lab rats and did not show any fear.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Experimenters then created a loud noise by hitting a metal bar whenever Little Albert touched the rats, Little Albert showed fear.</li> </ul>
[F]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- After several pairing of the stimulus, Little Albert showed signs of distress and started crying whenever he saw the lab rats.</li> </ul>
[C]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Same fear was displayed when other white fluffy objects were shown to Little Albert.</li> <li>- Classical conditioning was successful</li> </ul>
[E]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ecological validity: Low, lab environment.</li> <li>- Culture bias: Babies are too young to have any cultural influence.</li> <li>- Immoral to evoke fear under lab conditions, unless participants approves to be purposely horrified otherwise.                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Caused permanent unnecessary mental harm and distress.</li> <li>- Welfare of the human participant must always be the paramount consideration of any experiments.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<b>Philip Zimbardo - Stanford Prison Experiment (Conformity/SIT)</b>	
[A]	Prove that situational factors can affect behaviour
[P]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 22 male subjects were selected through personality assessment based on their mental stability, maturity and social ability.</li> <li>- Randomly assigned the role of either prisoner or warden.</li> <li>- <b>"Prisoners"</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Signed a consent document that some of their human rights will be suspended for the experiment and that all subjects would receive \$15 a day up to 2 weeks.</li> <li>- "Arrested" by surprise by real police from their house, taken to a real police station for standard procedures.</li> <li>- Driven blindfolded to a prison (set, not a real prison) where they were stripped naked, delouse, and dressed in prisoner uniform.</li> <li>- Stayed in the prison for 24 hours a day, followed a schedule of work, rest and meal.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- <b>"Wardens"</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Put on warden costumes with the correct props. They worked 8 hours a day, and were given no specific instructions.</li> <li>- Asked to keep a reasonable degree of order and were prohibited against any means of physical violence.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
[F]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Experiment was terminated in 6 days, instead of the intended 14 days due to abnormal reactions shown by both prisoners and wardens.</li> <li>- <b>"Prisoners"</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Displayed passivity and dependence. Half the prisoners showed signs of depression, crying, fits of rage, acute anxiety.</li> <li>- Due to this reason, they were released early.</li> <li>- All but two prisoners would forfeit the money if they could be released early.</li> <li>- Experimenters proposed that these behaviours were results of the loss of personal identity, dependency and learned helplessness.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- <b>"Wardens"</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Displayed huge enjoyment of power at their disposal, leading towards abusive use of power, dehumanizing the prisoners.</li> <li>- Some wardens worked extra time with no extra pay and were disappointed that the experiment was over.</li> <li>- They punished the prisoners for no apparent justifications (abusive use of power).</li> <li>- Not all wardens displayed aggression, but none opposed other's use of it.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
[C]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The situation (prison environment) affected all participant's behaviour.</li> <li>- Arguable that the environment of a prison is what causes prisoners to act violently.</li> <li>- Supports SIT                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Displayed the categorisation and development of identity in both groups</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

[E]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ecological validity: Low, lab environment, overt observation</li> <li>- Prohibition of physical violence limited the generalising ability of the experiment             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Experimenters argue that..</li> <li>- The functional equivalent of the prison system (setting, costumes etc.) were implemented.</li> <li>- Reactions and behaviours of the subjects exceeded the level of "role play".</li> <li>- Calling each other by ID number in private, wardens showed aggression even when they thought they were not being watched.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Reliability: Experiment was not repeated until years after, subjects did not act as predicted.</li> <li>- Culture bias: only studied subjects from the US</li> <li>- Ethical considerations and issues             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Participants signed consent forms, but they had no clear idea of the procedure of the experiment.</li> <li>- Induced aggression in subjects.</li> <li>- Created discrimination and violence.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Gender bias: only male subjects were used</li> </ul>
-----	---

<b>Stanley Milgram - Study On Obedience (Compliance)</b>	
[A]	Investigating the effect of authority on compliance and obedience.
[P]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Subjects were 40 males, age range from 20 to 50, found through newspaper advert.</li> <li>- Subjects were led to believe that the experiment was investigating the effect of punishment on learning.</li> <li>- They were given the role of the "teacher" through a fixed lottery.</li> <li>- They saw the learner (which is an actor) in real life, strapped to a chair connected with an electrode.</li> <li>- The experimenter took the subject to another room and told them to apply an electric shock by pressing the button whenever the learner gets a question wrong.</li> <li>- The experimenter wore a grey lab coat.</li> <li>- The "teacher" was given a test shock of 45 volts.</li> <li>- At certain voltages, different vocal feedback was given through a recorded system. After 315 volts, no response was given.</li> </ul>
[F]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 65% of the subjects continued on to the maximum 450 volts.</li> <li>- No one stopped before 300 volts.</li> <li>- Subjects were observed to show signs of stress (e.g. sweat, tremble, biting their lips).</li> </ul>
[C]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Subjects displayed compliance because of the authority figure (the experimenter in the grey lab coat).</li> <li>- Compliance, not conformity. Because it is evident that the subjects did not internalise the idea of giving shock.</li> <li>- When subjects were asked to electrocute a puppy, level of obedience increased.</li> </ul>

[E]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Ecological validity: Low, lab environment.</li><li>- Culture bias: Unrepresentative sample, all subjects were from the US.</li><li>- Other researchers replicated the study in other countries.<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Findings can then be generalised.</li></ul></li><li>- Caused distress in subjects.</li><li>- They were told "you have no choice but to carry on" but in actual fact subjects had the right to leave.</li><li>- Subjects were deceived to thinking that they were actually giving out electric shocks<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- They were then debriefed, and showed that the learner was unharmed.</li></ul></li><li>- Gender bias: Only male subjects used initially. In later replicates, female subjects and "victim" were also used.<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- When a female "victim" was used, level of obedience reduced.</li></ul></li></ul>
-----	--

## Sociocultural cognition

**Describe the role of situational and dispositional factors in explaining behaviour. (8)**

**Describe (8) - Give a detail account.**

### **Attribution**

- Process of interpreting and explaining behaviour.
- People do not passively observe their own and others' actions.

