Mark schemes

**Q1.**

Please note that the AOs for the new AQA Specification (Sept 2015 onwards) have changed. Under the new Specification the following system of AOs applies:

•        AO1 knowledge and understanding

•        AO2 application (of psychological knowledge)

•        AO3 evaluation, analysis, interpretation.

Although the essential content for this mark scheme remains the same, mark schemes for the new AQA Specification (Sept 2015 onwards) take a different format as follows:

•        A single set of numbered levels (formerly bands) to cover all skills

•        Content appears as a bulleted list

•        No IDA expectation in A Level essays, however, credit for references to issues, debates and approaches where relevant.

**AO1 = 6**

**AO2 = 6**

There are several reasons why people obey. Research has suggested that we obey those with legitimate authority; we accept that they have the right to tell us what to do. The process of gradual commitment also causes people to obey, by the time they realise just what they are doing, it is almost too late to stop. Milgram proposed the agency theory to explain why we obey, in an agentic state we are much more likely to obey than if we are in an autonomous state. If people do not have to acknowledge the outcome of their actions they are more likely to obey.

Candidates could offer several explanations in less detail or one or two explanations but in much more detail.

The evaluation could consider how effective these explanations are, whether there is any empirical support, what conditions are necessary for the obedience to occur and what helps people to resist obedience.

Descriptions of Milgram’s research can be credited depending on how it is *used*. For example, using his research to illustrate the effect of buffers or of gradual commitment.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **AO1Knowledgeand understanding** | **AO2Application of knowledge and understanding** |
| **6 marks Accurate andreasonably detailed**Accurate and reasonably detailed explanation that demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of why people obey. There is appropriate selection of material to address the question. | **6 marks Effective evaluation**Effective use of material to address the question and provide informed commentary. Effective evaluation of research. Broad range of issues and / or evidence in reasonable depth, or a narrower range in greater depth. Clear expression of ideas, good range of specialist terms, few errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling. |
| **5 – 4 marks Less detailed but generally accurate**Less detailed but generally accurate explanation that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. There is some evidence of selection of material to address the question. | **5 – 4 marks Reasonable evaluation**Material is not always used effectively but produces a reasonable commentary. Reasonable evaluation of research. A range of issues and/or evidence in limited depth, or a narrower range in greater depth. Reasonable expression of ideas, a range of specialist terms, some errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling. |
| **3 – 2 marks Basic**Basic explanation that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question. | **3 – 2 marks Basic evaluation**The use of material provides only a basic commentary. Basic evaluation of research. Superficial consideration of a restricted range of issues and/or evidence. Expression of ideas lacks clarity, some specialist terms used, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling detract from clarity. |
| **1 mark Very brief / flawed or inappropriate**Very brief or flawed explanation demonstrating very little knowledge. Selection and presentation of information is largely or wholly inappropriate. | **1 mark Rudimentary evaluation**The use of material provides only a rudimentary commentary. Evaluation of research is just discernible or absent. Expression of ideas poor, few specialist terms used, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling often obscure the meaning. |
| **0 marks**No creditworthy material. | **0 marks**No creditworthy material. |

**Q2.**

**AO2 = 4**

Reasons why people are less likely to obey might include:

•        Not accepting that the person giving the order has legitimate authority

•        Questioning the motives of the person giving the order.

Any other reason for resisting obedience which has been made relevant to the stem.
Candidates could consider one reason in detail or more than one but in less detail.
One mark for identifying the reason(s) and further marks for elaboration.

**Q3.**

**AO3 = 4 (2+2)**

Strengths of Milgram’s Methodology:

•        Can easily be replicated, therefore reliability can be assessed.

•        It is easier to control the variables, so that it is only the independent variable that is being manipulated.

•        Can determine whether the IV does cause the DV to change, causal conclusions can be drawn.

Limitations of Milgram’s methodology:

•        As the situation is often artificial, there is a loss of external validity.

•        Demand characteristics may cause participants to behave in ways that are not normal.

•        Investigator effects can also cause participants to behave differently.

For example, a strength is that in a laboratory experiment it is easier to control all the variables
(1 mark). This means that you can see whether the independent variable is the one affecting the dependent variable and not some other variable (elaboration for a further mark).

**Q4.**

**AO3 = 2**

There are several ways in which Milgram’s work has been criticised as being unethical:

•        Deception – participants were deceived in many ways, the initial advert, the selection of teacher and learner, the fake shocks etc.

•        Lack of informed consent – because they were deceived participants could not give their full informed consent.

•        Harm – some participants suffered extreme stress reactions, as well as embarrassment and the feelings of being used.

For example, one aspect of Milgram’s work that was unethical was the fact that some participants were harmed (1 mark). Some were seen to sweat; tremble and shake with the stress in fact some even had seizures (a further mark for elaboration). Candidates do not have to name the issue itself, but should receive credit if they do.

**Q5.**

**AO1 = 4 (2+2)**

1 mark for identification and a further mark for elaboration (× 2).
There are several reasons why people obey:

•        Agentic state – the individual sees himself or herself as the agent carrying out the order.

