

THE MILGRAM EXPERIMENT ETHICAL ISSUES

THE MILGRAM EXPERIMENT ETHICAL ISSUES REPRESENT A SEMINAL MOMENT IN THE HISTORY OF PSYCHOLOGY, PROFOUNDLY SHAPING THE WAY SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH INVOLVING HUMAN SUBJECTS IS CONDUCTED TODAY. STANLEY MILGRAM'S CONTROVERSIAL OBEDIENCE STUDY, CARRIED OUT IN THE EARLY 1960s, SOUGHT TO UNDERSTAND THE EXTENT TO WHICH INDIVIDUALS WOULD OBEY AN AUTHORITY FIGURE, EVEN WHEN INSTRUCTED TO PERFORM ACTIONS CONFLICTING WITH THEIR PERSONAL CONSCIENCE. WHILE THE EXPERIMENT YIELDED STARTLING INSIGHTS INTO HUMAN OBEDIENCE, ITS METHODOLOGY TRIGGERED WIDESPREAD ETHICAL DEBATE, QUESTIONING THE TREATMENT OF PARTICIPANTS AND THE MORAL RESPONSIBILITIES OF RESEARCHERS. THIS ARTICLE WILL DELVE INTO THE SPECIFIC ETHICAL BREACHES IDENTIFIED IN THE MILGRAM EXPERIMENT, EXAMINING CONCERNS SUCH AS DECEPTION, PSYCHOLOGICAL DISTRESS, THE LACK OF TRUE INFORMED CONSENT, AND THE PERCEIVED COERCION OF PARTICIPANTS. FURTHERMORE, IT WILL EXPLORE THE LONG-LASTING IMPACT OF THESE ISSUES ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF CONTEMPORARY ETHICAL GUIDELINES AND REVIEW BOARD PROTOCOLS, HIGHLIGHTING HOW THIS SINGLE STUDY CATALYZED A FUNDAMENTAL SHIFT TOWARDS GREATER PARTICIPANT PROTECTION IN ALL FORMS OF RESEARCH.

- UNDERSTANDING THE MILGRAM EXPERIMENT: A BRIEF OVERVIEW
- THE IMMEDIATE ETHICAL CONCERNS IN MILGRAM'S STUDY
- LONG-TERM REPERCUSSIONS AND CRITICISMS OF MILGRAM'S ETHICS
- EVOLUTION OF ETHICAL GUIDELINES POST-MILGRAM
- BALANCING SCIENTIFIC DISCOVERY WITH ETHICAL IMPERATIVES

UNDERSTANDING THE MILGRAM EXPERIMENT: A BRIEF OVERVIEW

THE MILGRAM EXPERIMENT, CONDUCTED BY YALE UNIVERSITY PSYCHOLOGIST STANLEY MILGRAM IN 1961-1962, REMAINS ONE OF THE MOST FAMOUS AND CONTENTIOUS STUDIES IN SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY. ITS PRIMARY OBJECTIVE WAS TO INVESTIGATE THE DEGREE TO WHICH INDIVIDUALS WOULD OBEY AN AUTHORITY FIGURE, EVEN WHEN THE COMMANDS GIVEN REQUIRED THEM TO INFLICT WHAT THEY BELIEVED TO BE SEVERE PAIN ON ANOTHER PERSON. THIS RESEARCH WAS LARGELY INSPIRED BY THE HOLOCAUST AND THE DESIRE TO UNDERSTAND HOW ORDINARY CITIZENS COULD PARTICIPATE IN ATROCITIES UNDER ORDERS.

