

- 4 Evaluate the classic studies by Watson and Rayner (1920) and Raine et al. (1997) in how they could be used as a means of social control.

(16)

Watson and Rayner (1920) had an aim to see if it was possible to condition a phobia into a 11-month old baby (Little Albert), and afterwards remove the phobia (extinction). Little Albert was said to have been emotionless and 'had never cried' noted by the researchers. Firstly they introduced him to a white ~~cat~~^{mouse} and other items/animals resembling it, Little Albert did not have a fearful response to the NS (neutral stimulus). However when a iron bar was banged, Little Albert shouted and started crying, the iron bar banging was the UCS (unconditioned stimulus) and the crying to the iron rod was UCR (unconditioned response), when the researchers made the white mouse appear with the sound of the iron bar banging numerous times, this caused little Albert to be scared and cry ^(conditioned response) when the white mouse appeared (conditioned stimulus). Unfortunately Little Albert had died in his infant years so the phobia was not made extinct and it was not known how long his conditioning was active for.

Watson and Rayner's application for this study was to show that conditioning of this kind was possible and that it could be possible to help those suffering from a phobia to see the rational that there is nothing to be afraid of.



In the wrong hands this sort of conditioning could be damaging to young children, and maybe even society as a whole, this could be used to explain the negative views towards the Jews from the Nazis during the holocaust, as they may have been conditioned to perform negative actions to them.

Another issue of social control is ~~this~~ when this is used to control those with phobias and try to ~~the~~ the method of flooding (treatment for phobia) to try get rid of their phobia.

Raine et al (~~1997~~) (1997) holds the aim to see whether there are brain ~~abnormalities~~ abnormalities ^{between} ~~the~~ murderers and non-murderers. He did this by assembling a sample of around 21 murderers who ~~claim~~ claim NGR (not guilty by reason of insanity). Majority of these men suffer from schizophrenia and other psychiatric disorders. He compared PET (Positron Emission Tomography) scans of the murderers to the ~~21~~ 21 ~~murders~~ control participants (6 of who have schizophrenia). Results showed that there were brain abnormalities in the frontal cortex, specifically in the pre-frontal cortex, where it is ~~is~~ known to us to make our decision / risk assessment. Also abnormalities in the amygdala where we think about the consequences / long term ramifications of our actions.



On the issue of social control, Raine et al is not stating that these brain scans can prove who will become a murderer but he does state that it could be used as an early intervention tool to target children with troubled backgrounds to give extra support to their school to deter them away from alcohol / drug abuse.

In conclusion, it does seem that these studies intend to control our individual differences, more so with Raine et al with early intervention to tackle aggression levels in individuals who have individual differences but these experiments held valuable results / conclusions that could better our society and reduce the crime and phobia rate.

