

## Mark schemes

## Q1.

[AO1 = 1]

D

[1]

## Q2.

[AO2 = 6]

Level	Mark	Description
3	5-6	Application of knowledge of obedience 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 obedience. The answer lacks clarity in places. Terminology is used appropriately on occasions.
1	1-2	There is limited application of knowledge of obedience. The answer, as a whole, lacks clarity and has inaccuracies. Terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.
	0	No relevant content.

**Possible content:**

- the boys obeyed because the Headteacher is a legitimate authority figure – in a hierarchical system, like a school, those who impose the rules have the power to punish, in this case with a detention
- the boys obeyed due to situational variables, eg location – the boys are summoned to the Headteacher's office; proximity of authority figure – the Headteacher is issuing orders face-to-face; lack of social support – the boys are called to the office 'one-by-one'
- the boys obeyed due to being in an agentic state – when the boys then decided to wear their jumper correctly.
- some of the boys may have an authoritarian personality, respect for those they perceive to be in authority and therefore blindly obey the Headteacher

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

Credit other relevant application points e.g. External locus of control, uniform. Research studies can be credited if they clearly linked to the scenario.

[6]

**Q3.****[AO2 = 6]**

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

**Possible content:**

- social support/disobedient role models/diffusion of responsibility – Tanya and Natasha have support from each other which gives them the confidence to disobey/defy Mr Boat
- proximity of the authority figure – Mr Boat is at the far end of a queue/relatively far away so disobedience/defiance is more likely
- (lack of) legitimacy of the setting/order/system – Mr Boat and the students are not at school and so the order lacks legitimacy in this setting (the supermarket), Mr Boat is not wearing his work clothes, making disobedience/defiance more likely
- use of evidence as application and/or other valid points, e.g. Natasha and Tanya are in an autonomous, rather than agentic, state.
- dispositional factors e.g. Natasha and/or Tanya have an internal locus of control so disobey Mr Boat.

Credit other relevant application points.

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

**[6]**

**Q4.****[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]**

**Q5.****[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.

**Q6.****[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]**

**Q7.****[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]**

**Q8.****[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.