|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **LT 4: Obedience: Milgram’s (1963) Research** | | |
| **Procedure** | | **Findings** |
| * Milgram recruited 40 male participants through a newspaper. The ad stated he was looking for participants for a study about memory. The pps were between 20-50 and their jobs ranged from unskilled to professional. They were offered $4.50 to take part. * Upon arrival for the experiment, there was a rigged draw for their role. A confederate, ‘Mr. Wallace’, always ended up as the ‘learner’ while the true pp was the ‘teacher’. There was also another ‘experimenter’ (another confederate) dressed in a lab coat, played by an actor. Pps were told they could leave the study at any time. * The learner was strapped to a chair in another room and wired with elctrodes. The teacher was required to give the learner an increasingly severe electric shock each time the learner made a mistake on a learning task (the task involved learning word pairs). * The shocks were demonstrated to the teacher. Thereafter, the shocks were not real. * The shock level started at 15 which was labelled as ‘slight shock’ on the machine, and rose through 30 levels to 450 volts which was labelled ‘danger – severe shock’. When the teacher got to 300 volts (‘intense shock’) the learner pounded on the wall and then gave no response to the next question. After the 315-volt shock the learner pounded on the wall again. After that, there was no further response from the learner. * When the ‘teacher’ turned to the ‘experimenter’ for guidance, the experimenter gave a standard instruction: ‘an absence of response should be treated as a wrong answer’. * If the ‘teacher felt unsure’ about continuing, the experimenter used a sequence of 4 standard ‘prods’ which were repeated if necessary:  1. Prod 1 = ‘please continue’ or ‘please go on’ 2. Prod 2 = ‘the experiment requires that you continue’ 3. Prod 3 = ‘it is absolutely essential that you continue’ 4. Prod 4 = ‘you have no other choice, you must go on’ | | * No pps stopped below 300 volts * 12.5% (5 participants) stopped at 300 volts (‘intense shock’) * 65% continued to the highest level of 450 volts (‘danger – severe shock’) * Qualitative data in the form of observations was also collected: there were signs of sweating, trembling stuttering, biting their lisp, groaning and digging their finger nails into their hands. * It was reported that 3 pps even had ‘full blown seizures’ * All pps were debriefed and assured that their behaviour was entirely normal. They were also sent a follow-up questionnaire; 84% reported that they felt glad to have participated.   *Prior to the study Milgram asked 14 psychology students to predict the pp’s behaviour. The students estimated that no more than 3% of the pps would continue to 450 volts. This shows that the findings were not expected.* |
| **Evaluation of Milgram’s Research** | | |
| **Demand Characteristics**  P: One issue with Milgram’s research into obedience is that it can be argued it may be subject to demand characteristics.  E: For example, it was stated by Orne and Holland (1968) that participants behaved the way they did because they didn’t really believe in the set up – they guessed it wasn’t real electric shocks. This was later backed up by Perry (2013) who listened to recordings of Milgram’s research and reported that many of them expressed doubts about the shocks.  E: This is an issue because if the participants were not convinced they were giving shocks and so only did it to go along with the research (i.e. showing demand characteristics) then Milgram’s internal validity is questioned, as he’s not actually measuring obedience.  L: Overall the credibility of Milgram’s research into obedience is thrown into question. | **High External Validity**  P: One strength of Milgram’s study is that, although it was conducted in a lab, it does have high external validity.  E: For example, Milgram explained that the central feature of this situation was the relationship between the authority figure (the experimenter) and the participant. Milgram argued that the lab environment accurately reflected wider authority relationships in real life.  E: This is a strength because the processes of obedience to authority that occurred in Milgram’s lab study can be generalised to other situations. For example, Hofling et al (1966) studied nurses on a hospital ward and found that levels of obedience to unjustified demands by doctors were very high (with 21 out of 22 nurses obeying). So Milgram’s findings do have something valuable to tell us about how obedience operates in real life.  L: Overall, this supportive research and explanation strengthen the external validity and the credibility of Milgram’s research. | **Ethical Issues**  P: One issue with Milgram’s research into obedience is that it breaches ethical issues.  E: For example, the research had an element of deception, as Milgram originally advertised for volunteers to take part in a study into memory, not into obedience (the real aim), the allocation of roles was fixed, and the electric shocks weren’t real.  E: This is an issue because the deception means that the participants were not fully aware of the true nature of the research, and leading the participants into thinking they were delivering potentially fatal shocks could have caused serious psychological distress (as noted previously) to the participants.  L: However, although these ethical issues were breached, In research such as this a cost-benefit analysis is crucial because we must consider that furthering our knowledge of how people obey authority could be considered more important than the breaching of some of these ethical issues. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **LT 5: Obedience: Situational Variables** | | |