•        Gradual commitment – having agreed to do something, it is difficult to then change your mind. This is similar to the “foot-in-the-door” technique.

•        Legitimate authority – whereby the person giving the order is seen to have the right to do so.

•        Presence of buffers – a buffer is anything that prevents the person from having to acknowledge the consequences of their actions.

For example, people obey when they are in the agentic state (1 mark). This means that they see themselves as an agent who is obliged to carry out the orders of someone else, rather than being autonomous (elaboration for a further mark).

**Q6.**

**[AO1 = 1]**

D

**[1]**

**Q7.**

Please note that the AOs for the new AQA Specification (Sept 2015 onwards) have changed. Under the new Specification the following system of AOs applies:

•        AO1 knowledge and understanding

•        AO2 application (of psychological knowledge)

•        AO3 evaluation, analysis, interpretation.

  (a)     **AO3 = 4**

For each issue, 1 mark for identification of issue and a further mark for elaboration. For example, one issue is deception; Milgram deceived participants into believing that they had an equal chance of being the teacher or learner, when in fact it was rigged.

The ethical issue could be for either the participant or the experimenter.

(b)     **AO3 = 2**

1 mark for identification of a way of dealing with the issue and a further mark for elaboration.
For example, deception could be dealt with by debriefing the participant. It would have to be explained why it was necessary to deceive them and answer any questions that they might have wanted to ask, as well as reassuring them.

If the answer could apply to either ethical issue it is credit-worthy. The candidate doesn’t need to specify which ethical issue they have chosen to deal with.

**Q8.**

**AO3 = 2 + 2**

An advantage of research outside of laboratory settings is that it may be high in ecological validity, this means that the results can be generalised beyond the research setting.

A limitation of research outside of the laboratory settings is that there is a lack of control, other factors may have influenced the outcome.

Usually 1 mark for identification of the advantage / limitation and a further mark for elaboration. Examiners should be aware that sometimes a very concise answer can gain both marks.

**Q9.**

(a)     **[AO1 = 6]**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Level** | **Marks** | **Description** |
| 3 | 5 – 6 | Knowledge of two explanations of obedience is clear and accurate. The answer is clear and coherent. Specialist terminology is used effectively. |
| 2 | 3 – 4 | Some knowledge of two explanations of obedience but there may be some detail missing/lack of clarity. There is some appropriate use of specialist terminology. |
| 1 | 1 – 2 | Some knowledge of an explanation of obedience is evident but lacks clarity/detail/links to obedience. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used. |
|   | 0 | No relevant content. |

**Possible explanations:**

•        Authoritarian personality: a collection of traits/dispositions developed from strict/rigid parenting; examples of traits – conformist /conventional/dogmatic; obedient/servile towards people of perceived higher status.

•        Legitimacy of authority: of context/setting; genuineness/status of authority figure.

•        Agentic shift/state: person ‘unthinkingly’ carries out orders; diffusion of responsibility.

•        Accept other possible explanations: e.g. ‘foot in the door’/gradual commitment; credit situational ‘factors’ that affect obedience if these are presented as explanations.

•        Accept details of Milgram's original study/variation/other obedience research as elaboration/illustration of the explanation.

(b)     **[AO3 = 3]**

**3 marks** for brief evaluation of one of the explanations presented in 01. Full marks may be awarded for a single point fully elaborated or for a number of points briefly stated. Content will depend on the explanation chosen.

**Possible explanations:**

•        Use of evidence/analysis of evidence to illustrate the validity of the explanation.

•        Methodological evaluation of evidence (if used as commentary to assess the strength, or otherwise, of the explanation).

•        Strengths and/or limitations of the explanation.

•        Comparison with alternatives.

**Q10.**

**AO1 = 4**

There are several reasons why people obey:

•        Presence of legitimate authority

•        Authority takes responsibility for consequences

•        Gradual commitment

•        Personality factors (eg authoritarian personality)

•        Being in the agentic state

•        Situational factors (eg role of buffers).

For each explanation, 1 mark for a basic answer and a further mark for elaboration. For example, one reason people obey is due to gradual commitment (1 mark). This is where you are told to do something small and gradually the orders become more extreme but by then you can’t say no (further mark for elaboration).

**Q11.**

Please note that the AOs for the new AQA Specification (Sept 2015 onwards) have changed. Under the new Specification the following system of AOs applies:

•        AO1 knowledge and understanding

•        AO2 application (of psychological knowledge)

•        AO3 evaluation, analysis, interpretation.

**[AO1 = 2, AO2 = 4]**

**AO1**

Award 2 marks for an outline / identification of two factors, 1 mark per factor. Likely factors include:legitimacy of the system / location, legitimacy of the authority figure / uniform, proximity of the victim, proximity of the authority figure, personality type (authoritarian), social support, culture.
Accept other valid answers.
0 marks for ‘proximity’ without elaboration.

**AO2**

Award 4 marks for a brief discussion of how / why the chosen factor(s) affect obedience to authority. Maximum of 2 marks per factor.
Content will depend on which factor(s) are described. Credit use of evidence / real life examples to support the discussion of the factor(s).
Possible answer: if the authority figure wears a uniform (1) this increases obedience (1) as the authority figure looks more legitimate (1).