### **Actor-observer effect**

- When people attribute behaviour whether they perform it themselves or observe others doing it.

### **Two factors of attributions**

- Situational attributions
  - Attributing to situational or external factors (e.g. Weather)
- Dispositional attributions
  - Attributing to personal or internal factors (e.g. Intelligence)

<b>Philip Zimbardo - Stanford Prison Experiment (Conformity/SIT)</b>	
[A]	Prove that situational factors can affect behaviour
[P]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 22 male subjects were selected through personality assessment based on their mental stability, maturity and social ability.</li> <li>- Randomly assigned the role of either prisoner or warden.</li> <li>- <b>"Prisoners"</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Signed a consent document that some of their human rights will be suspended for the experiment and that all subjects would receive \$15 a day up to 2 weeks.</li> <li>- "Arrested" by surprise by real police from their house, taken to a real police station for standard procedures.</li> <li>- Driven blindfolded to a prison (set, not a real prison) where they were stripped naked, delouse, and dressed in prisoner uniform.</li> <li>- Stayed in the prison for 24 hours a day, followed a schedule of work, rest and meal.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- <b>"Wardens"</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Put on warden costumes with the correct props. They worked 8 hours a day, and were given no specific instructions.</li> <li>- Asked to keep a reasonable degree of order and were prohibited against any means of physical violence.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<p>[F]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Experiment was terminated in 6 days, instead of the intended 14 days due to abnormal reactions shown by both prisoners and wardens.</li> <li>- <b>"Prisoners"</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Displayed passivity and dependence. Half the prisoners showed signs of depression, crying, fits of rage, acute anxiety.</li> <li>- Due to this reason, they were released early.</li> <li>- All but two prisoners would forfeit the money if they could be released early.</li> <li>- Experimenters proposed that these behaviours were results of the loss of personal identity, dependency and learned helplessness.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- <b>"Wardens"</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Displayed huge enjoyment of power at their disposal, leading towards abusive use of power, dehumanizing the prisoners.</li> <li>- Some wardens worked extra time with no extra pay and were disappointed that the experiment was over.</li> <li>- They punished the prisoners for no apparent justifications (abusive use of power).</li> <li>- Not all wardens displayed aggression, but none opposed other's use of it.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p>[C]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The situation (prison environment) affected all participant's behaviour.</li> <li>- Arguable that the environment of a prison is what causes prisoners to act violently.</li> <li>- Supports SIT             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Displayed the categorisation and development of identity in both groups</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p>[E]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ecological validity: Low, lab environment, overt observation</li> <li>- Prohibition of physical violence limited the generalising ability of the experiment             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Experimenters argue that..</li> <li>- The functional equivalent of the prison system (setting, costumes etc.) were implemented.</li> <li>- Reactions and behaviours of the subjects exceeded the level of "role play".</li> <li>- Calling each other by ID number in private, wardens showed aggression even when they thought they were not being watched.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Reliability: Experiment was not repeated until years after, subjects did not act as predicted.</li> <li>- Culture bias: only studied subjects from the US</li> <li>- Ethical considerations and issues             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Participants signed consent forms, but they had no clear idea of the procedure of the experiment.</li> <li>- Induced aggression in subjects.</li> <li>- Created discrimination and violence.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Gender bias: only male subjects were used</li> </ul>

<b>Solomon Asch - Asch's Paradigm Experiment (Conformity)</b>	
[A]	Investigate the existence of conformity.
[P]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Subject was placed into a room with 6 confederates and the experimenter.</li> <li>- Subject was deceived that the 6 confederates were participants just like them.</li> <li>- The subject was placed on the second last seat so they will be the second last to give an answer.</li> <li>- The group of subject and confederates were asked to select the line on the second card that matched the line on the first card.</li> <li>- There were 18 sets of cards in total, some of which had lines that were completely different in length, others are similar in length.</li> <li>- Confederates were instructed to answer correctly on some of the cards but answer incorrectly for most.</li> </ul>
[F]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 75% conformed at least once to the wrong answer</li> <li>- 32% conformed to more than half of the wrong answers</li> <li>- 24% did not conform at all</li> </ul>
[C]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Conformity happened</li> <li>- Those who did not conform sparked further research</li> </ul>
[E]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ecological validity: Low, lab conditions.</li> <li>- Controlled environment removed confounding variables.</li> <li>- Meaningless stimuli.</li> <li>- Gender bias, only male participants were used.</li> <li>- Culture bias, only population of the US were used. Cannot be generalised to all population.</li> <li>- Ethics: Deception, but subjects were debriefed.</li> </ul>



**Discuss two errors in attributions (for example, fundamental attribution error, illusory correlation, self-serving bias). (22)**

**Discuss (22) - A considered and balanced review, including a range of arguments, factors or hypothesis. Opinions and conclusions presented clearly supported by appropriate evidence.**

\*There are more than two errors in attribution here, choose two you are most confident with.

**Attribution**

- Process of interpreting and explaining behaviour.
- People do not passively observe their own and others' actions.

**Actor-observer effect**

- When people attribute behaviour whether they perform it themselves or observe others doing it.

**Two factors of attributions**

- Situational attributions
  - Attributing to situational or external factors (e.g. Weather)
- Dispositional attributions
  - Attributing to personal or internal factors (e.g. Intelligence)

Errors in attributions

**Fundamental Attribution Error**

- When the role of disposition is overestimated and the affect of the situation is underestimated.

