Solutions

Marking: **M1** a correct method, **A1** the correct answer, **B1** an independent mark.

Each answer shows the steps, then the **result**.

2.1

when others are present, each person feels less personally responsible for helping; so each waits for someone else to act, and help is less likely or slower

2.2

65 % of the 40 men continued to the highest level, 450 V; obedience fell when the learner was in the same room / when another teacher refused first

2.3

Darley and Latané (1968); students talking over an intercom heard another student have a seizure; the number of other listeners they believed were present was changed; 85 % helped when they believed they were alone, against 31 % when they believed four others could hear; more bystanders reduce helping, through diffusion of responsibility

2.4

award up to [6]: the two old schools are in-groups, so students favour their own and compete (social identity theory); Sherif (1954): competition between two camp groups led to hostility; simple contact did not reduce it; superordinate goals that need both groups did; so the school should set mixed teams tasks that neither group can do alone, e.g. a joint school event or project; building a new shared identity (the merged school) also helps / a limit: Sherif studied boys at a camp, so results may differ in a school

3.1

Mark with the markbands: [13-15] focused on the claim, accurate knowledge, evidence used to build an argument, the concept used to evaluate throughout, a supported conclusion; [10-12] mostly focused, evidence used, some evaluation through the concept; [7-9] relevant knowledge but mostly description; [4-6] limited knowledge, little evaluation; [1-3] little that is relevant. Points that may be included: Milgram (1963): 65 % of ordinary men went to 450 V, which suggests the situation is powerful; variations: obedience fell when the learner was close or another teacher refused, so changes in the situation change obedience; the agentic state: people shift responsibility to the authority, so they feel less responsible for harm; responsibility of researchers: participants were deceived and distressed, so the study raises ethical concerns and limits replication; but some participants refused, so personal factors also matter; sample bias: 40 American men in 1963; bystander research shows a similar effect of the situation on responsibility (diffusion of responsibility); conclusion: the situation strongly shapes obedience, but individual differences remain, so “not because of who they are” goes too far