THE CORE DESIGN AND OBJECTIVE

MILGRAM RECRUITED PARTICIPANTS, PRIMARILY MEN, THROUGH NEWSPAPER ADVERTISEMENTS, TELLING THEM THEY WOULD BE INVOLVED IN A STUDY ON MEMORY AND LEARNING. UPON ARRIVAL, EACH PARTICIPANT WAS INTRODUCED TO ANOTHER INDIVIDUAL, WHO WAS, UNBEKNOWNST TO THE TRUE PARTICIPANT, A CONFEDERATE OF THE EXPERIMENTER. ROLES WERE SEEMINGLY ASSIGNED RANDOMLY, WITH THE REAL PARTICIPANT ALWAYS BECOMING THE "TEACHER" AND THE CONFEDERATE THE "LEARNER." AN EXPERIMENTER, DRESSED IN A GREY LAB COAT, PROVIDED INSTRUCTIONS. THE SETUP INVOLVED THE "TEACHER" ADMINISTERING ELECTRIC SHOCKS OF INCREASING INTENSITY TO THE "LEARNER" FOR INCORRECT ANSWERS DURING A WORD ASSOCIATION TASK. THE "LEARNER" WAS SEATED IN AN ADJACENT ROOM, STRAPPED TO A CHAIR WITH ELECTRODES ATTACHED, AND PROVIDED PRE-RECORDED SCREAMS AND PROTESTS AS THE SHOCK LEVEL INCREASED, EVENTUALLY FALLING SILENT.

THE SHOCKING RESULTS

THE "TEACHER" WAS INSTRUCTED TO CONTINUE THE SHOCKS DESPITE THE "LEARNER'S" APPARENT DISTRESS, WITH THE EXPERIMENTER PROVIDING A SERIES OF FOUR PRODS (E.G., "PLEASE CONTINUE," "THE EXPERIMENT REQUIRES THAT YOU

CONTINUE," "IT IS ABSOLUTELY ESSENTIAL THAT YOU CONTINUE," "YOU HAVE NO OTHER CHOICE, YOU MUST GO ON") WHENEVER A PARTICIPANT HESITATED. MILGRAM'S FINDINGS WERE ASTONISHING: 65% OF PARTICIPANTS ADMINISTERED THE MAXIMUM 450-VOLT SHOCK, A LEVEL CLEARLY MARKED AS "XXX - DANGER - SEVERE SHOCK." EVERY PARTICIPANT ADMINISTERED AT LEAST 300 VOLTS. THESE RESULTS SUGGESTED A POWERFUL HUMAN TENDENCY TOWARDS OBEDIENCE TO AUTHORITY, EVEN WHEN SUCH OBEDIENCE CONFLICTED WITH PERSONAL MORALITY, DIRECTLY LEADING TO EXTENSIVE DISCUSSIONS ABOUT **THE MILGRAM EXPERIMENT ETHICAL ISSUES**.

THE IMMEDIATE ETHICAL CONCERNS IN MILGRAM'S STUDY

FROM ITS INCEPTION, **THE MILGRAM EXPERIMENT ETHICAL ISSUES** WERE GLARINGLY APPARENT TO MANY WITHIN THE PSYCHOLOGICAL COMMUNITY. THE METHODS EMPLOYED DIRECTLY CHALLENGED THE PREVAILING, ALBEIT NASCENT, ETHICAL STANDARDS FOR HUMAN SUBJECTS RESEARCH. THE CONTROVERSY CENTERED ON SEVERAL KEY AREAS THAT DEMONSTRABLY COMPROMISED THE WELFARE AND RIGHTS OF THE PARTICIPANTS.

DECEPTION AND LACK OF INFORMED CONSENT

ONE OF THE MOST SIGNIFICANT ETHICAL VIOLATIONS IN MILGRAM'S STUDY WAS THE EXTENSIVE USE OF DECEPTION. PARTICIPANTS WERE MISLED ABOUT NEARLY EVERY ASPECT OF THE EXPERIMENT, FROM ITS TRUE PURPOSE TO THE NATURE OF THE "LEARNER." THIS DECEPTION DIRECTLY NEGATED THE POSSIBILITY OF GENUINE INFORMED CONSENT, A CORNERSTONE OF ETHICAL RESEARCH. INFORMED CONSENT REQUIRES THAT PARTICIPANTS BE FULLY AWARE OF THE NATURE, PURPOSE, AND POTENTIAL RISKS OF A STUDY BEFORE AGREEING TO PARTICIPATE.