<b>Lee et al. - Audience and Game show experiment (FAE)</b>	
[A]	Demonstrate the Fundamental Attributional Error (FAE).
[P]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Subjects were split into groups of <b>hosts, audiences</b> and <b>contestants</b>, randomly.</li> <li>- <b>Hosts</b> were asked to design their own questions.</li> <li>- <b>Audiences</b> watched the show.</li> <li>- After the game show the <b>audience</b> were asked to rank the intelligence of people taken part.</li> </ul>
[F]	- Audience consistently rated the hosts smarter.
[C]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- They failed to attribute the role to the person's situation (random assignment of role).</li> <li>- Instead attributed the person's performance to dispositional factors.</li> </ul>
[E]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Only student participants were used.</li> <li>- University students spend their days listening to professors - authority figures who ask questions and give answers and is a learned response rather than attribution error.</li> </ul>

<b>Jones and Harris - Castro Essays evaluation (FAE)</b>	
[A]	Demonstrate the Fundamental Attributional Error (FAE)
[P]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Participants were university students.</li> <li>- Subjects read pro and anti Fidel Castro (the Cuban revolutionary) essays.</li> <li>- Subjects were asked to rate the "Pro Castro" attitudes of the writer on the scale of 10 to 70.</li> </ul>
[F]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- When subject believed that the writers had free choice of their position, they rated writers with who spoke in favor of Castro as having a more positive attitude towards Castro.</li> <li>- When subject were told that the writers determined their position with a coin toss, they still rated writers who spoke in favor of Castro as having a more positive attitude.</li> </ul>
[C]	- This proves that although behaviour was severely constrained by situation, observers still opted for internal attribution.

### Self Fulfilling Prophecy

- Been told too much that you end up believing it.

<b>Leon Festinger - When Prophecy Fails (Self Fulfilling Prophecy)</b>	
[A]	Investigate the existence of Self Fulfilling Prophecy.
[P]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Experimenters found a group of superstitious people in Chicago believing that the world would end on December 21st.</li> <li>- They became part of the group to observe their behaviour when the world didn't actually come to an end.</li> <li>- Experimenters needed to be part of the group because the group isolated themselves from all non-believers.</li> </ul>
[F]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The group of people explained to themselves that God did not destroy the world because of their prayers.</li> <li>- Caused cognitive dissonance (discomfort caused by conflicting cognitions i.e. ideas, beliefs).</li> <li>- This is to protect there own group self esteem.</li> </ul>
[C]	- Self Fulfilling Prophecy was apparent as the believers made up a reason when their believe did not come true.
[E]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ecological validity: High, naturalistic observation.</li> <li>- Culture bias: only one superstitious group were studied locally.</li> </ul>

## Illusory Correlation

- Correlating data that has a seemingly convincing connection but in fact is not connected at all.

<b>Snyder and Swann - Introverts and Extroverts (Illusory Correlation)</b>	
[A]	Testing stereotype.
[P]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Told female students that they would either meet someone that was either introvert or extrovert.</li> <li>- They were then asked to prepare a set of questions for the person they were going to meet.</li> </ul>
[F]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Participants that thought they were meeting an introvert asked questions like “<i>What do you dislike about parties?</i>” or “<i>Are there times you wish you could be more outgoing?</i>”</li> <li>- Participants that thought they were meeting an extrovert asked questions like “<i>What do you do to liven up a party?</i>”</li> </ul>
[C]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Questions asked displayed the participants’ stereotypes towards either personality.</li> <li>- Revealed the formation of stereotyping - Illusory Correlation</li> </ul>

## Modesty Bias & Self Serving Bias

- Modesty bias: Tendency to attributing success to *external* factors and failures to *internal* factors.
- Self serving bias: Tendency to attributing success to *internal* factors and failures to *external* factors.

Greenberg et al.

- Argues that Self Serving Bias is a way to protect and boost our own self esteem.
- If success is attributed to disposition, we feel satisfaction which boosts our self esteem.
- If failure is attributed to situation, i.e. factors beyond our control, our self esteem will be protected.

<b>Kashima and Triandis - Self Serving Bias and Modesty Bias study</b>	
[A]	Cultural factors affecting attribution (Self Serving Bias and Modesty Bias).
[P]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Participants were students from Japan and America.</li> <li>- They were given pictures of unfamiliar countries and were asked to remember details.</li> <li>- Participants then performed a recall of the details.</li> </ul>
[F]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- American students tend to attribute success to dispositional factors more. (Self serving bias).</li> <li>- Japanese students tent to attribute failure to dispositional factors more (Modesty bias).</li> </ul>
[C]	- Biases in attribution can be affected by our cultural background.
[E]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ecological validity: High, naturalistic observation.</li> <li>- Culture bias: only one superstitious group were studied locally.</li> </ul>

**Evaluate social identity theory, making reference to relevant studies. (22)**

**Evaluate (22) - An appraisal by weighing up the strengths and limitations.**

Social Identity Theory (Theorist: Henry Tajfel)

- Social Categorisation
  - Grouping of different social circles based on the members' stereotypical culture and behaviour.
- Social Identity
  - Identifying yourself with a particular social group based on their in-group norms.
  - Cultural expectations
  - Belongingness
- Social Comparison
  - Comparing in-group members with out-group members, looking for benefits to be in the in-group which boosts self esteem.
- Positive Distinctiveness
  - Using verbal or non-verbal cues to make your social group more socially valued, creating an increasingly positive meaning for the group's identity.
  - Rewards as motivators.

