|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Explanations of obedience-situational variables** | | |
| **Proximity** | Research evidence | **Other evaluation**  **Lack of internal validity**  Orne and Holland criticised Milgrams original experiment as participants could work out it was fake but it is argued that this is even more likely with the extra manipulation. For example in the variation where the experimenter was a member of the public even Milgram recognised that this situation was so contrived participants would have worked out the truth so this is a limitation of all Milgram’s studies because it is unclear whether the results are genuinely due to the operation of obedience or because the participants saw through the deception and acted accordingly.  **Cross-cultural replications**  A general strength of the variations and his original work is that his findings have been replicated in other countries e.g. Miranda (1981) found obedience levels of 90% in Spanish students so shows the conclusions are not just limited to American males but as Smith and Bond (1998) point out most of the replications take part in the western world so it is premature to conclude that findings on location, proximity and uniform would apply to people everywhere**.**  **Control of variables**  A strength of Milgram’s variations is that he systematically altered one variable at a time to see what effect it would have on obedience levels. All other procedures and variables were kept the same as the study was replicated over and over with more than 100 participants |
| Location | Research evidence |
| Uniform | **Research support** of situational variables in real life studies e.g. Bickman (1974) carried out a field study in which confederates dressed as a milkman, security guard or in jacket and tie asked passers-by to pick up litter or give a coin for the parking meter. People were twice as likely to obey the security guard than jacket and tie. |