- **NO TRUE INFORMED CONSENT:** PARTICIPANTS WERE TOLD THE STUDY WAS ABOUT "MEMORY AND LEARNING," NOT OBEDIENCE TO AUTHORITY OR THE WILLINGNESS TO INFLICT PAIN.
- **DECEPTION REGARDING ROLES:** THE RANDOM ASSIGNMENT OF ROLES WAS RIGGED, ENSURING THE TRUE PARTICIPANT WAS ALWAYS THE "TEACHER."
- **MISLEADING PURPOSE:** THE "SHOCKS" WERE FAKE, AND THE "LEARNER" WAS A CONFEDERATE ACTING OUT DISTRESS, A FACT CONCEALED FROM THE "TEACHER."

BECAUSE PARTICIPANTS WERE UNAWARE OF THE TRUE NATURE OF THE STUDY, THEY COULD NOT MAKE AN AUTONOMOUS DECISION ABOUT WHETHER TO PARTICIPATE, THUS UNDERMINING THEIR AUTONOMY AND DIGNITY.

PSYCHOLOGICAL DISTRESS AND HARM TO PARTICIPANTS

PARTICIPANTS IN MILGRAM'S EXPERIMENT EXPERIENCED SIGNIFICANT PSYCHOLOGICAL DISTRESS. MANY SHOWED SIGNS OF EXTREME TENSION, INCLUDING SWEATING, TREMBLING, STUTTERING, GROANING, BITING THEIR LIPS, AND NERVOUS LAUGHTER. SOME EVEN EXPERIENCED FULL-BLOWN UNCONTROLLABLE SEIZURES. THEY BELIEVED THEY WERE GENUINELY CAUSING SEVERE PAIN, AND POTENTIALLY SERIOUS HARM, TO ANOTHER HUMAN BEING. THIS INFLICTED MENTAL ANGUISH RAISES SERIOUS QUESTIONS ABOUT THE PRINCIPLE OF BENEFICENCE, WHICH DICTATES THAT RESEARCHERS MUST MINIMIZE HARM AND MAXIMIZE BENEFITS TO PARTICIPANTS.

THE IMMEDIATE AND PROFOUND EMOTIONAL SUFFERING ENDURED BY PARTICIPANTS WAS A PRIMARY SOURCE OF CRITICISM REGARDING **THE MILGRAM EXPERIMENT ETHICAL ISSUES**. WHILE MILGRAM ARGUED THAT THE FINDINGS WERE OF IMMENSE SCIENTIFIC VALUE, CRITICS COUNTERED THAT THE ENDS DID NOT JUSTIFY THE MEANS, ESPECIALLY WHEN THE HARM WAS SO READILY APPARENT DURING THE EXPERIMENT ITSELF.

THE RIGHT TO WITHDRAW AND COERCION

ALTHOUGH PARTICIPANTS WERE TECHNICALLY FREE TO WITHDRAW AT ANY POINT, THE EXPERIMENTER'S PRODS CREATED A SITUATION THAT MANY FELT WAS COERCIVE. WHEN A PARTICIPANT EXPRESSED A DESIRE TO STOP, THE EXPERIMENTER'S FIRM, AUTHORITATIVE COMMANDS TO CONTINUE MADE IT DIFFICULT FOR THEM TO EXERCISE THEIR RIGHT TO WITHDRAW WITHOUT FEELING THEY WERE DEFYING LEGITIMATE AUTHORITY OR SABOTAGING THE EXPERIMENT. THIS SUBTLE FORM OF COERCION CAN BE SEEN AS UNDERMINING PARTICIPANT AUTONOMY AND THEIR PERCEIVED ABILITY TO MAKE INDEPENDENT CHOICES.

LONG-TERM REPERCUSSIONS AND CRITICISMS OF MILGRAM'S ETHICS

BEYOND THE IMMEDIATE ETHICAL BREACHES DURING THE EXPERIMENT, **THE MILGRAM EXPERIMENT ETHICAL ISSUES** ALSO SPARKED EXTENSIVE DEBATE ABOUT THE LONG-TERM EFFECTS ON PARTICIPANTS AND THE BROADER IMPLICATIONS FOR PUBLIC TRUST IN SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH. THE ETHICAL SCRUTINY CONTINUED FOR DECADES, SHAPING FUNDAMENTAL CHANGES IN RESEARCH ETHICS.