<b>Henry Tajfel - Intergroup discrimination Experiment (SIT)</b>	
[A]	To test the Social Identity Theory
[P]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 48 boys were assigned at random to 2 groups based on their preference between <i>Klee</i> or <i>Kandinsky's</i> art work.</li> <li>- Asked to rate in-group and out-group based on traits e.g. like-ability.</li> </ul>
[F]	Tajfel found that the out-group was rated less likeable, but never actually disliked.
[C]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There seems to be a preference of the in-group over out-group, however it is not clear that they make social comparisons to enhance either self-esteem.</li> <li>- Later research - Social identity does not account for intergroup conflict. In the absence of competition, social comparison can be positive.</li> </ul>
[E]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Supports Social Identity Theory</li> <li>- Showed the formation and the features of SIT</li> <li>- Ecological validity: Low, lab conditions</li> <li>- Meaningless groups</li> <li>- Controlled environment removed confounding variables.</li> </ul>

<b>Cialdini et al. - Football game observation (SIT)</b>	
[A]	Demonstrate social comparison with college football supporters.
[P]	- Observed what college students wear to school the next day after their football game.
[F]	- Students wore apparel with the representative colour of their school the day after the football game if the school won.
[C]	- Result of positive self-concept results in a bias intergroup comparison. - Having a positive representation of your social group (Positive distinctiveness)
[E]	- Covert observation, high in ecological validity. - Culture bias: Only observed American students. - Gender neutral, both male and female students showed support to school team.

<b>Philip Zimbardo - Stanford Prison Experiment (Conformity/SIT)</b>	
[A]	Prove that situational factors can affect behaviour
[P]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 22 male subjects were selected through personality assessment based on their mental stability, maturity and social ability.</li> <li>- Randomly assigned the role of either prisoner or warden.</li> <li>- <b>"Prisoners"</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Signed a consent document that some of their human rights will be suspended for the experiment and that all subjects would receive \$15 a day up to 2 weeks.</li> <li>- "Arrested" by surprise by real police from their house, taken to a real police station for standard procedures.</li> <li>- Driven blindfolded to a prison (set, not a real prison) where they were stripped naked, delouse, and dressed in prisoner uniform.</li> <li>- Stayed in the prison for 24 hours a day, followed a schedule of work, rest and meal.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- <b>"Wardens"</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Put on warden costumes with the correct props. They worked 8 hours a day, and were given no specific instructions.</li> <li>- Asked to keep a reasonable degree of order and were prohibited against any means of physical violence.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<p>[F]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Experiment was terminated in 6 days, instead of the intended 14 days due to abnormal reactions shown by both prisoners and wardens.</li> <li>- <b>"Prisoners"</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Displayed passivity and dependence. Half the prisoners showed signs of depression, crying, fits of rage, acute anxiety.</li> <li>- Due to this reason, they were released early.</li> <li>- All but two prisoners would forfeit the money if they could be released early.</li> <li>- Experimenters proposed that these behaviours were results of the loss of personal identity, dependency and learned helplessness.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- <b>"Wardens"</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Displayed huge enjoyment of power at their disposal, leading towards abusive use of power, dehumanizing the prisoners.</li> <li>- Some wardens worked extra time with no extra pay and were disappointed that the experiment was over.</li> <li>- They punished the prisoners for no apparent justifications (abusive use of power).</li> <li>- Not all wardens displayed aggression, but none opposed other's use of it.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p>[C]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The situation (prison environment) affected all participant's behaviour.</li> <li>- Arguable that the environment of a prison is what causes prisoners to act violently.</li> <li>- Supports SIT             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Displayed the categorisation and development of identity in both groups</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p>[E]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ecological validity: Low, lab environment, overt observation</li> <li>- Prohibition of physical violence limited the generalising ability of the experiment             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Experimenters argue that..</li> <li>- The functional equivalent of the prison system (setting, costumes etc.) were implemented.</li> <li>- Reactions and behaviours of the subjects exceeded the level of "role play".</li> <li>- Calling each other by ID number in private, wardens showed aggression even when they thought they were not being watched.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Reliability: Experiment was not repeated until years after, subjects did not act as predicted.</li> <li>- Culture bias: only studied subjects from the US</li> <li>- Ethical considerations and issues             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Participants signed consent forms, but they had no clear idea of the procedure of the experiment.</li> <li>- Induced aggression in subjects.</li> <li>- Created discrimination and violence.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Gender bias: only male subjects were used</li> </ul>

### Strengths of SIT

- Creates norms and culture for people to adhere and belong to.
- Explanation for stereotyping and discrimination.

### Weaknesses of SIT

- Describe but does not predict.
- Reductionist theory, does not take into account of the interaction with situational factors.
- Personal identity in individuals with high self esteem may be stronger than group identity.

## **Explain the formation of stereotypes and their effect on behaviour. (8)**

**Explain (8) - Detailed account including reasons or causes.**

### The formation of Stereotypes

Generalised image of a social group, usually oversimplified based on assumptions.

#### **"Grain of truth hypothesis"**

- Stereotypes must originate from some kind of truth in order to create the assumption.

#### **"Illusory correlation"**

- Correlating the assumption with all individuals with the particular criteria.

Caused **"Confirmation bias"**

- Overlooking factors that might disprove one's belief and over exaggerating factors that supports one's point of view.

#### **"Gatekeepers"**

- People who maintain the stereotype. Likely to be people from the out-group, the media.

The above factors therefore enhances and strengthens the stereotype.

### **Social categorisation**

- Categorising yourself to an in-group and identifying the out-group.

