2.4 Human relationships

Name: _____ Class: _____ Date: _____ **Total: 30 marks**

KEY WORDS bystander effect • diffusion of responsibility • obedience • agentic state • superordinate goal • prejudice

Objective

Build the skills to answer exam questions on **human relationships** : helping and the **bystander effect** , obedience and conformity, and prejudice, conflict and how to reduce it.

You must be able to:

- describe Darley and Latané (1968) and explain diffusion of responsibility
- describe Milgram (1963) and the factors that changed obedience
- explain how superordinate goals reduce conflict (Sherif, 1954)
- evaluate research on relationships with the concepts, especially responsibility

1 Key knowledge and worked examples

■ Helping

Darley and Latané (1968): students talking over an intercom heard another student have a seizure. When they believed they were the only listener, 85 % went for help before the seizure ended; when they believed four others could hear, only 31 % did. **Bystander effect**: the more people present, the less each person helps, because of **diffusion of responsibility** .

■ Obedience

Milgram (1963): 40 men were told by an experimenter to give a "learner" electric shocks for wrong answers. The shocks were not real, but the men believed they were. **65 %** continued to the highest level, 450 volts. Obedience fell when the learner was in the same room or when another "teacher" refused first. Milgram explained obedience by the **agentic state**: people see themselves as acting for the authority, so they feel less responsible. Many participants were in real distress; the study would not pass an ethics review today in this form.

exercises.lol exercises.com.cn

■ Prejudice and conflict


Sherif's Robbers Cave study (1954): two groups of 11- and 12-year-old boys at a summer camp competed for prizes and became hostile. Simply meeting did not reduce the conflict; it fell when they worked together on **superordinate goals** , such as fixing the camp's water supply. Social identity theory (1.3) explains why even small groups favour themselves.

2 Practice


2.1 Explain **diffusion of responsibility**. [2]



2.2 State the main finding of Milgram (1963) and **one** change that reduced obedience. [3]



2.3 *(Paper 1 Section A.)* Describe **one** study of the bystander effect. [4]




exercises.lol exercises.com.cn

2.4 *(Paper 1 Section B, human relationships.)* Two schools have merged. Students from the two old schools sit apart, and fights break out at lunch. Using research, explain how the school could reduce this conflict. [6]



3 Exam-style questions

3.1 *(Paper 1 Section C.)* "People obey authority because of the situation they are in, not because of who they are." Discuss this claim with reference to the concept of **responsibility**. [15]



exercises.lol exercises.com.cn

exercises.lol exercises.com.cn

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