

These findings imply that our brains immediately "leap" at the chance to assume less individual responsibility when we are part of a group.

CONCLUSION

The results of this body of research may seem rather pessimistic, but you should recognize that these studies deal with extremely specific situations in which people fail to help. Frequent examples may be found every day of people helping other people, of altruistic behaviors, and heroic acts. Darley and Latané's research is important, however, not only to explain a perplexing human behavior, but to help change it. Perhaps, as more people become aware of the bystander effect, they will make the extra effort to intervene in an emergency, even if others are present. In fact, research has demonstrated that people who have learned about the bystander effect, are more likely to help in emergencies (Beaman et al., 1978). The bottom line is this: Never assume that others have intervened or will intervene in an emergency. *Always act as if you are the only person there.*

- Beaman, A., Barnes, P., Klentz, B., & McQuirk, B. (1978). Increasing helping rates through information dissemination: Teaching pays. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 4, 406-411.
- Garcia, S., Weaver, K., Darley, J., & Moskowitz, G. (2002). Crowded minds: The implicit bystander effect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83, 843-853.
- Hoefnagels, Cees, and Machteld Zwikker. (2001). The Bystander Dilemma and Child Abuse: Extending the Latané and Darley Model to Domestic Violence. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 31, 1158-1183.
- Latané, B., & Darley, J. M. (1968). Group inhibition of bystander intervention in emergencies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 10, 215-221.
- Latané, B., & Darley, J. M. (1970). *The unresponsive bystander: Why doesn't he help?* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

OBEY AT ANY COST?

Milgram, S. (1963). Behavioral study of obedience. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 67, 371-378.

If someone in a position of authority ordered you to deliver an electrical shock of 350 volts to another person, because the other person answered a question incorrectly, would you obey? Neither would I. If you met someone who was willing to do such a thing, you would probably think of him or her as cruel and sadistic. This study by Stanley Milgram of Yale University set out to examine the idea of obedience and produced some shocking and disturbing findings.

Milgram's research on obedience is among the most famous in all of psychology's history. It is included in every general psychology text and every social psychology text. If you talk to students of psychology, more of them are familiar with this study than with any other. Out of this study came a book by Milgram (1974) on the psychology of obedience and a film about the research itself that is widely shown in college and university classes. Not only is

this experiment referred to in discussions of obedience, but it has also been highly influential in issues of research methodology and the ethics of using human subjects in psychological research.

Milgram's idea for this project grew out of his desire to investigate scientifically how people could be capable of carrying out great harm to others simply because they were ordered to do so. Milgram was referring specifically to the hideous atrocities committed on command during World War II, and also, more generally, to the inhumanity that has been perpetrated throughout history by people following the orders of others. It appeared to Milgram that in some situations, the tendency to obey is so deeply ingrained and powerful that it cancels out a person's ability to behave morally, ethically, or even sympathetically.

When behavioral scientists decide to study some complex aspect of human behavior, their first step is to gain control over the behavioral situation so that they can approach it scientifically. This can often be the greatest challenge to a researcher, since many events in the real world are difficult to re-create in a laboratory setting. So Milgram's problem was how to cause one person to order another person to physically injure a third person without anyone actually getting injured.

THEORETICAL PROPOSITIONS

Milgram's primary theoretical basis for this study was that humans have a tendency to obey other people who are in a position of authority over them, even if, in obeying, they violate their own codes of moral and ethical behavior. He believed that, for example, many individuals who would never intentionally cause someone physical harm would inflict pain on a victim if ordered to do so by a person perceived to be a powerful authority figure.

METHOD

Probably the most ingenious portion of this study is the technique that was developed to test the power of obedience in the laboratory. Milgram designed a rather scary-looking shock generator: a large electronic device with 30 toggle switches labeled with voltage levels starting at 30 volts and increasing by 15-volt intervals up to 450 volts. These switches were labeled in groups such as *slight shock*, *moderate shock*, and *danger: severe shock*. The idea was that a subject could be ordered to administer electric shocks at increasing levels to another person. Before you conclude that Milgram was truly sadistic himself, this was a very realistic-looking simulated shock generator, but no one ever actually received any painful shocks.

