

Reliability – the study uses standardised procedures which can be replicated so the study achieves reliability. Milgram had also recorded his experiment so even today people are able to watch and agree with Milgram, so the study has a high inter-rater reliability

Application - The study demonstrates how obedience to authority works and this can be used to increase obedience in settings like schools, workplaces and prisons. The study also gives a better understanding of obedience so tragedies like WW2 could be prevented. For example, soldiers could be trained to report and refuse orders that would be war crimes.

Validity- Milgram's study has been criticised for lacking ecological validity because the task is artificial – in real life, teachers are not asked to deliver electric shocks to learners. However, the study probably was valid because the participants showed genuine distress, which shows they thought it was real.

Ethical issues - The main criticism is that participants' wellbeing was ignored: they were **deceived** (about the shocks) and did not give **informed consent** (they were told it was a memory test, not an obedience test). When they tried to **withdraw**, the "prods" made this difficult for them.

Preview from Notesale.co.uk
Page 4 of 26

BURGER 2009

AIM

The aim of the study was to replicate Milgram's findings and to see whether people would still obey today but under more ethical conditions

SAMPLE

There were 70 participants used and were a mixture of men and women. They were recruited through volunteering sampling and were randomly put into 2 conditions. Their ages ranged from 20-81

Burger had screened out volunteers if they had heard of Milgram's original experiment, or if they had studied psychology for more than 2 years.

PROCEDURE

Burger had employed a confederate just like Milgram had. He also had the experimenter administer a very mild 15V shock to the participants (with their consent) so they could see that the generator was real. The script resembles Milgram's but the test shock that the participant receives is only 15V rather than Milgram's painful 45V. The participant/teacher watches the learner being strapped into the electric chair and then sits at the shock generator in an adjacent room. The teacher reads out 25 multiple choice questions and the learner uses a buzzer to indicate the answer. If the answer is wrong, the experimenter directs the teacher to deliver a shock, starting at 15V and going up in 15V intervals.

The learner indicates he has a "slight heart condition" but the experimenter replies that the shocks are not harmful. At 75V the learner starts making sounds of pain. At 150V the learner cries that he wants to stop and complains about chest pains.

If the teacher moves to deliver the 165V shock, the experimenter stops the experiment.

In the "**model refusal**" condition, a second confederate pretends to be a second teacher. This teacher delivers the shocks, with the naïve participant watching. At 90V the confederate teacher turns to the naïve participant and says, "*I don't know about this.*" He refuses to go on and the experimenter tells the naïve participant to take over delivering the shocks.

RESULTS AND CONCLUSION

Burger found that 70% of the participants in the base condition were prepared to continue after 150 volts compared to 82.5% in Milgram's variation #5 which included the learner complaining about a heart condition.

Burger also compared men and women but didn't find a difference in obedience. Women were slightly less likely to obey in the "model refusal" condition but this was not statistically significant.

Burger concluded that when people ask whether the same results would be found today as Milgram found in 1963 and 1974 that answer is yes

STRENGTHS OF THE THEORY

There's a lot of research in support of Realistic Conflict, especially the "Robbers Cave" study and also a lot of attitude surveys like the Michigan National Election Studies.

Sherif's robbers cave experiment found that competition increases hostility between the two groups of 12-year-old boys.

The study is high in ecological validity as it is based on a summer camp and involves activities commonly carried out in these camps, which strengthens the results.

Sherif supports this as he also found a reduction in intergroup conflict as a result of the removal of competition. Therefore, RCT can be applied to real life by helping reduce prejudice between groups in society through the use of superordinate goals.

Preview from Notesale.co.uk
Page 16 of 26

SHERIF ET AL

AIM

To find out what factors make two groups develop hostile relationships and then to see how this hostility can be reduced. Specifically, to see if two groups of boys can be manipulated into conflict through competition and then conflict resolution by working together.

SAMPLE

The study has consisted of 22 participants which were 11 years old. They were selected through opportunity sampling.

The participants were split into 2 groups of 11 boys. One group was called the eagles and the other was called the rattlers.

PROCEDURE

The 2 groups were taken into a summer camp. Each group did not know about the existence of the other group. There were three stages of the study:

In-group formation – this was the formation of the two groups. Each group spent time bonding with each other by member only within the group. Each group had 4 tasks to accomplish

Friction phase – after the first week the two groups were told about one another and a tournament was set up with competitive activities. As soon as they heard about each other, the two groups became hostile. Adjectives and phrases were recorded to see if they were derogatory and behaviour was observed.

Integration phase – sheriff tried to bring the two groups together by introducing tasks which brought them together. Superordinate goals were introduced, and this led to the reduction of friction

RESULTS AND CONCLUSION

Friction phase – when the two groups first came into contact, there was some name-calling. When the eagles won the tournament, the rattlers stole their prizes

Integration phase – the groups had shared films and meals, which led to name calling and food fights. Each shared task led to reduced hostility and increase co-operation.

Sheriff concluded that prejudice will occur in a situation merely where two groups are created – this supports social identity theory. Sheriffs study also supports the idea that competition may also be a factor resulting in prejudice.