For Live Classes, Recorded Lectures, Notes & Past Papers visit:
www.megalecture.com OALEVELNOTES.COM
AS Revision 101

1.4 Variations of the Milgram Experiment

Similar experiments to the 1963 Study of Obedience, conducted by Stanley Milgram

In Milgram's book, *Obedience to Authority: An Experimental View* (1974), he outlines 19 different variations of the original study of obedience, some of which were previously unreported. Each of the variations had one thing in common; they all led to a reduction in obedience. Some of the variations are listed below:

PROCEDURE	%age giving final 450V shock
Original study The subject would administer the shocks to a learner (actor) who earned the role of learner via a fixed lottery; if the teacher hesitated, the experimenter would actively encourage him to continue	**65%** (26/40)
Change in location The same experiment was carried out in a run-down office block, instead of the original location, which was Yale University. This was because Milgram suggested having the experiment carried out at such a well-respected University meant the subjects assumed whatever they were doing was fine	**41%** (19/40)
Learner's presence in the room In one variation, the learner was physically present in the room with the subject, so he had to watch the learner be shocked, and if he refused to touch the shock plate, the subject was told to hold the learner's hand down	**30%** (12/40)
Experimenter not present in the room In this variation, the experimenter was not in the same room as the teacher, and all communication between the teacher and experimenter was done via a telephone – however, the experimenter behaved in the same way as before	**23%** (9/40)
Increase the number of teachers Another experiment used three teachers, two of whom were actors, and so only one was the real subject. They would behave as though they were also being studied. The first acting teacher would drop out at 150V, the second at 210V), the third (real subject) was then free to drop out at any point	**10%** (4/40)
Conflicting experimenters In this variation, there were two experimenters present who would conflict with each other, this means they would argue over what was best to do next and would often give the teacher contradictory instructions	**0%** (0/40)

Mega Lecture

Evaluating the Variations

One of the strengths of the variations is its **strong controls**. This means that the studies are replicable and so reliability can be tested. Having strong controls means that there is a lack of bias, which allows you to draw more accurate conclusions about cause and effect.

Of course, the most important weakness to consider, which is similar to the original experiment, is how unethical the variations were. Again, there was a lot of deception involved in each experiment, and there is always a certain risk when dealing with subjects in such a way that could cause them distress, as finding out what the true nature of the experiment is might cause them.

Also, the **experimental validity** and **ecological validity** (and the **population validity**) are all questionable. The results can not necessarily be applied to the population as a whole, because throughout, it was essentially all people from the same categories used as subjects (20 – 40 year old men); although in one variation of the experiment all women were used instead of men. The results of that experiment were not significantly different from the original study, although women seemed to communicate higher experiences of stress than the men did.

youtube.com/c/MegaLecture/
+92 336 7801123
aspsychology101.wordpress.com