

# Oxford Revise | AQA A Level Psychology | Answers

## Chapter 1

All exemplar answers given would achieve full marks or the top level.

### 1. Marks for this question: AO1 = 1

A deeper type of conformity, where a person agrees publicly and privately with the majority, but only while they are a member of the group.

### 2. Marks for this question: AO1 = 4

This question is level-marked:

Level	Marks	Description
2	3–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Two explanations of resistance to social influence are present and mostly clear and accurate, with evidence of either breadth or detail.</li> <li>The answer is mostly coherent with effective use of specialist terminology.</li> </ul>
1	1–2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is limited/partial explanation of resistance to social influence.</li> <li>The answer may lack coherence.</li> <li>Use of specialist terminology may be either absent or inappropriate.</li> </ul> <p><b>OR</b> only <b>one</b> explanation is explained and is mostly clear and accurate with effective use of specialist terminology.</p> <p><b>OR</b> for 1 mark, one explanation is partially explained that is lacking coherence.</p>
	0	<p>No relevant content.</p> <p><b>OR</b> if social support and locus of control are named but not explained.</p>

### Possible AO1 content:

- Social support: the presence of an ally gives someone psychological power to go against the majority (resist conformity) and disobey orders (resist obedience).
- Use of Asch and/or Milgram to provide an example of social support in resisting social influence.
- Locus of control is the extent to which a person feels in control of the events that influence their life.
- People with a high internal locus of control resist social influence because they believe they are responsible for their successes and failures.
- Internal locus of control characteristics (achievement-orientated, able to resist coercion, and active seekers of information) that allow for resistance to social influence.

**Note:** locus of control should focus on internal rather than external, but marks can be awarded for explaining why those with an external locus of control won't resist social influence. Credit other relevant material.

### 3. Marks for this question: AO2 = 4

This question is level-marked:

Level	Marks	Description
2	3–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Knowledge of the role of social influence processes in social change is clear and mostly accurate.</li> <li>The material is applied appropriately.</li> <li>The answer is generally coherent with effective use of specialist terminology.</li> </ul>
1	1–2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some knowledge of the role of social influence processes in social change is evident.</li> <li>Application is not always appropriate.</li> <li>The answer lacks accuracy and detail.</li> <li>Use of specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriate.</li> </ul>
	0	No relevant content. <b>OR</b> the answer only identifies social change through minority processes.

#### Possible AO2 application:

- Emily and Luke's parents should use a social norms intervention to change the misperception that most 15-year-olds game all night.
- They should provide information that the majority of 15-year-olds stop gaming at 9pm.
- They could achieve this by putting up posters at the school (accept any creditworthy ways) saying '82% of 15-year-olds stop gaming at 9pm'.
- Receiving the true normative message should influence Emily and Luke to fit in with the behaviour of the majority (normative social influence).

Credit other relevant applications.

### 4. Marks for this question: AO3 = 3

**3 marks** for a clear, coherent limitation using appropriate terminology.

**2 marks** for a limitation that lacks some clarity or detail.

**1 mark** for a brief or muddled limitation.

#### Possible AO3 evaluation:

- Those who believed the shocks were real gave lower intensity shocks, suggesting demand characteristics.
- Ethical issues such as deception about the purpose of the study, 'random' allocation to the role of teacher, and fake shocks. Participants showed distress (psychological harm).
- Lack of right to withdraw due to the verbal prompts from the experimenter.

Credit any valid limitation.

## 5. Marks for this question: AO2 = 4

This question is level-marked:

Level	Marks	Description
2	3–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Knowledge of concepts related to conformity to social roles is clear and mostly accurate.</li> <li>The material is applied appropriately.</li> <li>Reference to Zimbardo's SPE is present and accurate.</li> <li>The answer is generally coherent with effective use of specialist terminology.</li> </ul>
1	1–2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some knowledge of concepts related to conformity to social roles is evident.</li> <li>Application is not always appropriate.</li> <li>Reference to Zimbardo's SPE is muddled or absent.</li> <li>The answer lacks accuracy and detail.</li> <li>Use of specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriate.</li> </ul>
	0	No relevant content.

### Possible AO2 application:

- Kas was aggressive online due to anonymity.
- De-individuation occurred due to many negative comments (one in a faceless crowd).
- Kas was friendly face to face due to a lack of de-individuation.
- Kas was personally responsible for her actions when she could be identified.
- Guards in Zimbardo's Stanford Prison Experiment quickly became aggressive to prisoners.
- De-individuation occurred due to the anonymity granted by their uniforms.

