SOCIAL INFLUENCE
EVALUATING
ASCH
SMITH AND BOND
CULTURE
1952-1994 STUDIES
ANALYSED
SAME PROCEDURE AS ASCH.
133 IN 17 COUNTRIES
US INDIVIDUALISTS
UK
JAPAN COLLECTIVISTS
FIJI.
CHANGE OVER TIME 2ND PART
97/133 US STUDIES
CONFORMITY COLLECTIVISTS RESULTS
SINCE ASCH 1950 LOWER IN US.
CONSISTENT
LARGER MAJORITY
MORE FEMALE
MORE AMBIGUOUS STIMULI
OVERSIMPLIFIED
NEED MORE DETAIL.
CULTURAL DIFFERENCE
LIMITATIONS
VAGUELY THROUGH.
OF TASK
MEANINGFULNESS
SPORTS CLUB
TEST
WITH PEOPLE
YOU KNOW.
WERE TRICKED.
IMPACT
ANTISEMITISM
NOT FATAL LINE MEDIUM IMPORTANCE
LOW VALIDITY
MORE
(1958) WILLIAMS & SOLOMON
DECEPTION
ETHICS.
VALIDITY.
UNDERSTANDING
LACK OF
CONTROL
REAL-WORLD
STUCK TO THEIR GUNS.
INDEPENDANT.
PARTICIPANTS
213'S
CRITISMS
STUDY 'CHILD OF IT'S TIME'
UNIQUE
CULTURALLY
USA-1950's, ANTI-COMMUNIST
SCARED TO BE DIF.?
PERRIN & SPENCER (1980)
REPEATED ENGLAND 70's.
I CONFORM IN 396 TRIALS
BUT IN JAIL HIGH.
ASCH EFFECT
UNPREDICTABLE PHENOMENON
TYPES
COMPLIANCE
AGREE
GAIN APPROVAL
AVOID DISAPPROVAL
INTERNALISATION
AGREE
ACCEPT THEIR VIEW
MATCHES OWN.
IDENTIFICATION
AGREE
ACCEPT THEIR VIEW
DOES YOU WANT TO BE LIKE THEM
ASCH (1956)
'VISION TEST'
123 MALE US.
PLACED
CONFEDERATES 12/18
GIVE WRONG ANSWER
ONLY 4 P's
DIDN'T CONFORM AT ALL.
IN 12 TRIALS 36.8%
INCORRECT
CONFORMED
WHY?
1) DISTORTION OF PERCEPTION BELIEVED WRONG.
2) DISTORTION OF JUDGEMENT DOUBT.
3) DISTORTION OF ACTION AVOID DISAPPROVAL
VARIATIONS
LINE LENGTHS CLOSER ↑ CONFORMITY
MAJORITY SIZE
LUCAS (2006)
SELF-EFFICACY ↑ MORE INDEPENDANT
3 PEOPLE
SITUATION
INDIVIDUAL
1 OR 2
30% CONFORMED STOPS THERE.
NOT MUCH
META-ANALYSIS 145 STUDIES
WOMEN MORE COMPLIANT
THAN MEN.
MORE INTERPERSWITL
LESS CONFIDENT.
INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES
ENGEL & CARLI (2011)
MAJOR INFLUENCE
CONFORMITY
NORMATIVE SOCIAL INFLUENCE
INFORMATIVE SOCIAL INFLUENCE
COMPLIANCE
PEOPLE
EVALUATE
GENUINELY BELIEVE THAT'S
EVALUATION
INTERNALISATION
MUST LIKEWISE WHEN
SITUATION UNCLEAR
CRITICAL OF ACTION
EXPRESS
UNCONFRONTABLE DEVIATING
LOW INTERDEPENDENT FRIENDS
EQUALLY INFLUENCED
DEUTSCH & GERARD (1955)
WHY?
SOCIAL IMPACT THEORY
LATANE (81)
EXPLAINS
PEOPLE PRESENT NUMBER
INDIVIDUAL IMPACT STRENGTH
ONE PERSON
IMMEDIACY
MANY.
SEDUCED (%) SUPPORT
CONSOLIDATION
LISTERING &
CORRELATION
CONTINUING OVERESTIMATE
REAL-WORLD
MANY RAPED
14 MILL KILLED
MASSACRE IN CHINA 1937
OTHERWISE JAPAN
GROUP IMMEDIACY.
MOSCOVICI'S (1969)
CONVERSION
KEY FACTOR CONSISTENCY
WERE TRICKED. INFLUENCED UNDERSTANDING OF
CONTROL
REAL-WORLD
MINORITY INFLUENCE CONFORMITY
2 CONFEDS
4 REAL P's.
6 WOMEN IN EACH 32 GROUPS PROCEDURE
8.42%. AGREED P's FINDINGS
AT LEAST ONCE SAME MORE 32%.
CONSISTENT-INCONSISTENT WHEN CONVERTED
1.25%. CONFORMITY
MORE INFLUENCE MAJORITY
THINK OTHERS WILL BE THINKING SAME.
PEOPLE BELIEVE
WASTE OF TIME. MINORITY
CHALLENGED
MAJORITY (1974) EVALUATING
MORE PRIVATE OUTGROUP
PUBLIC INFLUENCE-INGROUP
CAN LEAD TO INTERNALISATION
MORE INSIGHTS
MORE THOUGHT
ANTI-MAJORITY-MINORITY
DON'T PREVIOUS
OBSERVED
REJECTED.
MAJORITY (1994) RESEARCH
SUPPORT
CONSISTENCE MOST
ADULT MINORITY MAJORITY
THEY'RE INFLUENCE.
ETHICS
VALIDITY
IN REALITY (MINORITY INFLUENCE)
TAINTED & REVOKED
MAASS (2006)
DISCUSSION
CONFIRM
ACCEPTABLE P's TOLD ATTEND
STRESS CAUSED:
FEAR.
JURY VOTE
95%.
INFLUENCED