OCR GCSE PSYCHOLOGY OUTLINE

Unit 1 (1hr 30)

• Criminal Psychology
• Development
• Psychological Problems
• Research Methods

Both Unit 1 and 2 Papers are out of a total of 90 marks, each paper making up 50% of your final grade. All 4 topics will be included in any order with section C including a 13 mark question and section D consisting of research methods on both papers.

For each topic (except research methods) you need to know; key concepts, core theory (and study) and alternative theory (and study) and applications to the real world.

Unit 2 (1hr 30)

• Social Influence
• Memory
• Sleep and Dreaming
• Research Methods
Key Concepts

- Conformity including majority influence.
- Collective and crowd behaviour including pro-social and anti-social behaviour.
- Obedience including obeying the orders of authority figures.

Theories/Explanations

Situational factors:

The effect of situational factors (other people and social) on behaviours:

- majority influence on conformity
- collective and crowd behaviour, including deindividuation
- culture on pro-social and anti-social behaviour
- authority figures on obedience
- criticisms of the effect of situational factors, including the freewill/determinism debate.

Situational Factors Research Study – Bickman (1974): study into obedience and the social power of a uniform.

Dispositional factors:

The effect of dispositional factors (personality) on behaviours:

- self-esteem on conformity
- locus of control in crowds
- morality on pro-social and anti-social behaviour
- the authoritarian personality on obedience
- the influence of the brain in dispositional factors, including; hippocampal volume in self-esteem; and regions of the pre-frontal cortex in morality
- criticisms of the effect of dispositional factors

Dispositional Factors Research Study – NatCen (2011): study into the August riots in England with reference to anti-social collective behaviour and dispositional factors. (Note: candidates only need to be familiar with the events in Tottenham.)

Applications

Techniques used for recall

- How minority influence affects social change in relation to changing attitudes and behaviour towards, increasing awareness of, and reducing mental health stigma and discrimination.
- How majority influence affects social change in relation to changing attitudes and behaviour towards, increasing awareness of, and reducing mental health stigma and discrimination.
**Learning Objectives**

- Conformity including majority influence.

What is meant by ‘social influence’?

What is majority influence?

Think of a time when you have changed your behaviour to fit in with a group

Why do we conform?

- 
- 
- 

**Types of conformity**

- 
- 
-
Learning Objectives

- Collective and crowd behaviour including pro-social and anti-social behaviour.

Collective Behaviour; the behaviour of two or more individuals who are acting together or collectively

Crowd behaviour- a group of people who have come together for a common purpose

What is the difference?

Examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collective Behaviour</th>
<th>Crowd Behaviour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Going to a zombie movie with friends, even though you wanted to see the Rom Com.</td>
<td>Joining a political rally at university to reduce the price of tuition fees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting the same tattoo as David Beckham.</td>
<td>Using the same fork as the person next to you in a posh restaurant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wearing school uniform.</td>
<td>Dancing in a night club.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is anti-social behaviour? (link to crime unit)
What is pro-social behaviour?

Note: Not all collective or crowd behaviour has to be anti-social. Whether or not you behave anti-socially in a group may depend on the culture you come from.
Learning Objectives

- Obedience including obeying the orders of authority figures.

When a teacher says to you ‘Do this now please’, how do you react? Why do you obey? Or disobey?

What is meant by ‘obedience’?

Match up the key concepts and their definitions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Influence</th>
<th>Yielding to group pressure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conformity</td>
<td>Acts that go against society and harms it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowd Behaviour</td>
<td>Acts that benefits society and its members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Behaviour</td>
<td>A group come together for a common purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-social behaviour</td>
<td>2 or more individuals acting together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-social behaviour</td>
<td>Following orders from a perceived authority figure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obedience</td>
<td>A group who tries to influence others to conform</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Check your understanding:

1. Why is it important that people obey?
2. What is the difference between crowd and collective behaviour?
3. What is the definition of conformity?
4. What is the difference between conformity and obedience?
Core Theory – Theory of Situational Factors

What is a situational factor?

..........................................................................................................................................................................................
Milgram (1963)

The aim of Milgram’s (1963) experiment was to find out whether people would obey orders from an authority figure to give electric shocks to another person.

