



General Certificate of Education

Psychology 5181/6181 *Specification A*

PYA3 Social Psychology and Research Methods

Mark Scheme

2006 examination - January series

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

UNIT 3 (PYA3)

SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY AND RESEARCH METHODS

QUALITY OF WRITTEN COMMUNICATION (QoWC)

| | |
|----------------|--|
| 2 marks | The work is characterised by clear expression of ideas, a good range of specialist terms and only few errors in grammar, punctuation and spelling that detract from the clarity of the material. |
| 1 mark | The work is characterised by reasonable expression of ideas, the use of some specialist terms and errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling that detract from the clarity of the material. |
| 0 marks | The work is characterised by poor expression of ideas, limited use of specialist terms, errors and poor grammar, punctuation and spelling and legibility which obscure the clarity of the material. |

ASSESSMENT OBJECTIVES ONE AND TWO

| | |
|------------|---|
| AO1 | Assessment objective one = knowledge and understanding of psychological theories, terminology, concepts, studies and methods and communication of knowledge and understanding of psychology in a clear and effective manner. |
| AO2 | Assessment objective two = analysis and evaluation of psychological theories, concepts, studies and methods and communication of knowledge and understanding of psychology in a clear and effective manner. |
| AO3 | Assessment objective three = design, conduct and report psychological investigation (s) choosing from a range of methods, and taking into account the issues of reliability, validity and ethics, and collect and draw conclusions from the data. |

Section A – Social Psychology

Total for this question: 30 marks

(3 marks + 3 marks)

1 (a) Give **two** explanations of why people yield to majority influence.

| Marking Criteria | Performance Descriptions (for each explanation) |
|---|--|
| <p>Majority influence is when a person changes their behaviour as a result of real or imagined group pressure. This may be due to several reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People conform so that they are liked and belong to the group, ie normative influence. • People conform because they are unsure and want to be correct, ie informational influence. • People may also conform because they change their beliefs, ie internalisation. | <p>3</p> <p>Accurate and reasonably detailed The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed explanation of why people yield to majority influence that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. The explanation may use appropriate psychological terminology, or refer to explicit research. For example, they change their behaviour so that the rest of the group likes them, this is normative social influence, but they might not change their beliefs only their behaviour.</p> |
| | <p>2</p> <p>Less detailed but generally accurate The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate explanation of why people yield to majority influence that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, they conform because they are unsure how to behave and want to be correct.</p> |
| | <p>1</p> <p>Basic The candidate provides a basic explanation of why people yield to majority influence that demonstrates some relevant knowledge but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, simply saying that it is a result of Normative Influence.</p> |
| | <p>0</p> <p>Flawed or inappropriate The candidate provides an explanation which is flawed or an inappropriate explanation that fails to demonstrate any knowledge or understanding of the topic. For example, the candidate may offer a reason why people yield to minority influence or the reason is incorrect.</p> |

1 (b) (i) Explain **one** ethical issue that has arisen in social influence research.

(3 marks)

| Marking Criteria | Performance Descriptions |
|---|--|
| <p>There are several ethical issues that candidates may offer, but the most likely ones are those identified on the specification; eg, deception, informed consent and the protection of participants from psychological harm. However, other ethical issues (such as confidentiality, the need for privacy, right to withdraw etc) are also relevant as long as it could be relevant to social influence (S.I.) research. There is no requirement to make this link to S.I. explicit (it would be hard to think of any ethical issues that have no link to S.I. research).</p> | <p>3</p> <p>Accurate and reasonably detailed</p> <p>The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed description of the ethical issue that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, the candidate has given an outline of deception, which shows explicitly <i>why</i> this is an important issue (for example, it prevents fully informed consent being given, makes participants distrustful of future research participation etc).</p> |
| | <p>2</p> <p>Less detailed but generally accurate</p> <p>The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate description of the ethical issue that demonstrates relevant knowledge. For example, the candidate may give a less detailed outline, which shows some understanding of <i>why</i> this is an important ethical issue. Lack of informed consent means participants don't know what they are saying yes to.</p> |
| <p>Mere identification of ethical guidelines eg debriefing, would not count as issues without identification of the underlying issue they address.</p> | <p>1</p> <p>Basic</p> <p>The candidate provides a basic description of the ethical issue that demonstrates some relevant knowledge but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, the candidate may give a basic outline of the use of deception in obedience research, which shows little understanding of <i>why</i> this is an important ethical issue. Deception is not telling participants about the study. Correctly identifying an ethical issue would also receive one mark.</p> |
| | <p>0</p> <p>Flawed or inappropriate</p> <p>The candidate provides a description which is flawed or an inappropriate description that fails to demonstrate any knowledge or understanding of the topic. For example, the candidate has described some procedures of a study that has been considered unethical.</p> |

