

Psychology

Learning in Place, Phase II

April 6-10, 20-24



Name: _____

School: _____

Teacher: _____

Psychology (PSYCH) Learning in Place, Phase II

April 6-10

✓	Task	Text	Write
	Describe the development of social psychology.	Passage 1	1. Create a timeline of key people and events in the development of social psychology.
	What did Bandura's Bobo Doll experiment tell us about social learning theory?	Passage 2	<p>2. Write a paper that analyzes the hypothesis and predictions, experiment, and conclusions of Bandura's Bobo Doll experiment. In the paper, be sure to answer the following questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Which, if any, of the four predictions would you have agreed with based on your understanding and experience with social psychology? Why? b. Evaluate the samples and variables used in the experiment – do they seem reliable? Why or why not? c. What do the result tell us, or not tell us, about social behavior? d. Why might it be controversial to repeat this experiment today? <p>This paper should be at least 1 page, if typed, 12 point font, double-spaced, and no more than 2 pages. If handwritten, this paper should be at least 2 pages in length, single-spaced, and no more than 4 pages.</p>

April 20-24

✓	Task	Text	Write
	What did Milgram's Shock experiment tell us about obedience?	Passage 3	<p>1. Write a paper that analyzes the hypothesis and predictions, experiment, and conclusions of Milgram's shock experiment. In the paper, be sure to answer the following questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. What historical event(s) led to Milgram's desire to test obedience? b. What hypotheses was Milgram aiming to test? c. Evaluate the samples and variables used in this experiment – do they seem reliable? Why or why not? d. What are the major criticisms of the Milgram experiment? e. Do you believe this experiment is ethical? Could it be replicated today? Why or why not? f. If the experiment were replicated today, would you expect similar results? Why or why not? <p>This paper should be at least 2 pages, if typed, 12 point font, double-spaced, and no more than 3 pages. If handwritten, this paper should be at least 4 pages in length, single-spaced, and no more than 6 pages.</p>

History of Social Psychology

Early Influences

Aristotle believed that humans were naturally sociable, a necessity which allows us to live together (an individual centered approach), whilst Plato felt that the state controlled the individual and encouraged social responsibility through social context (a socio-centered approach).

Hegel (1770–1831) introduced the concept that society has inevitable links with the development of the social mind. This led to the idea of a group mind, important in the study of social psychology.

Lazarus & Steinthal wrote about Anglo-European influences in 1860. “Volkerpsychologie” emerged, which focused on the idea of a collective mind. It emphasized the notion that personality develops because of cultural and community influences, especially through language, which is both a social product of the community as well as a means of encouraging particular social thought in the individual. Therefore Wundt (1900–1920) encouraged the methodological study of language and its influence on the social being.

Early Texts

Texts focusing on social psychology first emerged at the start of the 20th century. The first notable book in English was published by McDougall in 1908 (*An Introduction to Social Psychology*), which included chapters on emotion and sentiment, morality, character and religion, quite different to those incorporated in the field today.

He believed that social behavior was innate/instinctive and therefore individual, hence his choice of topics. This belief is not the principle upheld in modern social psychology, however.

Allport’s work (1924) underpins current thinking to a greater degree, as he acknowledged that social behaviour results from interactions between people. He also took a methodological approach, discussing actual research and emphasizing that the field was one of a “science ... which studies the behavior of the individual in so far as his behavior stimulates other individuals, or is itself a reaction to this behavior” (1942: p. 12). His book also dealt with topics still evident today, such as emotion, conformity and the effects of an audience on others.

Murchison (1935) published The first handbook on social psychology was published by Murchison in 1935. Murphy & Murphy (1931/37) produced a book summarizing the findings of 1,000 studies in social psychology. A text by Klineberg (1940) looked at the interaction between social context and personality development by the 1950s a number of texts were available on the subject.

Early Experiments

There is some disagreement about the first true experiment, but the following are certainly among some of the most important. Triplett (1898) applied the experimental method to investigate the performance of cyclists and schoolchildren on how the presence of others influences overall performance – thus how individual's are affected and behave in the social context.

By 1935 the study of social norms had developed, looking at how individuals behave according to the rules of society. This was conducted by Sherif (1935).

Lewin et al. then began experimental research into leadership and group processes by 1939, looking at effective work ethics under different styles of leadership.

