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19 The Power of the Situation

1  01:00:17:00 >> You put on the glasses.

2  01:00:18:21 You put on... you take the night stick, and, you know, you act the part.

3  01:00:22:10 >> ZIMBARDO: What power can turn a pacifist student into a sadistic guard?

4  01:00:27:29 >> Hi, Mr. Correctional Officer.

5  01:00:30:18 >> ZIMBARDO: Why would an ordinary, law-abiding man give potentially lethal shots to a stranger?

6  01:00:36:03 >> This one will be 195 volts.

7  01:00:41:00 >> ZIMBARDO: How can a person's eyesight be improved by simply changing the situation in which it's measured?

8  01:00:49:04 "The Power of the Situation," this time on Discovering Psychology.

9  01:01:28:16 >> ZIMBARDO: Most of psychology focuses on the individual: how an individual, taken alone, behaves, thinks, or feels.

10 01:01:37:21 But social psychology tries to understand human behavior within its broader social context.

11 01:01:45:03 Social psychologists look at all the ways in which people are influenced by other people.

12 01:01:51:14 The social context is the canvas on which we paint our lives.

13 01:01:55:22 It's where interactions with other people take place.

14 01:01:58:21 At every stage of life, from birth to death, people are there for us: to reward and punish, to arouse and frustrate, to make us laugh and cry.

15 01:02:09:20 More often than not the social context enriches our lives.

16 01:02:14:01 We need other people to reach our full potential.
To be isolated means being vulnerable to a host of pathologies of both body and mind.

But there are also times when the social context works against us, threatening our integrity and even our lives.

( Hitler speaking in German ) In the 1930s and '40s, the world witnessed and almost succumbed to the horrors of fascism.

By this man's command, war spread across continents.

Adolf Hitler had succeeded in creating a sociopolitical structure powerful enough to exert total control over the German people.

With the help of propaganda on a scale never before seen, the Nazi high command was even able to justify the so-called final solution.

Inevitably, social psychologists began to wonder how dictators could transform rational individuals into blindly obedient masses.

( cannons and gunshots firing ) With the fate of the world in doubt, the answers seemed critically important.

And so a team of researchers in the United States began to study the ways in which leaders directly affect their followers and how groups change the behavior of individuals.

The research team was led by Kurt Lewin, himself a refugee of Nazi Germany.

Lewin wanted to demonstrate that it was possible to translate socially significant issues, like the power of leaders, into hypotheses and test them in controlled experiments.

At a time when psychology was dominated by the study of rats in the laboratory, not people in the real world, Lewin's dynamic approach was a radical departure.

It was the beginning of modern social psychology.

Lewin and his colleagues were fascinated by the way dictators were able to mold the behavior of individuals by putting them into uniforms, giving them a new identity as part of the group.
So in 1939 they set up a unique experiment to assess the effects of different leadership styles on the way people behaved in groups.

They began by organizing three groups of boys meeting after school.

Each group had a leader who was trained by the researchers to play three very different styles of leadership.

When the men acted as autocratic leaders, they were to make all the decisions for the group.

When they acted as laissez-faire leaders, their job was to allow complete freedom, with almost no guidance.

And when they acted as democratic leaders, they actively encouraged and assisted the group's decision making.

At the end of each six-week period, the leaders switched groups.

In other words, each group of boys was exposed to all three leadership styles under three different men.

Under the autocratic leaders, the boys worked the hardest, but typically only when the leader was watching.

They were more aggressive and hostile, and they showed more submission to the leader.

They behaved like miniature fascists.

When the groups experienced a laissez-faire leadership style, little was accomplished.

The boys did the least amount of work and work of the poorest quality.

Total freedom without guidance led to chaos.

But when the groups were democratically run, they showed the highest levels of motivation and originality.

There was more mutual praise and more playfulness.

To the research team, the results were reassuring.

Democratic leadership had worked best, at a time when
dictatorship was proving so successful in Europe.

But there's also another powerful lesson here.

Notice that it was leadership style and the social situations it created, and not the personality of the individuals involved, that were the critical factors in the experiment.

This leads us to a central theme in social psychology: that social situations significantly control individual behavior.

For Lewin, human behavior is always a function of the individual and the social environment.

This means that the best, and worst, of human nature can often be brought out by manipulating some aspects of the social environment.

In another classic experiment, it was shown that even our most obvious perceptions can be manipulated.

Which line on the right do you think is the same size as the line on the left?

The correct answer, of course, is "B."

That's clear to anyone with normal vision.

Or is it?

Let's say you're a subject in what you think is an experiment on visual judgment, but which is really an experiment on conformity.

When every other person is asked to choose the proper line, they do something strange.