The subjects for this study were 40 males between the ages of 20 and 50. There were 15 skilled or unskilled workers, 16 white-collar sales- or businessmen, and nine professional men. They were recruited through newspaper ads and direct-mail solicitation asking for subjects to be paid participants in a study about memory and learning at Yale University. Each subject participated in the study individually. In order to obtain an adequate number of

subjects, each was paid \$4.50. (Remember, these are 1963 dollars.) All subjects were clearly told that this payment was simply for coming to the laboratory, and it was theirs to keep no matter what happened after they arrived. This was to ensure that subjects did not behave in certain ways because they were fearful of not being paid.

In addition to the subjects, there were two other key participants: a confederate in the experiment (a 47-year-old accountant) posing as another subject, and an *actor* (dressed in a gray lab coat, looking very official) playing the part of the experimenter.

As a participant arrived at the social interaction laboratory at Yale, he was seated next to another *subject* (the confederate). Obviously, the true purpose of the experiment could not be revealed to subjects, since this would completely alter their behavior. Therefore, a *cover story* was given by the experimenter, who explained to the subjects that this was a study on the effect of punishment on learning. The subjects then drew pieces of paper out of a hat to determine who would be the teacher and who would be the learner. This drawing was rigged so that the true subject always became the teacher and the accomplice was always the learner. Keep in mind that the *learner* was a confederate in the experiment, as was the person playing the part of the *experimenter*.

The learner was then taken into the next room and was, with the subject watching, strapped to a chair and wired up with electrodes (complete with electrode paste to *avoid any blisters or burns*) connected to the shock generator in the adjoining room. The learner, although his arms were strapped down, was able to reach four buttons marked *a*, *b*, *c*, and *d*, in order to answer questions posed by the teacher from the next room.

The learning task was thoroughly explained to the teacher and the learner. Briefly, it involved the learner memorizing connections between various pairs of words. It was a rather lengthy list and not an easy memory task. The teacher-subject would read the list of word pairs and then test the learner's memory of them. The teacher was instructed by the experimenter to administer an electric shock each time the learner responded incorrectly. Most important, for each incorrect response, the teacher was to move up one level of shock on the generator. All of this was simulated so realistically that no subject suspected that the shocks were not really being delivered.

The learner-confederate's responses were preprogrammed to be correct or incorrect in the same sequence for all the subjects. Furthermore, as the amount of voltage increased with incorrect responses, the learner began to shout his discomfort from the other room (in prearranged, prerecorded phrases, including the fact that his heart was bothering him), and at the 300-volt level, he pounded on the wall and demanded to be let out. After 300 volts he became completely silent and refused to answer any more questions. The teacher was instructed to treat this lack of a response as an incorrect response and to continue the procedure.

Most of the subjects would turn to the experimenter at some point for guidance on whether to continue the shocks. When this happened, the ex-

perimenter ordered the subject to continue, in a series of commands increasing in severity as more prodding was necessary:

Command 1: Please continue.

Command 2: The experiment requires that you continue.

Command 3: It is absolutely essential that you continue.

Command 4: You have no other choice, you must go on.

A measure of obedience was obtained simply by recording the level of shock at which each subject refused to continue. Since there were 30 switches on the generator, each subject could receive a score of 0 to 30. Subjects who went all the way to the top of the scale were referred to as *obedient subjects* and those who broke off at any lower point were termed *defiant subjects*.

RESULTS

Would the subjects obey the commands of this experimenter? How high on the voltage scale did they go? What would you predict? Think of yourself, your friends, people in general. What percentage do you think would deliver shocks all the way through the 30 levels; all the way up to 450 volts—danger: severe shock? Before discussing the actual results of the study, Milgram asked a group of Yale University seniors, all psychology majors, as well as various colleagues to make such a prediction. The estimates ranged from 0% to 3%, with an average estimate of 1.2%. That is, no more than 3 people out of 100 were predicted to deliver the maximum shock.

Table 1 summarizes the "shocking" results. Upon command of the experimenter, every subject continued at least to the 300-volt level, which was when the confederate banged on the wall to be let out and stopped answering. But most surprising is the number of subjects who obeyed orders to continue all the way to the top of the scale.

Although 14 subjects defied orders and broke off before reaching the maximum voltage, 26 of the 40 subjects, or 65%, followed the experimenter's orders and proceeded to the top of the shock scale. This is not to say that the subjects were calm or happy about what they were doing. Many exhibited signs of extreme stress and concern for the man receiving the shocks, and even became angry at the experimenter. Yet they obeyed.