**Q12.**

Please note that the AOs for the new AQA Specification (Sept 2015 onwards) have changed. Under the new Specification the following system of AOs applies:

•        AO1 knowledge and understanding

•        AO2 application (of psychological knowledge)

•        AO3 evaluation, analysis, interpretation.

Although the essential content for this mark scheme remains the same, mark schemes for the new AQA Specification (Sept 2015 onwards) take a different format as follows:

•        A single set of numbered levels (formerly bands) to cover all skills

•        Content appears as a bulleted list

•        No IDA expectation in A Level essays, however, credit for references to issues, debates and approaches where relevant.

**AO1 = 6**

There are several explanations why people obey, such as:

•        legitimate authority

•        gradual commitment

•        agentic shift

•        lack of personal responsibility

•        situational factors, eg role of buffers

•        personality factors, eg authoritarian personality.

Students may offer one explanation in detail or more than one but in less detail. There is a breadth-depth trade-off here.

Merely identifying reasons without any explanation, maximum 2 marks.

|  |
| --- |
| **6 marks Accurate and reasonably detailed**Accurate and reasonably detailed explanation that demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of why people obey. There is appropriate selection of material to address the question. |
| **5 – 4 marks Less detailed but generally accurate**Less detailed but generally accurate explanation that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding of why people obey. There is some evidence of selection of material to address the question. |
| **3 – 2 marks Basic**Basic explanation that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and understanding of why people obey, but lacks detail and may be muddled. |
| **1 mark Very brief / flawed or inappropriate**The student provides a explanation, which is very brief or flawed and demonstrates very limited knowledge of why people obey. |
| **0 marks**No creditworthy material. |

**Q13.**

**AO3 = 4**

For each issue, 1 mark for identification of issue and a further mark for elaboration. For example, one issue is deception (1 mark); Milgram deceived participants into believing that they had an equal chance of being the teacher or learner, when in fact it was rigged (further mark for elaboration).

Right to withdraw is only an ethical issue in terms of it being made difficult to withdraw.
Milgram did in fact give his participants the right to withdraw at the very start of the experiment; however he then made it very difficult for them to do so. Simply stating ‘there was no right to withdrawߣ will not gain credit.

Explanation doesnߣt have to explicitly refer to Milgramߣs research.

**Q14.**

Please note that the AOs for the new AQA Specification (Sept 2015 onwards) have changed. Under the new Specification the following system of AOs applies:

•        AO1 knowledge and understanding

•        AO2 application (of psychological knowledge)

•        AO3 evaluation, analysis, interpretation.

(a)     **[AO3 = 3]**

One mark for identifying independent measures / groups / samples / unrelated design.

Up to 2 marks for an explanation of any relevant advantage of using this design in this study.

1 mark for an advantage, 1 mark for application to the study.

Possible answer:

As participants will either be approached by a confederate wearing uniform or a confederate in everyday clothing / as participants only take part in one condition (1), they are unlikely to guess the aim of the study / there are no order effects (1).

One mark can be awarded for an advantage that corresponds to an incorrectly identified design.

(b)     **[AO3 = 2]**

Independent variable: whether the researcher was dressed in everyday clothing or a uniform / type of clothing.

Dependent variable: whether participants pick up litter / obey (or not) / the number of people who picked up a piece of litter.

No credit for “obedience” or “level of obedience” or “amount of obedience”.

•        Award both marks for correct IV and DV that are not labelled but are in the order of the question.

•        Award 1 mark for correct IV and DV that are not labelled and are not in the order of the question ie DV then IV.

•        No credit for either IV or DV **alone** (if not labelled).

(c)     **[AO1 = 1, AO2 = 2]**

**AO1**

1 mark for knowledge of likely outcome:
More people will pick up litter in Condition B than in Condition A / fewer people will pick up litter in Condition A than in Condition B.

**AO2**

2 marks for an explanation of the results based on application of obedience research to the scenario.

Possible answer: the confederate’s uniform (1), increased the legitimacy / authority / status of the demands or order given (1) or similar. Credit use of evidence as part of the explanation eg Bickman, Milgram.

(d)     **[AO2 = 1, AO3 = 1]**

**AO2**

1 mark for plausible application of the issue to the study.

**AO3**

1 mark for knowledge / identification of a relevant ethical issue. Likely issues: (lack of) consent, opportunity to withdraw, deception, treating people with respect, protection from harm, confidentiality, debriefing.

Possible answer: An ethical issue in the study is lack of consent (1) because the researcher did not ask the participants if they wanted to be in the study (1).

**Q15.**

**AO3 = 6**

**Students may refer to one methodological and one ethical issue, or two ethical or two methodological issues.**

There are a range of ethical issues that can be considered during the experiment.

•        Protection from harm – participants were clearly distressed.

•        While participants were in fact given the right to withdraw initially it was made very difficult for them to do so during the experiment. Students can only gain credit for right to withdraw if this is explained.

•        Deception – participants were deceived at several stages of the study

•        Informed consent – because of deception, participants were unable to give their full informed consent.