Credit other relevant applications.

## 6. Marks for this question: AO1 = 2

**2 marks** for a clear, coherent definition of role of the agentic state in obedience.

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

### Exemplar answer:

*The agentic state refers to when a person obeys because they feel they are acting on behalf of another person and carrying out their wishes. They are an 'agent' for that person, so the behaviour is not something they would choose to do.*

**Note:** Do not credit examples unless these add to the definition, e.g. participants in the Milgram experiment typically said they did not want to shock the learner but were doing what they were told.

## 7. Marks for this question: AO3 = 6

This question is level-marked:

Level	Marks	Description
3	5–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evaluation of the role of social support and locus of control in resisting social influence is thorough and effective.</li> <li>The answer is clear, coherent, and focused.</li> <li>Specialist terminology is used effectively.</li> </ul>
2	3–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evaluation of the role of social support and locus of control in resisting social influence is evident but there are occasional inaccuracies/omissions.</li> <li>The answer lacks clarity in places.</li> <li>Specialist terminology is used appropriately on occasions.</li> </ul> <p><b>OR</b> only one of the roles (either social support or locus of control) is present, thorough, and effective.</p>
1	1–2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evaluation of the role of social support and locus of control in resisting social influence is limited.</li> <li>The answer lacks clarity and organisation.</li> <li>Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.</li> <li>One of the roles (either social support or locus of control) may be absent.</li> </ul>
	0	No relevant content.

### Possible AO3 evaluation:

- Social support does not have to be valid to be effective, though it is most effective when it is valid.
- The power of social support was seen in the Rosenstrasse protest, when Jewish women took support from each other to disobey Gestapo police.
- A positive correlation was found between scores of external locus of control and a range of measures of social influence in a meta-analysis. High internals could resist social influence.
- Locus of control does not influence resistance to informational social influence (no correlation between locus of control and predisposition to informational social influence).

Credit other relevant evaluations.

## 8. Marks for this question: AO1 = 6

This question is level-marked:

Level	Marks	Description
3	5–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Knowledge of three situational variables affecting obedience is clear and generally accurate.</li> <li>Specialist terminology is used appropriately.</li> </ul>
2	3–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Knowledge of three situational variables affecting obedience is evident but there may be some omissions/lack of clarity.</li> <li>There is some appropriate use of specialist terminology.</li> </ul> <p><b>OR</b> two situational variables affecting obedience are present, clear, and accurate.</p>
1	1–2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Knowledge of three situational variables affecting obedience is evident but there may be serious omissions and/or inaccuracies.</li> <li>Specialist terminology is either missing or inappropriately used.</li> </ul> <p><b>OR</b> one situational variable affecting obedience is present, clear, and accurate.</p>
	0	No relevant content.

### Possible AO1 content:

**Note:** the three factors affecting obedience in the specification are uniform, location, and proximity, but other factors can be credited.

- Uniform:** when the experimenter was called away and replaced with another confederate in regular clothing, obedience dropped to 20%. Uniform is perceived to signify legitimate authority.
- Uniform:** when a person on the street was instructed to give a small amount of money for an expired parking meter, most gave money to a confederate dressed as a police officer rather than a beggar or businessperson because the uniform signified legitimate authority.
- Location:** when the location of Milgram's study changed to a rundown office, obedience dropped to 48%. A prestigious location (Yale University) gives confidence in the legitimate authority figures.
- Proximity:** when the learner and teacher were in the same room in Milgram's study, obedience dropped to 40%; seeing the pain inflicted on another decreased the influence to obey.
- Proximity:** obedience dropped to 30% in Milgram's study when the teacher had to force the learner's hand onto the shock plate; inflicting pain further decreased the influence to obey.
- Proximity:** when the experimenter gave instructions over the phone, obedience dropped to 21% in Milgram's study because the teacher didn't feel the same pressure to obey when the authority figure wasn't physically present.
- Social support:** only 10% of participants obeyed in Milgram's study when they had two rebel (confederate) participants who refused to shock the learner; having social support gives psychological power to disobey.

Credit other relevant material.