Later Developments

Much of the key research in social psychology developed following World War II, when people became interested in the behavior of individuals when grouped together and in social situations. Key studies were carried out in several areas.

Some studies focused on how attitudes are formed, changed by the social context and measured to ascertain whether change has occurred. Amongst some of the most famous work in social psychology is that on obedience conducted by Milgram in his “electric shock” study, which looked at the role an authority figure plays in shaping behavior. Similarly, Zimbardo's prison simulation notably demonstrated conformity to given roles in the social world.

Wider topics then began to emerge, such as social perception, aggression, relationships, decision making, pro social behavior and attribution, many of which are central to today's topics.

Thus the growth years of social psychology occurred during the decades following the 1940s.

Passage 2

Bandura's Bobo Doll Experiment

Martyn Shuttleworth

The Bobo Doll Experiment was performed in 1961 by Albert Bandura, to try and add credence to his belief that all human behavior was learned, through social imitation and copying, rather than inherited through genetic factors.

These findings are still debated about over 40 years later.

In the modern world, there are many concerns about the effect of social influences on the development and growth of a child's personality and morality. Television, computer games, food additives, music and the lack of role models are all cited as reasons for a supposed breakdown in society, and an increased tendency towards violence.

These concerns have existed for many years, even before the media turned these factors into sensationalist stories, to try and sell more newspapers. During the 1960's, there was a lot of concern and debate about whether a child's development was down to genetics, environmental factors or social learning from others around them.

For this purpose, Bandura designed the Bobo Doll Experiment to try and prove that children would copy an adult role model's behavior. He wanted to show, by using aggressive and non-aggressive actors, that a child would tend to imitate and learn from the behavior of a trusted adult.

The Bobo doll is an inflatable toy about five feet tall, designed to spring back upright when knocked over.

Children were chosen as subjects for the study, because they have less social conditioning; they have also had less instruction and teaching of the rules of society than adult subjects.

Hypotheses and Predictions

Bandura had a number of predictions about the outcomes of the Bobo Doll Experiment, fitting with his views on the theories of social learning.

1. Children witnessing an adult role model behaving in an overly aggressive manner would be likely to replicate similar behavior themselves, even if the adult was not present.

2. Subjects who had observed a non-aggressive adult would be the least likely to show violent tendencies, even if the adult was not present. They would be even less likely to exhibit this type of aggression than the control group of children, who had seen no role model at all.
3. Bandura believed that children would be much more likely to copy the behavior of a role model of the same sex. He wanted to show that it was much easier for a child to identify and interact with an adult of the same gender.
4. The final prediction was that male children would tend to be more aggressive than female children, because society has always tolerated and advocated violent behavior in men more than women.

Setting Up the Experiment

For the Bobo Doll Experiment, Bandura selected a number of children from the local Stanford Nursery School, varying in age from 3 to 6 years, with the average age being 4 years and 4 months.

To test the prediction that boys would be more prone to aggression than girls, he picked 36 subjects of each sex.

The control group, which would not see an adult role model at all, consisted of 24 children, 12 boys and 12 girls.

The second group, which would be exposed to an adult showing aggressive tendencies, was similarly made up of 24 children of either sex. Both of the resulting groups of 12 were further divided; half would be tested with a female role model, half with a male role model.

The third group was structured in exactly the same way as the second, the only difference being that they would be exposed to a passive adult.

For the Bobo Doll Experiment, it was necessary to pre-select and sort the children, to try and ensure that there was an even spread of personality types across the test groups; some subjects already known to be more aggressive in personality than others.

For this, one of the teachers from the nursery worked with the experimenter, to rate each child's personality and attempt to construct well balanced groups.

It must also be noted that each subject was tested alone and individually, to ensure that the effects and reactions of their classmates would bear no influence on the final results or findings of the experiment.

The Bobo Doll Experiment proper began by placing one of the children from the test groups in a room with an adult. The subject sat in one corner of the room, with a few appealing toys to play with, such as potato prints and sticker activities.

The adult sat in the other corner of the room, with a few toys, as well as a Bobo doll and mallet. The child was not permitted to play or interact with these toys.

For the children in group two, after one minute of playing with the toys, the adult would begin to verbally and physically attack the doll for a period of 10 minutes.