### **Stereotype threat**

**Spotlight anxiety** - Affects the performance of the individual if they are being discriminated due to stereotyping.

- Afraid of doing something that confirms that you belong to the stereotypical group.
- Conforming to the social norms of the particular stereotype. (Self fulfilling prophecy)
- Individual must relate and believe in the stereotype
- Discrimination
  - Prejudice
  - Labeling, stigmatization
  - In extreme cases, genocide



<b>Aronson and Steele - African and European American study (Stereotype)</b>	
[A]	To demonstrate the effect of stereotype threat.
[P]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Participants were African Americans and European Americans.</li> <li>- 30 minutest verbal test made up of difficult multiple choice questions.</li> <li>- <b>Group 1</b> was told it was a "genuine test on verbal abilities".</li> <li>- <b>Group 2</b> was told it was a "laboratory task that was used to study how certain problems are generally solved".</li> <li>- Did similar experiment with females and lower social class.</li> </ul>
[F]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- African Americans scored significantly lower on the test in <b>Group 1</b> than European Americans.</li> <li>- African Americans scored equally as good as European Americans on the test in <b>Group 2</b>.</li> </ul>
[C]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Stereotype threat can affect any social or cultural group, provided that the members believe in the stereotype.</li> <li>- Believing in negative stereotypes can harm the performances of group members.</li> </ul>

<b>Spencer et al. - Stereotype threat Maths experiment (Stereotype)</b>	
[A]	To demonstrate the effect of stereotype threat.
[P]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Participants were a group of male and female students.</li> <li>- Gave difficult maths test to students who were strong in mathematics.</li> <li>- Predicts that female under the stereotype threat would underperform.</li> <li>- This stereotype threat stems from a common negative stereotype amongst society that women are less capable in maths.</li> </ul>
[F]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Hypothesis was true, women in the experiment significantly underperformed compared to men with equal abilities.</li> <li>- A literature test was also done. The two groups performed equally well because neither groups were put under stereotype threat</li> </ul>
[C]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Stereotype threat can affect any social or cultural group, provided that the members believe in the stereotype.</li> <li>- Believing in negative stereotypes can harm the performances of group members.</li> </ul>

## **Social norms**

**Explain social learning theory, making reference to two relevant studies. (8)**

**Explain (8) - Detailed account including reasons or causes.**

### Social Learning Theory (Theorist: Albert Bandura)

#### **Attention**

- Paying attention to the model.

#### **Retention**

- Retain the behaviour of the model that was observed.

#### **Reproduction**

- Replicate the behaviour of the learning model.

#### **Motivation**

- Learners must want to display what they have learnt from the learning model.

#### **Factors influencing SLT**

- Consistency

The model must act in a consistent way across situations.

- Relevance/Appropriateness

Behaviours are more likely to be learnt if relevant and socially appropriate to the learner.

- Powerfulness

Models with more power and control are more likely to be learnt from.

- Identification

The ability of the learner to identify with the model, e.g. age, gender.

- Reward

If the model was rewarded, the learner is more likely to learn from the model.

If the learner is rewarded, they will more likely repeat the behaviour that was learnt.

- Friendliness

Friendly models are more likely to be imitated.

<b>Albert Bandura - Bobo Doll Experiment (SLT)</b>	
[A]	To demonstrate that learning can occur through observation of role models
[P]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 36 boys and 36 girls from age 3 to 6 were divided into groups according to their aggression evaluation from their parents and teachers.</li> <li>- Group 1 was exposed to adult models who showed aggression by beating up a Bobo Doll. Models were of both genders.</li> <li>- Group 2 observed an adult model who displayed no aggression. Models were of both genders.</li> <li>- Group 3 was a controlled group who did not see any model. (Control)</li> <li>- The children were then placed into the room with a Bobo doll after 10 minutes of watching the model.</li> </ul>
[F]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Children who observed the aggressive model showed significantly more aggression both physically and verbally.</li> <li>- Boys were more likely to imitate physical aggression.</li> <li>- Girls were more likely to imitate verbal aggression.</li> </ul>
[C]	- Social learning theory was demonstrated in the study because the children showed signs of observational learning.
[E]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ethics: Induced aggression</li> <li>- Oversimplification of the learning process</li> <li>- Ecological validity: Low, lab conditions</li> <li>- Confounding variable: children unfamiliar with doll were 5 times more likely to imitate aggressive behaviour.</li> </ul>

<b>Charlton et al. - St Helena TV violence study (SLT, covert observation)</b>	
[A]	Investigate the effect of the introduction of television on aggression in children.
[P]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TV was introduced to St Helena Island, violent content shown on TV was equal to the UK.</li> <li>- Cameras were set up in playgrounds of two primary schools</li> </ul>
[F]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- After 5 years, aggression of children did not increase</li> <li>- Good behaviour evident prior the introduction of TV were maintained</li> </ul>
[C]	- Without correct and complete SLT process, ARRM, Social Learning cannot be achieved.

**Discuss the use of compliance techniques (for example, lowballing, foot-in-the-door, reciprocity). (22)**

**Discuss (22) - A considered and balanced review, including a range of arguments, factors or hypothesis. Opinions and conclusions presented clearly supported by appropriate evidence.**

Compliance techniques

**Foot in the door (Commitment)** - "commit to this? might as well with that too.."

- Feeling of commitment to a certain thing.

<b>Dickerson - Take shorter shower (Compliance - Commitment)</b>	
[A]	Investigate the effect of compliance (commitment) on behaviour.
[P]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Students from the university was asked to sign a poster saying "Take shorter showers, if I can do it, so can you!"</li> <li>- Then the students were asked to do a survey that was designed to make them think about their own water wastage.</li> <li>- The shower times of students were monitored.</li> </ul>
[F]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Those who signed the poster were forced to think about their own water wastage, they averaged the shower time of 3.5 minutes.</li> <li>- That result was significantly lower than the average time across the dormitories.</li> <li>- Might be able to argue that the students signed the poster because they are already committed to the cause.</li> </ul>
[C]	- Students felt that they are committed to a cause.

**Door in the face (Reciprocity)** - "how bout settle with less?"

- Feeling the need to return a favour.

