

identification of those engaging in conversation, thus ensuring absolute anonymity in the study. (Bergen, Antfolk, Jern, Alanko, & Santtila, 2013, p. 108)

Do you agree?

You may also be surprised to learn that a few IRBs have allowed both Milgram's obedience experiment and Zimbardo's prison experiment to be replicated with the addition of more human subject protections. For example, Jerry Burger replicated Milgram's experiment with several modifications (Burger, 2009). In the experiment, the following protections were implemented: (1) no subject was allowed to go beyond the 150-volt mark; (2) a two-step screening process was used to exclude any individuals who might have a negative reaction to the experience; (3) participants were told at these two times that they could withdraw from the study at any time and still receive their \$50 for participation; (4) participants were monitored by a clinical psychologist to identify excessive stress; and (5) participants were told immediately after the experiment that the "learner" had received no shocks. After all of these safeguards were implemented, the IRB at Santa Clara University, where Dr. Burger is a faculty member, approved the project. Somewhat troubling, results indicated that obedience rates in this 2006 replication were only slightly lower than those Milgram found. In fact, the majority of both men and women continued after the limit of 150 volts was reached. Burger illuminated the importance of his findings by concluding, "Although one must be cautious when making the leap from laboratory studies to complex social behaviors like genocide, understanding the social psychological factors that contribute to people acting in unexpected and unsettling ways is important" (Burger, 2009, p. 10). If you had been serving on an IRB, would you have determined that the benefits learned from this study outweighed the potential costs?
