

Activity 6

Mark Scheme

Paper 1

From the study by Laney et al. (false memory): Explain why the study was carried out. [2 marks]
<p>Award 1 mark for partial explanation. Award 2 marks for full explanation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To test whether positive false memories could be implanted (for a food) (1) and whether this would lead to increased liking (for the food). (1) To find out whether people could be led to believe that they liked asparagus when they were young (1) and if that made them give a higher rating to a photograph of asparagus. (1)
Discuss at least two strengths and two weaknesses of the Piliavin et al. study. [8 marks]
<p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The setting was a subway train which is not artificial (a real situation). People can find themselves in this situation daily, so the study does have ecological validity. As the setting is on a train and therefore natural and no one was aware that the whole situation was staged, there was very little chance that anyone would have shown behaviour to fit the aim of the study. Therefore, the behaviour shown by the participants was natural and therefore valid/reduced demand characteristics. The data collection included both qualitative and quantitative data, so was informative about how much helping there was (or wasn't) and why. <p>Weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The positioning of people in the carriages could not be controlled (this is just one example). Therefore, they may not have noticed the incident or ignored it as they were reading etc., so it may not have been the type of victim affecting helping levels. The participants in the train did not know this was a study so were deceived and obviously informed consent could not have been taken from them prior to the collapse. This goes against ethical guidelines. Participants may have been distressed by the events on the train, which goes against the guideline of protecting participants from harm. <p>Mark according to the levels of response criteria below:</p> <p>Level 4 (7–8 marks)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The candidate has discussed at least two strengths and two weaknesses of the study. Accurate knowledge and understanding is applied. There is a clear line of reasoning which is logically structured and thoroughly evaluated. <p>Level 3 (5–6 marks)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The candidate has given at least one strength and at least one weakness of the study. Knowledge and understanding is applied. There is evidence of some structured reasoning and some evaluation. <p>Level 2 (3–4 marks)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The candidate has given one of the required strengths or weaknesses of the study. Some evidence that knowledge and understanding is applied but this may be limited. There is evidence of some reasoning with limited evaluation. <p>Level 1 (1–2 marks)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The candidate has given one basic strength or weakness that is in the context of the study OR The candidate has given two evaluation points that are basic. <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response worthy of credit.</p>

Paper 2

A hypothesis in a study says 'Emotions will differ following exposure to a happy or an angry stooge.' Is this a directional (one-tailed) or a non-directional (two-tailed) hypothesis? Include a reason in your answer. [1 mark]

Award 1 mark for the correct answer. Must include an appropriate reason for this mark, answer without reason cannot be credited.

For example:

- Non-directional/two tailed (hypothesis), because the direction of change is not specified.

Sakri thinks that the way he scores the participants' answers may differ from the way Hilja scores them. Suggest how Sakri can test whether he and Hilja are reliable in their scoring of the questionnaire. [3 marks]

Award 1 mark for suggestion.

Award 2 marks for suggestion with brief elaboration.

Award 3 marks for suggestion with full elaboration.

For example:

- Sakri could compare his scores to Hilja's (for a sample of results) (1) then correlate them/conduct a test to see if people who he gives high scores to, also get high scores from Hilja. (1) if they correlate/each person's scores from the two of them are similar, then their inter-rater reliability is high. (1)

Credit application of testing inter-rater reliability.

Other appropriate responses should also be created.

Paper 3

Describe the cognitive explanation of schizophrenia, as outlined by Frith (1992). [4]

Award 1–2 marks for a basic answer with some understanding of the topic area. There will be limited reference to the question.

Award 3–4 marks for a detailed answer with clear understanding of the topic area. There will be detailed reference to the question.

For example:

- The cognitive explanation of schizophrenia states that schizophrenia is caused by a problem of faulty information processing. Frith suggested specifically that people with schizophrenia may have faulty 'metacognitive' processes and have difficulty reflecting on thoughts, emotions and behaviours. This could be linked with theory of mind and the way that people with schizophrenia struggle to understand the behaviour of others. They may also have problems with attention and with generating self-initiated actions as well as problems recognising their own 'inner speech' which may explain auditory hallucinations.

Other appropriate responses should also be credited.

Discuss one strength and one weakness of one way of measuring leadership. [6]

Answers could include:

- The LPI rating uses scales and it would be appropriate to identify both strengths and weaknesses of the such as the ease with which such scales can be administered, the fact that they produce quantitative data and that this data can then be used in comparisons with others as well as to measure change. Weaknesses include the problem of knowing that everyone interprets the scale in the same way and the fact that respondents will be subject to social desirability bias.

Mark according to the levels of response criteria below:

Level 3 (5–6 marks)

- Candidates will show a clear understanding of the question and will discuss at least one strength and one weakness.
- Candidates will provide a good explanation with clear detail.

Level 2 (3–4 marks)

- Candidates show an understanding of the question and will discuss one appropriate weakness in detail or one appropriate strength in detail.
- Candidates will provide a good explanation.

Level 1 (1–2 marks)

- Candidates will show a basic understanding of the question and will attempt a discussion of either a strength or a weakness.
- Candidates will provide a limited explanation.

Level 0 (0 marks)

No response worthy of credit.

Paper 4

Fear of blood and injections are common phobias. Explain how a different phobia can be explained through conditioning. [4]

Award 1–2 marks for a basic description.

Award 3–4 marks for a detailed description with elaboration.

Guidance:

- Any phobia is acceptable.
- Candidates can choose a well-known example.

Basic answer

- A loud noise was made every time Albert saw a white rat, (1) and he learned to associate the fear of the noise with the rat. (1)

Detailed answer

- Little Albert's fear of rats was created by repeated association (1) of the sight of the rat with a loud noise that elicited a fear response. (1) He would then show a fear response just on sight of the rat, without the loud noise (1) although he was not afraid of the rat at the start of the experiment. (1)

Design a study to investigate worker preference for job rotation and or job enrichment. [10]

Level 4 (9–10 marks)

- The design is appropriate to the named investigation and is based on thorough psychological knowledge.
- The design is accurate, coherent and detailed, and it tests the proposed investigation competently.
- Four or five design features are included. The features are clearly applied to the design throughout the answer and the candidate clearly understands the main features involved in designing an investigation.
- The response has proposed an appropriate design, has applied a range of relevant methodological design features with competence and shown clear understanding.

Level 3 (7–8 marks)

- The design is appropriate to the named investigation and is based on good psychological knowledge.
- The design is accurate, coherent and detailed, and it tests the proposed investigation competently.
- Two or three design features are included. The features are often applied to the design and the candidate shows good understanding in places.
- The response has proposed an appropriate design, has applied some relevant methodological design features and has shown good understanding.

Level 2 (4–6 marks)

- The design is mostly appropriate to the named investigation and is based on psychological knowledge.
- The design is mostly accurate, coherent and detailed in places and it tests the proposed investigation.
- Design features are limited in their understanding.

Level 1 (1–3 marks)

- The design may not be appropriate to the named investigation and use of terminology is sparse or absent. Basic psychological understanding is shown.
- The design lacks coherence and is limited in understanding.
- One or two appropriate design features are identified but incorrectly applied.
- The response lacks detail.

0 – no response worthy of credit

Additional guidance:

- Candidates may choose any method (most likely a questionnaire).
- Five or more features of the chosen method and study design are expected.