•        Socially sensitive research eg the obedience alibi and the ‘Germans are different’ hypothesis are also creditworthy.

One mark for identification of the issue and a further 2 marks for elaboration.

The methodological issues can relate to the fact that this was an experiment, so it could be said to lack external validity as well as internal validity. In Milgram’s early versions he only used male participants, thus population validity is an issue. Any relevant methodological issue can be credited.

One mark for identification of the issue and a further 2 marks for elaboration.

**Q16.**

Please note that the AOs for the new AQA Specification (Sept 2015 onwards) have changed. Under the new Specification the following system of AOs applies:

•        AO1 knowledge and understanding

•        AO2 application (of psychological knowledge)

•        AO3 evaluation, analysis, interpretation.

Although the essential content for this mark scheme remains the same, mark schemes for the new AQA Specification (Sept 2015 onwards) take a different format as follows:

•        A single set of numbered levels (formerly bands) to cover all skills

•        Content appears as a bulleted list

•        No IDA expectation in A Level essays, however, credit for references to issues, debates and approaches where relevant.

**AO3 = 4**

The data suggest that the confederates have a considerable influence on whether or not the participant obeys; candidates could consider the implications of the difference between 92.5% and 10%. They might consider whether the confederates are acting as role models, informing the participant how to behave. Credit could also include comparison of power of confederates with power of having the experimenter in the same room.

The question is not just asking candidates to describe the data in the table, but to consider the effect that the confederates have, to access the top bands answers need to be shaped to fit the question.

|  |
| --- |
| **AO3   Interpretation of data** |
| **4 marks   Accurate and reasonably detailed**Accurate and reasonably detailed answer that demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of what the data suggest about obedience.  There is appropriate selection of material to address the question. |
| **3 marks  Less detailed but generally accurate**Less detailed but generally accurate answer that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. There is some evidence of selection of material to address the question. |
| **2 marks  Basic**Basic answer that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question. |
| **1 mark  Very brief/flawed or inappropriate**Very brief or flawed answer demonstrating very little knowledge. Selection and presentation of information is largely or wholly inappropriate. |
| **0 marks**No creditworthy material. |

**Q17.**

Please note that the AOs for the new AQA Specification (Sept 2015 onwards) have changed. Under the new Specification the following system of AOs applies:

•        AO1 knowledge and understanding

•        AO2 application (of psychological knowledge)

•        AO3 evaluation, analysis, interpretation.

(a)     **[AO1 = 2, AO2 = 2]**

**AO1**

Award up to two marks for an outline of the Authoritarian Personality as an explanation for obedience to authority.
Likely points: a collection of traits / dispositions; developed from strict / rigid parenting; conformist / conventional / dogmatic; obedient / servile towards people perceived as having higher status / harsh towards people perceived as having lower status; reference to F-scale as a way of measuring personality type.
One mark only for a list of traits.
Accept other valid answers.
0 marks for simply saying ‘obedience is more likely’.

**AO2**

Award up to two marks for discussion which may be for two brief points or a single point that is elaborated.
Likely points: measurement of authoritarianism relies on self-report (F-scale) data which may be unreliable; contrast with situational factors (Milgram) eg proximity of authority figure, may have greater influence on obedience levels; difficulty in establishing cause and effect between authoritarianism / parenting style and obedience; explanation cannot easily account for obedience of entire social groups / societies.
Credit use of evidence as part of the discussion.

(b)     **[AO1 = 2]**

Award up to two marks for an outline of one psychological explanation for defiance. Award one mark for identification / brief outline of a relevant explanation and one mark for elaboration / expansion which could be through an example.
Likely explanations: the influence of disobedient role models / social support; being in an autonomous state; past experience; opportunity to question the motives of the authority figure; personal conviction.
Also credit the inverse of factors / explanations usually used to explain obedience to authority eg (lack of) proximity of authority figure; proximity of victim; (lack of) legitimacy of authority figure / uniform / setting.
Credit descriptions of evidence used as elaboration / expansion eg detail of Milgram`s variations that led to an increase in defiance.

Do not credit reference to increase in defiance / decrease in obedience alone.

**Q18.**

**Marks for this question: AO1 = 6, AO3 = 10**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Level** | **Marks** | **Description** |
| 4 | 13 – 16 | Knowledge is accurate and generally well detailed.Discussion / evaluation / application is thorough and effective. The answer is clear, coherent and focused. Specialist terminology is used effectively. Minor detail and / or expansion of argument sometimes lacking. |
| 3 | 9 – 12 | Knowledge is evident. There are occasional inaccuracies.Discussion / evaluation / application is apparent and mostly effective. The answer is mostly clear and organised. Specialist terminology is mostly used effectively. Lacks focus in places. |
| 2 | 5 – 8 | Some knowledge is present. Focus is mainly on description. Any discussion / evaluation / application is only partly effective. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is used inappropriately on occasions.One explanation at Level 4 |
| 1 | 1 – 4 | Knowledge is limited. Discussion / evaluation / application is limited, poorly focused or absent. The answer as a whole lacks clarity, has many inaccuracies and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology either absent or inappropriately used.One explanation at Level 3 |
|   | 0 | No relevant content. |

Please note that although the content for this mark scheme remains the same, on most mark schemes for the new AQA Specification (Sept 2015 onwards) content appears as a bulleted list.