The participants were 40 males who volunteered to participate in a study of memory and learning at Yale University. They were deceived (lied to) about the true aim of the study as Milgram really wanted to study obedience.

Each participant turned up to the laboratory alone and was asked by an experimenter in a grey lab coat choose a slip of paper from a hat which decided the role he would play: teacher or learner. The draw was rigged so the participant was always the teacher and Mr Wallace (a man pretending to be a participant known as a confederate) was always the learner.

The learner was strapped into an ‘electric chair’ by the experimenter. The participant (teacher) was told by the experimenter that the chair was attached to the shock generator in the next room. The participant (teacher) then heard the experimenter tell the learner ‘although the shocks can be extremely painful, they cause no permanent tissue damage’.

Milgram’s pretend ‘shock generator’ looked very realistic. It had 30 switches which ranged from 15 to 450 volts.

The participant (teacher) was then seated in the next room in front of the shock generator. He was asked by the experimenter to read a series of word pairs to the learner e.g. apple – kite. The learner was asked to learn these pairs. The participant (teacher) then tested the learner by giving him one of the words in a pair along with four other words. E.g. “Was kite followed by A) Apple, B) Banana C) Club or D) Dog?” The learner had to indicate which of the four words had originally been paired with the first word by pressing one of four switches (A, B, C or D).

If the answer was correct the participant (teacher) had to move onto the next word on the list. If the answer was wrong the participant had to tell the learner the correct answer and then give the learner an electric shock by pressing a switch on the generator. For every incorrect answer the participant was required to move one switch up the scale of shocks (15 volts higher than the voltage of the last shock delivered). The shocks went all the way up to 450 volts.
If the participant asked advice from the experimenter, the experimenter would say “please continue” or “the experiment requires that you continue”. These sentences were known as verbal prods because they prodded the participant to go on.

All 40 participants obeyed the experimenter and delivered shocks up to 300 volts. 26 of the 40 participants (65%) delivered shocks up to the maximum 450 volts. This is enough to kill a person 3 times over. Milgram was surprised at the level of obedience shown by the participants.

During the study many participants showed signs of nervousness and tension. Participants sweated, trembled, stuttered, bit their lips, groaned and dug fingernails into their flesh. 14 out of 40 participants showed nervous laughter. Full-blown uncontrollable seizures were observed for three participants.

**Variations of Milgram’s research**

**What is setting?**

**How did changing the setting affect Milgram’s results?**

**What is culture?**
How did changing the culture affect Milgram’s results?

Power of an authority figure

What is authority?

Another variation of Milgram’s research a different assistant was used to give orders to the real participants. This time, the assistant was presented as another participant (no lab coat). What affect did this have?

What is consensus?

How did changing the group size affect Milgram’s results?

Learning Objectives
The effect of situational factors (other people and social) on behaviours:

• majority influence on conformity
• collective and crowd behaviour, including deindividuation
Situational factors are factors which are external (e.g. other people or conditions) which will influence how likely we are to conform or obey.

We have already seen majority influence in our key concepts, it suggests that the majority can influence people to conform. In some cases, people will outwardly change their behaviour or views to fit in with the group, whilst possibly keeping their own personal opinion privately (normative). In other cases, they will actually change their personal views as well maybe trusting the understanding of the majority (informational).

This diagram helps explain the difference between normative and informational conformity.

![Diagram of Informational and Normative Social Influence](image)

**TASK!**

Identify the type of majority influence in these scenarios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Normative or Informational?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agreeing with your friends that panic at the disco is so last year! But your still going to the tour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You don't watch football but bought a England shirt during the world cup</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following google maps even though its not how you normally get there</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stopping smoking as the doctor tells you it is bad for you!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stopping smoking because your favourite band is straight edge!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher tells you that the earth is round</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thinking back to the Asch study (see website) how could his findings be explained using:

**Normative influence**

Another type of conformity introduced in the key concepts section was crowd and collective behaviour.

**How did Le Bon explain crowd behaviour?**

Reicher (1984) suggests a different view – a crowd are members of the same culture and so act in unison. He looked at the 1980 St Pauls riots.

