

## Mark schemes

**Q1.****[AO1 = 1]**

C

**[1]****Q2.****[AO1 = 4]**

Level	Mark	Description
2	3-4	Outline of how two variables affect conformity is clear and has some detail. The answer is generally coherent with appropriate use of specialist terminology.
1	1-2	Outline of how two variables affect conformity lacks clarity and/or detail. The answer as a whole is not clearly expressed. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.  <b>OR</b> one variable at Level 2/1.
	0	No relevant content.

**Possible content:**

Asch found that:

- changing group size affected level of conformity – up to three confederates levels increased, thereafter they tended to plateau
- changing task difficulty affected level of conformity – where the lines were of similar length/making the judgement more difficult, conformity levels increased; when correct answer was obvious/making judgement easier, conformity levels decreased
- unanimity affected level of conformity – where the majority were unanimous in their wrong answer, conformity levels increased; when there was an ally, conformity levels decreased; whereas withdrawal of a dissenter led to increased conformity
- writing the answer down (rather than saying aloud) reduced conformity
- individual differences, eg highly confident individuals conformed less.

Credit answers that give relevant variable and associated percentage, ie without reference to increase/decrease.

No marks for just naming the variables.

Cannot give both marks for same variable with two different effects.

Credit other relevant findings in relation to other variables studied by Asch.

**[4]**

**Q3.****[AO3 = 4]**

For **each** ethical limitation award marks as follows:

**2 marks** for a clear and coherent explanation of an ethical limitation of Asch's investigations

**1 mark** for a muddled or limited explanation.

**Possible limitations:**

- deception - participants believed they were taking part in a test of perception
- lack of protection from harm - participants were put in a stressful and embarrassing situation
- lack of informed consent - participants did not consent to take part in a study of conformity.

Credit other relevant ethical limitations.

**Note:** Methodological limitations are not creditworthy.

**[4]****Q4.****[AO3 = 4]**

Level	Mark	Description
2	3-4	Two reasons why Asch's conformity investigations could be considered to be unrealistic are clearly explained. Minor detail is sometimes lacking or there is slight inaccuracy. The answer as a whole is clear with appropriate use of specialist terminology.
1	1-2	Two reasons why Asch's conformity investigations could be considered to be unrealistic lacks detail/accuracy. The answer as a whole lacks clarity. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.  <b>OR</b> one suggestion at Level 1/2.
	0	No relevant content.

**Possible content:**

- Asch's task was artificial because judging line length lacks mundane realism, as it is not a usual task in everyday life
- Asch's situation was artificial because the confederates were strangers/actors, so it was not a valid measurement of how people conform in their usual social contexts
- in Asch's experiment the answer to the question was obvious whereas in real life conformity often occurs where there is no 'correct' answer
- Asch's study took place in a laboratory so participants may have guessed the aim of the experiment and changed their behaviour (demand characteristics), therefore this does not reflect conformity in everyday life.

Credit other relevant material eg population/temporal validity

**[4]**

**Q5.****[AO2 = 6]**

Level	Mark	Description
3	5-6	Application of knowledge of conformity is clear and effective. The answer is generally coherent with appropriate use of terminology.
2	3-4	There is some appropriate application of knowledge of conformity. The answer lacks clarity in places. Terminology is used appropriately on occasions.
1	1-2	There is limited application of knowledge of conformity. The answer, as a whole, lacks clarity and has inaccuracies. Terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.
	0	No relevant content.

**Possible content:**

- Charlie may be conforming due to normative social influence – his decision to wear his jumper inside-out is motivated by a desire to fit in with the group and avoid being isolated. This pressure may be felt particularly keenly as he is new to the school (and presumably may not have many other friends).
- Charlie may be demonstrating compliance – his ‘worrying’ suggests that he is conflicted, but decides to wear his jumper inside-out (publicly) even though, internally, he may not agree with the behaviour
- Charlie may be demonstrating identification – the fact that he thinks the boys are ‘cool’, values the group membership and displays group behaviour

Credit other relevant application points, eg external locus of control; group size and unanimity (lack of an ally); research studies can be credited if they are clearly linked to the scenario

No explicit application to the scenario **maximum** of 1 mark

**Note:** that it would be difficult to make a case for internalisation/informational social influence in this scenario, but students may be awarded credit if they do.

**[6]**

**Q6.****[AO1 = 3]**

**3 marks** for a clear, coherent and detailed outline of informational social influence as an explanation for conformity, using appropriate terminology.

**2 marks** for a less detailed outline.

**1 mark** for a muddled or limited outline.

**Possible content:**

- going along with the majority through acceptance of new information
- occurs because of a desire to be right/correct
- occurs in ambiguous/difficult/novel situations
- conforming for cognitive reasons
- leads to internalisation
- a permanent change in view/behaviour.

Credit other relevant content including the use of examples to illustrate informational social influence.

**[3]****Q7.****[AO1 = 3]**

**1 mark each** for a brief outline of a correct finding that identifies an appropriate finding with a correct percentage **or** direction of influence.

**Possible content:**

- naïve participants gave a wrong answer about 37% of the time (do **not** accept '37% conformed')
- participants conformed on 32% of critical trials (do **not** accept '32% conformed')
- 25% of participants did not conform/75% conformed at least once
- 5% conformed every time
- the control group conformed (less than) 1% of the time
- increasing the size of the majority increased conformity
- increasing task difficulty increased conformity
- presence of a dissenter who did not conform reduced conformity (to 5%)
- withdrawal of a dissenter led to increased conformity
- writing the answer down (rather than saying aloud) reduced conformity
- individual differences, eg highly confident individuals conformed less.