**AO1**

Marks for description / elaboration of at least two explanations of defiance of authority. Likely explanations: the influence of disobedient role models / presence of social support; internal locus of control - being in an autonomous state; past experience. Also credit the inverse of factors / explanations usually used to explain obedience to authority, eg (lack of) proximity of authority figure; proximity of victim; (lack of) legitimacy of authority figure / uniform / setting; (lack of) authoritarian personality. Credit description of relevant evidence up to two marks.
Likely studies include Milgram 1963, 1974, Bickman 1974, Hofling 1966, Feldman and Schelbe 1972, Gamson 1982, Hamilton 1978, Rochat and Modigliani 1995.

**AO3**

Marks for discussion of at least two explanations of defiance of obedience. Use of evidence to support / illustrate the influence of the explanations chosen, eg specific studies of defiance and / or variations of Milgram's basic experiment that demonstrated increased defiance. Discussion of the wider implications of the explanations, eg in real-life situations of defiance. Credit any other social psychological concepts that are appropriately applied to defiance of authority. Comparison of relative power of explanations. Only credit evaluation of the methodology used in studies when made relevant to discussion of the explanations eg use of specific studies.

**Q19.**

Please note that the AOs for the new AQA Specification (Sept 2015 onwards) have changed. Under the new Specification the following system of AOs applies:

•        AO1 knowledge and understanding

•        AO2 application (of psychological knowledge)

•        AO3 evaluation, analysis, interpretation.

Although the essential content for this mark scheme remains the same, mark schemes for the new AQA Specification (Sept 2015 onwards) take a different format as follows:

•        A single set of numbered levels (formerly bands) to cover all skills

•        Content appears as a bulleted list

•        No IDA expectation in A Level essays, however, credit for references to issues, debates and approaches where relevant.

**AO2 = 4**

There are various reasons why people obey:

•        Legitimate authority

•        Power of uniform

•        Any other psychological explanation, if it is relevant to the scenario, is creditworthy.

On a train, it is likely that the ticket collector is seen as having legitimate authority and so will be obeyed, however another passenger does not have such authority and so is unlikely to be obeyed.

For full marks there must be explicit engagement with the stem.

|  |
| --- |
| **AO2 Mark bands** |
| **4 marks  Effective analysis of unfamiliar situation**Effective explanation that demonstrates sound knowledge of why people are more likely to obey a ticket collector than another passenger. |
| **3 marks  Reasonable analysis of unfamiliar situation**Reasonable explanation that demonstrates knowledge why people obey on a train / ticket collector. |
| **2 marks  Basic analysis of unfamiliar situation**Basic explanation of why people obey.  |
| **1 mark  Rudimentary analysis of unfamiliar situation**Rudimentary, muddled, explanation of why people obey, demonstrating very limited knowledge. |
| **0 marks**No creditworthy material. |

**Q20.**

**[AO1 = 2]**

A and E

**Q21.**

**[AO1 = 2 AO3 = 2]**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Level** | **Marks** | **Description** |
| 2 | 3 – 4 | Outline of the authoritarian personality as an explanation of obedience to authority is clear and has some detail. Some evaluation relevant to obedience is clear. The answer is generally coherent with effective use of terminology. |
| 1 | 1 – 2 | Outline of the authoritarian personality lacks clarity and / or detail and / or link to obedience. Evaluation is limited. The answer as a whole is not clearly expressed. Terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.**Either** outline **or** evaluation is done well. |
|  | 0 | No relevant content. |

**Outline – possible content:**

•        a collection of traits / dispositions developed from strict / rigid parenting, eg conformist / conventional / dogmatic

•        obedient / servile towards people of perceived higher status.

Credit other traits relevant to obedience.

**Evaluation – possible content:**

•        situational factors, eg proximity (Milgram), may have greater influence on obedience levels

•        difficult establishing cause / effect between authoritarianism / parenting style and obedience

•        explanation cannot easily account for obedience of entire social groups / societies

•        evaluation of F-scale where used to evaluate the explanation.

Credit other relevant evaluation points.

**Q22.**

**[AO3 = 1]**

**1 mark** for a brief relevant limitation.

**Possible limitations:**

•   contradicted by Milgram’s situational evidence

•   measurement by F scale which has questionable validity

•   based on limited sample

Credit other relevant limitations.