For the third group tested, the adult would sit quietly and play peacefully with the toys for ten minutes.

The control group, of course, sat in the room for ten minutes with no adult present.

The next stage of the Bobo Doll Experiment was to take the subject into another room, which was filled with interesting toys. The child was not permitted to play with these toys, being told that they were reserved for other children to play with. This was intended to build up the levels of frustration within the subject.

The child was then taken into yet another room filled with interesting toys, some of an aggressive type, some non-aggressive; the room also contained the Bobo doll and the mallet. The subject was watched through a one-way mirror, and a number of types of behavior were assessed.

The first factor measured was physical aggression, consisting of hitting the doll with the mallet or punching, kicking or sitting on the doll. Verbal aggression was also assessed, whether it was general abuse or an imitation of phrases used by the adult role-model.

The third measurement was the amount of times the mallet was used to display other forms of aggression than hitting the doll. The final behaviors studied were modes of aggression, shown by the subject, which were not direct imitations of the role-model's behavior.



Results

The results for the Bobo Doll Experiment showed, as expected by prediction one, that children who were exposed to the aggressive model were more likely to show imitative aggressive behavior themselves.

Prediction four was proved correct in that boys were nearly three times more likely to replicate physically violent behavior than girls.

The measurements for verbally aggressive behavior again showed that children exposed to aggressive role models were more likely to imitate this behavior. The levels of verbal aggression expressed were about the same for boys and girls.

Subjects in the Bobo Doll Experiment exposed to the non-aggressive model, or no model at all, showed little imitative aggressive behavior. This finding partially proved prediction two, with children exposed to a passive role model showing less imitative aggression.

However, the results did not fully prove this prediction, as there was no discernible difference in the imitative aggression levels between groups one and three.

Male subjects exposed to non-aggressive role models were less likely to use the mallet to hit the Bobo doll. Strangely, male subjects placed with non-aggressive female models were more likely to use the mallet than the control group.

Conclusion

The findings of the Bobo Doll Experiment proved to be a little inconclusive with most of the predictions not being fully proved.

It is not certain that children learn socially, but it is likely that children observing an adult model utilizing violence are more likely to believe that this type of behavior is normal. They may, therefore, be more likely to use this type of action themselves when confronted by similar situations.

Bandura found that girls were much less likely to be physically violent, but were equally as prone to verbal aggression as boys. This is something often encountered in society, where bullying at school, by boys, is more often of a physical nature; intimidation amongst girls tends to be more verbal and social.

There were a few criticisms of the experiment; the Bobo doll springs back upright when it is hit and there is a strong possibility that the children saw it as a game rather than anything else.

There was a follow up experiment, in 1963, which used the same methodology but showed the subjects violence via video; this had a much less defined response than the initial experiment. Another refinement of the Bobo Doll Experiment, in 1965, tried to establish the effects of rewarding or punishing bad and violent behavior. Children, who witnessed the model being punished for aggressive behavior, were much less likely to follow suit. Interestingly, there was no change in aggression when the model was rewarded for bad behavior.

Passage 3

Milgram's Experiments and the Perils of Obedience

By

Kendra Cherry

If an authority figure ordered you to deliver a 400-volt electrical shock to another person, would you follow orders? Most people would answer with an adamant "no." However, the Milgram obedience experiment aimed to prove otherwise.

During the 1960s, Yale University psychologist Stanley Milgram conducted a series of obedience experiments that led to some surprising results. These results offer a compelling and disturbing look at the power of authority and obedience.

More recent investigations cast doubt on some of the implications of Milgram's findings and even question the results and procedures themselves. Despite its problems, the study has, without question, significantly impacted psychology.

What Were the Milgram Experiments?

"The social psychology of this century reveals a major lesson: often it is not so much the kind of person a man is as the kind of situation in which he finds himself that determines how he will act." - Stanley Milgram, 1974

Milgram started his experiments in 1961, shortly after the trial of the World War II criminal Adolph Eichmann had begun. Eichmann's defense that he was merely following instructions when he ordered the deaths of millions of Jews roused Milgram's interest.

In his 1974 book *"Obedience to Authority,"* Milgram posed the question, "Could it be that Eichmann and his million accomplices in the Holocaust were just following orders? Could we call them all accomplices?"

