Mark Scheme

Question			Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
1	a		**From Levine et al.'s (2001) study into cross-cultural altruism:** **Describe the dependent variable in <u>one</u> condition of this study.** <u>Answers to be drawn from:</u> <u>The dropped pen condition:</u> Participants were considered to have shown helping behaviour if they called back to the experimenter that he had dropped the pen and/or picked up the pen and took it to the experimenter. <u>The hurt leg condition:</u> Helping behaviour was shown if the participant offered to help and/or began to help pick up magazines without offering. <u>The blind person (trying to cross the street):</u> Helping behaviour was scored if participants informed the experimenter that the light was green and/or helped them across the street. Other appropriate descriptions should be credited.	3	**3 marks** - A clear and accurate description that: • Identifies one of the three measures of helping (1) • Both measures are included. e.g. 'participants informed the experimenter that the light was green or helped them cross the street (2) **2 marks** - A reasonably accurate description that: • Identifies one of the three measures of helping. (1) • Only one measure included. e.g. 'participants informed the experimenter the light was green' (1) **1 mark** - A partial or vague answer, e.g. mere identification of one of the measures of helping. **0 mark** - No creditworthy information. <u>Examiner's Comments</u> Many candidates demonstrated good knowledge of Levine et al.'s study giving a clear outline of one condition and how the dependent variable of helping was measured within the condition. Most candidates were able to score 2 marks or more with some candidates only including one of the measures.

Mark Scheme

Question			Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
	b		**From Levine et al.'s (2001) study into cross-cultural altruism:** **Explain how this study links to the key theme of responses to people in need.** <u>Possible answers:</u> Levine et al.'s study links to the key theme of people in need by showing that the willingness to help people inneed differed across cultures/cities. Features of cities or types of helping: • Cultural values (Individualism-Collectivism, simpatia) • Economic prosperity/ wealth • Population size • Walking speed/ pace of life • Dropped pen/ hurt leg/ blind victim (types of helping) Findings: • Individualistic cultures showed lower levels of helping • Countries which were more helpful had lower PPP/ less wealth • No relationship between population size and helping • Faster cities showed less likelihood of help (small correlation) • Simpatia cultures, such as Brazil, were more helpful than non-simpatia cultures, such as Malaysia • A cities helping rate was relatively stable across all three measures. • The most helpful city was Rio de Janeiro (Brazil) Other appropriate explanations should be credited.	3	**3 marks** for a clear answer which: • Recognises helping is affected by culture/countries • Features of cities or types of helping • An accurate finding of one measure. **2 marks** for a reasonable answer which refers to two of the above **1 mark** a vague/partial answer which refers to one of the above **0 mark** - No creditworthy information. <u>Examiner's Comments</u> Candidates who gained full marks referenced the cross-cultural nature of the study with details of measures taken and what was found by Levine et al. The most commonly missed element from candidate responses stopping them from gaining full marks was the findings from the research.
			Total	6	
2			A		debrief
			Total	1	

Mark Scheme

Question			Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
3	a		**Outline one result from Bocchiaro et al.'s (2012) study into disobedience and whistle-blowing.** Likely answers: • 76.5% (n=114) of participants obeyed the experimenter and wrote the statement. • 14.1% (n=21) of participants disobeyed the experimenter and did not write the statement. • 9.4% (n=14) whistle-blew. • 6% (n=9) were anonymous whistleblowers (whistle-blew but had written the statement). • 3.4% (n=5) were open whistleblowers (whistle-blew and had not written the statement). • Other appropriate answer. Example of a 2-mark answer: 76.5% of the participants showed obedience by writing the statement to fellow students as instructed by the experimenter. Example of a 1-mark answer: The behaviour shown most often by participants was obedience.	2	**2 marks -** A clear, accurate and contextualised result with correct numerical details. **1 mark -** A clear identification of a result from Bocchiaro et al.'s study but no numerical details. The result must have some detail about the direction (e.g. more/less/least/most common/ least common/majority/minority) **0 mark -** No or incorrect answer. **N.B.** If the numerical details are incorrect the answer gains no credit. Examiner's Comments The question required an outline of an accurate result from Bocchiaro et al.'s study, with correct numerical details. Many candidates gave incorrect percentages and gained no credit. Some responses were often only a few percentages or decimal places away from the correct answer as listed on the mark scheme. Some candidates wasted time by outlining two different results when the question asked for one.

Mark Scheme

Question			Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
	b		**Milgram's (1963) study of obedience is often considered to be a controlled observation.** **Explain the term 'controlled observation' in the context of this study.** <u>Likely answers:</u> *An understanding of the term 'controlled observation':* • A controlled observation is a research method where researchers watch participants in an artificial/ contained/manipulated/standardised environment/ conditions. *How Milgram controlled the environment/conditions:* • Milgram organised the environment (at Yale University) in **the same way** for every participant. • The 'teacher' participant sat at **the same** electric shock machine whilst the learner was always in an adjacent room out-of-sight of the teacher. • Milgram contrived the situation so that the participant **always** sat at an electric shock generator in one room whilst the 'stooge' learner sat out-of-sight in another room. *What behaviour Milgram observed:* • Milgram observed and recorded the behaviour of the 'teacher' participants as they were asked to give increasingly strong electric shocks to the learner when they got a question wrong. • Milgram observed and recorded responses from participants to the commands of an authority figure.	3	**3 marks -** A clear and accurate response which shows: • An understanding of the term 'controlled observation' (e.g. artificial, contained, manipulated, standardised). • How Milgram controlled the environment/ conditions (reference to 'the same', 'all', 'every' needed WITH an **example**). • What behaviour Milgram observed. **2 marks -** An answer which address at least two of the above points. **1 mark -** A partial or vague answer which addresses at least one of the above points. or is uncontextualised answer, e.g. Milgram controlled the environment, so it was standardised and the same for all participants. He observed and recorded their behaviour through a one-way mirror (no contextualisation). **0 mark -** No or incorrect answer. <u>Examiner's Comments</u> Responses to this question were quite poor. Many candidates are simply describing Milgram rather than explaining how he used a controlled observation, or they are making tautological comments such as 'A controlled observation is one that is done in a controlled environment'. Better responses demonstrated an understanding of the key term 'controlled' and 'observation' separately and went on to support this with evidence of how Milgram controlled the environment.
			Total	5	

Mark Scheme

Question			Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
4	a		**Explain how Milgram's (1963) study into obedience may be considered ethnocentric.** Knowledge of the concept of ethnocentrism e.g. unrepresentative of other ethnic groups, cannot generalise to other societies, cultural bias, way of thinking focussed on your own cultural group etc Briefly relating to Milgram's study e.g. only Americans were studied, carried out in America. Relating to Milgram's study in a more developed way e.g. Milgram's study only investigated Americans (1) whereas other countries may show higher or lower levels of obedience to authority depending on cultural norms (1).	3 (AO3)	1 mark: knowledge of the concept of ethnocentrism *Plus* 1 mark: briefly relating to Milgram's study *Plus* 1 mark: further development to Milgram <u>Examiner's Comments</u> The majority of candidates gave a good outline, however, not all fully explained ethnocentrism in the context of Milgram's research. Many candidates were able to show knowledge of the concept of ethnocentrism and briefly relate to the sample used in Milgram's research. **Assessment for learning** Many had a reasonable understanding of ethnocentrism and were able to outline how ethnocentric bias is shown through sample selection. For full marks, a more developed link to Milgram's research was required. It is good practice to get students to reflect on how findings of research could differ between cultures to fully develop their understanding of ethnocentric bias e.g. other countries may show higher or lower levels of obedience to authority depending on cultural norms. More collectivist cultures may show higher levels of obedience.