PARTICIPANT TRUST AND PUBLIC PERCEPTION OF RESEARCH

THE WIDESPREAD KNOWLEDGE OF THE DECEPTIVE PRACTICES AND PSYCHOLOGICAL DISTRESS CAUSED BY MILGRAM'S STUDY ERODED PUBLIC TRUST IN PSYCHOLOGICAL RESEARCH. WHEN PARTICIPANTS DISCOVERED THEY HAD BEEN DECEIVED AND MANIPULATED INTO BELIEVING THEY HAD POTENTIALLY HARMED ANOTHER PERSON, IT COULD HAVE LED TO FEELINGS OF FOOLISHNESS, BETRAYAL, OR EVEN SELF-DOUBT ABOUT THEIR OWN MORAL CHARACTER. THIS BETRAYAL OF TRUST POSED A SIGNIFICANT THREAT TO THE WILLINGNESS OF FUTURE INDIVIDUALS TO PARTICIPATE IN PSYCHOLOGICAL STUDIES, FEARING SIMILAR EXPERIENCES OF MANIPULATION OR DISTRESS.

LACK OF ADEQUATE DEBRIEFING

WHILE MILGRAM DID CONDUCT A DEBRIEFING SESSION WITH PARTICIPANTS AFTER THE EXPERIMENT, ITS ADEQUACY HAS BEEN A POINT OF CONTENTION. A PROPER DEBRIEFING SHOULD FULLY INFORM PARTICIPANTS OF THE TRUE NATURE OF THE STUDY, EXPLAIN ANY DECEPTION, AND ADDRESS ANY DISTRESS OR MISCONCEPTIONS. WHILE MILGRAM ATTEMPTED TO REASSURE PARTICIPANTS THAT NO ONE WAS HARMED, CRITICS ARGUED THAT SIMPLY BEING TOLD THIS MIGHT NOT HAVE BEEN ENOUGH TO FULLY ALLEVIATE THE GUILT OR SELF-DOUBT EXPERIENCED BY THOSE WHO BELIEVED THEY HAD ADMINISTERED LETHAL SHOCKS. THE PSYCHOLOGICAL IMPACT OF REALIZING ONE'S CAPACITY FOR EXTREME OBEDIENCE UNDER AUTHORITY IS NOT EASILY UNDONE BY A BRIEF EXPLANATION.

THE ROLE OF THE EXPERIMENTER'S AUTHORITY

THE EXPERIMENT ITSELF SHOWCASED THE POWERFUL INFLUENCE OF AUTHORITY, AND IRONICALLY, THE EXPERIMENTER'S ROLE IN PUSHING PARTICIPANTS TO CONTINUE ALSO BECAME AN ETHICAL CONCERN. THE EXPERIMENTER, AS THE AUTHORITY FIGURE, IMPLICITLY LEVERAGED THIS POWER TO OVERRIDE PARTICIPANTS' ETHICAL RESERVATIONS. THIS DYNAMIC CREATED AN ENVIRONMENT WHERE PARTICIPANTS MIGHT HAVE FELT PRESSURED TO CONTINUE, BLURRING THE LINE BETWEEN FREE WILL AND COERCION. THIS ASPECT FURTHER EXACERBATED **THE MILGRAM EXPERIMENT ETHICAL ISSUES**, HIGHLIGHTING THE NEED FOR RESEARCHERS TO BE ACUTELY AWARE OF THEIR POWER DYNAMICS WITH PARTICIPANTS.

EVOLUTION OF ETHICAL GUIDELINES POST-MILGRAM

THE PROFOUND CONTROVERSY SURROUNDING **THE MILGRAM EXPERIMENT ETHICAL ISSUES** SERVED AS A CRUCIAL CATALYST FOR

THE FORMALIZATION AND STRENGTHENING OF ETHICAL GUIDELINES IN HUMAN SUBJECTS RESEARCH ACROSS VARIOUS DISCIPLINES, PARTICULARLY IN PSYCHOLOGY. IT BECAME EVIDENT THAT GREATER PROTECTIONS WERE NEEDED TO SAFEGUARD THE WELFARE AND RIGHTS OF PARTICIPANTS.