**9. Marks for this question: AO3 = 4**

This question is level-marked:

Level	Marks	Description
2	3–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One or more strengths of explanations for conformity is clear, appropriate, and effective.</li> <li>There is appropriate use of specialist terminology.</li> </ul>
1	1–2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One or more strengths of explanations for conformity is limited or muddled.</li> <li>Use of specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriate.</li> </ul>
	0	No relevant content.

**Possible AO3 content:**

- The hotel towel study: the guests that received the normative message increased their towel reuse by 25% compared to the guests that just received the environmental message.
- Researchers found that participants' political beliefs were influenced by what they thought were real reactions from a crowd during presidential debates.
- Another study found that participants who were exposed to negative views about African Americans, from people that they thought were experts, then showed similar racist views. This shows how prejudice can develop through conformity.

Credit other relevant material.

**10. Marks for this question: AO1 = 3, AO3 = 5**

This question is level-marked:

Level	Marks	Description
4	7–8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Knowledge of the authoritarian explanation of obedience is accurate with some detail.</li> <li>Discussion is thorough and effective.</li> <li>Minor detail and/or expansion of argument is sometimes lacking.</li> <li>The answer is clear, coherent, and focused.</li> <li>Specialist terminology is used effectively.</li> </ul>
3	5–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Knowledge of the authoritarian explanation of obedience is evident but there are occasional inaccuracies or omissions.</li> <li>Discussion is mostly effective.</li> <li>The answer is mostly clear and organised but occasionally lacks focus.</li> <li>Specialist terminology is used appropriately.</li> </ul>

2	3–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited knowledge of the authoritarian explanation of obedience is present.</li> <li>Focus is mainly on description.</li> <li>Any discussion is of limited effectiveness.</li> <li>The answer lacks clarity, accuracy, and organisation in places.</li> <li>Specialist terminology is used inappropriately on occasions.</li> </ul>
1	1–2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Knowledge of the authoritarian explanation of obedience is very limited.</li> <li>Discussion is limited, poorly focused, or absent.</li> <li>The answer as a whole lacks clarity, has many inaccuracies, and is poorly organised.</li> <li>Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.</li> </ul>
	0	No relevant content.

**Possible AO1 content:**

- The Authoritarian Personality is a dispositional explanation of obedience.
- The 'Potential for Fascism' scale (the F-scale) was devised to measure the Authoritarian Personality. The higher the F-scale score, the more politically right-wing someone is.
- The authoritarian personality was refined as a cluster of three personality variables referred to as right-wing authoritarianism (RWA), which predispose people to obey.

**Possible AO3 discussion:**

- Researchers found a positive correlation between people high in RWA and the level of shock they gave themselves when they made mistakes on a learning task.
- Use of the F-scale to determine right-wing leanings ignores extreme left-wing ideology, which has historically also been linked to unquestioning obedience to legitimate political authority.
- Methodological issues: people who simply ticked to agree with all F-scale questions would appear to be RWA when they are just 'acquiescers' who tend to agree with everything.
- Situational evidence: Milgram maintained that his variations gave stronger evidence for a situational explanation for obedience.

Credit other relevant material.

**11. Marks for this question: AO1 = 3, AO2 = 2, AO3 = 3**

This question is level-marked:

Level	Marks	Description
4	7–8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Knowledge of explanations for conformity is accurate with some detail.</li> <li>Application is effective.</li> <li>Discussion is thorough and effective.</li> <li>Minor detail and/or expansion of argument is sometimes lacking.</li> <li>The answer is clear, coherent, and focused.</li> <li>Specialist terminology is used effectively.</li> </ul>
3	5–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Knowledge of explanations for conformity is evident but there are occasional inaccuracies/omissions.</li> <li>Application/discussion is mostly effective.</li> <li>The answer is mostly clear and organised but occasionally lacks focus.</li> <li>Specialist terminology is used appropriately.</li> </ul>
2	3–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited knowledge of explanations for conformity is present.</li> <li>Focus is mainly on description.</li> <li>Any application/discussion is of limited effectiveness.</li> <li>The answer lacks clarity, accuracy, and organisation in places.</li> <li>Specialist terminology is used inappropriately on occasions.</li> </ul>
1	1–2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Knowledge of explanations for conformity is very limited.</li> <li>Application/discussion is limited, poorly focused, or absent.</li> <li>The answer as a whole lacks clarity, has many inaccuracies, and is poorly organised.</li> <li>Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.</li> </ul>
	0	No relevant content.