Mark Scheme

Question			Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
	b		**Describe the procedure used in Piliavin et al's (1969) Subway Samaritan study.** Key features include: • **Research team:** There were 4 teams of 4 researchers: 2 female observers, 2 males - one acting as victim, one the model. • **Victim description:** The victims (3 white, 1 black) were all male. They either smelled of liquor and carried a liquor bottle in a brown bag or appeared sober and carried a black cane. • **Model conditions:** The models (all white) were males.There were 4 model conditions: (i) Critical area - early. (ii) Critical area - late. (iii) Adjacent area - early. (iv) Adjacent area - late. • **Observations:** On each trial one observer noted the race, sex and location of every rider seated or standing in the critical area. In addition, she counted the total number of individuals who came to the victim's assistance. She also recorded the race, sex and location of every helper. The second observer coded the race, sex and location of all persons in the adjacent area. She also recorded the latency of the first helper's arrival after the victim had fallen and on appropriate trials, the latency of the first helper's arrival after the model had arrived. Both observers recorded comments spontaneously made by nearby passengers and attempted to elicit comments from a rider sitting next to them. • **Location of research team:** Observers took seats outside the critical area • **The staged emergency** The victim stood near a pole in the critical area. After about 70 seconds he staggered forward and collapsed. Until receiving help he remained supine/lying straight upwards on the floor looking at the ceiling. If he received no help by the time the train stopped the model helped him to his feet. • **Standardised features:** All models wore identical clothing. The victim	6 (AO1)	**5-6 marks** for a detailed and accurate description of four or more key features (with one or two developed) **OR** six briefly described key features of the study's procedure. **3-4 marks** for an accurate description of two key features in detail **OR** three briefly outlined key features of the study's procedure. **1-2 marks** for a brief or vague description of the study's procedure which identifies one or two key features. **0 mark** - no creditworthy response. N.B Recognition of research method or location alone is not procedural element <u>Examiner's Comments</u> The majority of candidates responded well to this question with. Many candidates provided appropriate details and described the victims, the staged emergency, observations taken and model conditions clearly. Some responses showed a confusion with terminology (e.g. difference between 'victim' and 'model') and inaccurate information (e.g. timings of model intervention). Some candidates forgot to focus on procedure and included irrelevant material (sample, results or conclusions). These gained no marks as the question was specifically about the procedure.

Mark Scheme

Question			Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
			acted identically in both conditions. • At the stop the team disembarked and waited separately until other passengers had left the station. They then changed platforms to repeat the process in the opposite direction.		
			Total	9	

Mark Scheme

Question			Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
5	a		**Outline <u>two</u> controls used by Milgram's (1963) study into obedience.** Possible suggestions include: • The setting at Yale University was the **same** for every participant. • Who was to be the teacher and who was to be the learner was **always** controlled through a fixed lottery. • The learner's responses were **always** the **same** (because they had been recorded/were played on a recorder). • The experimenter's verbal prods were **always** the **same**, e.g. 'Please continue/Please go on'; 'The experiment requires that you continue'; 'It is absolutely essential that you continue'; 'You have no other choice; you must go on'. • The **same** electric shock machine was used by **every** participant. • The shock machine was **standardised** with voltage levels rising in 15-volt intervals from 15v - 450v. • **Each** participant was given a 45v sample shock. • Other appropriate answer.	4 (2+2)	**For each control:** **2 marks –** A clear, contextualised response. **1 mark –** A partial or <u>uncontextualised</u> answer, e.g. The setting was the same for all participants. **0 mark –** No or incorrect answer. **N.B.** Understanding of the word 'control' must be demonstrated to get credit (e.g. same, all, always, standardised, every participant, each participant). <u>Examiner's Comments</u> The majority of candidates performed well on this question. However, a few did not gain any marks because they had not demonstrated any understanding of the word control (e.g. same, all, every, always, standardised, each participant). Exemplar 2 1. The participant received a small electric shock before the experiment took place to convince them that the 'learner' ~~who~~ would actually feel electric shocks being 'administered' to them. 2. The participant watched as the 'learner' was strapped into ~~the~~ a chair in which the participant believed would give them electric shocks, so that they ~~were~~ ~~not~~ would not doubt whether the ~~process~~ experiment was real [4] This exemplar illustrates a candidate who knows considerable detail about Milgram's study. This candidate gains no marks as they had not demonstrated any understanding of the word 'control' in their response.

Mark Scheme

Question			Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
	b		**Bocchiaro et al. used a comparison group to predict the results of their (2012) study into disobedience and whistleblowing. Describe the procedure used in this part of the study.** • Participants were provided with a detailed description of the scenario in which other students would be asked to persuade associates to participate in a sensory deprivation study. They were then asked to say, 'What would you do?' and 'What would the average student at your university would do?' • Participants were asked to predict their behaviour and that of others when facing the scenario designed for the main investigation in which other students would be asked to persuade associates to participate in a sensory deprivation study. • Participants were asked to predict how they would behave if they were asked to write a letter persuading associates to participate in a sensory deprivation study. They were also asked to predict how they thought other students from their university would behave if they were asked to do the same. • Other appropriate descriptions.	3	**3 marks –** A clear and accurate response that refers to all 3 aspects: (a)They were asked to predict what they would do. (b)They were asked to predict what other students at their university/people/participants would do. (c)The prediction of behaviour is related to the scenario on sensory deprivation designed for the main investigation. **2 marks –** Only two aspects of the procedure are identified, e.g. Participants were asked to predict what they and what other students at their university would do. **1 mark –** Only one aspect of the procedure is identified, e.g. They were asked to predict what they would do. **0 mark –** No or incorrect answer. <u>Examiner's Comments</u> The majority of candidates showed minimal understanding of this part of Bocchiaro et al.'s study. Stronger responses were able to describe that participants were asked to predict i) what they would do and ii) what an average student at your university would do, and then linked this to the study on 'sensory deprivation'. The candidates that described the comparison group did not provide sufficient context. Candidates often described the actual study rather than the comparison group. This question was specifically about the procedure so those candidates describing results gained no marks.
			Total	7	

Mark Scheme

Question			Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
6	a		Give one of the materials used in Bocchiaro et al.'s study into obedience and whistleblowing. Possible materials: • Computer. • Mailbox. • Research Committee forms. • Personality inventories (i.e. HEXACO, SVO). • Pen/pencil. • Consent form.	1	1 mark for naming one of the materials used. 0 marks – no creditworthy response (e.g. authority figure, cover story, money, letter for research committee). Examiner's Comments Some candidates were able to name a material used in Bocchiaro et al.'s study – computer, mailbox, research committee forms. Some candidates gave generic materials (paper) or stated aspects of the procedure (cover story, authority figure) or stated a material from a different core study and therefore did not answer the question.