**Q23.**

**[AO1 = 1]**

C

**Q24.**

**[AO1 = 6 AO3 = 6]**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Level** | **Marks** | **Description** |
| 4 | 10 – 12 | Knowledge of the research into the effect of situational variables is accurate and generally well detailed. Discussion is effective. Minor detail and/or expansion is sometimes lacking. The answer is clear and coherent. Specialist terminology is used effectively. |
| 3 | 7 – 9 | Knowledge of the research into the effect of situational variables is evident, but there are occasional inaccuracies/omissions. There is some effective discussion. The answer is mostly clear and organised. Specialist terminology is mostly used appropriately. |
| 2 | 4 – 6 | Limited knowledge of the research into the effect of situational variables is present. Focus is mainly on description. Any discussion is of limited effectiveness. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is used inappropriately on occasions. Or knowledge of the research into the effect of situational variables at level 4 can be awarded 6 marks. |
| 1 | 1 – 3 | Knowledge of the research into the effect of situational variables is very limited. Discussion is limited, poorly focused or absent. The answer as a whole lacks clarity, has many inaccuracies and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used. |
|   | 0 | No relevant content. |

**Possible Content:**

Knowledge of procedure and/or findings of research into the effects of:

•        Proximity – Milgram – teacher and the learner were in the same room, obedience decreased; touch proximity condition; experimenter leaves the room, obedience decreased

•        Location – Milgram – run-down office block vs Yale; Hofling hospital location

•        Uniform – Bickman – more likely to obey a man dressed as a guard. In Milgram’s experiment the experimenter wore a grey lab coat.

**Possible discussion points about what the research tells us about why people obey:**

•        Analysis of the effects of variations

•        Discussion of reasons why rate of obedience changes (agentic/autonomous state; legitimacy of authority; personality/dispositional factors)

•        Methodological evaluation of research when used to analyse the variables eg demand characteristics, external validity may be more a feature of some variations than others

•        Use of systematic procedures to ensure that cause and effect could be established. This enables conclusions to be drawn

•        Use of evidence/real-life examples to support or contradict the research into the effect of variables eg Mandel (1998) – mass killing of Jews was undertaken in close proximity of the victims without protest; Slater’s (2006) study in a virtual environment included a condition where the participant had to shock the leaner via text from a mobile phone.

Credit other relevant limitations.

**Q25.**

**[AO1 = 3]**

**3 marks** for clear, coherent alternative explanation with some detail.

**2 marks** for alternative explanation outlined with some elaboration.

**1 mark** for a very brief or muddled outline.

**Possible explanations:**

•        legitimacy of authority: of context/setting; genuineness/status of authority figure

•        agentic shift/state: person ‘unthinkingly’ carries out orders; diffusion of responsibility

•        accept situational factors/variables that affect obedience if these are presented as explanations eg proximity; location; uniform.

•        accept other possible explanations, eg ‘foot in the door’/gradual commitment; presence of ‘buffers’; locus of control

Note that explanations may well overlap.

No credit for simple identification of an alternative explanation.

**Q26.**

**[AO1 = 3 AO3 = 5]**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Level** | **Marks** | **Description** |
| 4 | 7 – 8 | Knowledge of the authoritarian personality is accurate with some detail. Discussion of the authoritarian personality as an explanation of obedience is thorough and effective. Minor detail and/or expansion of argument is sometimes lacking. The answer is clear, coherent and effective. Specialist terminology is used effectively. |
| 3 | 5 – 6 | Knowledge of the authoritarian personality is evident but there are occasional inaccuracies/omissions. Discussion of the authoritarian personality as an explanation of obedience is mostly effective. The answer is mostly clear and organised but occasionally lacks focus. Specialist terminology is used appropriately. |
| 2 | 3 – 4 | Limited knowledge of the authoritarian personality is present. Focus is mainly on description. Any discussion of the authoritarian personality as an explanation of obedience is of limited effectiveness. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is used inappropriately on occasions. |
| 1 | 1 – 2 | Knowledge of the authoritarian personality is limited, poorly focused or absent. The answer as a whole lacks clarity, has many inaccuracies and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used. |
|   | 0 | No relevant content. |

**AO1 Possible content:**

•        authoritarian personality is a collection of traits developed from strict/rigid parenting

•        examples of traits – conformist/conventional/dogmatic/hostile towards those of perceived lower status (scapegoating)

•        obedient/servile towards people of perceived higher status.

•        assessment of the authoritarian personality using the F-scale

**AO3 Possible discussion points:**

•        dispositional explanations cannot explain obedience in entire societies

•        research findings in obedience studies, eg Milgram can be more readily explained by situational factors

•        use of evidence/analysis of evidence to illustrate the validity of the explanation, eg using the F-scale

•        methodological evaluation of evidence if used to discuss the strength, or otherwise, of the explanation

•        comparison with alternatives.

Credit other relevant information.

Answers that just describe the authoritarian personality with no reference to obedience can receive a maximum of 3 marks

**Q27.**

**[AO1 = 1]**

**1 mark** – D

**Q28.**

**[AO1 = 6 AO2 = 4 AO3 = 6]**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Level** | **Mark** | **Description** |
| 4 | 13-16 | Knowledge of legitimacy of authority and agentic state is accurate and generally well detailed. Application is effective. Discussion is thorough and effective. Minor detail and/or expansion of argument is sometimes lacking. The answer is clear, coherent and focused. Specialist terminology is used effectively. |
| 3 | 9-12 | Knowledge of legitimacy of authority and agentic state is evident but there are occasional inaccuracies/omissions. Application and/or discussion is mostly effective. The answer is mostly clear and organised but occasionally lacks focus. Specialist terminology is used appropriately. |
| 2 | 5-8 | Limited knowledge of legitimacy of authority and agentic state is present. Focus is mainly on description. Any discussion and/or application is of limited effectiveness. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is used inappropriately on occasions OR one theory only at Level 3/4. |
| 1 | 1-4 | Knowledge of legitimacy of authority and agentic state is very limited. Discussion and/or application is limited, poorly focused or absent. The answer as a whole lacks clarity, has many inaccuracies and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used OR one theory only at Level 1/2. |
|   | 0 | No relevant content. |

**Possible content:**

Legitimacy of authority:

•   when a person recognises their own and other’s position in a social hierarchy

•   legitimacy is increased by visible symbols of authority, eg uniform

•   legitimacy of setting, order, system.