| After Stanley Milgram conducted his first study on obedience, he carried out a large number of variations in order to consider the *situational variables* that might create greater or lesser obedience. | | |
| **Proximity**  In the original experiment the teacher and learner were in adjoining rooms, so the teacher could hear the learner but not see him. In the proximity variation they were in the same room. In this variation the obedience rate dropped from the baseline 65% to 45%.  In an even more dramatic version, the teacher had to physically force the learner’s hand onto an ‘electroshock plate’ when he refused to answer a questions. In this *touch proximity* condition, the obedience rate dropped further to 30%.  In the third proximity variation, the experimenter left the room and gave instructions via the phone. In this *remote instruction* condition time proximity was reduced. The outcome was a further reduction in obedience to 20.5%. The participants also frequently pretended to give shocks or gave weaker ones than they were ordered to.  **Location**  He conducted a variation of the study in a run-down building rather than the prestigious Yale University setting where it was originally conducted. In this situation the experimenter had less authority. Obedience fell to 47.5%.  **Uniform**  In the original study the experimenter wore a lab coat (a uniform). In this variation however, the experimenter was called away for an inconvenient phone call, and was replaced by an ‘ordinary member of the public’ (again, played by a confederate) who wore everyday clothes rather than a lab coat. The obedience rate dropped to 20% which was the lowest of the variations. | | |
| **Evaluation of Milgram’s Situational Variables** | | |
| **Empirical Support**  P: One strength of Milgram’s theory of situation variables is that there is supportive empirical evidence.  E: For example, Bickman’s (1974) field experiment had 3 confederates dressed in 3 different outfits – jacket and tie, a milkman’s outfit and a guard’s uniform. The confederates stood in the street and asked passers-by to perform tasks e.g. picking up litter. People were twice as likely obey the assistant dressed as a guard than the one dressed in a suit and tie.  E: This is a strength because it supports Milgram’s theory that a uniform conveys authority and is a situational factor that is likely to cause obedience.  L: Bickman’s research therefore increases the credibility of Milgram’s theory of situational factors. | **High Internal Validity**  P: One strength of Milgram’s variations is that it has high internal validity.  E: For example, he systematically altered one variable at a time (e.g. proximity) to see what effect that particular variable would have on the level of obedience. All the other variables were kept the same as the study was replicated.  E: This is a strength because by only changing one variable, you can draw accurate conclusion from any changes observed in the change in obedience rate and say that the variable you have manipulated must have been the influence because all other variables had been maintained and controlled for.  L: The high control therefore increases the internal validity of the variation experiments, which increases the credibility of Milgram’s theory of situational factors overall. | **Not Ethnocentric**  P: One strength of Milgram’s research is that it is not ethnocentric.  E: For example, there have been other pieces of research conducted in other cultures that are supportive of Milgram. Miranda et al (1981) found an obedience rate of over 90% amongst Spanish students.  E: This is a strength because it suggests that Milgram’s conclusions are not limited to American males, but are valid across cultures, and apply to females too. However, the majority of research has been carried out in western societies (which are culturally not that different from the USA) so it may be different in some places further from the similarities of America.  L: This therefore means that, overall, the credibility of Milgram’s variation research and theory of situational variables is increased. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **LT 1: Obedience: Key Concepts** | |
| **Authority** – A level of status or power |  |
| 1. **Obedience –** Following orders or commands from people in authority. It is a classic example of social influence because it describes situations in which we often do something we do not want to do. We will follow an order, instruction or command if we regard the person who gives it to us as a person who has **authority** over us. |  |