Mark Scheme

Question			Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
	b		**Outline the procedure used in Milgram's study into obedience.** • The study took place in a laboratory at Yale University. • The 40 participants in the experimental group were always given the role of teacher (through a fixed lottery) and saw the learner (a confederate) strapped into a chair with (non-active) electrodes attached to his arms. They were given a trial shock of 45-volts to simulate genuineness. • The 'teacher' then sat in front of an electric shock generator in an adjacent room. He had to conduct a paired word test on the learner and give him an electric shock of increasing intensity for every wrong answer. The machine had 30 switches ranging from 15 – 450 volts, in 15-volt increments. • The 'learner' (Mr Wallace, a 47-year-old, mild- mannered and likeable accountant) produced (via a tape recording) a set of predetermined responses, giving approximately three wrong answers to every correct one. At 300 volts he pounded on the wall and thereafter made no further replies. • If the 'teacher' turned to the experimenter for advice on whether to proceed, the experimenter responded with a series of standardised prods e.g. "Please continue / Please go on." • The study finished when either the 'teacher' refused to continue (was disobedient/defiant) or reached 450 volts (was obedient). • The participant was then fully debriefed.	5	**5 marks** for an accurate description which identifies at least five of the key features of the procedure. **3–4 marks** for an accurate description which identifies most of the key features of the procedure. **1–2 marks** for a description which identifies some key features of the procedure. There may be some inaccuracies. **0 marks** – no creditworthy response. **NB** Reference to the sample or results gains no credit as the question is about the procedure. Examiner's Comments The more successful responses to this question provided an accurate description of at least 5 key features of Milgram's procedure. These features were detailed and not just listed. Some candidates included details about Milgram's sample, methodology, results or conclusions which gained no credit as the question is specifically about Milgram's procedure.
			Total	6	

Mark Scheme

Question			Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
7	a		**Briefly describe the sample used in Levine's study into helping behaviour.** Creditworthy features of sample: • 23 • Cities/countries • Over 16's • Reference to 2 or more cities/countries/continents • Exclusions (or inclusions) - people who were physically disabled, very old, carrying heavy packages and so forth (those not fully capable or expected to help) were excluded. • Both men and women • All cities had pop of 230,000 NB Do not credit sampling techniques.	2	**1 mark** for each creditworthy from the list (up to 2). **0 marks** – no creditworthy response. Examiner's Comments The majority of candidates earned both marks with a number of candidates giving lots of detail – more than was required. Common errors were to describe the sampling method or to describe Piliavin et al's sample.
	b		**Outline one way in which Levine's study may show sampling bias.** Possible answers: • Age biased – as young and very old people were not selected. • Researcher bias – there may have been an unconscious bias in who researchers approached giving an unrepresentative sample. • Culturally biased – too many individualistic cultures studied. • Culturally biased – cities were used to represent the whole country's culture/rural areas and towns not used. • Culturally biased – sample too small to represent all 196 countries	2	**2 marks** for identifying a bias in the sample and for explaining its impact. **1 mark** for identifying a bias in the sample or for a muddled explanation. **0 marks** – no creditworthy response. Examiner's Comments Most candidates were able to access at least 1 of the 2 marks and there was a good a variety of responses to this question. Stronger responses were more explicit about the effect of the sampling bias identified.
			Total	4	

Mark Scheme

Question			Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
8	a		**Explain how the procedure from Piliavin et al.'s (1969) study relates to the key theme of responses to people in need.** Possible answer: In Piliavin et al's study passengers response times were measured (1) when a confederate posed as a person in need by staggering and then collapsing (1) either by appearing drunk or disabled (1).	3	**3 marks** for a clear answer which; • identifies one measure of response (the DV) • identifies the people in need (e.g. a drunk person and a person with a cane) • identifies what the need was (e.g. helping getting up after collapsing, emergency situation) **2 marks** for an answer which addresses two of the above points, or all three in a muddled / vague way. **1 mark** for a partial or vague answer which addresses at least one of the above points. **0 marks** – no creditworthy response.

Mark Scheme

Question			Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
	b	i	**Levine et al. study** (2001) **carried out a study into responses to people in need.** **Give two results from this study.** One mark for each result, including; • The only statistically reliable relationship wasbetween the economic productivity measure and overall helping: cities that were more helpful tended to have lower PPP. • Although statistically insignificant, there was a small relationship between walking speed and overallhelping, with participants in faster cities somewhat less likely to help. • More individualistic countries showed somewhat less overall helping and less helping in the hurt leg situation than collectivist countries, but none of the correlations reached significance. • There was no relationship between population size and helping behaviour. • The two community variables of economicproductivity and individualism-collectivism and walking speed were highly intercorrelated. • Simpatia countries were, on average, more helpful than non simpatia countries.Overall, a city's helping rate was relatively stable across all three measures. • No significant gender differences in helping behaviour were found in the two conditions. • There were low correlations between the community variables and helping measures.	2	**2 marks** for giving two accurate findings. **1 mark** for giving one accurate finding. **0 marks** – no creditworthy response. NB If candidates refer to the statistical data for individual cities / countries (e.g. Rio de Janeiro had a 93% helping rate) then this can be credited as a distinct finding. Where percentages are used they need to be accurate to the nearest whole number (allow rounding up or down here).
		ii	**Explain why this study can be described as a quasi experiment.** Possible answer: • Because the experiment used a naturally occurring IV (1) as a person's place of residence is predetermined and not in the control of the researchers (1).	2	**2 marks** for a clear answer that shows understanding of the nature of quasi experiments and applies this to the study specifically. **1 mark** for a muddled answer that shows understanding of the nature of quasi experiments and applies this to the study specifically, or that shows a clear understanding of the nature of quasi experimentsor is able to demonstrate understanding through application to the study. **0 marks** – no creditworthy response.