Agentic state:

•   when a person acts on behalf of an authority figure/person of higher status

•   the actor feels no personal responsibility/does not feel guilty for their actions

•   the opposite of an autonomous state in which people act according to their own principles

•   reference to binding factors.

Accept other valid points.

**Possible application:**

Legitimacy of authority:

•   Freddie pays no attention to his friend as they have equal status in the social hierarchy

•   the deputy head is a legitimate authority within the social system (school)

•   the deputy head is a visible symbol of authority (high-vis jacket).

Agentic state:

•   when making fun of his friend’s request, Freddie is in an autonomous state

•   when he sees the deputy head, Freddie enters the agentic state ‘without thinking’ and observes school rules (queuing in line).

Accept other valid application points.

**Possible discussion:**

•   use of evidence to support/contradict the explanations, eg Milgram variations, Bickman, Hofling

•   use of real-life examples to illustrate explanations, eg My Lai massacre

•   neither explanation can account for rates of disobedience in studies

•   obedience may be dispositional, not situational, eg authoritarian personality

•   discussion of difficulty measuring and/or distinguishing between reasons why obedience occurs.

Accept other valid points.

Only credit evaluation of the methodology used in studies when made relevant to the discussion of the explanations.

**[16]**

**Q29.**

**[AO1 = 2]**

**2 marks** for a clear and coherent outline.

**1 mark** for limited / muddled outline.

**Possible content:**

•   when a person acts on behalf of an authority figure / person of higher status

•   the actor feels no personal responsibility / does not feel guilty for their actions

•   the opposite of an autonomous state in which people act according to their own principles

Points above may be presented in the context of an example / study.

**[2]**

**Q30.**

**[AO3 = 2]**

**2 marks** for a clear and coherent explanation of an appropriate limitation of the authoritarian personality as an explanation of obedience.

**1 mark** for a muddled or limited explanation of an appropriate limitation.

**Possible limitations:**

•   situational factors, e.g. proximity (Milgram), may have greater influence on obedience levels

•   explanation maybe flawed because it relies on self-report (F-scale)/questionnaire data

•   difficult establishing cause/effect between authoritarianism/parenting style and obedience as it is based on retrospective data/level of education may determine authoritarianism and obedience

•   explanation cannot easily account for obedience of entire social groups/societies.

Credit other relevant limitations.

**[2]**

**Q31.**

**[AO1 = 4]**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Level** | **Mark** | **Description** |
| 2 | 3-4 | The authoritarian personality explanation of obedience is outlined in some detail. The answer is generally coherent with effective use of terminology. |
| 1 | 1-2 | There is limited/partial outline of the authoritarian personality explanation of obedience. The answer may lack coherence. Use of terminology may be either absent or inappropriate. |
|  | 0 | No relevant content. |

**Possible content:**

•   a dispositional explanation, which suggests obedient behaviour is due to internal traits such as personality type, rather than external/situational factors

•   traits/dispositions developed from strict/rigid parenting

•   traits/dispositions include conformist/conventional/dogmatic/respect for authority

•   obedient/servile towards people of perceived higher status

•   harsh/hostile towards people perceived as having lower status

•   reference to F-scale as a way of measuring personality type

•   use of research to illustrate the explanation.

Maximum **1 mark** for an answer with no link to obedience/obedient behaviour.

Maximum **3 marks** if there is no reference to the authoritarian personality being a dispositional or internal explanation of obedience.

Credit other relevant information.

**[4]**

**Q32.**

**[AO3 = 4]**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Level** | **Mark** | **Description** |
| 2 | 3-4 | The methodology of Milgram’s research into obedience is evaluated in some detail. The answer is generally coherent with effective use of terminology. |
| 1 | 1-2 | There is limited/partial evaluation of Milgram’s methodology. The answer may lack coherence. Use of terminology may be either absent or inappropriate. |
|   | 0 | No relevant content. |

**Possible evaluation:**

•   can easily be replicated, therefore reliability can be assessed

•   it is easier to control the variables, so that it is only the independent variable that is being manipulated

•   can determine whether the IV does cause the DV to change, causal conclusions can be drawn

•   as the situation is artificial, there is a loss of validity

•   lack of mundane realism in the electric shock task

•   demand characteristics may cause participants to behave in ways that are not normal

•   investigator effects can also cause participants to behave differently

•   issues relating to the sample leading to bias and lack of representativeness

•   use of evidence to support or refute the evaluation.

Credit other relevant evaluation.

Students may focus on one point in detail or more than one point in less detail.

