Milgram 1963:

AO1

- **Experiment**
  - 40 male volunteer participants told study was punishment on learning (really obedience study)
  - Real participant and 2 confederates, one experimenter (authority figure) and one learner.
  - Real participant told he must increase electric shock to learner each time he got question wrong
  - At 300 (fake) volts learner pounded on wall then didn’t respond to next question
  - If real participant stops, experimenter says prods e.g. ‘it’s essential you continue’ or ‘you have no choice, you must continue’

- **Results**
  - Predictions were that 4% would go to 300 volts and 1 in 1000 would go to 450 volts
  - 65% continued to 450 volts (max voltage), all participants went to 300 volts and 12.5% stopped at 300 volts

- **Conclusions**
  - People surprisingly obedient to authority, even if task is brutal

Variations of study (to see which effect on obedience):

- Proximity of victim, when in same room, obedience dropped from 65% to 40%, when teacher pushed learner’s hand on shock plate obedience dropped to 30%
- Proximity of authority figure, when experimenter left room and gave order over telephone, obedience dropped from 65% to 21%
- Presence of allies, when confederate teachers with you back out of study almost all real participants back out too, only 10% do max voltage
- Increasing teacher’s discretion, when teacher chose voltage levels, 5% gave max voltage, 95% stopped giving shocks when learner protested
- If experiment moves from Yale uni to run-down office obedience dropped from 65% to 48%

AO2

- **Strengths**
  - Lab experiment, high control over EV’s so cause and effect can be proved.
  - Easily replicated

- **Weaknesses**
  - Ethical issues
    - Deception, didn’t tell participants true aim of study, Milgram argued that without deception study would be pointless
    - Right to withdraw, participants didn’t feel like they had right to withdraw as they were told that they must continue
    - Baumrind, said Milgram caused psychological harm. Milgram argued that 84% were glad to have participated, 74% learnt personal importance.

- Lab experiment, lacks ecological validity
- Orne and Holland, said participants would distrust experimenter because they know true purpose of study is disguised e.g. if learner cries in pain, experimenter doesn’t react so teacher may think learner isn’t in real harm
- Holfing et al, tested obedience in real life setting. Dr Smith told nurses to give 20mg of Astrotene over the phone even though this was not allowed. 21/22 obeyed.
- Volunteers, participants more motivated, lacks population validity

Why people obey:

AO1

- Gradual commitment, participants already started giving shocks so hard to resist increasing shocks.
- Difficult to change mind after starting
- Agentic shift, person shifts from agentic state (sees themselves as an agent carrying out someone’s wises) and autonomous state (sees themselves acting upon their own)
- Legitimate authority, authority figure is obeyed because we respect them and we assume they know what they are doing
- Role of buffers, teacher can’t see effects of electric shocks on learner

AO2

- Monocausal emphasis, focuses on obedience but not other factors e.g. anti-semitism
- Agentic shift, holocaust perpetrators did their duties over months, Milgram’s participants experienced ½ an hour in a lab. Men killed Jews, Milgram’s participants gave shocks.
- Consequences of obedience alibi, Mandel suggests obedience had role in holocaust, takes blame off war criminals which is distressing for those affected
Resisting pressure to conform:

AO1
- Support from other non-conformist gives people confidence to reject majority
- Allen and Levine, in one condition one dissenter had glasses (poor vision) so invalid social support, in another condition one dissenter had good vision so valid social support. Both conditions reduced conformity compared to no dissenter (no social support)

AO2
- Hornsey et al, found little movement towards majority when there was moral significance e.g. cheating
- Griskevicius et al, found women conform more as they seek partners they think others want, men want women more unique

Resisting pressures to obey:

AO1
- When study moved from Yale to run-down office obedience dropped
- Obedience dropped when you see the consequences of your actions and you have social support

AO2
- Philosopher Lawrence Kohlberg, found that people who based judgement on moral principles were less obedient
- Less educated, Protestants less likely to conform than well-educated, Catholics

Locus of control:

AO1
- Person’s view of personal control over behaviour.
- High internal believe their behaviour caused by person’s decisions.
- High external believe behaviour caused by external influences, luck or fate.

AO2
- Twenge et al, meta-analysis, more external locus of control scores in students/children from 1960-2002.
- Externality correlated with poor education and depression
- Rotter, high internal people are more successful

Conditions for social change through minority influence:

AO1
- Drawing attention to issue – suffragettes used political, educational tactics to draw attention to inequality
- Role of conflict – majority experience conflict between suffragettes. Some deemed them as troublemakers, others leaned towards their beliefs
- Consistency – fought for 15 years, even when jailed
- Augmentation principle – suffragettes willing to suffer to prove point.

AO2
- Minority lack social power and are seen deviant so majority avoid deviant minority so they aren’t seen as deviant too

Abnormality

Definitions of Abnormality:

Deviation from Social Norms

AO1
- Social norms – Explicit (written set of laws) and implicit (unwritten norms) rules about acceptable behaviour set by social groups e.g. commit crimes they are abnormal because break explicit rules, wear abnormal clothes they are abnormal because break implicit rules
- If go against social norms, they are deviant
- Deviant behaviour – Behaviour considered anti-social/undesirable by society. It may be unpredictable and cause observer discomfort.