Mark Scheme

Question			Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
			Total	7	

Mark Scheme

Question			Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
9	a		Explain how Milgram's (1963) study into obedience can be related to the social area. Social Area: Looks at the factors that lead to us to behave in a given way due to the presence of others whether actual, implied or imagined.	3	3 marks for a clear answer which; • identifies the main principle of the social area • identifies how obedience was judged/measured (behaviour) • identifies the presence of an authority figure as the influencing factor. 2 marks for an answer which addresses at least two of the above points. 1 mark for a partial or vague answer which addresses at least one of the above points. 0 marks – no creditworthy response. If candidates have not outlined any relevant information in relation to the social area e.g. the assumptions, then no marks can be awarded.,

Mark Scheme

Question			Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
	b		**Explain the extent to which Bocchiaro et al.'s (2012) study into disobedience changes our understanding of individual, social and cultural diversity.** Possible content: • This area of research led to the idea that all individuals are susceptible; if they are asked by a figure in authority, to gradually carry out terrible acts they would previously have said were inconceivable. • Bocchiaro et al found similar results and extended the evidence to include female behaviour along with male behaviour. • The contemporary study, Bocchiaro et al, uses students so may be limited in its ability to explain how different groups in society may behave but does look at a different part of society to Milgram who studied volunteers with a range of occupations. • Bocchiaro furthered Milgram's ethnocentric research and showed that obedience is high cross-culturally as well as the importance of considering individual explanations alongside situational ones. • The contemporary study also showed that obedience was similar over time and research in this area suggests that people are inherently obedient.	6	**5-6 marks** for a clear response which considers at least two discussion points in some depth by explaining the point and then effectively analysing the extent to which it changes our understanding of individual, social or cultural diversity **3-4 marks** for a response which considers at least one discussion point in some depth, or considers fewer but does explain the points and effectively analyses the extent to which it changes our understanding of individual, social or cultural diversity. **1-2 marks** for a response which considers at least one discussion point and then analyses the extent to which it changes our understanding of individual, social and/or cultural diversity. **0 marks** – no creditworthy response.
			Total	**9**	
10			C nominal	1	
			Total	**1**	

Mark Scheme

Question			Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
11	a		**Explain how the procedure from Bocchiaro et al.'s study relates to the key theme of responses to people in authority.** <u>Possible answers:</u> Participants were tested to see if they would obey, disobey or whistleblow (1) a request from a person posing as an experimenter, deemed to be a legitimate authority figure (1), who wanted to carry out a potentially unethical study (into sensory deprivation) (1). The presence of the formally dressed, stern researcher who was deemed by participants to be a legitimate authority figure (1) led to 76.5% of them obeying his unjust/unethical request (1) by writing a statement to convince other students to participate in a sensory-deprivation study (1). Other appropriate answer.	4	**3 marks for a clear answer which;** • recognises the response is related to obedience/disobedience/whistle -blowing • the person in authority is the experimenter/there is an authority figure • outlines how participants' obedience/disobedience/whistleblowin g was investigated i.e. what the participants were asked to do. **2 marks** for an answer which addresses at least two of the above points. **1 mark** for a partial or vague answer which addresses at least one of the above points; for a partial answer that is not contextualised to Bocchiaro et al.'s study. **0 marks** – no creditworthy response.

Mark Scheme

Question			Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
	b		**Outline one weakness of the method used in Milgram's study into obedience.** As Milgram's study is now generally considered a controlled observation containing elements of the experimental condition, possible weaknesses are likely to apply to lack of external validity, artificiality of task/setting, low construct validity, potential for demand characteristics. <u>Examples of 1-mark answer:</u> The method lacks ecological validity (1). The study was unethical because participants showed signs of extreme stress when asked to administer, what they believed were genuine electric shocks to another person (1). <u>Examples of 2-mark answers:</u> The method lacked ecological validity (1) as sitting in a room giving what are presumed to be genuine electric shocks to another person for getting a question wrong does not reflect a rea- life situation (1). The method lacked external validity (1) because people are rarely expected to electrocute a complete stranger (just because they get a question wrong) as measure of obedience (1). Experiments have low construct validity (1) as the dependent variable – in this case, the voltage to which participants shocked – is a very narrow measure of obedience (1). Other appropriate answer.	2	**2 marks** for a clearly identified and relevant weakness which is appropriately applied to the study i.e. contextualised. **1 mark** for a partial or vague response, not contextualised to Milgram's study; identifying a relevant ethical weakness either explicitly or implicitly through application to the study (as this is not an actual weakness of the method, it is a weakness of how the method was used). **0 marks** – no creditworthy response.
			Total	5	

Mark Scheme

Question			Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
12	a		**Describe the background to Milgram's study into obedience.** **Possible content:** • From 1933-45 millions of innocent people were slaughtered on command – such inhumane actions could only be carried out on a massive scale because large numbers of people obeyed. • For many people, obedience is such an ingrained behavioural tendency that it will override training in ethics, empathy and moral values. • When given extreme commands by legitimate authority figures, subordinates adopt an agentic state where they become an instrument for carrying out another's wishes. • The adoption of the agentic state can account for horrific acts committed in the name of obedience, e.g. atrocities of WWII, the Balkans conflicts, the atrocities of Rwanda. <u>Examples of a 4-mark answer</u> Throughout history, there have been many atrocities which have resulted in mass genocide and these often rely on people obeying the orders of others (1). For many people, obedience to authority is so ingrained that it happens without question – even if it goes against personal morals and ethics (1). People given extreme commands almost seem to enter an agentic state where they deny responsibility for their actions (1). The aim of Milgram's study was to investigate the process of obedience by testing how far an individual will go in obeying an authority figure, even when the command breaches the moral code that an individual should not hurt another person against his will (1). During WW2 millions of innocent people were systematically slaughtered (1) on command from the Nazis/Hitler (1). Milgram wanted to investigate the process of obedience by testing how far an individual will go in obeying an authority figure (1) when the command breaches moral and ethical codes (1).	4	**3-4 marks** for a detailed and accurate description of the background to the study that demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of the subsequent aim of the investigation N.B. For full marks the response must include reference to the Holocaust/Nazi behaviour during WW2/war (1), to obedience/following commands/through control (1), from an authority figure (1), even though the demands were immoral/unethical/destructive (1). **1-2 marks** for a brief or vague description of the background to the study which may contain some inaccuracies or irrelevancies. **0 marks** – no creditworthy response. NB: If the candidate merely refers to Milgram's aim without any reference to the background, only 1 mark can be awarded. <u>Examiner's Comments</u> Candidates who performed well on this question showed a thorough knowledge of the background to Milgram's study and were able to link this to the subsequent aim of the study, e.g. 'Milgram based his study on previous historical events in which inhumane acts were carried out under the orders of someone in high authority i.e. WW2 and the authority figure of Hitler. Milgram wanted to investigate how likely we are to obey people of high authority, even if the orders appear immoral and we do not personally agree with them.' Some candidates provided an outline of Milgram's actual study, therefore not answering the question.

Mark Scheme

Question			Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
	b	i	**Describe the sample used in Bocchiaro et al.'s study into whistleblowing.** **Possible features:** • University/undergraduate students ('students' alone is not creditworthy). • University based in Amsterdam/Netherlands/VU University. • Total of 149 used/160 volunteers but 11 dropped out. • Volunteer/self-selecting sample. • (96) women, (53) men (accept males and females). • Mean age = 20.8 years. • 138 comparison students.	2	**2 marks** for a detailed and accurate description of the sample including at least two features. **1 mark** for a brief or vague description of the sample including one feature. There may be some inaccuracy. N.B. References to those used in the pilot studies are not creditworthy. **0 marks** – no creditworthy response. Examiner's Comments Many candidates provided detailed and accurate descriptions which included two or more features of Bocchiaro's sample. Others referred to features such as opportunity sampling, Yale University, America; indicating they either muddled core studies or did not have real understanding of Bocchiaro's study.