The researchers were concerned that some of the subjects might suffer psychological distress from having gone through the ordeal of shocking another person, especially when the learner had ceased to respond for the last third of the experiment. To help alleviate this anxiety, after the subjects finished the experiment, they received a full explanation (called a debriefing) of the true purpose of the study and of all the procedures, including the deception that had been employed. In addition, the subjects were interviewed as to their feelings and thoughts during the procedure and the confederate "learner" was brought in for a friendly reconciliation with each subject.

TABLE 1 Level of Shock Delivered by Subjects

NUMBER OF VOLTS TO BE DELIVERED	NUMBER WHO REFUSED TO CONTINUE AT THIS LEVEL
Slight shock	
15	0
30	0
45	0
60	0
Moderate shock	
75	0
90	0
105	0
120	0
Strong shock	
135	0
150	0
165	0
180	0
Very strong shock	
195	0
210	0
225	0
240	0
Intense shock	
255	0
270	0
285	0
300	5
Extreme intensity shock	
315	4
330	2
345	1
360	1
Danger: severe shock	
375	1
390	0
405	0
420	0
XXX—	
435	0
450	26

(From Milgram, 1963, p. 376.)

DISCUSSION

Milgram's discussion of his findings focused on two main points. The first was the surprising strength of the subjects' tendency to obey. These were average, normal people who agreed to participate in an experiment about learning, not sadistic, cruel individuals in any way. Milgram points out that from childhood these subjects had learned that it is immoral to hurt others against their

will. So, why did they do so? The experimenter was a person in a position of authority, but if you think about it, how much authority did he really have? He had no power to enforce his orders, and subjects would lose nothing by refusing to follow orders. Clearly the *situation* carried a force of its own that somehow made obedience significantly greater than was expected.

The second key observation made during the course of this study was the extreme tension and anxiety manifested by the subjects as they obeyed the experimenter's commands. Again, it might be expected that such discomfort could be relieved simply by refusing to go on, and yet this is not what happened. Milgram quotes one observer (who watched a subject through a one-way mirror):

I observe a mature and initially poised businessman enter the laboratory smiling and confident. Within 20 minutes he was reduced to a twitching, stuttering wreck who was rapidly approaching a point of nervous collapse. . . . At one point he pushed his fist into his forehead and muttered, "Oh, God! Let's stop it." And yet he continued to respond to every word of the experimenter and obeyed to the end. (p. 377)

Milgram listed several points at the end of the article to attempt to explain why this particular situation produced such a high degree of obedience. In summary, from the point of view of the subject, his main points were that (1) if it's being sponsored by Yale, it must be in good hands, and who am I to question such a great institution; (2) the goals of the experiment appear to be important, and therefore, since I volunteered, I'll do my part to assist in the realization of those goals; (3) the learner, after all, also voluntarily came here and he has an obligation to the project too; (4) hey, it was just by chance that I'm the teacher and he's the learner—we drew lots and it could have just as easily been the other way around; (5) they're paying me for this, I'd better do my job; (6) I don't know all that much about the rights of a psychologist and his subjects, so I will yield to his discretion on this; and (7) they told us both that the shocks are painful, but not dangerous.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE FINDINGS

Milgram's findings have held up quite well in the nearly 30 years since this article was published. Milgram himself repeated the procedure on similar subjects outside of the Yale setting, on unpaid college student volunteers, and on women subjects, and he found similar results each time.

In addition, he expanded further on his findings in this study by conducting a series of related experiments designed to reveal the conditions that promote or limit obedience (see Milgram, 1974). He found that the physical, and therefore emotional, distance of the victim from the teacher altered the amount of obedience. The highest level of obedience (93% going to the top of the voltage scale) occurred when the learner was in another room and could not be seen or heard. When the learner was in the same room with the

subject and the subject was required to force the learner's hand onto a shock plate, the rate of obedience dropped to 30%.

Milgram also discovered that the physical distance of the authority figure to the subject also influenced obedience. The closer the experimenter, the greater the obedience. In one condition, the experimenter was out of the room and telephoned his commands to the subject. In this case obedience fell to only 21%.

Finally, on a more positive note, when subjects were allowed to punish the learner by using any level of shock they wished, no one ever pressed any switch higher than No. 2, or 45 volts.