<b>Cialdini - Juvenile day trip/social worker (Compliance - Reciprocity)</b>	
[A]	Investigate the effect of compliance (reciprocity) on behaviour.
[P] [F]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Experimenters pretended they were from a "County Youth Counseling Programme".</li> <li>- They stopped at different university campuses recruiting students to look after a group of juvenile on their day trip. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 83% refused this job.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- On another day, the experimenters asked if the students would be willing to be part of a counseling programme for two hours a week for two years. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Everyone refused the job.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Then, the experimenter asked them to look after a group of juvenile on their day trip. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 50% agreed.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
[C]	- Students felt the need to accept the second offer as a for of returning a favour because they declined the first offer.

**Obedience to authority**

- Feeling of having to obey the authority.

<b>Stanley Milgram - Study On Obedience (Compliance)</b>	
[A]	Investigating the effect of authority on compliance and obedience.
[P]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Subjects were 40 males, age range from 20 to 50, found through newspaper advert.</li> <li>- Subjects were led to believe that the experiment was investigating the effect of punishment on learning.</li> <li>- They were given the role of the "teacher" through a fixed lottery.</li> <li>- They saw the learner (which is an actor) in real life, strapped to a chair connected with an electrode.</li> <li>- The experimenter took the subject to another room and told them to apply an electric shock by pressing the button whenever the learner gets a question wrong.</li> <li>- The experimenter wore a grey lab coat.</li> <li>- The "teacher" was given a test shock of 45 volts</li> <li>- At certain voltages, different vocal feedback was given through a recorded system. After 315 volts, no response was given.</li> </ul>
[F]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 65% of the subjects continued on to the maximum 450 volts</li> <li>- No one stopped before 300 volts.</li> <li>- Subjects were observed to show signs of stress (e.g. sweat, tremble, biting their lips)</li> </ul>
[C]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Subjects displayed compliance because of the authority figure (the experimenter in the grey lab coat).</li> <li>- Compliance, not conformity. Because it is evident that the subjects did not internalise the idea of giving shock.</li> <li>- When subjects were asked to electrocute a puppy, level of obedience increased.</li> </ul>
[E]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ecological validity: Low, lab environment.</li> <li>- Culture bias: Unrepresentative sample, all subjects were from the US.</li> <li>- Other researchers replicated the study in other countries                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Findings can then be generalised.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Caused distress in subjects</li> <li>- They were told "you have no choice but to carry on" but in actual fact subjects had the right to leave</li> <li>- Subjects were deceived to thinking that they were actually giving out electric shocks                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- They were then debriefed, and showed that the learner was unharmed.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Gender bias: Only male subjects used initially. In later replicates, female subjects and "victim" were also used.                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- When a female "victim" was used, level of obedience reduced.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

**Evaluate research on conformity to group norms. (22)**

**Evaluate (22) - An appraisal by weighing up the strengths and limitations.**

<b>Solomon Asch - Asch's Paradigm Experiment (Conformity)</b>	
[A]	Investigate the existence of conformity.
[P]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Subject was placed into a room with 6 confederates and the experimenter.</li> <li>- Subject was deceived that the 6 confederates were participants just like them.</li> <li>- The subject was placed on the second last seat so they will be the second last to give an answer.</li> <li>- The group of subject and confederates were asked to select the line on the second card that matched the line on the first card.</li> <li>- There were 18 sets of cards in total, some of which had lines that were completely different in length, others are similar in length.</li> <li>- Confederates were instructed to answer correctly on some of the cards but answer incorrectly for most.</li> </ul>
[F]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 75% conformed at least once to the wrong answer</li> <li>- 32% conformed to more than half of the wrong answers</li> <li>- 24% did not conform at all</li> </ul>
[C]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Conformity happened</li> <li>- Those who did not conform sparked further research</li> </ul>
[E]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ecological validity: Low, lab conditions.</li> <li>- Controlled environment removed confounding variables.</li> <li>- Meaningless stimuli.</li> <li>- Gender bias, only male participants were used.</li> <li>- Culture bias, only population of the US were used. Cannot be generalised to all population.</li> <li>- Ethics: Deception, but subjects were debriefed.</li> </ul>

<b>Perrin and Spencer - Asch's Paradigm with professionals (Conformity)</b>	
Experiment brief	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Replication of the "Asch's Paradigm" study.</li> <li>- Except the subjects used were all from professional fields. - Maths, Chemistry, Medical and Engineering students.</li> </ul>
[F]	- Only 1 out of 396 trials did the subject conform to the big group.
[C]	- Individuals with high self esteem and confidence are less likely to conform.
[E]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Offered an alternative view on the factors affecting conformity.</li> <li>- Improved upon the theory of conformity and the original study (Asch's Paradigm)</li> <li>- Evaluative points of Asch's Paradigm apply.</li> </ul>

<b>Moscovici and Lage - Shades of blue study (Conformity)</b>	
[A]	Investigate whether a minority group can influence a bigger group through conformity.
[P]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 4 subjects were placed into a room with 2 confederates and the experimenter.</li> <li>- Subjects were deceived that the 2 confederates were participants just like them.</li> <li>- Subjects were asked to judge whether different shades of blue-green cards were blue or green.</li> <li>- The 2 confederates were instructed to give the wrong answer consistently.</li> </ul>
[F]	- The minority of 2 confederates were able to influence 32% of the participants to give a wrong answer.
[C]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Uncovered an important element of conformity.</li> <li style="padding-left: 20px;">- Consistency of the group.</li> </ul>
[E]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Offered an alternative view on the factors affecting conformity.</li> <li>- Improved upon the theory of conformity and the original study (Asch's Paradigm)</li> <li>- Evaluative points of Asch's Paradigm apply.</li> </ul>

**Discuss factors influencing conformity (for example, culture, groupthink, risky shift, minority influence). (22)**

**Discuss (22) - A considered and balanced review, including a range of arguments, factors or hypothesis. Opinions and conclusions presented clearly supported by appropriate evidence.**

Factors influencing conformity

**Cultural factors**

- The theory of Cultural Dimensions
- Individualism/Collectivism
- Individualism on Conformity
  - Individual thoughts are encouraged, hence lower level of conformity.
- Collectivism on Conformity
  - Tendency to conform more easily because a harmony will be reached that way.