Mark Scheme

Question			Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
		ii	**Outline one way in which Bocchiaro et al.'s study showed sampling bias.** **Possible examples of bias:** • Selection bias. • Gender bias. • Age bias. • Cultural bias. • Intellectual bias. • Occupation bias. <u>Examples of a 1-mark answer</u> • The study was gender biased (1). • The study was only carried out in the Netherlands (1). <u>Examples of a 2-mark answer</u> • The study was gender biased towards female participants (1) which meant that obedience levels did not fully represent male's behaviour (1). • There may have been a selection bias (1) as the kind of people prepared to take part in a psychology experiment may be more confident than average which may affect their preparedness to 'blow the whistle' (1). • The average age of the sample was low (1) which made it hard to make generalisations about how obedient older adults may be when put in the same situation as these young students (1).	2	**2 marks** for a clearly identifiable and relevant type of bias outlined in the context of this study, e.g. reference to the Netherlands, specific ages or numbers of participants. **1 mark** for a vague response or for a clearly identifiable type of bias which has not been contextualised, e.g. all participants were students in the same university so the sample is unlikely to be representative of the wider population because they are all of a similar age / participants were all students from the same university, therefore their ages were similar and they were from the same area, meaning the results of this study were less generalisable: bias = age/culture but the context is very vague and could apply to other studies, e.g. Loftus & Palmer. **0 marks** – no creditworthy response. <u>Examiner's Comments</u> Many candidates were able to clearly identify a relevant type of bias in the context of Bocchiaro's study. Some candidates, although able to identify an appropriate bias did not contextualise their response and therefore lost marks, e.g. 'Bocchiaro only used students within his sample so findings cannot be generalised.'
			Total	8	

Mark Scheme

Question			Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
13			**Explain how the findings from Milgram's study relate to the key theme of responses to people in authority.** Possible answer: In Milgram's study most people obeyed orders (1) from the experimenter who represented authority (1) by administering the highest possible voltage to someone they believed was another participant because they were under instruction to (1).	3	**3 marks** for a clear answer which; • recognises the response is related to obedience • the person in authority is the experimenter • outlines how participants demonstrated obedience. **2 marks** for an answer which addresses at least two of the above points. **1 mark** for a partial or vague answer which addresses at least one of the above points. **0 marks** – no creditworthy response. NB Accept other words/phrases that suggest obedience (for the first mark) e.g. following commands/orders. NB Do not credit Milgram as the authority figure but do credit other references which suggest the experimenter e.g. man in lab coat. NB It is enough to talk about percentage shocking or similar for the 3rd mark – we are not expecting the candidates to detail the whole procedure. <u>Examiner's Comments</u> Most candidates were able to earn two marks here – normally for referring to obedience or a similar concept and by outlining how obedience was measured in the study. Fewer candidates made the explicit link between the experimenter and authority figure which was what was needed for the third mark.
			Total	3	

Mark Scheme

Question			Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
14	a		**Piliavin et al. carried out a study into responses to people in need.** **Identify two materials used in this study.** One mark for each of any of the following; • (black) cane or stick • paper bag and/or bottle • (Eisenhower/army) jacket or coat • (old) slacks (trousers) • stopwatch or similar • notepad/checklist	2	**2 marks** for naming two of the materials used. **1 mark** for naming one of the materials used. **0 marks** – no creditworthy response. NB Candidates may write about the confederate's clothes as a collective outfit as this is creditworthy as one of the materials. NB It is not important for the candidate to get the colour of the cane right for the mark. NB Do not credit the train as a material. <u>Examiner's Comments</u> Most candidates were able to identify two appropriate materials and earn both marks. **Misconception** A significant number of candidates offered people as examples of materials. It is therefore important that all candidates are familiar with this potentially straightforward concept.

Mark Scheme

Question			Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
	b	i	Give two ways in which this study may be	1	**2 marks** for two clearly stated ways. Examiner's Comments Most candidates recognised that carrying out the study in one city or one country made it ethnocentric. There were some good responses among candidates who earned both marks – for example identifying the cultural assumptions present in the way the experiment was set up, or the fact the confederates were not representative of all ethnic groups. AfL It is important that candidates have a broad understanding of the concept of ethnocentrism and recognise that it applies to more than just the sample of participants used in a study.
		ii	considered ethnocentric. Possible answers; • only black and white victims were used not other ethnic groups • all the models were white • the study was only carried out in one city/one country • there is a cultural assumption that being drunk is a bad thing • there is a cultural assumption that someone with a disability is vulnerable	1	**1 mark** for one clearly stated way. **0 marks** – no creditworthy response. NB It is permissible to credit cultural bias but this is likely to negate a 2nd mark for a more specific example of ethnocentrism. Examiner's Comments Most candidates recognised that carrying out the study in one city or one country made it ethnocentric. There were some good responses among candidates who earned both marks – for example identifying the cultural assumptions present in the way the experiment was set up, or the fact the confederates were not representative of all ethnic groups. AfL It is important that candidates have a broad understanding of the concept of ethnocentrism and recognise that it applies to more than just the sample of participants used in a study.
			Total	4	

Mark Scheme

Question			Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
15	a		**In Bocchiaro et al.'s study on disobedience and whistleblowing, eight pilot tests were carried out before the main study: Explain why Bocchiaro carried out these pilot tests.** Possible answers: • They were conducted to ensure the procedure was credible as a study on sensory deprivation. • To ensure that the cover story on sensory deprivation given was morally acceptable. • These tests served to standardise the experimenter-authority behaviour throughout the experimental period.	2	**2 marks** – Clear explanation given on why Bocchiaro carried out pilot tests as given in answer guidance **1 mark – Partial or vague answer that is in context of the study OR** clear explanation not in context of the original study *e.g To ensure that the procedure was believable / realistic/ credible / ethical* **0 marks –** No creditworthy response *Response must be contextualised for full marks* Examiner's Comments Many candidates showed little knowledge of the pilot tests and so could not give a clear explanation of why Bocchiaro carried out these tests prior to the main study. A number of candidates outlined the function of the comparison group within the Bocchiaro study.