| 1. **Defiance** – Is the opposite of obedience. It refers to resisting orders or commands from people in authority. It is about deciding not to go along with an instruction and being your own person. You know it is not right to follow the order, so you don’t. | http://t0.gstatic.com/images?q=tbn:ANd9GcRHvCZM0CDYnU3R9dtxb6a9_1UNxzdN1rqi-OC5EAUnHQSS9D_vgofoUlAI:www.carlamaclachlan.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/10/no.jpg |
| 1. **Denial of Responsibility** – Blaming actions on a higher authority rather than accepting blame oneself. For example “I was only doing as I was told. It was not my fault something nasty happened.” It also consists of the idea of the ‘Agentic State’ – when a person feels that are acting out the wishes or orders of another person, they feel less responsible for their own actions than if they were following their own wishes. | It’s not my fault!  I was TOLD to do it! |

|  |
| --- |
| **Learning Table 2: Core Theory: Situational Factors** |
| This theory argues that obedience is mainly the result of factors in the **environment/situation**. |
| 1. **Effect of setting –** people may act obediently because of the physical environment (the place where they are.) E.g. in a doctors surgery or place of worship people behave appropriately according to the unspoken rules of the place. *For example* if an experiment is carried out in a prestigious University, the setting is professional and authoritative. |
| 1. **Effect of cultural setting** – different cultures may promote different levels of obedience.   *Collectivist cultures* – cultures promoting group welfare. People act for the good of society and therefore follow rules which may benefit society more than it benefits them as individuals. Many Eastern countries have collectivist cultures e.g. Japan.  *Individualist cultures* – cultures in which independence is encouraged. People’s priority is to strive for the achievement of personal goals. Many Western countries have individualistic cultures e.g. USA and UK. |
| 1. **Power of an authority figure with the power to punish disobedience** - people are more likely to obey when the person commanding has a great level of authority. With authority comes the power to punish. *For example* if a researcher wears a white lab coat, the perception of their authority increases. Also shown in countries with a dictator (a single, all powerful political leader) as the obedience levels are high. |
| 1. **Impact of consensus** (everybody agreeing/doing the same) – the presence and behaviour of other people can make obedience or defiance feel forced. Support from others can give people confidence to disobey an order that they do not agree with. |
| http://t0.gstatic.com/images?q=tbn:ANd9GcToSJS9ouNCzbGSo1dh5EQwooxMOzFo2Pm-SS5hvWpySeG5WNe7rT2k9pI:i.istockimg.com/file_thumbview_approve/10218066/2/stock-illustration-10218066-american-and-japanese-friendship-flag.jpghttp://t1.gstatic.com/images?q=tbn:ANd9GcS78pKS8pDcnSqqlFKFa468JQHJPiZj7KoO6uFIQFv1400IHWq4hGSK7ImJBg:upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/a/aa/Santhome_Basilica.jpg  http://t1.gstatic.com/images?q=tbn:ANd9GcQVztwnYx7zaxXSyb86_Tm2pnOt50qQdb6tCHfwUiDe2YsaS16O60bVFeU:www.jeubfamily.com/wp-content/uploads/conformity1.jpghttp://t3.gstatic.com/images?q=tbn:ANd9GcQdCWxhC7Eo_cXclNG0daA2336G8NKDgk7LrkIbS92u-FWCIGAULGtAqOrj:www.politicalcampaigningtips.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/argen2.jpg |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade** | | | **Criticisms of the Situational Factors** | | |
| **E GRADE ANSWER** | **C GRADE ANSWER** | **A GRADE ANSWER** | **Must Know** | **Must Know** | **Could Know** |
| **Lacks Ecological Validity** | **Ethical Issues** | **Reductionist** |
| P: A criticism of the theory of situational factors as an explanation of obedience is that a lot of the supporting research **lacks ecological validity**. | P: An issue with the theory of situational factors as an explanation of obedience is that there are **ethical issues with many of the supporting studies**. | P: A key criticism of the theory of situational factors is that it is **reductionist**. |
|  | E: For example, Milgram had control over such extraneous variables as the confederate (Mr Wallace) and even exactly what was said to each participant to encourage them to continue. Furthermore, the situation the participants were placed in, (giving electric shocks to a stranger to teach them to remember something) is **not very realistic at all**. | E: For example, Milgram breached the ethical issue of **deception** as participants were unaware that the shocks were not real. Furthermore, he made it extremely hard for participants to **withdraw** from the experience claiming ‘the experiment requires you to continue’ every time they protested. | E: This is because the theory **reduces the complex behaviour of obedience** down to a simple **factors present in the environment** (such as the prestigious setting or the presence of a powerful authority figure). |