<b>Bond and Smith - Asch's Paradigm with different cultures (Conformity/Culture)</b>	
Experiment brief	- Meta-analysis of 133 Asch's Paradigm study in 17 different countries around the world.
[F]	- Individualist societies tend to have a lower rate of conformity (e.g. US, UK, France) - Collectivist societies tend to have a higher rate of conformity (e.g. Hong Kong, Fiji, Brazil)
[C]	- Displayed the effect of culture on conformity.
[E]	- Emic approach: took care of the cultural differences around the world individually - Evaluative points of Asch's Paradigm apply.



**Unanimity**

- The likelihood of conformity increases when everyone agrees to a point.
- Compare Asch's Paradigm (original version) to a variation of Asch's Paradigm.

<b>Solomon Asch - Asch's Paradigm Experiment (Conformity)</b>	
[A]	Investigate the existence of conformity.
[P]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Subject was placed into a room with 6 confederates and the experimenter.</li> <li>- Subject was deceived that the 6 confederates were participants just like them.</li> <li>- The subject was placed on the second last seat so they will be the second last to give an answer.</li> <li>- The group of subject and confederates were asked to select the line on the second card that matched the line on the first card.</li> <li>- There were 18 sets of cards in total, some of which had lines that were completely different in length, others are similar in length.</li> <li>- Confederates were instructed to answer correctly on some of the cards but answer incorrectly for most.</li> </ul>
[F]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 75% conformed at least once to the wrong answer</li> <li>- 32% conformed to more than half of the wrong answers</li> <li>- 24% did not conform at all</li> </ul>
[C]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Conformity happened</li> <li>- Those who did not conform sparked further research</li> </ul>
[E]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ecological validity: Low, lab conditions.</li> <li>- Controlled environment removed confounding variables.</li> <li>- Meaningless stimuli.</li> <li>- Gender bias, only male participants were used.</li> <li>- Culture bias, only population of the US were used. Cannot be generalised to all population.</li> <li>- Ethics: Deception, but subjects were debriefed.</li> </ul>

<b>Solomon Asch - Asch's Paradigm variation (Conformity)</b>	
Experiment brief	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Replication of the original Asch's Paradigm study.</li> <li>- Except at points of the experiment, one confederate was instructed to disagree with majority, even if it was also a wrong answer.</li> </ul>
[F]	- Conformity rate dropped significantly.
[C]	- Consistency and unanimity is crucial for conformity to happen.
[E]	- Evaluative points of Asch's Paradigm apply.

**Minority influences**

- A stem of the original conformity theory.
- That a minority, if consistent enough, can influence the bigger group.

<b>Moscovici and Lage - Shades of blue study (Conformity)</b>	
[A]	Investigate whether a minority group can influence a bigger group through conformity.
[P]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 4 subjects were placed into a room with 2 confederates and the experimenter.</li> <li>- Subjects were deceived that the 2 confederates were participants just like them.</li> <li>- Subjects were asked to judge whether different shades of blue-green cards were blue or green.</li> <li>- The 2 confederates were instructed to give the wrong answer consistently.</li> </ul>
[F]	- The minority of 2 confederates were able to influence 32% of the participants to give a wrong answer.
[C]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Uncovered an important element of conformity.</li> <li>- Consistency of the group.</li> </ul>
[E]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Offered an alternative view on the factors affecting conformity.</li> <li>- Improved upon the theory of conformity and the original study (Asch's Paradigm)</li> <li>- Evaluative points of Asch's Paradigm apply.</li> </ul>

## **Cultural norms**

**Define the terms “culture” and “cultural norms”. (8)**

**Define (8) - Precise meaning of a word, phrase concept or physical quantity.**

### **Culture:**

- Dynamic system of rules, implicit or explicit, established by a social group.

Surface culture (Visible, Explicit)

- Music, Clothing, Food

Deep culture (Invisible, Implicit)

- Emotions, Beliefs, Expressions

### **Cultural norms:**

- Behaviour typical to the specific cultural group.

- Observational (social) learning

- Rules within the deep culture

- Expectations

- “Gatekeepers” (e.g. the media) keep the cultural norms in place.

**Examine the role of two cultural dimensions on behaviour (for example, individualism/collectivism, power distance, uncertainty avoidance, Confucian dynamism, masculinity/femininity). (22)**

**Examine (22) - Consider an argument or concept in a way that uncovers the assumptions and interrelationships of the issue.**

The Theory of Cultural Dimensions (Theorist: Geert Hofstede)

Initial study carried out by Geert Hofstede which led to the theory.

<b>Geert Hofstede - IBM Employee Correlation Study</b>	
[A]	Identify traits through the classification of behaviour according to culture
[P]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Participants were 60,000 IBM employees from over 50 different countries.</li> <li>- They were asked to fill in surveys</li> <li>- The study carried on for 10 years</li> </ul>
[F] [C]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Hofstede concluded with 4 bipolar Cultural Dimensions                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Individualism-Collectivism</li> <li>- Masculinity-Femininity</li> <li>- Power Distance</li> <li>- Uncertainty Avoidance</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
[E]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Survey may consist of leading questions or predetermined results</li> <li>- Useful for quantitative data</li> <li>- Unable to retrieve meaningful/insightful qualitative data</li> <li>- Questions require participants to have level of literacy skills</li> <li>- Questions were originally in English, some meanings might be lost in translation</li> </ul>

**Individualism-Collectivism**

- Measure of whether people prefer to work alone or in groups.
- Indication of the degree of social integration.

