

Social Psychology:

Lewin (1939): Leadership Style and Resulting Behavior (including how group identity impacts behavior)

Experiment: 3 groups of boys: 3 types of leaders

- Autocratic leaders: make all decisions for the group
- Laissez Faire leaders: allow complete freedom with little guidance
- Democratic leaders: actively encouraged and assisted group decision making

Leadership Styles: Findings—3 groups, 3 types of leaders

- Autocratic—worked hardest when watched, most hostile/aggressive
- Laissez Faire—least productive, poorest quality
- Democratic—highest motivation, most original, most playful, most praise

Conclusion: leadership style and social situation created differences, not individual personalities!

Implications for parenting?

Conform—change behavior to match others (self initiated) Good or bad? It depends
2 types—

- informational (use others when unsure + want to be right),
- normative (copy others to fit in (want to be accepted))

Asch (1955):

Findings: 70% side with wrong atleast once

Effect inc with group size

As long as one dissents—effect stops

Answer in private—reduces but does not stop

Recent studies—still powerful

More likely: ambiguous task, attractive group, low status

Male vs Female?—depends on the situation

Milgram (1963) Obedience:

Obedience: change behavior at a command of authority figure (again, not necessarily bad)

Experiment: “teacher” shocks “learner” for mistakes to see if punishment increases learning, but really looking at obedience.

Findings: 2/3 went all the way!

Extremely difficult for most to disobey authority—even if it goes against own values

Conclusion: Obedience is part of basic human condition brought out by situations

There are some qualifying circumstances...

Contributing factors:

All of these increase obedience:

- Authority claims responsibility

- Demands escalate gradually
- Authority close
- Authority appears legitimate/prestigious
- Victim out of sight
- See others obeying—no role model for disobeying

Zimbardo—Stanford Prison (1970s):

Experiment—would random assignment to roles create behavior differences?

Study on conformity to social roles....
(prisoners and guards)

Situational cues were powerful...

Findings: Even with equal chance at group placement...nice boys became brutal guards, healthy kids got sick (extreme stress reactions), active became passive and zombie like, all participants easily lost all perspective!

When situations end, people may return back to “regular” behavior

Ethical Concerns:

- Serious ethical concerns have been raised
 - Re: Milgram + Zimbardo studies
- Unlikely you could do either today, standards and procedures have changed

Compliance:

Change behavior at the request of another (due to direct social pressure)

Many techniques identified that increase compliance

-different ones work for different reasons

Don't always work but generally pretty powerful!

Compliance Tactics—special techniques used to get people to say yes! Tactics grouped by principle they target (why work):

1. Some work because of peoples **need for consistency** (aka commitment)
 - More likely to say yes 2nd time if you already said yes the 1st time
 - Example: Foot in the door
 - Ask small then larger (more agree if than started with larger)
 - Lowball
 - Reveal hidden “cost” after agree
2. Some work because of peoples **need for reciprocity**
 - Most like to give when they get
 - Goal: get them to give more than they get
 - Examples: Gifting
 - Free samples
 - Door in the face
 - No to 1st big thing increases chance you say yes to smaller thing
3. Some work because of how people **react to scarcity**

- Called reactance
 - I want it more if you say I cant have it (don't like freedom taken)
 - Examples: limit 6, while they last (deadline)