CRITICISMS

While Milgram's research has been extremely influential in our understanding of obedience, it has also had far-reaching effects in the area of the ethical treatment of human subjects. Even though no one ever received any shocks, how do you suppose you would feel, knowing you had been willing to shock someone (possibly to death) simply because a person in a lab coat told you to? Critics of Milgram's methods (e.g., Baumrind, 1964; Miller, 1986) claim that unacceptable levels of stress were created in the subjects during the experiment. Furthermore, it has been argued that the potential for lasting effects existed. When the deception is revealed to subjects at the end of their ordeal, they may feel used, embarrassed, and possibly distrustful of psychologists or legitimate authority figures in their future lives.

Another line of criticism focused on the validity of Milgram's findings. The basis for this criticism was that since the subjects had a trusting and rather dependent relationship with the experimenter, and the laboratory was an unfamiliar setting, obedience found there did not represent obedience in real life. Therefore, critics claim, the results of Milgram's studies were not only invalid, but because of this poor validity the treatment his subjects were exposed to could not be justified.

Milgram responded to criticisms by surveying subjects after they had participated. He found that 84% of his participants were glad to have participated, and only about 1% regretted the experience. In addition, a psychiatrist interviewed 40 of the subjects who were judged to have been the most uncomfortable in the laboratory and concluded that none had suffered any long-term effects. As to the criticism that his laboratory findings did not reflect real life, Milgram said, "A person who comes to the laboratory is an active, choosing adult, capable of accepting or rejecting the prescriptions for action addressed to him" (Milgram, 1964, p. 852).

The Milgram studies reported here have been a focal point in the ongoing debate over experimental ethics involving human subjects. It is, in fact, arguable whether this research has been more influential in the area of social psychology and obedience or in policy formation on the ethical treatment of human subjects in psychological research.

RECENT APPLICATIONS

The breadth of influence that Milgram's obedience project continues to exert on current research can best be appreciated through a brief annotated selection of recent studies that have been primarily motivated by Milgram's early methods and findings. As has been the case in every year since the early 1960s when Milgram carried out his studies, these studies are divided between attempts to refine and elaborate on people's tendency to obey authority figures, and the omnipresent debate about the ethics of using deception in research involving human subjects.

Thomas Blass, a leading authority on the work and career of Stanley Milgram, and author of his biography, *The Man Who Shocked the World* (2004), has reviewed all the research and social implications stemming from Milgram's obedience studies (Blass, 1999; 2002). In general, Blass has found universal support for Milgram's original findings, but, more importantly, he suggests that obedience rates have not changed significantly during the 40 plus years since Milgram first published his findings. This is contrary to many people's intuitive judgments that Americans in general have become less respectful of authority and more willing to rebel and fight back when ordered to perform behaviors with which they disagree. Another question that often arises about Milgram's early studies concerns gender and the fact that all his original subjects were male. Do you think, overall, that men or women would be more likely to obey an authority figure? Blass's review of later studies by Milgram and numerous others found *no difference* in obedience rates for males versus females. For more details about the history and influences of Milgram's work, see Blass's Web site at <http://www.stanleymilgram.com>.

A very pertinent application of Milgram's findings examined the psychological experience of "execution teams" charged with carrying out the death sentence in Louisiana State prisons (Osofsky & Osofsky, 2002). The researchers interviewed 50 correctional officers who were directly involved with executions. They found that, although exposed far more than most people to trauma and death, the subjects were not found to be clinically depressed. They reported relying on religious beliefs, identification with their peer group, and their ability to diffuse responsibility to deal with painful emotions. "Nevertheless, the officers experience conflicted feelings and frequently report having a hard time carrying out society's 'ultimate punishment'" (p. 358).

On the ethics side, a recent study employs Milgram's study in examining potentially thorny ethical issues for social science research conducted on the Internet (Pittenger, 2003). Today, a great deal of research is conducted via the World Wide Web, and the number of such studies is likely to increase significantly in the future. Pittenger contends that researchers must be alert to potential ethical violations relating to invasion of privacy, obtaining informed consent, using deceptive tactics on line. "The Internet offers unique

challenges to researchers," Pittenger writes. "Among these are the need to define the distinction between private and public behavior performed on the Internet, ensure mechanisms for obtaining valid informed consent from participants, and performing debriefing exercises, verify the validity of data collected" (p. 45).