They pick "C" instead of "B."

Now it's your turn.

What will you say?

In this study conducted by Solomon Asch, everyone but the subject was part of Asch's team.

In this situation, 70% of the subjects sided with the majority's wrong judgment at least once.
And many of those who didn't conform still felt uncomfortable in not going along with the group.

That is incorrect.

ZIMBARDO: The ultimate conformity...

...195 volts.

ZIMBARDO: ...total blind obedience to a leader, was elicited in a controversial laboratory experiment by this researcher, Stanley Milgram, a former student of Solomon Asch.

Milgram wondered whether the evil deeds of the Nazis were the result of their personal defects or whether anyone has the capacity for evil if the situation is powerful enough.

In 1961, when Hitler's henchman, Adolf Eichmann, was standing trial for war crimes, Milgram wanted to find out how far ordinary people would go in obeying orders.

Would they, like Eichmann, execute strangers if they were told to?

In Milgram's experiment, a subject was paid to participate in what he thought was a study of memory.

He was asked to play the role of teacher, helping someone improve his memory.

Want to step right in here, learner, and have a seat there.

You can leave your coat on the back of that chair, if you will please.

Guiding the subject was the experimenter in the lab coat, who acted as the legitimate authority in the situation.

Both the experimenter and the man being tested as the learner were part of Milgram's team.

And how was the subject supposed to help the learner improve his memory?

By delivering electric shocks as punishment for every mistake.
This machine generates electric shocks.

When you press one of the switches all the way down, the learner gets a shock.

>> ZIMBARDO: The shocks began as mild, but they had to be increased with each error until they were potentially lethal.

Although no shocks were actually given, the teacher-subject was made to think he was punishing the learner.

>> Let me out of here!

You have no right to keep me here!

Let me out!

Let me out of here!

Let me out!

>> Continue, please.

>> Let me out of here!

My heart's bothering me!

>> Go on.

>> Let me out.

>> Red.

(buzzer) That is incorrect.

This will be a 330.

>> Ow!

>> The correct phrase is "rich boy."

>> Let me out of here!

My heart's bothering me.

Let me out, I tell you.

Let me out of here!
105 01:10:24:05 Let me out of here!
106 01:10:25:11 You have no right to hold me here!
107 01:10:27:04 >> The next phrase is "fast..."
108 01:10:28:01 >> Let me out!
109 01:10:28:25 Let me out of here!
110 01:10:29:25 >> ...bird, car, train, plane."
111 01:10:33:01 ( buzzer ) >> Continue, teacher.
112 01:10:37:29 >> ZIMBARDO: What would you do in this situation?
113 01:10:40:14 Would you continue?
114 01:10:45:18 >> That is incorrect.
115 01:10:47:11 This will be 345.
116 01:10:50:14 >> Ow!
117 01:10:52:05 >> The correct answer is "fast bird."
118 01:10:57:10 The next one blunt.
119 01:10:59:16 ( buzzer ) >> ZIMBARDO: At the time, 40 experts were asked to predict the performance of the subjects.
120 01:11:09:17 They estimated that most would not go beyond 150 volts and only one in 1,000 -- the sadists -- would go all the way to 450 volts.
121 01:11:20:28 In fact, two-thirds of the subjects went all the way.
122 01:11:25:12 While many of them objected, the majority did not disobey.
123 01:11:31:20 I asked Stanley Milgram how many of the subjects who quit the experiment ever got up to help the learner without first getting the experimenter's permission.
124 01:11:41:03 He said, "Not one, not ever."
125 01:11:46:12 So blind obedience is not limited to the fascist mentality.
126 01:11:50:10 It's part of the basic human condition, brought out by situational forces.
Hundreds and hundreds of subjects obeyed the experimenter: men and women, young and old.

As the author C.P. Snow wrote, "When you think of the long and gloomy history of man, you'll find more hideous crimes have been committed in the name of obedience than have been committed in the name of rebellion."

Whenever we try to understand some unusual aspect of human behavior, like that of the Nazi guards or the subjects in the obedience experiment, we typically explain it in terms of personal traits, without sufficiently considering the impact of the situation.

This dual tendency to attribute the causes of behavior to personal factors while underestimating the effects of the situation is known as the fundamental attribution error.

We all make the fundamental attribution error, in part because our culture emphasizes individual accomplishments, and in part because we have difficulty admitting how easily we ourselves can be manipulated by situational forces.

Just consider the strange case of the Stanford University jail, which once stood here in the basement of the Psychology building.

It was part of an unusual experiment on the psychology of imprisonment that my colleagues Craig Haney, Curt Banks, Carlo Prescott, and I conducted in the early '70s.