THE BELMONT REPORT AND ITS PRINCIPLES

ONE OF THE MOST SIGNIFICANT OUTCOMES WAS THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE BELMONT REPORT IN 1978 IN THE UNITED STATES. THIS FOUNDATIONAL DOCUMENT OUTLINED THREE CORE ETHICAL PRINCIPLES FOR THE PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS IN RESEARCH, WHICH NOW UNDERPIN MOST ETHICAL REVIEW PROCESSES GLOBALLY:

1. **RESPECT FOR PERSONS:** THIS PRINCIPLE EMPHASIZES TREATING INDIVIDUALS AS AUTONOMOUS AGENTS, CAPABLE OF MAKING THEIR OWN DECISIONS. IT MANDATES INFORMED CONSENT, REQUIRING RESEARCHERS TO PROVIDE COMPREHENSIVE INFORMATION ABOUT THE STUDY SO PARTICIPANTS CAN MAKE A VOLUNTARY AND INFORMED CHOICE TO PARTICIPATE OR WITHDRAW. FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH DIMINISHED AUTONOMY (E.G., CHILDREN, PRISONERS), ADDITIONAL PROTECTIONS ARE REQUIRED.
2. **BENEFICENCE:** THIS PRINCIPLE REQUIRES RESEARCHERS TO MAXIMIZE POTENTIAL BENEFITS TO PARTICIPANTS AND SOCIETY WHILE MINIMIZING POTENTIAL HARM. IT INVOLVES A CAREFUL RISK-BENEFIT ANALYSIS, ENSURING THAT THE POTENTIAL GAINS OF THE RESEARCH OUTWEIGH THE RISKS TO PARTICIPANTS. MILGRAM'S STUDY WAS HEAVILY CRITICIZED FOR FAILING THIS PRINCIPLE DUE TO THE SIGNIFICANT PSYCHOLOGICAL DISTRESS INFLICTED.
3. **JUSTICE:** THIS PRINCIPLE CONCERNS THE EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF RESEARCH BENEFITS AND BURDENS. IT DICTATES THAT THE SELECTION OF RESEARCH SUBJECTS SHOULD BE FAIR, ENSURING THAT NO SINGLE GROUP IS UNDULY BURDENED BY RESEARCH RISKS OR UNFAIRLY EXCLUDED FROM POTENTIAL BENEFITS.

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARDS (IRBs)

FOLLOWING THE MILGRAM EXPERIMENT AND OTHER CONTROVERSIAL STUDIES (SUCH AS THE TUSKEGEE SYPHILIS STUDY), THE CONCEPT OF INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARDS (IRBs) OR RESEARCH ETHICS COMMITTEES (RECs) BECAME MANDATORY IN RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS. THESE INDEPENDENT COMMITTEES ARE TASKED WITH REVIEWING ALL RESEARCH PROPOSALS INVOLVING HUMAN SUBJECTS TO ENSURE THEY ADHERE TO ETHICAL GUIDELINES AND PROTECT PARTICIPANTS' RIGHTS AND WELFARE. IRBs SCRUTINIZE ASPECTS SUCH AS INFORMED CONSENT PROCEDURES, POTENTIAL RISKS AND BENEFITS, CONFIDENTIALITY, AND DEBRIEFING PLANS, DIRECTLY ADDRESSING MANY OF THE FAILINGS IDENTIFIED IN MILGRAM'S WORK.

MODERN ETHICAL STANDARDS IN PSYCHOLOGICAL RESEARCH

TODAY, PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS LIKE THE AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION (APA) HAVE STRINGENT ETHICAL CODES THAT GUIDE PSYCHOLOGISTS IN THEIR RESEARCH AND PRACTICE. THESE CODES ELABORATE ON PRINCIPLES LIKE INFORMED CONSENT, MINIMIZING HARM, PRIVACY, CONFIDENTIALITY, AND PROPER DEBRIEFING. DECEPTION IS ONLY PERMITTED UNDER VERY SPECIFIC CONDITIONS, TYPICALLY WHEN NO ALTERNATIVE METHODS EXIST, THE POTENTIAL BENEFITS ARE SUBSTANTIAL, AND PARTICIPANTS ARE FULLY DEBRIEFED AND GIVEN THE OPPORTUNITY TO WITHDRAW THEIR DATA AFTER BEING INFORMED OF THE DECEPTION. THE LESSONS LEARNED FROM **THE MILGRAM EXPERIMENT ETHICAL ISSUES** ARE EMBEDDED INTO THE VERY FABRIC OF THESE MODERN STANDARDS, ENSURING THAT PARTICIPANT WELL-BEING IS PRIORITIZED ABOVE ALL ELSE.