Mark Scheme

Question			Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
	b		**In Bocchiaro et al.'s study into disobedience and whistleblowing a sample of 149 students were selected for the main study: Outline one way this study may be considered ethnocentric.** Possible answer: • Bocchiaro's study may be considered ethnocentric because only students from one cultural location were studied (Amsterdam) and so results cannot be applied to other cities / cultures. • Other appropriate response	2	**2 marks** – Clear outline of one way Bocchiaro's study may be considered ethnocentric as given in answer guidance **1 mark** – Partial or vague answer *e.g. because they were all sampled from the same place / because they are all from the same location / as they are all from the same culture* **0 marks –** No creditworthy response eg. same university *Candidate must make it clear they understand what is meant by ethnocentrism (different to sampling bias).* <u>Examiner's Comments</u> The majority of candidates were able to give complete answers for this question and were awarded both marks. They had a good understanding of ethnocentrism and were able to apply the concept to the Dutch students in Bocchiaro's study. Where full marks were not given, the answer generally lacked context to the study (some referred to Germany / America as the culture). When this question was incorrectly answered it was often due to references to sample bias rather than ethnocentrism.
			Total	4	

Mark Scheme

Question			Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
16	a		**In Levine et al.'s study into cross cultural altruism, four community variables were recorded: Describe how two of the community variables were measured.** Any **two** of the following: • Population size. Population size for each of the 23 areas. • Economic indicator. Wealth of the city / purchasing power parity (PPP) • Cultural values. Rating of the 23 countries in the sample on the dimension of individualism-collectivism / Countries were rated on a 10-point scale • Pace of Life measured by walking speed (over 60 feet).	4	**For each community variable** **2 marks** – An accurate and detailed description of how one community variable was measured / recorded. For Pace of Life 'walking speed over 60ft' can be accepted. **1 mark** – Partial or vague description that may also not be contextualised e.g. *"how fast people walked" / "how many people lived there"* Can get 1 mark for just identifying the community variable. **0 marks** – no credit worthy information Examiner's Comments Many candidates were able to describe how two of the community variables in Levine's study were measured. They often referred to correct variables wealth / population size / culture type. Sometimes details of the measure were inaccurate or little detail was given for example on population size measurement. With economic status / wealth, many candidates referred to GDP instead of PPP. When PPP was identified many answers reflected understanding by identifying it as Purchasing Power Parity.

Mark Scheme

Question			Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
	b		**Explain how Levine et al.'s study into cross-cultural altruism informs our understanding of cultural diversity in helping behaviour.** Possible answer: • Levine found cross-cultural differences in helping behaviour (1 mark) For example, the cities in countries with high simpatia (Brazil, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Mexico and Spain) were more likely to help a stranger in need than non-simpatia countries (New York)/ cities that were more helpful tended to have lower Purchasing Power Parity (PPP) than those with higher PPP (2 Marks/ 1 mark for less detail context). *Candidates need to make it clear what the study told us about cultural differences in helping behaviour – various evidence from the study supports that knowledge of cultural diversity has been enhanced, so reference the original study to check the legitimacy of evidence given.*	3	**3 marks** – Response demonstrates **good** analysis that is relevant to the demand of the question. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise how Levine informs our understanding. Argument is highly skilled and shows **good** understanding. **2 marks** – Response demonstrates **reasonable** analysis that is partially relevant to the demand of the question. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise how Levine informs our understanding. Argument is competent and understanding is **reasonable**. **1 mark** – Response demonstrates **limited** analysis that may just be related to topic area. Few valid conclusions that summarise how Levine informs our understanding. Argument is basic with **limited** understanding shown. **0 marks –** No creditworthy response <u>Examiner's Comments</u> Many candidates knew that Levine's study informs our understanding of cultural diversity in helping behaviour. When providing an explanation of how the study informs our understanding of cross cultural altruism, many answers lacked depth by not providing comparisons or fully elaborating on the evidence given – for example, they stated that the wealth of the country was related to helping behaviour. Strong responses did include statistics relating to the core study but these were not necessary for full marks. This question was good at discriminating the higher ability candidates as they were able to thoroughly review an explanation.
			Total	7	

Mark Scheme

Question			Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
17	a	i	From Milgram's study of obedience: Outline how participants were gathered for the study. Possible answer: • Participants were gathered through a newspaper advertisement / direct mail solicitation which asked for volunteers (to take part in a study of memory and learning).	[2]	2 marks – An accurate outline which includes reference to the use of a <u>newspaper</u> advertisement / <u>direct mail</u> solicitation **and** volunteers. 1 mark – Vague or partial answer e.g. through a newspaper advertisement, through direct mail solicitation, through advertising, by asking for volunteers. 0 marks – No creditworthy information e.g. outlines relating to the sampling method or sample characteristics. • *No credit can be given for the mere identification of posters / adverts.* • *No credit can be given for the mere identification of posters / adverts placed around the (university) campus. This suggestion can however be ignored if the candidate has also referred to the use of a newspaper advertisement / direct mail solicitation.* • *No credit can be given if the candidate merely refers to the use of email / leaflets.* • *The use of 'self-selecting' rather than 'volunteer' should be credited, as also should reference to 'leaflets being sent out'/'newspaper article'.* <u>Examiner's Comments</u> A well answered question with many candidates gaining the full 2 marks.

Mark Scheme

Question			Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
		ii	**Explain one way the sample used in this study may be considered biased.** **Possible answers:** The sample may be considered biased because: • All participants were male / androcentric so findings cannot be generalised to females. • The sample was not representative as all participants were male so findings cannot be applied to females. • All participants were aged between 20 and 50 years so findings cannot be applied to individuals of other ages. • Participants were all drawn from the same area (New Haven area of America) so findings cannot be generalised to other areas of the USA / other areas of the world. • All participants were volunteers who may have different characteristics to other people so findings cannot be generalised to non-volunteers. • Participants had to be able to read to be able to understand the newspaper advertisement / the direct mailing message so findings cannot be generalised to non-readers / illiterate people. • Other appropriate explanations should be credited.	[2]	**2 marks –** A clear explanation of one way the sample may be considered biased based on the suggestions made in Answer Guidance. There should be **both**: (a) an identification of how the sample was biased (b) implications of the identified bias. **1 mark –** Vague or partial answer e.g. all participants were male / all participants were volunteers / all participants were from the same area i.e. identification of an appropriate bias with no implication; **0 marks –** No creditworthy information. • *References to 'it'/'the study' being ungeneralisable are not creditworthy – a sample may be unrepresentative whereas findings may not be generalisable.* • *The study does not have to be specifically contextualised to gain full marks.* Examiner's Comments Many candidates scored full marks here though some only got partial marks as they merely identified a way the sample could be considered biased e.g. there was a gender bias as all participants were male i.e. no implication of the bias was considered.