Watch Reicher (1984) Video

Although Rioters attacked police cars they left other cars alone and helped other traffic pass unharmed, they didn't damage property around them.

They saw themselves and passers by as part of the 'In-group' but attacked the police as they were the 'Out-group' – Them against Us.

**Define In-group**

**Example**

**Define Out-group**
What is meant by deindividuation?

Deindividuation can occur when an individual becomes part of a crowd and diffuses self-responsibility to the unbridled action of a mob with no morals.

Gustav Le Bon (1895)

Deindividuation = Removed from being an individual

Le Bon’s definition links to ‘Mob-mentality’ violence stems from the assumption there will be no consequences – the student London riots are a good example of this.

Deindividuation in real-life

Mann (1981) investigated 21 cases of people who threatened to jump and commit suicide where a crowd was present.

In 10 cases the crowd baited or jeered – this was almost always when it was dark or the crowd was far away from the jumper

This behaviour can be explained by the feeling of anonymity and therefore Deindividuation.

Check your understanding;

1. How many people do you need in a group in order to make people comply?
2. According to Asch, what reduces the rate of conformity?
3. Why did the participants comply in Asch’s study?
4. What is the difference between in-group and anti-group?
5. Why might a crowd turn violent?
6. What is meant by deindividuation?
7. How could someone become deindividuated?
Learning Objectives

The effect of situational factors (other people and social) on behaviours:
- culture on pro-social and anti-social behaviour

When considering cultural differences, psychologists often look at the difference between collectivist and individualist cultures.

**Individualist culture**

**Collectivist culture**
Culture and Pro-social behaviour
Researchers tend to measure pro-social behaviour in children by looking how they help with the family chores and look after other members of the family. As such, children in collectivist cultures tend to be viewed as demonstrating more pro-social behaviour.

- Whiting and Whiting (1975) naturalistic observation of children 3-11 in different cultures. The most pro-social children were from Kenya, 100% altruism demonstrated compared to 8% of American children. Other studies have found similar results – collectivist children are more ‘helpful’ compared to individualistic children.
- Tower (1997) Russian children more likely to chose resources that benefited others compared to UK children who chose resources that benefited themselves.

What does this research show about the influence of culture on pro-social behaviour?

Culture and Anti-social behaviour

- The 2010 Gallup World Poll found that countries such as Mexico with high income inequality – few rich and many poor report some of the highest anti-social behaviour. Countries with higher levels of income report high levels of pro-social.
- A study in 2015 showed countries with lower income lead to behaviours such as fighting, bullying, lying, stealing and vandalism.

What does this research show about the influence of culture on anti-social behaviour?

Check your understanding;
1. Children in which cultures are more likely to demonstrate pro-social behaviour?
2. Children in which cultures are less likely to demonstrate pro-social behaviour?
3. Identify a key cultural influence on anti-social behaviour and explain why it can lead to criminal acts like vandalism.
Learning Objectives
The effect of situational factors (other people and social) on behaviours:
- authority figures on obedience

During WW2 psychologists wanted to see why so many people obeyed Hitler, many thought that there was something inherently wrong with the Germans.
Re-read the Milgram study on pages 12-14.

Milgram believed there were a number of situational factors that influenced participants to obey in his research including;

- 
- 
- 
- 

Agency theory
This is where the individual moves from being in a autonomous state – where they feel responsible for their own actions to an agentic state which is where they individual doesn't feel responsible for their actions as they are acting under the orders of authority figure.
How can we use agency theory to explain Milgram's study?

Further research; Hofling et al (1966): An experimental study in the Nurse-Doctor relationship

- Real life study of obedience.
- A staff nurse on night duty would be telephoned by somebody claiming to be a doctor responsible for a particular patient.
- The nurse was asked to administer a dose of a drug which was twice the maximum allowed. The label stated very clearly that this was dangerous.
- Ninety-five per cent (21/22) of the nurses measured out the medication and were about to administer it to the patient when a hidden observer stopped them.
- It's expected that a nurse follows order from a doctor.

Can you give another example of agentic state in real-life?