Credit an answer which may focus on explanations for behaviour eg some participants reported 'distortions of perception' / 'distortions of judgement'.

Credit other relevant findings.

**[3]**

**Q8.****[AO3 = 3]**

**3 marks** for a clear, coherent and detailed explanation of an appropriate limitation of Asch's research into conformity, using appropriate terminology.

**2 marks** for a less detailed explanation of an appropriate limitation using some of the detail given below.

**1 mark** for a muddled or limited explanation.

**Possible limitations:**

- lacks temporal validity: Asch's findings may not be so relevant today – the outcome may have been influenced by social attitudes of the 1950s – post-war attitudes that people should work together and consent rather than dissent
- lacks mundane realism: Asch's task was artificial – therefore not a valid measure of real-life conformity where conforming takes place in a social context and often with people we know rather than strangers.
- lacks ecological validity: the research was carried out in a laboratory/controlled conditions, so behaviour may not represent real world conformity
- demand characteristics: artificiality of situation/task may have caused some participants to go along with the confederates, reducing internal validity
- gender bias/lack of generalisability: use of a male sample thus may not represent female behaviour.
- lacks population validity: use of volunteer sample whose behaviour may not represent that of a wider population
- ethical problems including deception (participants believed they were taking part in a test of perception) and protection from harm (participants were put in a stressful and embarrassing situation).

Credit other relevant limitations.

**[3]**

**Q9.****[AO1 = 6]**

Level	Marks	Description
3	5-6	Knowledge of the procedure of Zimbardo's research into social roles is clear and generally accurate. The answer is generally coherent and specialist terminology is used appropriately.
2	3-4	Some knowledge of the procedure of Zimbardo's research into social roles is evident but the answer lacks clarity. There is some appropriate use of specialist terminology.
1	1-2	Limited knowledge of the procedure of Zimbardo's research into social roles is present. There may be inaccuracies, specialist terminology is either missing or inappropriately used.
	0	No relevant content.

**Possible content:**

- observational study in basement at Stanford university
- 24 US male student volunteers
- psychological assessment: participants chosen psychologically stable and healthy
- agreed to participate in a 7 to 14-day study
- paid \$15 a day
- randomly assigned role of prisoner or guard
- prisoners unexpectedly arrested at home
- deloused, given prison uniform and ID number
- small mock prison cells housed 3 prisoners each
- given some rights, eg 3 meals, 3 supervised toilet trips a day and 2 visits per week
- guards were given uniforms, clubs, whistles and wore reflective sunglasses
- guards were told to run the prison but not harm the prisoners
- guards worked in teams of 3 for 8-hour shifts and allowed off site after shift
- Zimbardo took role of prison superintendent
- planned duration was 2 weeks but stopped after 6 days.

Credit other relevant content.

**[6]**

**Q10.****[AO3 = 3]**

**3 marks** for a clear and coherent explanation of a limitation of Zimbardo's research into social roles.

**2 marks** for a less detailed explanation of a limitation which lacks some clarity and/or coherence.

**1 mark** for a muddled or limited explanation.

**Possible limitations:**

- ethical issues: lack of informed consent, whether or not the consent gained was sufficiently informed; deception; lack of protection from psychological harm – participants soon became distressed; whether or not the distress should have been anticipated; right to withdraw was initially declined
- Zimbardo playing a 'dual-role'/participant observer. Zimbardo's own behaviour affected the way in which events unfolded, thus the validity of the findings could be questioned
- methodological issues: sample bias; demand characteristics/lack of internal validity; lack of ecological validity/mundane realism and their implications for the findings
- lack of supporting evidence/exact replication
- over exaggeration of findings: only a third of participants conformed to roles

Credit use of examples from the study to support argument and elaborate on the limitation given.

Just naming a limitation is not creditworthy.

If more than one limitation is identified credit the best one.

Credit other valid limitations.

**[3]**

**Q11.****[AO2 = 2]**

**2 marks** for a clear and coherent explanation of Ava's behaviour that is linked to conformity using appropriate terminology.

**1 mark** for a muddled/limited explanation.

**Possible content:**

- Ava wanted the approval of her friends so she agreed with them about having too much homework in order to be liked – normative social influence
- although Ava privately disagreed with her friends about the amount of homework she was set, she publicly agreed with them – compliance
- Ava wanted to have affinity with the group as they were her friends – identification
- Ava was influenced by her three friends as three is the optimum number for conformity – Asch's research.

Credit other relevant information.

**[2]****Q12.****[AO2 = 3]**

**3 marks** for a clear, elaborated explanation of how Asch's conformity research illustrates the chosen feature – must be explicit contextualisation.

**2 marks** for an explanation with some elaboration. Contextualisation may be implicit.

**1 mark** for a limited or muddled explanation.

**Possible content:**

- replicability – Asch's studies had standardised procedures (eg the number of confederates; length of lines etc) which meant that they could be repeated/replicated to assess consistency/reliability of the findings; this increased the validity of the conclusions drawn
- theory construction – Asch's findings led to the development of explanations/theories of conformity, eg that people will conform to group pressure to avoid ridicule (normative social influence)
- hypothesis testing – Asch's research tested the assumption that naive participants would conform to an obviously wrong answer when placed under group pressure; this was achieved by manipulating an IV (fake/genuine answer) to measure the effect on the DV and keeping other (possible confounding) variables constant.

Credit other relevant content.

**[3]**