**Possible AO1 content:**

- People conform due to normative social influence (NSI) and informational social influence (ISI).
- NSI is conforming to be liked. It is the most superficial level of conformity (compliance).
- Surveillance from others is necessary for NSI.
- ISI is conforming to be right. It is the deepest level of conformity (internalisation).
- ISI is strongest when there is ambiguity, an emergency, and when there are others deemed to be experts.

**Possible AO2 application:**

- André is showing NSI: he is conforming to be liked and to fit in.
- André said he doesn't want to be the only person eating meat in the house.
- André is showing compliance (superficial level of conformity), which is unlikely to last if he moves out of the house.
- Mi-Cha is showing ISI: she is conforming to be right.
- Mi-Cha listened to her housemates' views about meat and the environment and did her own research.
- Mi-Cha has internalised their viewpoint and is likely to stay a vegetarian even if she leaves the shared house.

**Possible AO3 discussion:**

- Evidence for NSI from the hotel-towel study: guests who received the normative message that 75% of guests reuse their towels were influenced to reuse their towels.
- Evidence for NSI was shown when college students who received the normative message that 4/5 students don't smoke were influenced to not smoke themselves.
- NSI is moderated by personality differences – nAffiliators are more likely to be influenced by NSI as they have a higher need to be liked.
- Evidence for ISI: political beliefs were influenced by what participants thought were crowd reactions to presidential debates.
- ISI is less influential if the task is based in physical reality and people can conduct their own research.
- ISI is most influential when a task is subjective (if there is no definitive answer).
- ISI is moderated by a person's self-efficacy – those who are confident in their answers won't be influenced by a majority.
- An Asch replication on engineering students found only one count of conformity in 396 trials, showing the power of self-efficacy in resisting ISI.

Credit other relevant material.

**12. Marks for this question: AO1 = 6, AO3 = 10**

This question is level-marked:

Level	Marks	Description
4	13–16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge of the variables affecting conformity as investigated by Asch is accurate and generally well detailed.</li> <li>• Discussion is thorough and effective.</li> <li>• Minor detail and/or expansion of argument is sometimes lacking.</li> <li>• The answer is clear, coherent, and focused.</li> <li>• Specialist terminology is used effectively.</li> </ul>

3	9–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge of the variables affecting conformity as investigated by Asch is evident but there are occasional inaccuracies/omissions.</li> <li>• Discussion is mostly effective.</li> <li>• The answer is mostly clear and organised but occasionally lacks focus.</li> <li>• Specialist terminology is used appropriately.</li> </ul>
2	5–8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited knowledge of the variables affecting conformity as investigated by Asch is present.</li> <li>• Focus is mainly on description.</li> <li>• Any discussion that is present is of limited effectiveness.</li> <li>• The answer lacks clarity, accuracy, and organisation in places.</li> <li>• Specialist terminology is used inappropriately on occasions.</li> </ul>
1	1–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge of the variables affecting conformity as investigated by Asch is very limited.</li> <li>• Any discussion is limited, poorly focused, or absent.</li> <li>• The answer as a whole lacks clarity, has many inaccuracies, and is poorly organised.</li> <li>• Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.</li> </ul>
	0	No relevant content.

**Possible AO1 content:**

- Asch's three-line study found overall conformity of 36.8%. The variables affecting conformity were compared to this percentage.
- Group size: the (confederate) majority was varied from 1 to 15. When the majority was less than 3, there was no conformity. When the majority was 3, conformity jumped to 30%, but didn't increase with further increases to the majority.
- Group size: Asch concluded that 3 is the critical number for conformity, with larger groups exerting no more influence.
- Unanimity of the majority: when a (confederate) 'lone dissenter' gave a different incorrect answer to the majority, conformity dropped to 9%. When they gave the correct answer, conformity dropped to 5.5%.
- Unanimity of the majority: Asch concluded that breaking the unanimity of the majority gave people psychological power to resist conformity.
- Task difficulty: Asch varied the line lengths to make the task harder. Conformity increased.
- Task difficulty: Asch concluded that when people are unsure of an answer, they rely on informational social influence and will conform to be right.

Credit other variables affecting conformity investigated by Asch.

**Note:** dispositional variables such as an external locus of control are not creditworthy because they were not investigated by Asch.

