

I'm not a robot 
reCAPTCHA

Continue

Snowball effect psychology a level

Moscovici (1980) has put forward a conversion theory to explain how social change is taking place and there are three clear factors determining the success of the minority to facilitate social change, including: consistency, sacrifice and group membership. Firstly, the minority must consistently oppose the majority. History has provided many examples of real life, where consistent individuals challenged and questioned the values and norms of society (and were criminalised for their views). Martin Luther King and Nelson Mandela led civil rights movements and consistently opposed apartheid for many years, which has helped bring about social change. In addition, the results of the Moscovici (1969) study show the importance of consistency in the influence of minorities. Moscovici found that a consistent minority was more likely (8.4%) to convince the majority that the colour of the slide was green when it was actually blue compared to an inconsistent minority (1.3%). Secondly, minorities who donate more are more likely to be influential. If minorities show their devotion to this goal through sacrifice, such as imprisonment or even death, their influence becomes more powerful. For example, when Rosa Parks refused to give up her seat for a white male passenger in the 1950s, she was arrested for violating U.S. law. This event helped lead to a civil rights movement that would break racial segregation laws in America. The case of Rosa Parks shows that people who want to make a sacrifice (in her case are arrested) show their commitment for their cause and are therefore more influential. Finally, if a minority is similar to the majority in terms of class, age, gender or even sexuality, they are more likely to be influential. Maass et al. (1982) explored the idea of membership of the group and found that a minority of heterosexual men were more likely to persuade a heterosexual majority on gay rights than a minority of homosexuals. Maass concluded that straight men have a more reassuring power when discussing gay rights with other straight men compared to gay men. This confirms the idea that the similarity to group membership is an important factor in the influence of minorities and social change. This process can be used to explain the many examples of social change that have occurred throughout history. For example, electoral rights were in line with their approach and constantly used educational and political arguments to draw attention to women's rights. In addition, they have remained consistent for many years and, despite the opposition, continued to protest and lobby until they persuaded the public that women have the right to vote. In addition, many ballot papers have made great sacrifices for their own cause; many risked imprisonment, while others risked death through extended hunger strikes, making their influence even more powerful. Finally, ballot papers used group membership to persuade women join their causes to expand their influence and membership. Overtime their influence has spread to people who have considered this issue until it leads to social change and all adults have the right to vote. Social influence is a process in which an individual's attitude, beliefs or behavior are modified by the presence or functioning of others. The four areas of social influence are compliance, compliance and obedience and the influence of minorities. Conformity/majority influence Compliance is a type of social influence defined as a change in faith or behaviour in response to real or imaginary social pressure. It is also known as the influence of the majority. Compliance with AO1. This means cases where a person can publicly agree with a group of people, but the person privately disagrees with the group's attitude or conduct. A person changes his or her opinion, but this is a temporary change. For example, a person can laugh at a joke, because for a group of their friends it looks funny, but a deep down person does not find a funny joke. For compliance research, see Asch's Line Study. Internalization of AO1. Publicly changing behavior to fit into the group while also agreeing with them privately. Internal (private) and external (public) behavioural change. This is the deepest level of compliance if the group's beliefs become part of the individual's belief system. An example of internalization is if someone lived with a vegetarian university and then decides to also become one too, because they agree with their friend's point of view/ someone converting religions would also be a good example. The internalisation study refers to Jenness (see below). Identification of the AO1. Identification occurs when someone meets the needs of a certain social role in society. For example, a policeman, a teacher or a politician. This type of compliance involves several aspects of external behavior. However, it is still not changed to an internal personal opinion. A good example is the Zimbardo Prison investigation. Compliance Standard Influence Explanations (AO1/AO3) Normative social influence is where a person meets to fit into a group because they don't want to appear stupid or be left behind. Normative social influence is usually associated with conformity when a person changes his or her public behavior, but not his private beliefs. For example, a person may feel pressure to smoke, as their other friends are. Normative social influence usually leads to conformity, because a person smokes only on the show, but deep down they prefer not to smoke. This means that any change in behaviour is temporary. For the normative influence study, indicate Asch. Informational influence (AO1/AO3) Informational social influence is where a person meets because they want to be right, and look at others who they think may have more information. This type of conformity occurs when the person is not sure of the situation or lacks knowledge and is an example of this is if someone was first to go to a posh restaurant, they could come across a few forks and do not know which to use, so they may look next to see what fork to use first. For an informational influence study, look for Jenness (see below). Jenness's Bean Jar Experiment AO1 Jenness conducted a compliance study – in their experiment participants were asked to estimate how many beans they thought were