**Collectivism**

- People find ways to benefit all.
- More harmonious society.
- Tendency to show higher level of affection towards family members.
  - Tend to live close together.
- Higher birth rate.

### Collectivism on Behaviour

#### Conformity and Compliance

- Tendency to conform more easily because a harmony will be reached that way.
- Unanimity
- Groupthink
- Compliance level is low
  - Compliance requires the subject to be persuaded.
  - Collectivists tend to be harder to persuade because they will seek other people's opinion in their group.

#### Emotions

- Less expression of emotion
  - Seen as unimportant and looked down upon, specially negative emotions
  - Emotional memory tend to be weaker (LTM)

#### Social identity

- Stronger social identity

### **Individualism**

- The interest of an individual prevails the interest of the group.
- Ties between individuals are relatively loose.
- Care only extend to their immediate family members.
- Individualist countries
  - Tend to be wealthier
  - Are in areas of the world with colder climate
  - Relatively lower birth rate

### Individualism on Behaviour

#### Conformity and Compliance

- Individual thoughts are encouraged, hence lower level of conformity.
- Compliance is higher.
  - Less likely that person from an individualist culture will seek for other's opinion before making a decision

Emotions

- Encourages expression of emotions.
  - Seen as a highly valued way of self expression.
  - Emotional memory tend to be stronger (LTM).

Social identity

- Stronger self identity

<b>Bond and Smith - Asch's Paradigm with different cultures (Conformity/Culture)</b>	
Experiment brief	- Meta-analysis of 133 Asch's Paradigm study in 17 different countries around the world.
[F]	- Individualist societies tend to have a lower rate of conformity (e.g. US, UK, France) - Collectivist societies tend to have a higher rate of conformity (e.g. Hong Kong, Fiji, Brazil)
[C]	- Displayed the effect of culture on conformity.
[E]	- Emic approach: took care of the cultural differences around the world individually - Evaluative points of Asch's Paradigm apply.

<b>Kashima and Triandis - Self Serving Bias and Modesty Bias study</b>	
[A]	Cultural factors affecting attribution (Self Serving Bias and Modesty Bias)
[P]	- Participants were students from Japan and America - They were given pictures of unfamiliar countries and were asked to remember details - Participants then performed a recall of the details
[F]	- American students tend to attribute success to dispositional factors more. (Self serving bias) - Japanese students tent to attribute failure to dispositional factors more (Modesty bias)
[C]	- Biases in attribution can be affected by our cultural background
[E]	- Ecological validity: High, naturalistic observation - Culture bias: only one superstitious group were studied locally

### **Masculinity-Femininity**

- Depicts the degree to which masculine traits are preferred to female characteristics.
- Masculine traits
  - Authority
  - Assertiveness
  - Performance
  - Success
- Female characteristics
  - Personal relationship
  - Quality of life
  - Service
  - Welfare
- To a minimal degree showing dominance of gender.

### **Masculinity**

- Where the culture's dominant values are masculine traits.
- Looser relationship ties, relatively independent.
- Must be a dominant character in a relationship.
- Materialistic achievements are important e.g. trophies.

### **Masculinity on Behaviour**

- Higher level of aggression
- More assertive

### **Femininity**

- Where the culture's dominant values are display less masculine traits.  
(or more feminine traits)
- Higher emphasis on harmonious interpersonal relationships.
- More overlapping social roles.
- Shows more concern over the weak.
- Importance on the quality of life.

### **Femininity on Behaviour**

- Display more affection.
- Higher quality of life.
- More harmonious social circles.

<b><u>Mead - New Guinea Anthropological study</u></b>	
[A]	Comparing masculine and feminine traits in different cultures in New Guinea.
[P]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Covert observation.</li> <li>- Research was done in three different tribes in New Guinea.</li> </ul>
[F]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- One tribe shows that both male and female displayed the same sensitive behaviour.</li> <li>- Another tribe shows that both male and female were aggressive and ruthless.</li> <li>- Another tribe shows that female had the dominant characteristics and male showed more "feminine" traits.</li> </ul>
[C]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mead's demonstration of cultural differences in many respects a valid indication of how society can influence gender-role development.</li> </ul>
[E]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Unscientific methodology.</li> <li>- Possible Confirmation Bias - Researcher believed that situation was influential in changing behaviour.</li> <li>- Re-analysis of Mead's material failed to show that one of the tribe displayed any gender dominance.</li> <li>- Covert observation, did not interfere with subject's life.</li> <li>- Female researcher, might not understand the perspective of a male subject.</li> </ul>



**Using one or more examples, explain “emic” and “etic” concepts. (8)**

**Explain (8) - Detailed account including reasons or causes.**

**Etic - Cross-culture approach**

- Tackles culture with one general approach.

<b><u>World Health Organisation Study on Depression</u></b>	
[A]	A study of diagnosis and classification of depression in Switzerland, Canada, Japan and Iran.
[P]	- 576 patients were studied - Used a standard diagnosis system for the four countries
[F]	- 40% of patients displayed symptoms that were not on the classification system.
[C]	- Diagnosis and classification system need an Emic (Culture specific) approach because socially acceptable norms are different in different cultures.

**Etic - Cultural specific approach**

- Tackles culture specifically and individually.

<b><u>Bond and Smith - Asch's Paradigm with different cultures (Conformity/Culture)</u></b>	
Experiment brief	- Meta-analysis of 133 Asch's Paradigm study in 17 different countries around the world.
[F]	- Individualist societies tend to have a lower rate of conformity (e.g. US, UK, France) - Collectivist societies tend to have a higher rate of conformity (e.g. Hong Kong, Fiji, Brazil)
[C]	- Displayed the effect of culture on conformity.
[E]	- Emic approach: took care of the cultural differences around the world individually - Evaluative points of Asch's Paradigm apply.