BALANCING SCIENTIFIC DISCOVERY WITH ETHICAL IMPERATIVES

THE MILGRAM EXPERIMENT PRESENTS A CLASSIC DILEMMA IN SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH: HOW TO BALANCE THE PURSUIT OF KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING WITH THE MORAL IMPERATIVE TO PROTECT HUMAN SUBJECTS. WHILE THE STUDY'S ETHICAL FAILURES ARE UNDENIABLE, ITS SCIENTIFIC INSIGHTS INTO HUMAN OBEDIENCE ARE PROFOUND AND CONTINUE TO INFLUENCE SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY.

THE VALUE OF MILGRAM'S FINDINGS VERSUS ITS ETHICAL COST

MILGRAM'S RESEARCH UNDENIABLY PROVIDED GROUNDBREAKING INSIGHTS INTO THE POWERFUL INFLUENCE OF AUTHORITY AND THE SITUATIONAL FACTORS THAT CAN COMPEL ORDINARY INDIVIDUALS TO ENGAGE IN ACTIONS THEY FIND MORALLY REPUGNANT. IT REVEALED UNCOMFORTABLE TRUTHS ABOUT HUMAN NATURE AND THE MECHANISMS OF SOCIAL CONTROL, CONTRIBUTING SIGNIFICANTLY TO OUR UNDERSTANDING OF HISTORICAL ATROCITIES AND EVERYDAY COMPLIANCE. HOWEVER, THIS SCIENTIFIC GAIN CAME AT A SUBSTANTIAL ETHICAL COST, SPECIFICALLY THE PSYCHOLOGICAL DISTRESS AND POTENTIAL LONG-TERM HARM TO PARTICIPANTS, AS WELL AS THE EROSION OF TRUST IN THE RESEARCH COMMUNITY. THIS TRADE-OFF IS CENTRAL TO THE ONGOING DEBATE ABOUT **THE MILGRAM EXPERIMENT ETHICAL ISSUES**, FORCING A RE-EVALUATION OF WHAT CONSTITUTES ACCEPTABLE RISK IN THE PURSUIT OF SCIENTIFIC KNOWLEDGE.

ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS IN CONTEMPORARY OBEDIENCE STUDIES

WHILE DIRECT REPLICATIONS OF MILGRAM'S EXPERIMENT UNDER THE ORIGINAL CONDITIONS WOULD BE DEEMED UNETHICAL TODAY, CONTEMPORARY RESEARCHERS HAVE FOUND INNOVATIVE AND ETHICALLY SOUND WAYS TO EXPLORE OBEDIENCE. THESE STUDIES OFTEN EMPLOY SIMULATION, VIRTUAL REALITY, OR LESS INTENSE FORMS OF SOCIAL INFLUENCE, ENSURING THAT PARTICIPANTS ARE FULLY INFORMED, THEIR RIGHT TO WITHDRAW IS UNEQUIVOCALLY RESPECTED, AND ANY POTENTIAL DISTRESS IS MINIMIZED AND IMMEDIATELY ADDRESSED. SUCH APPROACHES DEMONSTRATE THAT IT IS POSSIBLE TO CONTINUE EXPLORING COMPLEX HUMAN BEHAVIORS LIKE OBEDIENCE WITHOUT COMPROMISING FUNDAMENTAL ETHICAL PRINCIPLES. THE LEGACY OF MILGRAM'S WORK, THEREFORE, IS NOT JUST ITS FINDINGS, BUT ALSO ITS ROLE AS A CAUTIONARY TALE THAT GALVANIZED THE SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY TO UPHOLD THE HIGHEST ETHICAL STANDARDS IN ALL RESEARCH INVOLVING HUMAN BEINGS.

