

QuizletPlus

Describe and evaluate Bowlby's theory of maternal deprivation (16 marks)

Bowlby's 44 thieves study

44 teen criminals were studied accused of stealing
Parents were also interviewed to see if there was any prolonged separation from child
Control group of non criminals interviewed to see how often prolonged separation occurred

Results

14/44 were Affectionless psychopaths and 12 experienced prolonged separation from mother through critical period
Control group 2/44 had maternal separation

Outline and evaluate two explanations of resistance to social influence (16)

Resistance to social influence refers to the ability of people to withstand the social pressures to conform to the majority or obey authority and this is influenced by both situational and dispositional factors. The two explanations are social support and locus of control.

Social support refers to the presence of people to resist pressures to obey or conform as they act as a model to help others do the same. Pressure to conform is reduced if there are other people who are not conforming. Asch research shows that the dissenter does not have to give the right answer, but they allow others to follow their own conscience, acting as a 'model'. But Asch shown that this is not long-term, as if the dissenter starts to conform with the group again, so will the participant. In Milgram's variation, obedience dropped to 10% from 65%, when disobedient confederates were introduced, acting as a model for others to copy.

Locus of control refers to an individual's perception about the underlying main causes of events in their lives. Those with an internal locus of control have a high level of personal control, take responsibility for their own actions, are achievement orientated and resist pressure from others. Those with an external locus of control believe life is determined by external factors such as fate and luck, are more influenced by others and do not take responsibility over decisions. Most people are placed on a continuum scale between internal and external, most people aren't purely just internal or external. Those with a high internal locus of control will more likely resist pressures to conform or obey as they are more self-assured and take responsibility, so they are more likely to base decisions on their own beliefs

A strength is that there is research support which supports the idea that social support leads to resistance of social influence. For example: When Asch introduced a dissenter who gave the correct answer on the lines test, conformity decreased from 30% to 5%. This is a strength as it shows that social support is significant in bringing about independent behaviour and reducing social influence. Therefore, this increases the validity of social support as an explanation.

A limitation is that not all research supports the link between LOC and resistance. Twenge et al, found that over time, Americans have become more resistant to obedience, but have also become more external in their locus of control. This contradicts and opposes the suggestion that having an internal locus of control leads to resistance, as we would expect the Americans to be more internal. This reduces the validity of LOC as an explanation for resistance, but the results may be due to the changing nature of society, where things become increasingly outside of our personal control.

A strength is that there is research evidence to support the role of dissenting peers in resisting conformity. Allen and Levie found independence increased in an Asch like study even when the dissenter wore thick glasses and stated he had poor vision (he couldn't judge the line lengths accurately). This shows that resistance is not motivated by what someone says but enables someone to be free from pressure of conformity by a group and is supportive of the idea that social support decreases conformity levels and leads to more independent behaviour. This increases the reliability of the explanation as there is evidence to prove it.