1 (b) (ii) Outline how psychologists could deal with the ethical issue you have given in (i) above.

(3 marks)

| Marking Criteria | Performance Descriptions |
|--|---|
| <p>There are several ways in which psychologists deal with ethical issues. These can include a thorough debriefing, prior general consent, presumptive consent, the use of ethical committees. Whichever method a candidate offers it must relate to the ethical issue offered in (i).</p> | <p>3</p> <p>Accurate and reasonably detailed</p> <p>The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed outline of how psychologists have dealt with the ethical issue that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, the candidate has given an outline of presumptive consent: it involves informing a group of participants who are similar to the actual participants of the nature of the research and asking if they would take part in the study. If they agree, then the psychologist can assume the real participants would also take part.</p> |
| | <p>2</p> <p>Less detailed but generally accurate</p> <p>The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate outline of how psychologists have dealt with the ethical issue that demonstrates relevant knowledge. For example, the candidate may give a less detailed outline, of presumptive consent that states the psychologist would ask other people if they would take part in the research and if they agree, the psychologist would go ahead.</p> |
| | <p>1</p> <p>Basic</p> <p>The candidate provides a basic outline of how psychologists have dealt with the ethical issue that demonstrates some relevant knowledge but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, debrief.</p> |
| | <p>0</p> <p>Flawed or inappropriate</p> <p>The candidate provides an outline which is flawed or an inappropriate outline that fails to demonstrate any knowledge or understanding of the topic. For example, the candidate has described a way of dealing with an issue that is not the one outlined in (i) or the explanation is incorrect.</p> |

1 (c) ‘External validity is a broad concept and can include ecological validity.’

Briefly outline **two** studies of obedience. Consider whether such studies show external validity.

(18 marks)

| <p>Marking Criteria</p> | |
|---|--|
| <p>AO1 criteria is satisfied by an outline description of two studies of obedience. This may relate to any aspects of the study (aims, procedures, findings and/or conclusions). However, this material should have the potential to relate to external validity.</p> <p>AO2 criteria consists of a consideration of whether such studies are externally valid; ie whether findings can be applied to other settings.</p> <p>There are numerous appropriate studies that candidates might offer, but those identified on the specification are likely to be the most common; eg Milgram, Meeus & Raaijmakers. One appropriate study that candidates may offer is Hofling et al. It is also possible for candidates to consider Zimbardo’s prison simulation, provided they make it clear that it involved the prisoners obeying the guards.</p> <p>Examiners can accept a broad understanding of what is meant by the term external validity: whether the study can be generalised to other settings (ecological validity), to other peoples (population validity) and times (historical validity).</p> | <p>The commentary comes from a consideration of whether such studies were externally valid; ie by considering whether they can be generalised to other settings (ecological validity). One of the main criticisms faced by Milgram was that his study lacked ecological validity (Orme & Holland), that the situation was not realistic to the participants (experimental validity) and that this in turn affected their behaviour. One of the strengths of Hofling et al’s study was that it was conducted in the real world and thus was high in ecological validity. However, there have been criticisms (Rank & Jacobson) of Hofling et al, that the situation the nurses find themselves in was unrealistic and unlikely to occur in the real world. The findings were also not replicated, unlike Milgram’s findings, which were replicated both in the US and in other countries. Thus it was possible to argue that in fact Milgram’s findings can actually be claimed to have ecological validity whereas Hofling et al’s do not. Similarly, Zimbardo’s prison simulation study has not been replicated, although it could be possible for candidates to argue that Haslam’s recent study “The Prison” is a replication of Zimbardo’s study in a different setting, thus providing some evidence of ecological validity. (Although this more recent study challenges Zimbardo’s findings possibly due to both population and historical validity.) Many of the early studies used only male participants (and American undergraduates at that) thus they can be said to lack population validity.</p> <p>Candidates who only outline one study of obedience will be restricted to a maximum of 4 marks AO1 as it will be partial performance. If they offer more than two studies, then all should be marked and credit given to the best two.</p> |