THE ENDURING DISCUSSION SURROUNDING THE MILGRAM EXPERIMENT'S ETHICAL CHALLENGES SERVES AS A CONSTANT REMINDER OF THE DELICATE BALANCE RESEARCHERS MUST MAINTAIN. IT UNDERSCORES THAT SCIENTIFIC PROGRESS, HOWEVER SIGNIFICANT, MUST NEVER COME AT THE EXPENSE OF HUMAN DIGNITY, WELL-BEING, AND TRUST. THE SAFEGUARDS NOW COMMONPLACE IN RESEARCH ETHICS—INFORMED CONSENT, COMPREHENSIVE DEBRIEFING, AND RIGOROUS REVIEW BY ETHICS COMMITTEES—ARE DIRECT DESCENDANTS OF THE CRITICAL EXAMINATION OF STUDIES LIKE MILGRAM'S, ENSURING A FUTURE WHERE GROUNDBREAKING DISCOVERIES CAN BE MADE RESPONSIBLY AND HUMANELY.

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS ABOUT THE MILGRAM EXPERIMENT ETHICAL ISSUES

Q: WHAT WERE THE PRIMARY ETHICAL ISSUES IDENTIFIED IN THE MILGRAM EXPERIMENT?

A: THE PRIMARY ETHICAL ISSUES IN THE MILGRAM EXPERIMENT CENTERED ON DECEPTION, LACK OF INFORMED CONSENT, PSYCHOLOGICAL DISTRESS AND POTENTIAL HARM TO PARTICIPANTS, AND THE PERCEIVED COERCION OF PARTICIPANTS TO CONTINUE AGAINST THEIR WILL. PARTICIPANTS WERE NOT FULLY AWARE OF THE STUDY'S TRUE PURPOSE OR THE FACT THAT THE "LEARNER" WAS A CONFEDERATE, LEADING TO SIGNIFICANT EMOTIONAL TURMOIL AND A VIOLATION OF THEIR AUTONOMY.

Q: HOW DID THE MILGRAM EXPERIMENT VIOLATE THE PRINCIPLE OF INFORMED CONSENT?

A: THE MILGRAM EXPERIMENT VIOLATED THE PRINCIPLE OF INFORMED CONSENT BY EXTENSIVELY DECEIVING ITS PARTICIPANTS. THEY WERE TOLD THE STUDY WAS ABOUT "MEMORY AND LEARNING," NOT OBEDIENCE, AND WERE UNAWARE THAT THE "LEARNER" WAS AN ACTOR AND THE SHOCKS WERE FAKE. TRUE INFORMED CONSENT REQUIRES PARTICIPANTS TO BE FULLY AWARE OF ALL SIGNIFICANT ASPECTS OF A STUDY, INCLUDING ITS TRUE PURPOSE AND POTENTIAL RISKS, BEFORE AGREEING TO PARTICIPATE, WHICH WAS NOT POSSIBLE IN MILGRAM'S DESIGN.

Q: WHAT KIND OF PSYCHOLOGICAL HARM DID PARTICIPANTS EXPERIENCE IN THE MILGRAM EXPERIMENT?

A: PARTICIPANTS IN THE MILGRAM EXPERIMENT EXPERIENCED CONSIDERABLE PSYCHOLOGICAL HARM, INCLUDING EXTREME TENSION, VISIBLE DISTRESS (SWEATING, TREMBLING, STUTTERING, NERVOUS LAUGHTER), AND IN SOME CASES, UNCONTROLLABLE SEIZURES. THEY GENUINELY BELIEVED THEY WERE INFLECTING SEVERE PAIN, AND POTENTIALLY HARM, UPON ANOTHER HUMAN BEING, LEADING TO INTENSE INTERNAL CONFLICT AND GUILT. THIS MENTAL ANGUISH WAS A MAJOR ETHICAL CONCERN.

Q: DID PARTICIPANTS HAVE THE RIGHT TO WITHDRAW FROM MILGRAM'S STUDY?