An Experiment of Shocking Proportions

The participants in the most famous variation of the Milgram experiment were 40 men recruited using newspaper ads. In exchange for their participation, each person was paid \$4.50.

Milgram developed an intimidating shock generator, with shock levels starting at 30 volts and increasing in 15-volt increments all the way up to 450 volts. The many switches were labeled with terms including "slight shock," "moderate shock" and "danger: severe shock." The final two switches were labeled simply with an ominous "XXX."

Each participant took the role of a "teacher" who would then deliver a shock to the "student" whenever an incorrect answer was given. While the participant believed that he was delivering real shocks to the student, the "student" was a confederate in the experiment who was simply pretending to be shocked.

As the experiment progressed, the participant would hear the learner plead to be released or even complain about a heart condition. Once they reached the 300-volt level, the learner would bang on the wall and demand to be released. Beyond this point, the learner became completely silent and refused to answer any more questions. The experimenter then instructed the participant to treat this silence as an incorrect response and deliver a further shock.

Most participants asked the experimenter whether they should continue. The experimenter issued a series of commands to prod the participant along:

1. "Please continue."
2. "The experiment requires that you continue."
3. "It is absolutely essential that you continue."
4. "You have no other choice; you must go on."

Did the Majority Deliver the Maximum Shock?

The measure of obedience was the level of shock that the participant was willing to deliver. How far do you think most participants were willing to go?

When Milgram posed this question to a group of Yale University students, it was predicted that no more than 3 out of 100 participants would deliver the maximum shock. In reality, 65 percent of the participants in Milgram's study delivered the maximum shocks.

Of the 40 participants in the study, 26 delivered the maximum shocks while 14 stopped before reaching the highest levels. It is important to note that many of the subjects became extremely agitated, distraught, and angry at the experimenter, but they continued to follow orders all the way to the end.

Due to concerns about the amount of anxiety experienced by many of the participants, everyone was debriefed at the end of the experiment. The researchers explained the procedures and the use of deception.

However, many critics of the study have argued that many of the participants were still confused about the exact nature of the experiment. Milgram later surveyed the participants and found that 84 percent were glad to have participated while only 1 percent regretted their involvement.

The Moral Questions Milgram Raised

While Milgram's research raised serious ethical questions about the use of human subjects in psychology experiments, his results have also been consistently replicated in further experiments. Thomas Blass (1999) reviewed further research on obedience and found that Milgram's findings hold true in other experiments.

Why did so many of the participants in this experiment perform a seemingly sadistic act when instructed by an authority figure? According to Milgram, there are some situational factors that can explain such high levels of obedience:

- The physical presence of an authority figure dramatically increased compliance.
- The fact that Yale (a trusted and authoritative academic institution) sponsored the study led many participants to believe that the experiment must be safe.
- The selection of teacher and learner status seemed random.
- Participants assumed that the experimenter was a competent expert.
- The shocks were said to be painful, not dangerous.

Later experiments conducted by Milgram indicated that the presence of rebellious peers dramatically reduced obedience levels. When other people refused to go along with the experimenter's orders, 36 out of 40 participants refused to deliver the maximum shocks.

"Ordinary people, simply doing their jobs, and without any particular hostility on their part, can become agents in a terrible destructive process. Moreover, even when the destructive effects of their work become patently clear, and they are asked to carry out actions incompatible with fundamental standards of morality, relatively few people have the resources needed to resist authority," Milgram explained in "Obedience to Authority."

Milgram's experiment has become a classic in psychology, demonstrating the dangers of obedience. The research suggests that situational variables have a stronger sway than personality factors in determining obedience. However, other psychologists argue that both external and internal factors heavily influence obedience, such as personal beliefs and overall temperament.

Researchers Replicate Milgram: Would People Still Obey?

In 2009, researchers conducted a study designed to replicate Milgram's classic obedience experiment. In [an article published in the APS Observer](#), psychologist Jerry Burger of Santa Clara University and author of the study described how relevant Milgram's study is today:

"The haunting black-and-white images of ordinary citizens delivering what appear to be dangerous, if not deadly, electric shocks and the implications of the findings for atrocities like the Holocaust and Abu Ghraib are not easily dismissed. Yet because Milgram's procedures are clearly out-of-bounds by today's ethical standards, many questions about the research have gone unanswered. Chief among these is one that inevitably surfaces when I present Milgram's findings to students: Would people still act that way today?"