We wanted to see just what happens when you put good people in a bad situation -- in this case, in jail.

Each of the students who volunteered for our study was carefully tested.

Each had to be psychologically and physically healthy to participate.

A small group of students was then randomly selected to act as prisoners, while others became guards.

We surprised the prisoners by having them arrested at their homes and dormitories.

At the jail, uniforms and status symbols, rules, and other
details helped distinguish between the two groups, which were indistinguishable at the start.

The prisoners underwent a series of rituals to establish their new lowly status.

They lived in tiny cells.

They spent 24 hours a day here, cut off from their usual surroundings.

>> What is happening to prisoner 819?

>> Prisoner 819 is being punished, Mr. Correctional Officer.

>> Let's hear it five times, make sure you remember it.

>> Prisoner 819 is being punished, Mr. Correctional Officer.

>> Down.

Up.

Down.

>> ZIMBARDO: The guards, however, only worked eight-hour shifts, and returned to their normal routines as students when off the job.

>> All right, 516, these aren't belly rolls; these are push-ups.

Keep that back straight.

Down.

>> ZIMBARDO: What happened surprised everyone, including me.

The illusion became the reality.

The boundary between the role each person was playing and his real personal identity was erased.

>> Hi, Mr. Correctional Officer.

>> Now, keep it straight.

>> ZIMBARDO: Nice boys became brutal guards.
Healthy kids got sick.

"Get in that..."

If you don't eat, you're not going to have very much energy.

"ZIMBARDO: Active ones became passive and zombie-like prisoners."

"This is unbelievable."

They took our clothes.

"Hands off the door."

"And they took our bed."

"Hands off the door."

"Watch your hands."

"ZIMBARDO: The situation became so overpowering that many of the prisoners developed extreme stress reactions and had to be released."

"...your bed and your clothes..."

"ZIMBARDO: But no one ever said, "I quit the experiment."

They had lost all perspective.

"You come over here."

"Should I act it out, Mr."

"Correctional Officer?"

"You should act it out."

You be the bride of Frankenstein, and you be Frankenstein.

I want you to walk over here like Frankenstein and say that you love...

"ZIMBARDO: What kind of guard would you be: sadistic or supportive?"

Would you be a conforming prisoner or a heroic resister?
The prison study, like Milgram's experiment, is not typical of research in social psychology.

Some psychologists feel both studies violated ethical guidelines and should never have been done.

The prison study, like Milgram's experiment, is not typical of research in social psychology.

Some psychologists feel both studies violated ethical guidelines and should never have been done.

Two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten.

Now you go over there and tell 546 that you love him.

>> I love you.

>> Well, ain't that sweet?

Ain't that sweet?

>> ZIMBARDO: At times even I forgot I was an experimenter and acted like a prison warden.

And so we were forced to call off what was planned as a two-week experiment after only six days.

How could such basically good people have done such terrible things?

It's because we all have the capacity for evil and good, waiting for the right or wrong situation to bring it out.

And when the situation ends, we return to our old selves again.

Extensive follow-ups done over many years failed to reveal any negative long-term effects on the subjects in the prison study.

If anything, many subjects said it was a positive learning experience.

They had seen a side of themselves they had never thought possible.

>> You put a uniform on and are given a role, I mean, a job, saying your job is to keep these people in line.

Then you're not... certainly not the same person as if you're in street clothes and in a different role.

You really become that person once you put on that khaki uniform, you put on the glasses, you put on... you take the
night stick, and, you know, you act the part.

That's your costume, and you have to act accordingly when you put it on.

>> It still is a prison to me.

I... I don't look on it as an experiment or a simulation.

It's just a prison that was run by psychologists instead of run by the state.

I began to feel that... that identity, the person that I was that had decided to go to prison was distant from me, was... was remote until finally I wasn't that.

I was... I was 416.

I was really my number.

And 416 was going to have to decide what to do.

It let me in on some knowledge that... that I've never experienced firsthand.

>> Uh-huh.

>> I've read about it.

I've read a lot about it, but I've never experienced it firsthand.

I've never seen someone turn that way.

And I know you're a nice guy, you know.

Do you understand?

I do.

I do know you're a nice guy.

I don't get that... because I know what you can turn into.

I know what you're willing to do.

If you say, "Oh, well, I'm not going to hurt anybody.

Oh, well, it's a limited situation."
Or, "It's over in two weeks."

Well, if you were in the position, what would you have done?

I don't know.

Experiments like the prison study, which illuminate the darkest side of human nature, also raise important ethical questions about the treatment of subjects.