A: TECHNICALLY, PARTICIPANTS WERE TOLD THEY COULD WITHDRAW AT ANY TIME. HOWEVER, THE EXPERIMENTER'S USE OF A SERIES OF FOUR PRODS ("PLEASE CONTINUE," "THE EXPERIMENT REQUIRES THAT YOU CONTINUE," ETC.) WAS SEEN BY CRITICS AS A FORM OF COERCION. THESE AUTHORITATIVE COMMANDS MADE IT VERY DIFFICULT FOR PARTICIPANTS TO EXERCISE THEIR RIGHT TO WITHDRAW WITHOUT FEELING THEY WERE DEFYING LEGITIMATE AUTHORITY OR SABOTAGING THE EXPERIMENT, THUS UNDERMINING THEIR AUTONOMY.

Q: HOW DID THE MILGRAM EXPERIMENT INFLUENCE MODERN ETHICAL GUIDELINES FOR RESEARCH?

A: THE MILGRAM EXPERIMENT HAD A PROFOUND AND LASTING IMPACT ON MODERN ETHICAL GUIDELINES. IT WAS A KEY FACTOR IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE BELMONT REPORT, WHICH ESTABLISHED PRINCIPLES OF RESPECT FOR PERSONS, BENEFICENCE, AND JUSTICE. IT ALSO LED TO THE MANDATORY ESTABLISHMENT OF INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARDS (IRBs) OR RESEARCH ETHICS COMMITTEES (RECs) TO REVIEW AND APPROVE ALL RESEARCH INVOLVING HUMAN SUBJECTS, ENSURING STRICT ADHERENCE TO INFORMED CONSENT, MINIMIZATION OF HARM, AND COMPREHENSIVE DEBRIEFING, AMONG OTHER PROTECTIONS.

Q: IS DECEPTION EVER ALLOWED IN PSYCHOLOGICAL RESEARCH TODAY?

A: DECEPTION IS VERY STRICTLY REGULATED IN PSYCHOLOGICAL RESEARCH TODAY. IT IS ONLY PERMITTED UNDER SPECIFIC, LIMITED CIRCUMSTANCES: WHEN ALTERNATIVE NON-DECEPTIVE METHODS ARE NOT FEASIBLE, THE POTENTIAL SCIENTIFIC OR EDUCATIONAL VALUE OF THE STUDY IS SIGNIFICANT, AND THE DECEPTION DOES NOT CAUSE SIGNIFICANT PSYCHOLOGICAL OR

PHYSICAL HARM. CRUCIALLY, PARTICIPANTS MUST BE FULLY DEBRIEFED AS SOON AS POSSIBLE AFTER THE STUDY, INFORMED OF THE DECEPTION, AND GIVEN THE OPTION TO WITHDRAW THEIR DATA IF THEY OBJECT TO THE DECEPTION.

Q: WHAT IS THE "DEBRIEFING" PROCESS, AND HOW WAS IT HANDLED IN MILGRAM'S STUDY?

A: DEBRIEFING IS THE PROCESS WHERE RESEARCHERS EXPLAIN THE TRUE PURPOSE OF A STUDY, ANY DECEPTION USED, AND ADDRESS ANY DISTRESS OR MISCONCEPTIONS PARTICIPANTS MIGHT HAVE. IN MILGRAM'S STUDY, PARTICIPANTS WERE DEBRIEFED AND TOLD THAT THE "LEARNER" WAS UNHARMED AND THE SHOCKS WERE NOT REAL. HOWEVER, THE ADEQUACY OF THIS DEBRIEFING HAS BEEN DEBATED, WITH CRITICS ARGUING THAT IT MIGHT NOT HAVE BEEN SUFFICIENT TO FULLY ALLEVIATE THE GUILT, SELF-DOUBT, OR DISTRESS EXPERIENCED BY PARTICIPANTS WHO BELIEVED THEY HAD ADMINISTERED HARMFUL SHOCKS.

The Milgram Experiment Ethical Issues

The Milgram Experiment Ethical Issues

Related Articles

- [annotated bibliography example with multiple sources](#)
- [tracking themes in the great gatsby](#)
- [cover letter sample bookkeeper](#)

[Back to Home](#)