Mark Scheme

Question			Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
	b		Outline one conclusion that can be drawn from Bocchiaro et al.'s study into disobedience and whistleblowing. Possible answers: • Individuals tend to obey authority figures, (even if the authority is unjust) because the study showed that over 75%/the majority / most of the participants obeyed the experimenter and wrote letters encouraging others to take part in in the proposed sensory deprivation study. • What individual's think / say they and others will do in a given situation often differs from actually happens. Initially only 3.6/about 4% of participants indicated that they would obey the researcher when in reality 75%/the majority / most of the participants did so. • People underestimate how likely their peers are to obey unjust orders. The comparison group said only 18.8% of other students at their university would obey when in fact 76.5% did so. • Other appropriate conclusions should be credited.	[2]	2 marks – A clear and accurate outline of a conclusion which must include both: (a) an appropriate conclusion (b) evidence from the study to support the conclusion i.e. contextualisation. 1 mark – Vague or partial answer, e.g. • Individuals tend to obey authority figures, what individuals think / say they and others will do in a given situation often differs from actually happens i.e. a conclusion with no contextualisation. • 75%/the majority / most of the participants obeyed the experimenter and wrote letters encouraging others to take part in in the proposed sensory deprivation study, initially only 3.6/about 4% of participants indicated that they would obey the researcher when in reality 75%/the majority / most of the participants did so i.e. a finding / result with no conclusion. 0 marks – No creditworthy information. • *If percentages / numbers are given allow a range of +/- 5%.* Examiner's Comments There were a considerable number of instances where candidates provided an appropriate conclusion but failed to contextualise their answer / support their conclusion with evidence from the study.
			Total	6	

Mark Scheme

Question			Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
18	a		Using the data from Milgram's study of obedience presented above: Outline two conclusions. Possible answers (2 needed): • The majority of participants will obey the orders of an authority to administer lethal electric shocks • 300 volts is the point at which some participants were reluctant to continue administering electric shocks • Participants began to be disobedient to the authority figure past the 300 volt level • Over half of the participants administered the highest voltage showing high levels of obedience overall • Other appropriate response	4	Per conclusion: 2 marks – Clear outline of a conclusion which is drawn from the data table 1 mark – Attempt to give a conclusion that is not clearly expressed *e.g. All participants gave a 300v shock to the learner* 0 marks – no creditworthy response *Candidates should not be awarded marks for <u>only</u> giving findings – the data in the table needs to be summarised for what shows overall to gain full marks* *If a candidate states a conclusion that is not logically drawn from the data table then 0 marks should be awarded e.g. the average person is more obedient than originally thought (as this cannot be concluded from the data presented)* *If candidate says "100%" of, this can be taken to mean "All" IF used within a conclusive statement* <u>Examiner's Comments</u> Many candidates were unable to appreciate the difference between a finding and a conclusion. Many candidates gave findings, including figures, from the data table such as "100% of participants shocked up to 300v", without making a conclusive statement which impacted on marks as the question demanded conclusive statements to be given <u>using</u> the data provided. Also, many candidates gave conclusions that could not be drawn from the data table provided for example, it could not be known from the data table provided that people were more obedient than expected or that they entered an agentic state.

Mark Scheme

Question			Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
	b		From Bocchiaro et al.'s study into disobedience and whistleblowing: Describe one way the study is ethical. Possible answers: • Participants were told they could withdraw at any time - before or after being asked to write the supporting statement - without penalty • Signed a consent form giving consent to take part before the study (NOT informed) cover story was read out • After the personality tests were completed the participants were debriefed - each participant was informed of the reasons for the use of deception • During the debrief they made sure that participants did not feel uncomfortable about their obedience and about the fact they had been deceived • Participants were given a written debriefing form that outlined the reason for the fake cover story, as well as an email address to contact in case they wanted to complain or ask further questions about the study. • Other appropriate response	2	2 marks – An accurate and detailed way the study is ethical as detailed in the answer guidance 1 mark – Partial or vague way outlined or answer not fully contextualised *e.g. they were debriefed at the end of the study* 0 marks – no credit worthy response *The answer must be clearly linked to the Bocchiaro study to gain full marks* *If candidate says the participants gave "Informed consent" this should be awarded 0 marks as the consent given was NOT informed (because of the deception)* *The response must clearly link to an actual ethical issue to be given full marks, i.e. ref to distress being caused refers to protection of participants but is not explicitly linked so should only be awarded 1* <u>Examiner's Comments</u> Most candidates were able to provide an accurate way that Bocchiaro's study was ethical, however many candidates did not contextualise their responses so could not gain the 2nd mark. Some candidates attempted to contextualise their responses but referred to context that could have equally applied to the Milgram study, if it was not clear in their response that the Bocchiaro study was being referred to, then again they could not gain the 2nd mark.

Mark Scheme

Question			Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
	c		From Bocchiaro et al.'s study into disobedience and whistleblowing: Describe one way the study is not ethical. • The cover story given was deceptive and not what the study was truly about • Informed consent could not be obtained at the beginning as the participants needed to be unaware • Participants were asked to commit an immoral act and those who did without blowing the whistle may have felt harmed after the study / disappointed in their obedience • Other appropriate response	2	2 marks – An accurate and detailed way the study is not ethical as detailed in the answer guidance 1 mark – Partial or vague way outlined or answer not fully contextualised *e.g. they were deceived* 0 marks – no credit worthy information Examiner's Comments Most candidates were able to provide an accurate way that Bocchiaro's study was not ethical and although some candidates did not contextualise their responses, contextualisation here was better than it was on question 1b.
			Total	8	

Mark Scheme

Question			Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
19	a		In Milgram's study of obedience, the majority of participants reached the most severe shock available on the shock generator. Outline **one** reason to explain the high amounts of obedience observed. [2] Possible reasons; • Level of (legitimate) authority • Prestigious setting • Commitment to study • Payment for participation • No obvious point at which to stop • Denial of responsibility • Use of prods 2 mark responses • e.g. The participants thought the study was for a worthy purpose - advancement of knowledge about learning and memory (1) and therefore felt obliged to continue. (1) • e.g. The participant had volunteered to take part (1) – to discontinue administering shocks the experiment is a denial of this initial commitment. (1) • e.g. The participant believed the allocation of roles was due to chance (1) so they obeyed due to feeling the drawing of lots was fair. (1) • e.g. The experimenter was perceived to have legitimate authority (1) so participants were fearful of the consequences of not obeying. (1) 1 mark responses • e.g. the study took place in a prestigious university e.g. the experimenter kept using prods • e.g. the participant had no past experiences to guide his behaviour • e.g. they assumed the victim was still willing to 'play the game'	2	2 marks – An accurate and detailed description of why they obeyed as detailed in the answer guidance 1 mark – Partial or vague answer not fully described OR answer not linked to study. 0 marks – No creditworthy response *The candidate must make it clear why the reason they give would have explained obedience, they must go beyond merely identifying a reason for full marks.* *Reference the original study to check candidate's answers where needed.* *The answer given may not be limited to those given in the guidance but the reason must be a factor that would have increased obedience and not simply a feature of the study.* <u>Examiner's Comments</u> Most candidates were able to suggest a reason for the high amounts of obedience, with many possible responses being credited. However, a number of candidates did not earn the second mark. Although the majority tried to explain the reason they gave, either the explanation did not match the reason given (e.g. authority being linked to obligation) or the explanation was essentially a re-wording of obedient behaviour (e.g. stating participants could not withdraw rather than explaining why they could not).