**Possible AO3 discussion:**

- Issues with external validity/generalisability. Low population validity (the sample), low mundane realism (task not true to life).
- Low temporal validity – the research took place during McCarthyism where people were afraid to stand out for fear of being labelled a communist.
- No studies have investigated groups larger than nine. We are limited in our knowledge of how much larger groups may influence conformity.
- Task difficulty is moderated by a person's self-efficacy. Engineering students (high in self-efficacy) only conformed once in 396 trials.
- Asch's research was culturally biased and didn't account for conformity across cultures. Collectivist cultures have higher conformity rates than individualistic ones.

Credit other relevant discussion points.

**13. Marks for this question: AO1 = 6, AO2 = 4, AO3 = 6**

This question is level-marked:

Level	Marks	Description
4	13–16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge of minority influence is accurate and generally well detailed.</li> <li>• Application is effective.</li> <li>• Discussion is thorough and effective.</li> <li>• Minor detail and/or expansion of argument is sometimes lacking.</li> <li>• The answer is clear, coherent, and focused.</li> <li>• Specialist terminology is used effectively.</li> </ul>
3	9–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge of minority influence is evident but there are occasional inaccuracies/omissions.</li> <li>• Application and/or discussion is mostly effective.</li> <li>• The answer is mostly clear and organised but occasionally lacks focus.</li> <li>• Specialist terminology is used appropriately.</li> </ul>

2	5–8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited knowledge of minority influence is present.</li> <li>Focus is mainly on description.</li> <li>Any discussion and/or application is of limited effectiveness.</li> <li>The answer lacks clarity, accuracy, and organisation in places.</li> <li>Specialist terminology is used inappropriately on occasions.</li> </ul> <b>OR</b> one theory only at Level 3/4.
1	1–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Knowledge of minority influence is very limited. Discussion and/or application is limited, poorly focused, or absent.</li> <li>The answer lacks clarity, has many inaccuracies, and is poorly organised.</li> <li>Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.</li> </ul> <b>OR</b> one theory only at Level 2.
	0	No relevant content.

**Possible AO1 content:**

- Minority influence is when an individual or small group persuades a majority to change their attitudes, values, and behaviours to their own.
- Minority influence is harder to achieve than majority influence.
- Minority influence involves internalisation – the deepest level of conformity.
- Minority influence leads to conversion – conformity usually leads to permanent change.
- Processes affecting minority influence:
  - Consistency: synchronic and diachronic; both cause the majority to rethink their opinions.
  - Commitment: the minority make sacrifices to show they are serious about their message.
  - Flexibility: if the minority shows an element of compromise at the end of an argument, then the majority are more like to consider the minority message.
- Key study: four naïve participants and two confederates were shown blue slides. Confederates said they were green either every time or two thirds of the time. There was 8% conformity in the consistent condition, and less than 1% conformity in the inconsistent condition. For a minority to have any influence, they must be consistent.

**Possible AO2 application:**

- Ferdinand should be consistent in his message about going to Glastonbury Festival in order to be influential. He should not think of other reasons, or his original message will be lost/diluted.
- Ferdinand should show his commitment to going to Glastonbury by being willing to make sacrifices. Suitable sacrifices could be to drive to the festival/put the tent up/bring snacks for everyone/pay some money towards their tickets (credit any other relevant sacrifice).

- Ferdinand should show flexibility by showing an element of compromise at the end of the negotiations, such as going to Reading Festival next year (credit any other relevant compromise).

**Possible AO3 discussion:**

- There are benefits of minority viewpoints: causes a majority to do research, be creative, make better decisions, and be confident to voice opinions. A study of dissent in work groups found that groups improved their decision making when exposed to minority viewpoints.
- The majority may only accept the minority in a tokenistic way to appear democratic.
- Some minority groups lose the impact of their message by angering the public, e.g. blocking roads.
- Evidence for flexibility: a simulated jury discussing a compensation payment for a ski-lift accident were most influenced when a minority confederate compromised at the end of the negotiations. A degree of flexibility at the right time is influential.
- Moscovici's artificial task had no consequences and tells us little about how a minority would influence situations that had serious consequences, e.g. a jury.
- Minority influence may be influential on a private level. Moscovici asked participants to individually sort blue and green discs and found those who had experienced the consistent minority in the first task identified more as green.
- Minority groups may cause a majority to change their viewpoint, but on a private level.

Credit other relevant material.