| E: As a result, because the research used is conducted in a highly controlled, artificial environment (lab setting), the findings **cannot be generalised to a real life setting** because we cannot be sure that individuals would act similarly in the real world. | E: Although the theory of situational factors is based heavily upon unethical research, a **cost-benefit analysis** would have been conducted beforehand. This would be to establish if the potential costs (deceiving participants) would outweigh the benefits (in this case, finding out exactly why people obey). If they do not, the research would go ahead. | E: For example, it does not consider whether a person’s disposition (their personality) may have an impact on their obedient behaviour. |
|  | L: As a result this weakens situational factors as an explanation for obedience. | L: Therefore it can be said that the theory **provides valuable insight** into reasons why people obey as well as strongly supporting the situational theory of obedience. | L As a result, this **reduces the credibility** of the explanation because it cannot act as a full account. |
|  | | | http://t2.gstatic.com/images?q=tbn:ANd9GcTH-xzE_M4FUuZh0t6RXgQHFJ2f4HLq4c7Sz-ZbCam5iXuFduK-4amopTDJ:ecx.images-amazon.com/images/I/61waaR4IAlL._SL1456_.jpg | http://t3.gstatic.com/images?q=tbn:ANd9GcRVJVcfpaGndKXuY2HdtD3v30vffediLAm71ilQRcLBnfARO9zRpO87QhE:www.independent.co.uk/incoming/article9712887.ece/alternates/w620/Milgram.jpg | http://t1.gstatic.com/images?q=tbn:ANd9GcQpfEgCBTDlMRkSiGuZIuQkfkhi19k3hb8GOSGBgKjSk6NgVTM5DaydXyJH:www.mycareertopia.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/personality_test.bmp |

|  |
| --- |
| **Social Psychology: OBEDIENCE Learning table 4** |
| **DETAILS OF ALTERNATIVE THEORY: Theory of dispositional factors**  Another theory for explaining obedience suggests that situational factors are *irrelevant* and that obedience and defiance is dependent upon d**ispositional factors**. These are factors about a person themselves, their *personality traits*. This means that even if there was an opportunity to be disobedient, it would go against their nature.  **Authoritarian personality – (Adorno et al 1950)**  Someone with an authoritarian personality is more likely to be obedient, and also to be bigoted and prejudice.  Adorno et al (1950) designed the ‘F Scale’ which was used to measure an authoritarian personality. Responses to this scale showed that characteristics typical of an authoritarian personality included someone…   * who feels an active dislike for people from a lower social class * with fixed and conventional ideas of right and wrong, good and evil * who cannot deal with any ambiguity or uncertainty about the right way to behave * who is always willing to be ‘bossed’ by those of a higher status than themselves.   **Causes of Authoritarian Personality**  Adorno claimed that this authoritarian personality was **due to childhood experiences**. If a child had learnt to fear and obey authority due to dominating, strict parents the child may come to hate their parents. Adorno suggested that this hate is repressed by the child until later life when the it is displayed towards a minority group whom the person sees as deviant and bad, and therefore in need of punishment.  Description: http://3.bp.blogspot.com/_U00Re2PMivg/TAlFOLMn__I/AAAAAAAAAB4/8PYSfV2YuLM/s1600/strict-parents.jpg Description: http://www.yahalavoice.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/strict-parents.jpg fscale Description: http://www.collegescholarships.org/images/mla-vs-apa.jpg |

|  |
| --- |
| **Social Psychology: OBEDIENCE Learning table 3** |
| **AO1: DETAILS OF CORE STUDY OF OBEDIENCE: Bickman (1974)**  **Aim:** To investigate the effect of situational factors on obedience. |
| **Procedure:**   * Field experiment into obedience. * Bickman manipulated the appearance of three male experimenters who gave orders to 153 randomly occurring pedestrians on a street in New York (these were the participants.) * The three experimenters took turns dressing in each of the styles; * civilian (shirt and tie), * milkman * guard’s uniform (similar to a police officer’s.) * Experimenters gave one of the following orders to each passing pedestrian (pp.) * Picking up litter. Pointed to a bag on the ground and ordered ‘Pick up this bag for me.’ * Coin and parking meter. Nodded in the direction of a helper stood by a parking meter and said ‘This man is over parked at the meter but doesn’t have any change. Give him a dime.’ * Bus stop. Approached a person at the bus stop and said ‘Don’t you know you have to stand on the other side of the pole? This sign says “no standing.” |
| **Results:**   * People (pps) were nearly two to three times as likely to obey orders given by the experimenter dressed as a guard compared when dressed as civilian. * Coin and parking meter condition showed significant differences between obedience rates = 89% obeyed the guard, 57% obeyed the milkman, 33% obeyed the civilian. |