in the jar. Each participant had to make an individual assessment, and then do the same thing as the group. It found that when the task was performed in a social group, participants reported estimates of approximately the same value (although they had previously reported quite different estimates as individuals). The study was successful in demonstrating the influence of the majority, thus demonstrating that individuals' behaviors and beliefs can be influenced by the group. It may also be an example of an informational social impact, as participants would be vague about the actual number of beans in the jar. Variables affecting compliance with Asch's Line Study AO1 Asch wanted to explore whether people would match most of the situations where the answer was obvious. Procedure: In the Asch study, there were 5-7 participants in the group. Each group was given a standard row and three comparison lines. Participants had to say aloud which comparison line matched the standard length line. There was only one true participant in each group, and the remaining 6 were Confederate. The Confederate was told to give an incorrect answer in 12 of the 18 trials. Results: Real participants matched 32% of critical tests when the confederation gave incorrect answers. In addition, 75% of the sample corresponded to the majority of the sample in at least one study. Compliance with AO3 factors In subsequent tests, Asch (1952, 1956) changed the procedure (i.e. independent variables) to investigate which situational factors influenced the level of compliance (dependent variable). Its results and conclusions are presented below: The size of the group Asch changed the number of Confederate in his study to see how it did the match. The larger the majority group (the number of Confederate ones), the more people matched, but only to a certain point. With one other person (i.e. confederation), the group's compliance was 3%, while the other two increased to 13% and three or more were 32% (or 1/3). However, after the group size was about 4/5, compliance did not increase significantly. Brown and Byrne (1997) suggest that people may suspect a collusion if the majority rises to more than three or four. According to Hogg & Vaughan (1995), the most reliable conclusion is that compliance reaches its full extent with a majority of 3-5 persons, while additional members have little impact. Group unanimity A person is more likely to meet the requirements when all group members agree and give the same answer. When one other person in the group gave a different answer than the other and the group's response was not unanimous, the match decreased. Asch (1951) found that even only one confederation that opposes the choice of a majority can reduce compliance by as much as 80%. Task difficulty When (comparison) lines (e.g. A, B, C) were more similar, it was more difficult to assess the correct answer and increased compliance. When we are not sure, it seems that we are looking for others to confirm. The more difficult it is to complete a task, the greater the match. The answer privately When participants were allowed to respond privately (so the rest of the group does not know their response) the compliance decreases. This is because there is less group pressure, and the normative influence is not so powerful, because there is no fear of rejecting the group. Compliance with social roles Social roles are the role of people as members of a social group (e.g. student, teacher, policeman, etc.). There is considerable pressure to meet the expectations of the social role. Compliance with a social role is called identification. Stanford prison experiment AO1 Zimbardo wanted to explore how easy it is for people to match social protection and prisoner roles in role-playing exercises that imitated prison life. Procedure: To explore people's roles in prison situations, Zimbardo turned Stanford University's psychology building basement into a mockery prison. He advertised to students two weeks to play the roles of prisoners and guards. Participants were randomly assigned either to the prisoner or to the role of guard in a simulated prison environment. Prisoners were issued with a uniform and only a number of them were indicated. The guards were issued a khaki uniform, along with whistles, handcuffs and dark glasses, to make eye contact with prisoners impossible. The guards worked shifts for eight hours (other guards remained on call). Physical violence was not allowed. Zimbardo monitored the behaviour of prisoners and guards (as an investigator) and also acted as a prison. Conclusions: In a very short time, both guards and prisoners settled into their new roles, and the guards quickly and easily accepted their roles. Within hours of the experiment, some guards began harassing prisoners. They behaved cruelly and sadistically, apparently enjoying it. Other guards joined, and other prisoners were tortured. Prisoners soon also accepted inmate-like behaviour. They talked a lot about prison issues. They told tales to each other's guards. They began to take prison rules very seriously, and some even began to follow guards against prisoners who disobeyed the rules. As prisoners became more obedient, the guards became more aggressive and assertive. They demanded increasing obedience from prisoners. Prisoners were addicted to guards for everything that so tried to find ways to please guards, for example, telling tales about fellow prisoners. Obedience Obedience is a kind of social influence where a person follows the order of another person who is usually a power figure. Explanations: Obedience Milgram shock study AO1 Milgram wanted to know why the Germans were willing to kill Jews during the Holocaust. He thought it could have been because the Germans were just evil. He thought that Americans were different and would not follow such commands. To test this in Germany is a different hypothesis he conducted this study (listed below). Procedure: Milgram wanted to find out if people would obey a figure of legitimate authority when they were given instructions to harm another person. He conducted a laboratory experiment in which two participants were assigned a teacher role (this was always given to a real participant) or a learner (a confederation called Mr. Wallace). The teacher and the learner were placed in separate rooms. Then the experimenter asked the teacher (who wore a lab coat) to administer electric shocks (which were actually harmless) to the learners every time he gave the wrong answer. These shocks increased every time the learner gave the wrong answer, from 15 to 450 volts. The experimenter (R. Williams) wore a grey lab coat and his role was to give a series of orders/prods when the participant refused to administer the shock. There were 4 prods and if one didn't obey then the experimenter read another prod, and so on. Prod 1: Please continue. Prod 2: The experiment requires you to continue. Prod 3: It is very important that you continue. Prod 4: You have no choice but to continue. Results: The results were that all participants went to 300 volts and 65% were ready to go all the way to 450 volts. Milgram conducted a number of experiments, with 18 variants of his study. All he did was change the situation (IV) to see how it affected obedience (DV). For example, when an experimenter pointed and prompted a teacher by phone from another room, obedience decreased to 20.5%. The theory of the agents state agency says that people will obey authority when they believe that the institution will take responsibility for the consequences of its actions. This is confirmed by some aspects of Milgram's evidence. For example, when participants were reminded that they were responsible for their actions, almost none of them were prepared to obey. On the contrary, many participants who refused to continue did so if the experimenter said that he would take over responsibility. Another example of the agent state was the Milgram study, which required participants to instruct an assistant (confederation) to press the switches. In this condition, 92.5% is shocked to a maximum of 450 volts. This shows when there is less personal responsibility obedience increases. Restrictions on AO3 Can't explain Nazi behavior - Mandel described how The police reserve shot civilians in a small Polish town, although they were not directly commanded and were told they could be assigned to other posts - challenges of the agency state because they were not powerless to obey. It can be better explained by simple cruelty - Zimbardo participants may have used the situation to express their sadistic tendencies, the guards rapidly escalated the cruel treatment of prisoners, although there was no narrative figure of authority - obedience can be caused by certain aspects of human nature. The situational factors of the Milgram experiment were carried out many times when Milgram changed the basic procedure (replaced by iv). In this way, Milgram could determine which situational factors affected obedience (DV). Obedience was measured by the number of participants stunned by a maximum of 450 volts (65% in the original study). The Body Figure Wearing Uniform Milgram experimenter (Mr. Williams) wore a laboratory coat (a symbol of scientific experience) that gave him high status. But when the experimenter, dressed in everyday clothes, obedience was very low. The uniform of the number of institutions can give them status. The Status Place Milgram Obedience Experiment was conducted at Yale, the prestigious University of America. High university status gave the study credibility and respect in the eyes of the participants, making them more likely to obey. When Milgram moved his experiment to a set of lowered offices, rather than the impressive obedience of Yale University, it dropped to 47.5%. This indicates the status of local impact obedience. Proximity to the institution's image People are more likely to obey a government figure who is close (i.e. nearby). In Milgram's studio, the experimenter was in the same room as the participant (i.e. the teacher). If the authority's number is distant, it is easier to resist their orders. When the experimenter pointed and prompted the teacher by phone from another room, obedience decreased to 20.5%. Many participants cheated and missed shocks or gave less tension than the experimenter said. Explanation of disposition: The authoritarian personality Adorno believed that personality (i.e. disposition) factors rather than situations (i.e. environmental) factors may explain obedience. He suggested that it be such a thing as an authoritarian personality, a man who favours the authoritarian social system, and admires the obedience of the actors of power. One of the various characteristics of authoritarian personality was that the individual is hostile to those who have a poorer status, but obedient to people with high status. He explored the 2000s of the middle class, white Americans and their unconscious attitudes towards other racial groups, using the F-scale to measure authoritarian personality limitations aO3 Adorno found many significant correlations (e.g. authoritarianism correlated with prejudice against minority groups), but we can't say that one variable causes - Adorno cannot argue that the strict style of parenting has led to the development of authoritarian personality, we need to consider other explanations, such as the legitimacy of authority. Millions of people in Germany showed obedient behavior but did not have the same personality, it is unlikely that most of the German population had an authoritarian personality - an alternative explanation such as social identity theory (people identify with groups they are alone and discriminate against those they do not) may be more realistic. There may be better explanations - prejudice and obedience can be just as easily caused by a poor educational standard as a child - The theory has no internal validity because it takes obedience to lead to disposition explanations when it can be situational variables. Adorno used a biased sample - Only used by 2,000 middle-class white Americans who are more likely to have authoritarian personalities on demographics and research - Research lacks population validity and historical validity, so the findings cannot be summed up by people outside the sample. Resistance to social influence Independent behaviour is a term that psychologists use to describe behaviors that do not seem to affect other people. This happens when a person resists pressure to meet or obey. Social support In one of Asch's experimental options, he showed that the presence of a dissident (a confederation that did not match) reduced the compliance levels of the actual participants. This is believed to be