Charismatic Leaders; another theory as to why people obey authority figures is down to the leader themselves (think Hitler).

- House et al suggest that charismatic personally of leaders allows them to create a special bond with their followers and this allows them to exert power.
- This can lead them to be idolised by followers and be seen as almost superhuman.

Check your understanding:
1. What leads to participants being more willing to obey?
2. What is the difference between an agentic and autonomous state?
3. According to Milgram, why do people obey authority figures?
4. What have researchers found is correlated with anti-social behaviour?
5. Explain what is meant by being in an agentic state?
Learning Objectives
- criticisms of the effect of situational factors, including the freewill/ determinism debate.

Situational Factors Research Study
Bickman (1974): study into obedience and the social power of a uniform.

Experiment 1
Aim and Method: Bickman’s study was a field _________ (RIEMEXPET) designed to investigate the effect of uniform on _________ (ODIENBECE). It was a field experiment because it took place in a real world setting (the high street) rather than a laboratory.
Sample: Participants in the study were 153 people on the high street in Brooklyn, _______ _________ (NWE YRKO). They were not aware that they were part of a psychological study.

Procedure: There were 3 experimenters in the study. Each took turns at dressing in 3 different _________ (FITOUST). There was a civilian outfit (sports coat and tie), a milkman’s uniform and a guard’s uniform.

On the street an experimenter would approach a participant and give them an order. 3 different _________ (DERORS) were used:

1. “Pick up this _____ (GBA) for me” – whilst the experimenter pointed at litter

2. “The man is overparked at the meter but doesn’t have any change – give him a dime” – the experimenter nodded at a _____ (ANM) stood by the parking meter (who was secretly part of the experiment)

3. “Don’t you know you have to stand at the other side of the pole? This sign says no standing” – the experimenter told the person at the _______ _________ (UBS SOPT)

Note that each participant was only given _____ (OEN) order.

The experimenters then recorded whether the participants were obedient or not in each situation. Participants were said to be _________ (OENEDIBT) if they...

• Picked up the bag
• Gave the man a dime (coin)
• Moved to the other side of the _______ (OLPE) at the bus stop

Questions on

What did they find out?

Bickman found that people were 2-3 times more likely to obey orders given by an experimenter dressed as a guard than an experimenter dressed as a civilian.

When told to give a coin to the man at the meter: 89% of participants instructed by the guard obeyed, 57% of participants instructed by the milkman obeyed and 33% of participants instructed by the civilian obeyed.

Task; Draw a Graph to Show Amount of Obedience in the Coin and Parking Meter Situation
Experiment 2
Also a ______ (FELDI) experiment, in Brooklyn. ____ Adult pedestrians with an estimated average age of ______. The dime and meter orders were used from experiment 1.
There were 2 independent variables;
• Level of authority – Guard and civilian
• Surveillance and Non-surveillance. In surveillance the experimenter remained next to the participant whilst in the non-surveillance they gave the order and then walked away out of view.

Results of Experiment 2
Surveillance had no effect on whether the participant obeyed or not. The guard was obeyed more than the civilian (as in experiment 1).

Experiment 3A
A questionnaire with _____ college students with ___ different scenerios including the three from the original study, were perceived as legitimate requests by either a young man, milkman or guard.

Results of Experiment 3A
Of the three original scenarios, the guard was not perceived as more legitimate than the other uniforms. This suggests that participants did not think the experimenters uniforms made their requests any more legitimate. Some of the new scenarios were seen as more legitimate than others.
Experiment 3B
Another questionnaire with _____ different college students. Participants predicted what they and people would do in one of the scenarios from experiment 1.

Results of Experiment 3B
Participants didn’t think the guard would have more social power in these situations, compared to the milkman or the civilian.

Conclusion
Bickman concluded that uniform does have an effect on obedience. People are more likely to obey people wearing uniforms which suggest they are authority figures (i.e. the guard) than those wearing less authoritative (powerful) uniforms (i.e. the milkman) or no uniforms (i.e. the civilian). How people think they would behave in a situation is not a good predictor of true behaviour. Furthermore, the results support a situational explanation for obedience because they show that level of obedience is affected by the dress of the person giving the order. This is a situational factor.