An important question is: What should be done to protect subjects from irresponsible, deceptive practices in psychological research, while at the same time allowing for *some* deception when absolutely necessary for scientific advancement? A study by Wendler (1996) seeks to answer this question by proposing that subjects in studies involving deception be given an increased level of "informed consent." (See the discussion of this concept in the preface to this book.) This enhanced informed consent would inform you of the study's *intention* to use deception before you agree to be a subject in the experiment. "This 'second order consent' approach to acceptable deception," claims Wendler, "represents our best chance for reconciling respect for subjects with the occasional scientific need for deceptive research" (p. 87).

In closing, Milgram historian Thomas Blass remarks in his 2002 biographical review of Milgram's life and work:

We didn't need Milgram to tell us we have a tendency to obey orders. What we didn't know before Milgram's experiments is just how powerful this tendency is. And having been enlightened about our extreme readiness to obey authorities, we can try to take steps to guard ourselves against unwelcome or reprehensible commands (Blass, 2002, p. 73).

- Baumrind, D. (1964). Some thoughts on the ethics of research: After reading Milgram's "Behavioral Study of Obedience." *American Psychologist*, 19, 421-423.
- Blass, T. (1999). The Milgram paradigm after 35 years: Some things we now know about obedience to authority. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 29(5), 955-978.
- Blass, T. (2002). The man who shocked the world. *Psychology Today*, 35, 68-74.
- Blass, T. (2004). *The man who shocked the world*. NY: Basic Books.
- Milgram, S. (1964). Issues in the study of obedience: A reply to Baumrind. *American Psychologist*, 19, 448-452.
- Milgram, S. (1974). *Obedience to authority*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Miller, A. G. (1986). *The obedience studies: A case study of controversy in social science*. New York: Praeger.
- Osofsky, M., & Osofsky, H. (2002). The Psychological Experience of Security Officers Who Work with Executions. *Psychiatry: Interpersonal and Biological Processes*, 65, 358-370.
- Pittenger, D. (2003). Internet research: An opportunity to revisit classic ethical problems in behavioral research. *Ethics and Behavior*, 13, 45-60.
- Wendler, D. (1996). Deception in medical and behavioral research: Is it ever acceptable? *Milbank Quarterly*, 74(1), 87.