**[4]**

**Q33.**

**[AO1 = 6 AO3 = 10]**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Level** | **Marks** | **Description** |
| 4 | 13-16 | Knowledge of how situational variables affect obedience is accurate and generally well detailed. Discussion is thorough and effective. Minor detail and/or expansion of argument is sometimes lacking. The answer is clear, coherent and focused. Specialist terminology is used effectively. |
| 3 | 9-12 | Knowledge of how situational variables affect obedience is evident but there are occasional inaccuracies/omissions. Discussion is mostly effective. The answer is mostly clear and organised but occasionally lacks focus. Specialist terminology is used appropriately. |
| 2 | 5-8 | Limited knowledge of how situational variables affect obedience is present. Focus is mainly on description. Any discussion is of limited effectiveness. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is used inappropriately on occasions. |
| 1 | 1-4 | Knowledge of how situational variables affect obedience is very limited. Discussion is limited, poorly focused or absent. The answer as a whole lacks clarity, has many inaccuracies and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used. |
|   | 0 | No relevant content. |

**Possible content:**

•   knowledge of procedure and/or findings of research into the effects of:

•   proximity – Milgram – teacher and the learner were in the same room, obedience decreased; touch proximity condition; experimenter leaves the room issues order over the phone, obedience decreased

•   location – Milgram – run-down office block vs Yale; Hofling hospital location

•   uniform – Bickman – more likely to obey a man dressed as a guard. In Milgram’s experiment the experimenter wore a grey lab coat.

**Possible discussion:**

•   analysis/discussion of factors in the context of explanations: eg uniform as a visible sign of authority, location/setting makes authority seem more/less genuine (legitimacy of authority)

•   decreased proximity to authority figure meant that participants returned to a more autonomous state (agentic state)

•   discussion of relative power of factors, eg in Hofling study, 21/22 obeyed even though orders were given over the phone (so legitimacy of setting more important than proximity)

•   discussion of alternative theories, eg authoritarian personality (Adorno) suggests that dispositional factors are more influential than situational variables

•   methodological evaluation of studies/evidence if made relevant to discussion of the factors/why we obey, eg field studies such as Bickman may have more relevance than lab studies in this context

•   Mandel’s (1998) analysis of the ecological validity of Milgram’s research

•   Orne and Holland (1968) Milgram variations were contrived and even more likely to trigger suspicion in participants.

Credit other relevant material.

**[16]**

**Q34.**

**[AO1 = 3 AO3 = 5]**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Level** | **Mark** | **Description** |
| 4 | 7-8 | Knowledge of legitimacy of authority is accurate with some detail. Discussion is thorough and effective. Minor detail and/or expansion of argument is sometimes lacking. The answer is clear, coherent and focused. Specialist terminology is used effectively. |
| 3 | 5-6 | Knowledge of legitimacy of authority is evident but there are occasional inaccuracies/omissions. Discussion is mostly effective. The answer is mostly clear and organised but occasionally lacks focus. Specialist terminology is used appropriately. |
| 2 | 3-4 | Limited knowledge of legitimacy of authority is present. Focus is mainly on description. Any discussion is of limited effectiveness. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is used inappropriately on occasions. |
| 1 | 1-2 | Knowledge of legitimacy of authority is very limited. Discussion is limited, poorly focused or absent. The answer as a whole lacks clarity, has many inaccuracies and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used. |
|   | 0 | No relevant content. |

**Possible content**:

•   when a person recognises their own and other’s positions in a social hierarchy

•   leading to recognition of the authority figure’s right to issue a demand

•   legitimacy is increased by visible symbols of authority, eg uniform

•   legitimacy of setting, order, system

•   description of relevant evidence, eg Milgram variations (location), Bickman (uniform).

Accept other valid points.

**Possible discussion**:

•   use of evidence to support/contradict the explanations, eg Milgram variations, Bickman, Hofling

•   use of real-life examples to illustrate explanations, eg My Lai massacre

•   explanation cannot account for rates of disobedience in studies

•   obedience may be dispositional, not situational, eg authoritarian personality

•   discussion of difficulty measuring and/or explaining why obedience occurs

•   cultural differences in respect for and responses to authority.

Accept other valid points.

**[8]**

**Q35.**

**[AO1 = 4]**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Level** | **Mark** | **Description** |
| 2 | 3-4 | Outline and explanation of the findings of Milgram’s investigation into the effect of location on obedience is clear and has some detail. The answer is generally coherent with effective use of terminology. |
| 1 | 1-2 | Outline and explanation of the findings of Milgram’s investigation into the effect of location on obedience lacks clarity and/or detail. The answer as a whole is not clearly expressed. Terminology is either absent or inappropriately used. |
|   | 0 | No relevant content. |

**Possible content:**

•   measured obedience using electric shock experiment: change of venue to run-down building obedience levels dropped by 17.5% (accept 65% at Yale vs 47.5% in run-down office)

•   the status of the location changed the participant’s perception of the legitimacy of the authority of the investigator

•   higher authority at Yale than in the run-down office led to higher obedience levels/lower authority in run-down building led to lower levels of obedience.

Credit other relevant information.

**[4]**