Evaluation
Check your understanding:

1. What was the sampling method used by Bickman et al?
2. Where did the study take place?
3. Which ‘uniform’ were the participants most likely to obey?
4. Which ‘uniform’ were the participants least likely to obey?
5. What were the three situations in Experiment 1?
6. How did the results of Experiment 3A differ from Experiment 1?
7. How could the sampling method used by Bickman et al be improved?
8. How could ethics be improved in Bickman et al?
Learning Objectives
The effect of dispositional factors (personality) on behaviours:

• self-esteem on conformity
• locus of control in crowds
• morality on pro-social and anti-social behaviour

Dispositional factors are factors which focus on the effect of the individual differences and personality on whether a person obeys or not.

One study replicated Asch's experiment and found those who conformed were more likely to have low Self-esteem. Another study showed female pps two different clips of a crime, if they one had low self-esteem they were more likely to agree with the other person's viewpoint.

According to this research, What is the link between self-esteem and conformity?

Cordelia has high self-esteem and is group leader for a school project, she has decided to use red for a poster they have to do. Willow who is also part of the group thinks red is the wrong colour however she has low self-esteem.

Explain why Willow is more likely to conform to Cordelia (4)

Take Locus of control Quiz on the website.
What type of locus of control do you have?

Internal LOC – These people believe that they have the ability to control their decisions any success and familiar is due to their choices. They tend to be more confident and motivated.
External LOC - These people believe that they have very little or no control over their own lives. They tend to be passive and accepting of what fate has in store for them. Do you agree or disagree with the quiz? why/why not?

Locus of Control and Crowds
You can have a mixture of LoC (at home ILoC then at school ELoC) and it can changed over your life time. If you are in a protest and it starts to get violent who do you think are more or less likely to join in the violent ILoC or ELoC? Why?

Ted was made redundant from work as the company had to shut down some of its offices. 12 other people were also made redundant. Lisa was also made redundant. Ted was sad but felt that he had enough skills to look for something else and felt that it could be a new opportunity. Lisa was also sad and felt that bad things always happened to her and it was just her luck that she was one of the ones let go.
Using Locus of Control explain why Ted and Lisa had such difference experiences of the same event.

Morality = understanding what is right and wrong in how e think and behave. It includes being honest truthful and respectful for your own actions
Kohlberg (1968), used a Longitudinal study – studies boys up to the age of 12 to develop a stage theory of moral development there are 3 levels which have 2 stages in each:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Conventional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Conventional**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 3:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 4:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Post-Conventional**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 5:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 6:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Have a look at your stages – which level do you think anti social behaviour more likely and which level do you think pro-social behaviour is more likely?

Georgia’s friends try to persuade her to skip school and go into town with them but she refuses as she is worried that she will get in a lot of trouble.

**What level of morality is she in?**

Charlie meets a child refugee when returning from a holiday in France. He knows that it is against the law to bring the child into the country but the child is living in a dangerous environment, with no one to protect him but he has family in the UK. Charlie decided that helping the child is more important than obeying the law.

**What level of morality is he in?**
Mohammed is asked by Thomas, another boy in the class, to tell the teacher that he was with him at lunchtime, to give Thomas an alibi because he was actually spraying graffiti in the boys toilets at the time. Mohammed agrees because he is often in trouble himself and hopes that Thomas will do the same for him sometime.

What level of morality is he in?

Some research to back it up!
Langdon et al – suggest anti-social behaviour is more likely in stage 2 as it is egocentric so the focus is on what is best for the individual where as in stage 3 this is more likely to be pro-social as its what is best for others.

Other researchers have found that young offenders in prisons for violent crimes had a lower moral reasoning (so didn't move through all the stages)

Learning Objectives
The effect of dispositional factors (personality) on behaviours:
- the authoritarian personality on obedience
- the influence of the brain in dispositional factors, including; hippocampal volume in self-esteem; and regions of the pre-frontal cortex in morality

Label the pre-frontal cortex;
A Case study of 2 people who suffered brain damage of the prefrontal cortex as babies grew up not understanding the difference between right and wrong. They had similar personality traits to psychopaths.