Today the ethical guidelines of research are much stricter than they were earlier, and independent review boards are asked to evaluate every research proposal in order to protect the well-being of subjects, to weigh their emotional and physical costs against the scientific benefits.

It's unlikely that Milgram's experiment or the prison study could be done today because of the suffering they caused.

Now, you might wonder whether other social psychologists studied the better side of human nature, where situational power has positive effects.

Happily, the answer is yes.

Let's take a look at the only film of a remarkable experiment conducted by psychologist Tom Moriarty at a beach in New York City.

The man on the right is going to pretend to steal a radio from a member of the research team.

Now, notice the reaction of the people nearby.

Nothing.

But what if the victim asks her neighbor a favor, to keep an eye on the radio?

What then?

With a simple request, a special human bond is forged and personal responsibility established.

Want to convert apathy to action?

Try asking for it.
Try changing the situation and see how behavior changes.

One of the best examples of positive situational power is an experiment conducted by psychologist Ellen Langer of Harvard University.

Langer wanted to find out whether changing the situation at a flight-training session would improve the vision of her research subjects.

If the subjects were treated as pilots, would they actually see better?

Ellen Langer set up an experiment to answer this question.

We restaged her experiment with a sophisticated flight simulator.

These banks of computers simulate a flight experience so realistic that the Air Force trains its pilots here.

If subjects believe that pilots must have good vision, can the power of the situation actually improve their vision?

>> One of the most important visual tasks a fighter pilot can be asked to perform is to identify markings and features on another airplane.


>> ZIMBARDO: Langer selected Air Force ROTC cadets as subjects.

They all took a standard vision test.

None of them knew the experiment's real purpose.

Half the subjects, chosen at random, put on flight suits.

Then the instructor took each subject on a flight in the fully operational simulator.

>> Initiate master burn on both engines.

We've got a good jump on the nozzles and the fuel flow.

Releasing the brakes.

Okay, now the airplane's accelerating out real well,
approaching 350.

257 01:22:41:05  Left engine checks good.
258 01:22:42:10  Burn on termination.
259 01:22:43:02  The right one's coming on.
260 01:22:44:07  And we're level at 7,000 feet.
261 01:22:47:26  And just go through a very brief exercise on the flight controls.
262 01:22:52:05  >> ZIMBARDO: The subject was now in the grip of a powerful situation.
263 01:22:55:16  >> Over to 60 degrees.
264 01:22:57:01  Go ahead and get the radar set up here so we can pick up the target on the radar when he shows up.
265 01:23:05:11  Okay, now we've got a target.
266 01:23:06:21  Okay, what's its indicated airspeed?
267 01:23:08:24  >> 300.
268 01:23:09:16  >> 300, all right.
269 01:23:10:16  Good closure.
270 01:23:11:22  Looks like... looks like an FB-111.
271 01:23:15:28  Okay, we'll roll out on a heading of north, and we'll be at 7,000 feet, 350 indicated.
272 01:23:25:10  >> ZIMBARDO: During the flight, the instructor asked the subject to read markings on the other plane.
273 01:23:30:23  >> If you'd look at the aircraft, cover your left eye, and read what you see, please.
274 01:23:36:07  >> All right.
276 01:23:41:17  >> ZIMBARDO: The markings were in fact the same vision test each cadet had taken earlier.
Cover your left eye and read what you see, please.

Okay.

ZIMBARDO: 40% of the subjects in this situation actually improved their performance on the second vision test.

The simulator is not... not working today.

ZIMBARDO: But for a second control group of subjects, the situation was quite different.

These cadets were not treated as pilots, they did not put on flight suits, and they were told that the simulator was broken.

Only a few visual displays were working.

The visual displays are working.

As you know...

ZIMBARDO: Each subject took the same eye test as the first group.

Visual skills are extremely important to a fighter pilot.

So if you'd look at the aircraft and cover your left eye and read the markings, please.

"F," "D," "P."

ZIMBARDO: But not one of them improved his or her test score.

The situation was not powerful enough to affect their vision.

So there you have it.

We've seen how social psychology explores the influence of leaders, groups, and society.

Pull yourself right up to the counter, please.

ZIMBARDO: How researchers try to unravel the mysteries of human nature by using experiments and field studies.

This one will be 195 volts.
>> Ow!

>> We've got a good jump on the nozzles and fuel flow.

>> ZIMBARDO: And we've seen illustrations of one of the major lessons of social psychology: the power of situation.

In our next program, however, we're going to see the social animal in a different light: as an active force that can create and mold situations.

And we'll learn the second lesson of social psychology: that each of us constructs different realities out of the same circumstances.

Sometimes we create a little peace of heaven and sometimes a bit of hell.

Until next time, I'm Philip Zimbardo.
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