

In 2011, Burger et al. analysed comments made by participants. It was found that those expressing more personal responsibility came less and less likely to comply with the experimenters prods became more and more like orders. This contrasted significantly with those who were diffusing responsibility, who came more and more likely to comply as the experimenter spoke, suggesting that the mechanism was **not so much obedience as diffusion of responsibility**.

Burger (2009) Replication This replication used the '150 volt solution' where people started to scream from that point. 89% continued in Milgram's after this. 70% went to 150volts (and were prepared to go further) in Burger et al.s (2009) replication. Participants were told explicitly and repeatedly that they could withdraw. It could be argued that the screening process (people clinically well and not heard of milgram) biased the sample.

Milgram (1963) "randomly" allocated participant to teacher or learner (learner was actually a confederate). Teachers were given a mild electric shock and then sat in front of a row of switches. Teacher was told (by experimenter (a legitimate authority at yale), in lab coat) to continue administering shocks every time the learner gave an incorrect answer.

Professional psychologists predicted that 1 in a 1000 participants would shock to the end of the board. Around **60–70%** went to the end.

Hofling et al. (1966) told nurses that doses over 10 milligrams of astrogen (a fake drug) would be fatal. They were then called up by a person claiming to be a doctor, asking for 20 milligrams of the drug to be administered to a patient; all but one obeyed.

Milgram found that **proximity, legitimacy and accessibility (of the norm)** all moderated the effects of the experiment.

Milgram explained this in terms of the norm of **obedience to legitimate authority** (always obey authority) and **scriptlessness** (we lack an adequate model for disobedience in the face of authority). They arguably didn't want to continue, but didn't know how to stop. Replications where normal confederates tried to be the teacher yielded no shocks to the end, suggesting the norm must be **accessible**.

Participants were in an **agentic state** openly carrying out the will of the experimenter, without taking personal responsibility for their actions. Iterated versions of the experiment, but with someone else pressing the buttons, 83% shocked to the end.

Foot in the Door: "As the subject delivers more and more painful shocks, he seeks to justify what he has done; one form of justification is to go to the end" Milgram. The gradual increases of 15volts may have encouraged the need to appear consistent, as 15volts is not a large difference. (Relating to **Daryl Bem's Self Perception Theory** or **Festinger's Cognitive Dissonance** and the need to appear **consistent heuristic**)

Gradual

Cyberball: Williams et al. (2000) Participants are placed in front of a computer and told that they are going to play a game with two other people. Participants pass the ball to each other. However, 2 are confederates and pass the ball exclusively between the two of them, ostracising the participant. Ostracised participants report greater sadness, aggression and negative affect. It was found that ostracism activates the same areas correlated with pain (dorsal anterior cingulate cortex). Interestingly, they are more likely to conform after being ostracised but also to react aggressively to stimuli. Williams argues that people suffer from a lack of control and a feeling of being invisible, provoking both aggression and the opposite reactions. Interestingly, they set up minimal groups like do or do not smoke and uses Macs or PCs and found that these have no impact

Obedience

Ostracism

The ramifications of perhaps not conforming are potentially dire. Williams calls ostracism "the kiss of social death" (2007).

Conformity & Obedience

There are three types of social influence

Conformity (changing behaviours to match opinions or behaviours of others)

Obedience (changing behaviours in response to direct authority)

Compliance (changing attitudes or behaviours in response to pressure from others)

Conformity

It has a negative connotation, as we consider individuality (in western societies) as something remarkably important. But it can be very useful, consider travelling (following crowds in the fez medina). It helps us form judgments and decide actions.

Sherif (1936) Autokinetic Approach The original conformity study illustrating **informational social influence**. Here, the 'correct answer' was ambiguous, as the dot is commonly perceived to move, due to the lack of reference point. Participants conformed more over trials (one per day).

Asch (1956) illustrated a classic example of **conformity** (social influence) by showing participants a series of lines and asking them to say which lines were the same size. Only 25% did not conform with the group of confederates, suggesting that the majority conformed to the attitudes of the confederates to connect with their group, despite deliberately making a decision contrary to their own perception (this relates to Smith & Mackie's idea of connectedness).

Conformity in Opinons: Newcomb (1943) Bennington College Students became increasingly less conservative but increasingly more similar in attitudes as time went on.

Why conform?!

Informational Social Influence If the situation is ambiguous or novel and if individuals are experts, novices, confident or unconfident. These factors moderate the degree of conformity.

Normative Influence This is the motivation to fulfil others expectations and to another groups **norms** – often to **gain social approval**. This is the "need to belong" and characterised by the "connectedness" principle.

Latané's Social Impact Theory states that the status of the group, the proximity of the group to the person and the number of people will affect how likely it is that a person will conform to a groups social norm.