AUTHOR INDEX

- Aase, H., 83
 Able, K., 115
 Abraham, L., 26
 Abramson, L., 248
 Acherman, P., 48
 Ackerman, S., 285
 Adams, J., 240
 Adams, R.J., 40
 Ader, R., 70
 Addison, J., 299
 Adkins, A., 198
 Adolph, K., 32
 Aeschleman, S., 82
 Agar, N., 26
 Aguilar, A., 141
 Ajzen, I., 292
 Alberty, I., 189
 Alper, J., 26
 Amit, T., 141
 Anastasi, A., 277, 284
 Andrasik, F., 263
 Andrews, T., 100
 Anshel, R., 69
 Antikainen, R., 181
 Arenella, J., 277
 Aronoff, J., 278
 Aronow, E., 277
 Arthur, R., 179
 Arvey, R., 24
 Baillargeon, R., 141
 Baker, R., 63
 Baldwin, D., 216
 Boncroft, J., 167
 Banderet, L., 277
 Bandura, A., 89
 Barde, J., 215
 Barnard, P., 308
 Baumrind, D., 197
 Baumrind, D., 314
 Beaman, A., 308
 Beattie, V., 17
 Beckwith, J., 26
 Beere, D., 285
 Benn, A., 278
 Bennett, A., 116
 Bennett, E. L., 16, 17
 Berger, D., 83
 Berger, S., 32
 Best, J., 106
 Biehl, M., 174
 Billard, G., 9
 Billing, C., 26
 Bingman, B., 115
 Blakemore, C., 40
 Blass, T., 315, 316
 Boissy, A., 174
 Boisvert, C., 233
 Bolte, S., 173
 Bond, R., 300
 Bonobelli, A., 48
 Bottow, B., 149
 Bouchard, T., 24, 25
 Bower, B., 41
 Bowers, K. S., 62
 Brand, R., 217
 Braiker, H., 248
 Broughton, N., 233
 Brown, R., 263
 Bruner, A., 82
 Buhmann, H., 83
 Burrell, G., 233
 Cacioppo, J., 133
 Campos, J., 31
 CDC, 248
 Cerwonka, E., 299
 Chaiken, A., 98
 Chaves, J., 63
 Chesterman, P., 233
 Cloninger, A., 285
 Clum, C., 198
 Cohen, D., 225
 Cohen, N., 71
 Cohen, S., 180
 Collins, J., 108
 Cooper, G. F., 40
 Cooper, J., 190
 Coth, K., 47
 Couch, A., 241
 Cox, V. C., 254
 Cramer, P., 240-241
 Darley, J. M., 301, 308
 Davidson, A., 293
 Davis, W., 197
 Dawes, R., 262
 Dement, W. C., 46
 Dempster, C., 62
 Derlega, V., 98
 Desire, L., 174
 Dixon, W., 198
 Duhamel, K. N., 62
 Dunne, L., 17
 Dush, D., 285
 Dworetzky, J., 142
 Dyakonova, N., 198
 Eaves, L., 25
 Eidelman, A., 133
 Ehrenreich, H., 156
 Ekman, P., 175
 Ellsworth, P., 122
 Emde, R., 31
 Eron, L., 92, 283
 Evans, G. W., 255-256
 Exposito, F., 225
 Faust, D., 233
 Fazio, R., 188
 Feldman, R., 133
 Fernandez, A., 181
 Finkelstein, N., 247
 Fishbein, M., 292
 Fisher, S., 240
 Fode, K., 94
 Forgy, D., 116
 Forsyth, D., 298
 Fotilkes, D., 54
 Fouquereau, E., 181
 Fredrickson, B., 271
 Fredrikson, M., 69
 Freedman, J. L., 255
 French, C., 123
 Freud, S., 226, 241
 Friedman, M., 210
 Friesen, W., 174
 Furnham, A., 108
 Gabrieli, J., 10
 CalaniMoutafi, V., 41
 Gailman, E., 47
 Garcia, J., 69
 Garcia, S., 207
 Gardner, H., 100, 108
 Garry, M., 124
 Garb, H., 285
 Gauthier, T., 150
 Gazzaniga, M., 7, 8, 9, 10
 Georger, I., 217
 Gerge, I., 211
 Gee, G., 294
 Gelfand, M., 167
 Gerdes, C., 167
 Giles, C., 122
 Gilligan, C., 150
 Ginzburg, H., 140, 142
 Glass, G., 262
 Gleitman, H., 276
 Gossop, M., 190
 Goto, S., 294
 Greenberg, J., 234
 Greenberg, R., 47, 241
 Griffiths, P., 190
 Grinker, R., 41
 Grossman, L., 278
 Gyoer Koe, K., 278
 Gustafson, C. R., 71
 Haatainen, K., 113
 Hammer, D., 295
 Hargrady, M., 92
 Hansen, C., 173, 299
 Hansen, R., 173
 Hallman, T., 216
 Harlow, H., 134
 Harris, B., 76
 Harris, C., 209
 Hautzinger, M., 156
 Hawkley, L., 133
 Hawkins, W., 69
 Health, A., 25
 Henderson, C., 31
 Heshka, S., 255
 Hiatt, S., 31
 Hilgard, E., 63
 Hilsenroth, M., 285
 Hintikka, J., 181
 Hobson, J. A., 48, 55
 Hock, R., 263
 Hodgkinson, C., 116
 Hoefnagels, C., 307
 Hoffman, M. L., 150
 Hogg, M. A., 189
 Holmes, T. H., 179
 Hommet, C., 9
 Hon Kalampi, K., 181
 Hopson, J., 17
 Horn, R., 246
 Hurlsmann, L. R., 91
 Ingle, S., 198
 Inhelder, B., 142
 Isbell, T., 299
 Iyengar, S., 157
 Jaccard, J., 293
 Jacobson, L., 97, 98
 Jansma, L., 209
 Jones, S., 17
 Joseph, J., 25
 Jordan, J., 215
 Joslyn, S., 124
 Kanarek, T., 180
 Kaplan, S., 165
 Karkowski, L., 76
 Kaspi, A., 174
 Kasurada, E., 209
 Keibell, M., 122
 Kendler, K., 25, 76
 Kennell, J. H., 133
 Kessler, R., 25
 Ketcham, K., 123, 124
 Kiel, G., 116
 Kihlstrom, J. F., 62
 King, B., 166
 King, N., 69
 Kitayama, S., 225
 Klaus, M. H., 133
 Klein, P., 107
 Klentz, B., 308
 Klingenspor, B., 209
 Klumert, M., 31
 Kohlberg, L., 142