

either to the description of the experiment as a genuine learning situation or a hoax, or due to the wording of the question asking S to estimate the fee the "teacher" would seek ("before beginning" versus "after completing"). However, 16 out of 60 Ss, or 27%, predicted that the "teacher" would continue despite the "learner's" suffering, and the mean voltage at which Ss predicted that the teacher would stop was 196 V.

As a post-experimental check of the manipulations, Ss were asked to recall in a rough form the description of the study about which they had just made various predictions, and the wording of the questions they had answered. No S failed to recall the salient aspects which constituted the experimental manipulations.

Negative results are a notoriously ungrateful topic for an experimental report. Nevertheless, it is felt that especially this experimental situation, which has been the subject of so much ambiguity and controversy, requires extension and generalization unto situations of somewhat wider scopes than those originally explored by Milgram.

The present experiment indicates, first of all, that quite substantial variations in the description of a compliance situation need not affect college students' predictions as to how the person in the situation

will behave. This "robustness" implies that Milgram's (1963) discrepancies between predicted and obtained behaviors might have held up even if the judges had not been told the true nature of the experiment.

However, the present study did give results which show judges to be somewhat less optimistic in their assessment of others than was the case for Milgram. More than a quarter of the Ss predicted completion, and the average terminal shock intensity was fairly intense. Predicted as well as actual behavior, though happily robust against the type of variability often ascribable to imprecisions in procedure, are nevertheless inevitably a function of response alternatives.

References

- Baumrind, Diane. Some thoughts on ethics of research: After reading Milgram's "Behavioral study of obedience." *Amer. Psychol.*, 1964, 19, 421-423.
- Milgram, S. Behavioral study of obedience. *J. abnorm. soc. Psychol.*, 1963, 67, No. 4, 371-378.
- Milgram, S. Issues in the study of obedience: A reply to Baumrind. *Amer. Psychol.*, 1964, 19, 848-852.
- Milgram, S. Liberating effects of group pressure. *J. pers. soc. Psychol.*, 1965, 1, 127-134.
- Milgram, S. Some conditions of obedience and disobedience to authority. *Hum. Relat.*, 1965, 18, 57-76.

Note

1. This study was conducted while the senior author held a National Science Foundation Research Grant GS 534.

Errata

MADIGAN, S. A., & PAIVIO, A. Instructional effects on semantic satiation. *Psychon. Sci.*, 1967, 7 (2), 45-46.—On the seventh line of the abstract, the word "of" should be "or" so that it reads "neutrality or irrelevancy." In addition the source for Smith and Raygor in the bibliography should be *J. abnorm. soc. Psychol.*, 1956, 52, 323-326.

WOLFF, JOSEPH L. The role of dimensional preferences in discrimination learning. *Psychon. Sci.*, 1966, 5 (12), 455-456.—On page 456, first column, second full paragraph, the text should read: "These results indicate that the relationship between dimensional preferences and learning found by Suchman and Trabasso to hold for (a) nursery school and kindergarten children, (b) color and form, and (c) a card sorting task, holds in addition for (a) first-graders . . ."