| **Conclusion:**  Bickman concluded that these results demonstrated that dress alone can suggest authority. When people think someone has authority to punish them, they are more likely to obey. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade** | | | **Criticisms of the Bickman’s Research** | | |
| **E GRADE ANSWER** | **C GRADE ANSWER** | **A GRADE ANSWER** | **Must Know** | **Must Know** | **Could Know** |
| **Low Internal Validity** | **Ethical Issues** | **Culturally Bias** |
| P: A criticism of Bickman’s study is that the research has **low internal validity**. | P: Bickman’s research can be criticised as being **unethical** for several reasons. | P: A weakness of Bickman’s study is that it is **culturally bias**. |
|  | E: This is because Bickman used a field experiment to investigate obedience which means there **was a lack of controls over extraneous variables**. | E: For example, it was **not possible to get fully informed consent** from participants before the experiment took place, furthermore they were **not debriefed**. In addition pps may have been caused embarrassment or distress by the orders and the pressure to obey in front of others (**psychological harm**). | E: This is because Bickman only conducted his research in **Brooklyn**, which is part of an **individualistic** culture. Other research suggests that individualistic cultures are less inclined to obey, which may have affected the results. |
| E: For example, the findings could have been influenced by variables such as the crowded street, noise or weather. People may have been more willing to give the experimenter a dime if it meant they could get out of the rain more quickly. | E: However, Bickman would have carried out **a cost-benefit analysis** before the research was conducted. If the costs (causing psychological harm to pps) outweighed the benefits; (establishing strong support for situational factors as an explanation of obedience) the research would not have been allowed to proceed. | E: This means that if the study was replicated in other cultures the results **may not be seen elsewhere.** Consequently, the results **cannot be generalised to other cultures.** |
|  | L: Therefore, this **casts doubt over the credibility** of Bickman’s research and reduces the overall support for situational factors as an explanation of obedience. | L: As a consequence, although Bickman’s study can be criticised on ethical grounds, it can be said to **provide valuable insight** in the power of situational factors as an explanation of obedience. | L: As a result, this **reduces the credibility** of Bickman’s study and **weakens the explanatory power** of Situational Factors as an explanation for Obedience as a whole. |
|  | | | IMG_2293 | http://t0.gstatic.com/images?q=tbn:ANd9GcQgodEQW-WseYLmYTSoh_quXioLZ6RxXsN43j5F4MZZLiOx1-FRNqa7gLs:associationsnow.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/06/0625_ethics-800x480.jpg | http://t2.gstatic.com/images?q=tbn:ANd9GcQmoeOe7nw5GdCqdaTfvnuEgOzE9gvUcaF_jJULDBCDg8MMmX1lrslocgI:www.free-printable-flags.com/american-flags/usa9.gif |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Social Psychology: OBEDIENCE Learning table 5** | |
| **APPLICATION OF RESEARCH INTO OBEDIENCE - Keeping order in institutions and situations.**  **Prisons** operate based on the findings from research into obedience. The findings can be applied to the prison system to provide methods for establishing and maintaining obedience amongst prisoners. | |
| 1. **Authority** - Prisons have a **hierarchy of authority** for their staff. Governors have the ultimate authority over staff and prisoners. There is also a potential hierarchy amongst prisoners in order to encourage obedience. For example, positions of responsibility, such as working in the prison kitchen, are achievable as rewards for being obedient. | http://mastersdust.com/triadmc-content/uploads/2011/05/respect-my-authority-300x196.jpg |
| solitary confinement | 1. **Punishment -**  Guards have the **power to punish** e.g solitary confinement; therefore prisoners are more likely to obey than if the guards had no powers. The hierarchy of staff authority also means that the punishments can increase. |
| 1. **Uniforms -** Guards wear them as it gives them automatic status and therefore power. Uniforms may also result in the **reduction of identity** which can make the person wearing the uniform feel less individual and therefore take less responsibility for their own actions. In the guard’s case, it may make giving orders to prisoners/locking them up easier, as the guards feel less personally responsible. HOWEVER in the case of the prisoners wearing a uniform it may mean they feel less personally responsible for their actions and therefore get more involved in disruptive and disobedient behaviour. | **http://t1.gstatic.com/images?q=tbn:ANd9GcRpvyIklJ7TbyybB5qI1MPjcLuLY02O9x1ZreXcCOqEbtNvwBT_vw** |
| http://t1.gstatic.com/images?q=tbn:ANd9GcQYVTyEn4tyI3OuzI_hkNqYmEgl_xeo6ppxNVo4qASkf4IGH5jcCoBiwtPa:coloring.thecolor.com/color/images/The-Lock-And-Key.gif | 1. **Consensus** - Prisoners are **not given to opportunity to ‘gang up’**. They are locked in cells and closely monitored during social times. This is to minimise the chance of consensus to disobey. |