Mark Scheme

Question			Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
	b		From Bocchiaro et al's study into disobedience and whistleblowing: Identify **two** quantitative findings. **[2]** Any two of the following: Of all the respondents in the comparison group: • Only **3.6%** indicated they would obey the experimenter. (Accept 3-4%) • Most believed they would be either disobedient (**31.9**% - accept 30-33%) or whistleblowers (**64.5**% - accept 60-70%). • When asked to predict the behaviour of other typical students at their university, only **18.8**% (accept 18-20%) thought an average student at VU University would obey, while they believed most other students would either disobey (**43.9**% - 40-45%) or whistleblow (**37.3**% accept 35-40%). Of the **149** (accept 140-150) participants in the experimental situation: • **76.5**% (accept 70-80%)obeyed the experimenter (*n* = **114** – accept 110-120) • **14.1**% (14-15%) disobeyed (*n* = **21** – accept 20-22) and **9.4**% (accept 9-10%) (*n* = **14** accept 13-15) blew the whistle • Among whistleblowers **6.0**% (accept 5-7%) (*n* = **9** – accept 8-10) had written a message (Anonymous whistleblowers) and **3.4**% (accept 3-4%) (*n* = **5** – accept 4-6) had refused to do so (Open whistleblowers) • Other appropriate quantitative data (Mean / standard deviation figures / statistical test results). (Statistical analysis of) personality characteristics found no patterns in obedience / disobedience/whistle blowing.	2	**2 marks –** Two quantitative findings are correctly identified OR two quantitative findings are clearly outlined in context without specifically quoting figures. **1 mark –** One quantitative finding is correctly identified OR one quantitative finding is clearly outlined in context without specifically quoting figures. **0 marks –** No creditworthy response i.e. qualitative findings are referred to OR the quantitative findings are not within the accepted range (see opposite). *Reference the guides / original study to check candidate's answers where needed.* *N.B. The emphasis is on identifying* ***patterns*** *in findings not simply quoting figures.* *If a candidate has accurately outlined a quantitative finding without identifying specific figures i.e. stating "the majority of" or "very few" and it is appropriately contextualised (compared to another group) with a clear knowledge and understanding shown then this can be awarded 2 marks.* *If a candidate quotes findings outside of the accepted range but identifies a correct pattern – e.g. the majority (90%) were obedient this is still creditworthy.* *If a candidate uses raw number (e.g. 114 obeyed) to give credit this needs to be compared with another raw number e.g. 114 out of 149 obeyed or 114 obeyed while 14 blew the whistle.* *Candidates may have calculated their own means for some data sets; this should be credited if calculated correctly using data contained in the original study. Please refer to original study to check a candidate's response.* <u>Examiner's Comments</u> Most candidates were awarded both marks here. Although there was some leeway on how precise the figures needed to be, many candidates recalled the findings very accurately. Where

Mark Scheme

Question			Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
					candidates offered raw figures rather than percentages, they needed to state more than one figure before being awarded the first mark so that there was some point of comparison. If candidates did confuse statistics, it was often the rates of disobedience and whistle-blowing that were mixed up. A common error was for candidates to state what was measured rather than give the actual findings.
	c		To what extent does the study by Bocchiaro et al change our understanding of responses to people in authority? **[3]** Possible changes to understanding; • How the complexity of social situation influences obedience • How perceptions of obedience do not match reality • How dispositional may affect obedience • How people respond to the chance to challenge an unjust system (whistle blowing) 3 mark response • e.g. Although the study did develop our understanding of obedience to authority in a more complex social situation, more representative of real life than Milgram's study, the majority of participants still supported the theory that people will obey authority figures, even if the authority is unjust. 2 mark response • e.g. People believed that they would be highly likely to blow the whistle against authorities who were encouraging immoral behaviour but when put in the situation whistle blowing was not common. 1 mark responses • e.g. I understand that people are more obedient than we would like to think • e.g. understanding hasn't changed as obedience was high in both the classic and contemporary study	3	GOOD 3 – Response demonstrates good analysis that is mainly relevant to the question. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise to what extent our understanding of obedience had changed. Argument is highly skilled and shows good understanding. REASONABLE 2 – Response demonstrates reasonable analysis that is partially relevant to the question. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise to what extent our understanding of obedience had changed. Argument is competent and understanding is reasonable. LIMITED 1 – Response demonstrates limited analysis that may be related to the question. Limited but valid conclusions that partially summarise to what extent our understanding of obedience had changed. Argument is basic and understanding is limited. 0 marks – No creditworthy response *Responses are likely to refer to changes in our understanding in the context of comparing this study with Milgram's findings / conclusions, but responses where candidates consider changes within the Bocchiaro et al's study or in their own understanding having learnt about the study are also creditworthy.* *The question asks to what extent so candidates can argue that it does OR does not change our understanding, OR both. Some contemporary studies change our understanding more than others hence the command "to what extent".* *Top band answers would make a judgement about the extent to which a*

Mark Scheme

Question			Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
					change of understanding has occurred and support their argument with supporting evidence from the named study. Pure description of the study does not necessarily indicate change. <u>Examiner's Comments</u> Weaker responses to this question tended to describe Bocchiaro et al.'s findings in general rather than focusing on the idea of change and what we have learned. Given the instruction in the specification to compare the classic and contemporary studies, it was assumed that responses were comparing Bocchiaro et al.'s research with Milgram's if they did not explicit state otherwise. However, candidates still had to state what was different (e.g. marks were awarded for references to the role of dispositional factors but not for stating that obedience to authority was high). Some candidates did compare what predictions were made at the start of the study with the actual results and this was creditworthy too.
			Total	7	

Mark Scheme

Question			Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
20			*Outline one difference between Milgram's study of obedience and Bocchiaro et al.'s study into disobedience and whistleblowing.* Examples of a 2 mark answer • Milgram conducted his study in the New Haven area of the USA / the USA / America (1) whereas Bocchiaro et al. conducted their study in Amsterdam / the Netherlands / Holland (1). • Milgram's study was conducted in 1963/the 1960's (1) whereas Bocchiaro et al.'s study was conducted in 2012/2010's / within the last 10 years (1). • Milgram's study was all male / between the ages of 20 and 50 years / from the New Haven area of the USA / from a wide range of occupations whereas Bocchiaro et al.'s sample contained both males and females / had a mean age of around 20.8/20 years / from the Amsterdam area of the Netherlands / were all undergraduates / university students / students (1). • Other appropriate differences should be credited.	[2]	2 marks – A clear difference is evident that refers to **both** Milgram's and Bocchiaro et al.'s studies such as the ones suggested under Answer Guidance. 1 mark – Where the difference is implied by one study but not clear in the other (e.g. Milgram studied destructive obedience whereas Bocchiaro looked at a different type of obedience) or where the difference is stated but not illustrated by the studies (e.g. there was a difference in the nationalities being tested). 0 marks – No creditworthy information. Examiner's Comments This was a straightforward question for many candidates with answers commonly focusing on sample, presence / absence of authority figure, and ethical differences. A common error was to quote a difference already given in the question eg obedience versus disobedience / whistleblowing.
			Total	2	