Ethics in Social Science Research

Name

Institution Affiliation

Ethics in Social Science Research

The Milgram Experiment

Violations of ethical principles

The first ethical violation committed with the Milgram experiment concerns deception. The researcher cheated the subjects, who were convinced that they were causing harm to the learners (Yale University Library, 2013). The participants were also intentionally placed in a situation of high stress. Some teachers were convinced that they had severely injured or killed the learner.

Moreover, Milgram deceived his participants regarding the objective of the study. Whereas it intended to assess obedience, he stated to them that he was examining the impacts of punishment on learning. While the participants were interviewed after the completion of the study, most researchers assert that it was not adequate since it did not avert the ensuing psychological harm that could have influenced the participants (Yale University Library, 2013).

Due to the appalling repercussions of the investigation, most opponents believed that the volunteers might have uncovered the actual objective of the study and were merely adhering to the experimenter's instructions (Yale University Library, 2013). Currently, since the analysis has been repeated numerous times, many psychoanalysts acknowledge Milgram's results and intend to engage in the issue, even more, discovering the validity of his findings.

The Little Albert Experiment

Violations of ethical principles

Currently, if one is engaged as a subject in any medical or psychoanalytical experiment, there is the provision that withdrawal is possible at any phase of the investigation without

experiencing harm. To that effect, it can be noted that Albert and his mother were not offered such a privilege (Burgemeester, 2014).

Psychoanalysts should lessen or remove the possibility that participating in an investigation might result in harm during and after the study. Little Albert was hurt during the experiment and would possibly have experienced long-term damage (Burgemeester, 2014).

Whereas it might be reasonable to criticize the conduct of the father of behavioral psychology, the methodology applied in the experiment was not effective (Burgemeester, 2014). There were no controls in the investigation, and only one subject was used.

Participants have to be provided with as much information concerning the study as possible before the analysis commences so that they can choose to participate centering on knowledge. When the experiment is such that offering information before the investigation might influence the finding, then a substitute is a comprehensive interview at the end of the study (Burgemeester, 2014). There was no observance of informed consent in Watson's treatment of Albert.

Asch Conformity Experiments

Violations of ethical principles

There were two violations of ethical principles in Asch conformity experiments. The participants were not safeguarded from the psychological tension that might happen if they differed with the majority. Research demonstrates that subjects in Asch-type circumstances have considerably heightened levels of autonomic arousal (Penn State University, 2016). The study also proposes that they were in a conflict situation, experiencing difficulty to choose to whether to document their observations or to adapt to the perspective of others (Penn State University, 2016).

Secondly, Asch lied to the student volunteers maintaining they were being involved in a vision test. Nonetheless, the actual objective was to observe the way the 'naïve' subject would respond to the conduct of the study associates. Still, dishonesty was vital in generating useful findings (Penn State University, 2016).

Harlow's Monkey Experiments

Most significant breaches

To begin with, it was evident that monkeys in this experiment experienced emotional harm due to their rearing is seclusion. This was manifest when the monkeys were stationed with a monkey reared by the mother (Aalai, 2016). The monkeys clustered in a corner in a state of constant sadness and terror.

Again, Harlow applied intimidation to demonstrate that the monkey viewed the cloth "mother" superiorly. The experimenter would frighten the infants and observer as the monkey scamper towards the cloth model. Harlow also performed experiments that secluded monkeys from their peers to prove that those that did not grasp being part of the group at a young age could not mate and integrate as they grew older (Aalai, 2016).

Moreover, Harlow devised an anxious atmosphere in female monkeys that had repercussions once they were parents (Aalai, 2016). The monkeys were disturbed to the extent that they hit their infant's face into the floor and rubbed it from side to side.

Rectifying the breaches

Given a chance to reprise the study, I would not have used monkeys as the subjects. This is because guidelines state that experiments should not be illegitimate concerning protected and endangered species. This especially limits experiment with orangutans, gorillas, and chimpanzees. Additionally, I would have threatened the subjects of the research. This is in

alignment with the guidelines, which state that distress should be reduced during caging. This is because social species require companionship and animals unaccustomed to other animals might be anxious when caged with them.

References

Aalai, A. (2016). Revisiting Harry Harlow's legacy: Cruelty towards monkeys. Retrieved from https://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/the-first-impression/201607/revisiting-harry-harlow-s-legacy-cruelty-towards-monkeys

Burgemeester, A. (2014). The Little Albert Experiment. Retrieved from https://psychologized.org/the-little-albert-experiment/

Penn State University. (2016). Asch's Conformity Experiment. Retrieved from https://sites.psu.edu/dps16/2016/03/17/aschs-conformity-experiment/

Yale University Library. (2013). Obedience to authority in the archive. Retrieved from http://web.library.yale.edu/news/2013/09/obedience-authority-archive