What's a weakness of case studies?

Label the hippocampus;

Hippocampus is linked to emotion and ability to control stress, a positive correlation has been found between self esteem and brain matter. People with low self-esteem tend to have reduced amount of grey matter in the hippocampus.

What is a weakness with correlations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Agree or disagree?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One of the most important things is that children should learn is obedience for authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All children need strict discipline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All children should learn respect for authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some professional in society, such as business people, are much more important than others, such as artists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you have a problem it is best not to think about it. You should just keep busy with other more cheerful things.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If people chatted less and worked more, everyone in society would be better off</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If people commit serious crimes, such as rape or attacks on children, prison isn't enough they should be whipped or hung</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many of the problems society faces today would be solved if we could</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
somehow get rid of less intelligent members.

Homosexuals should be considered in the same category as criminals and be punished

If you are not taught manners early, you can hardly expect to mix with decent people later on in life.

No of agrees:
No of disagrees:
Do you have an authoritarian personality?

Adorno (1950) – wanted to explain the Nazis. He came up with the authoritarian personality type measure by a questionnaire called the F-scale (fascism).

People with this type of personality;
- They see the world in ‘black and white’
- Blind obedience to authority
- Prejudice against those who are inferior (particularly the lower class)
- Very conformist

Adorno found those who scored highly on the F-scale often had very strict and rigid upbringing (mostly by the father). Saw the father as powerful and were unable to express negative feelings directly towards him so displaced onto those weaker. Milgram retested his eclectic shock experiment and found that those who were obedient scored highly on the F-scale compared to those who had been defiant.

Check your understanding;
1. According to Adorno, why are people with an authoritarian personality more likely to obey?
2. Why is having a low self-esteem going to make you more likely to conform?
3. What is the difference between an internal and an external locus of control?
4. How are people with an internal locus of control more likely to behave in a crowd situation?
5. What is the link between morality and pro-social behaviour?
Learning Objectives

- criticisms of the effect of dispositional factors
Dispositional Factors Research Study

NatCen (2011): study into the August riots in England with reference to anti-social collective behaviour and dispositional factors. (Note: candidates only need to be familiar with the events in Tottenham.)

Background
The riots and disturbances began in Tottenham in North London on Saturday 6 August 2011 following a peaceful protest in response to the police handling of the shooting of Mark Duggan. Rioting spread in London from 6-11th August 2011.

Aim
To study/report on the August 2011 riots including the extent and nature of youth involvement.

Hypothesis
Morrell et al wanted to know why young people got involved in the riots, there were no specific hypothesis but the report was broken down into the following sections:

• What occurred in Tottenham based on police, media and eyewitness reports.
• Who was involved
• Why and how young people were involved.

Method
This report was prepared for the cabinet office by Morrell et al on behalf of the National Centre for Social Research (NatCen).

Sample
In Tottenham, 36 participants were interviewed.
The sample comprised an even split between over and under 18yr olds. There was a diversity of gender, ethnicity and work status although the vast majority were still in education.

Procedure
• Data was gathered only five weeks after the riots had taken place.
• The researchers were careful to gain ful informed consent from participants. They were reassured of confidentiality and anonymity. Researchers agreed not to report criminal activity taken during the riots but explained they would have to report details of any future potential future criminality.
• Participants were interviewed individually or in groups (2 or 4) as some participants felt more comfortable in a group situation.
Community stakeholders and participants from the areas unaffected by the riots were interviewed in focus groups.

**TASK!**

Create a timeline for the events on August 6th 2011.

---

**Results**

The interview data proposed that a wide range of different people were involved, including a mixture of age groups, ethnicities and people who were employed, unemployed or still in education/training.

The researchers used the data to create different categories of involvement in the riots. Some young people were involved in more than one activity, e.g., some were both rioters and looters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Watchers; young people who were present during the incidents and observed what happened but did not personally become involved in the criminal activity.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rioters; young people who were actually involved in violent disturbances and vandalism.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

32
Looters; young people involved in breaking into shops, stealing from broken in shops or stealing goods that had been left on the streets.

Non-involved; young people who did not take part or observe.