Burger made several alterations to Milgram's experiment.

- The maximum shock level was 150-volts as opposed to the original 450-volts.
- Participants were also carefully screened to eliminate those who might experience adverse reactions to the experiment.

The results of the new experiment revealed that participants obeyed at the same rate that they did when Milgram conducted his original study more than 40 years ago.

However, Alan C. Elms, Ph.D., of the University of California, Davis argued that the replication still had merit. Elms pointed out that while "direct comparisons of absolute levels of obedience cannot be made between the 150-volt maximum of Burger's research design and Milgram's 450-volt maximum, Burger's "obedience lite" procedures can be used to explore further some of the situational variables studied by Milgram as well as to look at additional variables," such as situational and personality differences.

Recent Criticisms and New Findings

Psychologist Gina Perry suggests that much of what we think we know about Milgram's famous experiments is only part of the story. While researching an article on the topic, she stumbled across hundreds of audiotapes found in Yale archives that documented numerous variations of Milgram's shock experiments.

Were Subjects Coerced?

While Milgram's reports of his process report methodical and uniform procedures, the audiotapes reveal something different. During the experimental sessions, the experimenters often went off-script and coerced the subjects into continuing the shocks.

"The slavish obedience to authority we have come to associate with Milgram's experiments comes to sound much more like bullying and coercion when you listen to these recordings," Perry suggested in an article for *Discover Magazine*.

Few Participants Were Really Debriefed

Milgram's experiments have long been the source of considerable criticism and controversy. From the get-go, the ethics of his experiments were highly dubious. Participants were subjected to significant psychological and emotional distress.

Milgram suggested that the subjects were "de-hoaxed" after the experiments. However, Perry's findings revealed that of the 700 or so people who took part in different variations of his studies between 1961 and 1962, very few were truly debriefed.

A true debriefing would have involved explaining that the shocks weren't real and that the other person was not injured. Instead, Milgram's sessions were mainly focused on calming the subjects down before sending them on their way. Many left in a state of considerable distress. While the truth was revealed to some months or even years later, many were simply never told a thing.

Variations Led to Differing Results

Another problem is that the version of the study presented by Milgram and the one that's most often retold does not tell the whole story.

The statistic that 65 percent of people obeyed orders applied only to one variation of the experiment, in which 26 out of 40 subjects obeyed. In other variations, far fewer people were willing to follow the experimenters' orders and in some versions of the study, not a single participant obeyed.

Did They Know the "Learner" Was Faking?

Perry even tracked down some of the people who took part in the experiments as well as Milgram's research assistants. What she discovered is that many of his subjects had deduced what Milgram's intent was and knew that the "learner" was merely pretending.

Such findings cast Milgram's results in a new light. It suggests that not only did Milgram intentionally engage in some hefty misdirection to obtain the results he wanted but that many of his participants were simply playing along.

Perry later explained to NPR that retracing the steps of Milgram's research upended her attitudes and beliefs about one of the most famous and controversial figures in psychology.

"I regarded Stanley Milgram as a misunderstood genius who'd been penalized in some ways for revealing something troubling and profound about human nature," she told NPR. "By the end of my research, I actually had quite a very different view of the man and the research."

Obedience Depends on a Few Critical Factors

More recent work by researchers suggests that while people do tend to obey authority figures, the process is not necessarily as cut-and-dry as Milgram depicted it.

In a 2012 essay published in *PLoS Biology*, psychologists Alex Haslam and Stephen Reicher suggested the degree to which people are willing to obey the questionable orders of an authority figure depends largely on two key factors:

- How much the individual **agrees** with the orders
- How much they **identify** with the person giving the orders

While it is clear that people are often far more susceptible to influence, persuasion, and obedience than they would often like to be, they are far from mindless machines just taking orders.

Why Is Milgram's Study Still So Powerful?

So why does Milgram's experiment maintain such a powerful hold on our imaginations, even decades after the fact? Perry believes that despite all its ethical issues and the problem of never truly being able to replicate Milgram's procedures, the study has taken on the role of what she calls a "powerful parable."

Milgram's work might not hold the answers to what makes people obey or even the degree to which they truly obey. It has, however, inspired other researchers to explore what makes people follow orders and, perhaps more importantly, what leads them to question authority.