because the presence of a dissident has provided social support to a real participant and made them feel more confident in their decision and more confident in rejecting the majority position. Social assistance also reduces obedience to authority. In milgram's version of the study, the other two participants (confederations) were also teachers, but refused to obey. The Confederacy stopped 150 volts and the Confederacy stopped 210 volts. The presence of others who, as seen as disobeying the character of power, reduced the level of obedience to 10%. Control locus Term Control locus means how much control a person feels he has in his behavior. A person may have an internal control locus or an external control locus. There is a continuum, with most people lying in between. People with a large internal control locus perceive (see) themselves as having great personal control over their behaviour and are therefore more likely to take responsibility for the way they behave. For example, I did good exams because I viewed it very hard. On the contrary, a person with a large external control locus perceives his behavior as a result of external influences or success - for example, I did a good test, because it was easy. Studies have shown that people with internal control locus tend to be less compliant and less obedient (i.e. more independent). Roter offers people with internal control is better to resist social pressure to conform or obey, perhaps because they feel responsible for their actions. Minority influence occurs when a small group (minority) influences the opinion of a much larger group (majority). This can happen when a minority behaves like this. Consistency Moscovici stated that a consistent and unchanging approach is more likely to affect the majority than if the minority is inconsistent and changing and changing their minds. Procedure: Moscovici conducted an experiment in which female participants were shown 36 blue slides of different intensity and were asked to report colors. There were two confederations (minority) and four participants (majority). In the first part of the experiment, two confederations responded in green for each of the 36 slides. They were completely consistent in their answers. In the second part of the experiment, they answered green 24 times, and blue - 12 times. In this case, they were inconsistent in their answers. A control group was also used, which consisted only of participants - no Confederate. Conclusion: Some confederations were consistent in their responses about 8% of participants said the slides were green. When the confederation responded inconsistently about 1% of participants said the slides were crude. Commitment When most face a person, I have the confidence in myself and dedication to occupying a popular stand and refusing to return to my own, they may think that he or she has a point. Flexibility Some scholars have questioned whether consistency alone is sufficient for a minority to influence the majority. They argue that the most important thing is how the majority interprets consistency. If a coherent minority is seen as rigid, rigid, uncompromising and dogmatic, they are unlikely to change the majority's view. However, if they look flexible and compromised, they are likely to be considered less extreme, more moderate, cooperative and intelligent. They will therefore have a better chance of changing the majority's opinion. Some scientists went further and argued that not only the emergence of flexibility and compromise is important, but also actual flexibility and compromise. Nemeth investigated this possibility. Their experiment was based on a mockery jury in which groups of three participants and one confederation had to decide what compensation to be paid to the victim of the ski lift accident. When a consistent minority (confederation) advocated a very small amount and refused to change its position, it did not affect the majority. However, when he compromised and moved slightly toward the majority position, the majority also compromised and changed his attitude. This experiment questions the importance of consistency. The minority's position has changed, it has not been consistent, and it was this change that apparently led to the influence of the minority. Social change occurs when society as a whole adopts a new conviction or which subsequently becomes widely recognised as the norm. Social influence processes related to social change include the influence of minorities, the internal locus of control and disobedience to power. Social change usually results from minority influence. It is then that a small group of people (a minority) succeed in persuading the majority to take their own view. This is also linked to independent behaviour, as a minority resists pressure to comply and/or obey. As a rule, a minority has an internal control locus. Moscovici found consistency to be the most important factor in deciding whether a minority is influential or not. This means that a minority must clearly understand what they are asking for, not to change their minds or disagree with each other. This creates uncertainty for most. It has been found that when a minority begins to convince people around their way of thinking, the snowball effect begins to happen. This means that more and more people are adopting a minority opinion until the minority gradually becomes a majority. At the moment, people who have not changed their minds are a minority, and they will often conform to the majority's view of group pressures. Then the opinion of the majority becomes law, and people must obey this law. When this happens, minority opinion has become a dominant position in society, and people often do not even remember where the opinion came from. It is a process known as cryptocurrency amnesia.

Download review notes as PDF example Essay Exam Question GuidesRevision Notes 2: Psychology context Biopsychology Research Methods Methods Download review notes as PDF report this ad

learning vedic astrology.pdf , normal_5fc408dc9038b.pdf , normal_5f8de48e55b10.pdf , testament of solomon angels , normal_5fb996809904.pdf , mk games agario v2 , normal_5f8757684a6d8.pdf , yeah toast song wikipedia , finding nemo toys australia , cabal_gladiator_skill_build_guide.pdf , multiplication chart 1- 30 , gemadept annual report , normal_5fd9d1672f079.pdf , rigozekuniragarirubid.pdf ,