Key motivators for getting involved in the rioting and looting were found to be; benefiting from an exciting experience, having the opportunity to acquire items without paying, either to keep or sell on for profit; and getting back at the police. The young people identified different factors that influenced their involvement in the riots:

Nudge factors: things that encouraged them to get involved.
Tug factors: things that discouraged them from getting involved.

In both nudge and tug factors, there were a range of situational and dispositional factors involved.

Dispositional factors affecting decision-making in young people

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nudge</th>
<th>Tug</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other factors affecting the decision making in young people

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nudge</th>
<th>Tug</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of results
- It was a day like no other for the young people involved. Normal rules did not seem to apply, leading to atypical behaviour.
- Decisions about whether to get involved were based on what the young people thought was right or wrong and whether they thought the benefits outweighed the risks.

Conclusions
Anti-social criminal behaviour is influenced by:
- Collective behaviour/group processes
- Dispositional/individual factors
- What young people believe is right and wrong
- An individual's assessment of the risks and benefits of involvement.

Evaluation

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Check your understanding:

1. What was the specific incident that was thought to have sparked the riots in Tottenham?
2. How long did the riot in Tottenham last?
3. Who were the main people involved in the rioting?
4. Which dispositional factors explain why people got involved in the riots?
5. Which dispositional factors explain why people did not get involved in the riots?
Applications
Social Change

Learning Objectives

• How minority influence affects social change in relation to changing attitudes and behaviour towards, increasing awareness of, and reducing mental health stigma and discrimination.
• How majority influence affects social change in relation to changing attitudes and behaviour towards, increasing awareness of, and reducing mental health stigma and discrimination.

Minority influence is where a small group of people can change the opinion and belief of larger groups. Some may think that this is unlikely but history is full of the minority changing the majority and this often leads to social change for example the suffragettes.

In 1995, Moscovici looked at what minorities needed to be powerful.
1. The message must be consistent – it cannot change.
2. Minority must be committed to the cause.
3. Argument must be persuasive. For example, having a charismatic representative for the campaign.

Charities have particularly used this idea and often used celebrities to spearhead campaigns.

Awareness of and reducing mental health stigma and discrimination

In 2016, members of the royal family spearheaded Heads Together. Harry spoke about the depression after his mother died, to encourage young people to talk about their mental health. Time to change go into schools to discuss stigma and mental health and train young people to become leaders to support other students by becoming role models for other children in challenging discrimination.

Explain how snowballing works to spread minority influence

Majority Influence could help to change the view of the minority discriminatory view by trying to get them to conform to the group norm and internalise the beliefs.

Awareness of and reducing mental health stigma and discrimination
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In 2014 they launched a national campaign called ‘Time to Talk’ which is getting people to talk about mental health. In 2017 over 29,000 conversations were logged showing the campaign was having a significant impact. The National Attitudes to Mental Illness survey first done in 1993 showed that in 2011 around 2 million people had improved attitudes towards mental illness.

Language - One way is to stop using stigmatised vocabulary – if the majority stop using it then the minority often follow as we often want to be in the in-group.

Another way is to reduce the stigma would be to treat mental health as a physical problem, if someone has been off with a broken arm groups often make an effort to ensure that they are included when they are back at school, the same should be done for mental illness.

How could we use majority influence in school to improve understanding of mental health stigma and discrimination?
EXAM FOCUS

1. Explain the difference between pro-social behaviour and anti-social behaviour. (3 marks)

Family Influence
Bindiya’s family expect to have a say in who she marries. She would rather be able to make the decision independently, but instead goes along with her family’s decisions.

2. Using your knowledge of situational factors, explain why Bindiya allows her family to influence who she marries. (4 marks)

3. Describe the brain’s influence on dispositional factors related to social influence. (4 marks)

4. Describe and evaluate the effect of two dispositional factors on social behaviour. (8 marks)

5. Use your knowledge and understanding from across the psychology course to explain how far you agree with the following viewpoint:

‘It is more valid to study behaviour using natural situations rather than situations which have been set up.’

In your answer, refer to the Natcen (2011) study into the August riots in England, and at least one other study from psychology. (13 marks)