1 (c)

| Marks | Performance Descriptions | Marks | Performance Descriptions |
|-------|--|-------|--|
| 6 | <p>AO1: Outline of two studies of obedience</p> <p>Accurate and reasonably detailed The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed outline of two studies of obedience that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, the candidate has outlined two studies in detail, such as providing an accurate outline of the procedures of both studies, or a less detailed description of all aspects of the study.</p> | 12-10 | <p>AO2: Evaluation of external validity in studies of obedience</p> <p>Informed commentary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within the time constraints for this part of the question, there is effective use of material to address the question and provide an informed commentary. • Effective analysis and evaluation of material. • Broad range of issues and/or evidence in reasonable depth, or a narrower range in greater depth. • The structure is generally clear and coherent. |
| 5-4 | <p>Less detailed but generally accurate The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate outline of two studies of obedience that demonstrates relevant knowledge. For example, the candidate has outlined the studies briefly, without providing much detail. If only one study is outlined, this is accurate and reasonably detailed (Max 4 marks).</p> | 9-7 | <p>Reasonable commentary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is appropriate selection of material to address the question, but this is not always used effectively to produce a reasonable commentary. • Reasonable analysis and evaluation of material. • A range of issues and/or evidence in limited depth, or a narrower range in greater depth. |
| 3-2 | <p>Basic The candidate provides a basic outline of two studies of obedience that demonstrates some relevant knowledge but lacks detail and may be muddled. If only one study is outlined, this is less detailed but generally accurate.</p> | 6-4 | <p>Basic commentary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The selection and use of material provides only a basic commentary. • Basic analysis and evaluation of material. • Superficial consideration of a restricted range of issues and/or evidence. |
| 1-0 | <p>Very brief/flawed or inappropriate The candidate provides an outline which is very brief/flawed or an inappropriate outline that fails to demonstrate any knowledge or understanding of the topic. For example, the candidate may outline studies that do not relate to obedience or the description is incorrect.</p> | 3-0 | <p>Rudimentary/absent or irrelevant commentary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The selection and use of material provides only a rudimentary commentary, or commentary is absent or wholly irrelevant. • Analysis and evaluation just discernible or absent. |

2 (a) Give **two** explanations of why people yield to minority influence.

(3 marks + 3 marks)

| Marking Criteria | Marks | Performance Descriptions (For each explanation) |
|---|-------|---|
| <p>There are several explanations for why people yield to the minority: the snowball effect (as a few people move towards the minority slowly more and more also follow this path); the theory of social impact (strength, number + status, immediacy); the dissociation model (social cryptoamnesia). The latter could be presented as one explanation or subdivided into several explanations.</p> <p>Informational social influence is also an explanation for minority influence (those with more knowledge or greater status provide information).</p> | 3 | <p>Accurate and reasonably detailed</p> <p>The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed explanation of why people yield to minority influence that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, the candidate may offer a detailed and accurate explanation of why people yield possibly using psychological terminology. For example, the snowball effect, initially a few people yield but gradually this influence gets stronger and stronger as more people pay attention to the minority's view.</p> |
| <p>Moscovici distinguished between compliance and conversion and suggested that it is through conversion that the minority can influence the majority. People are most likely to yield to the minority when it is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • consistent (ie consistent in its opinions) • flexible (ie not unbending, rigid and dogmatic) • committed (ie focused, enthusiastic and has invested in its views). | 2 | <p>Less detailed but generally accurate</p> <p>The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate explanation of why people yield to minority influence that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, the candidate offers the correct reason together with limited but accurate further detail. For example, if the minority is committed to its views, it is focused and very enthusiastic people might be influenced by it.</p> |
| <p>Candidates may present these as separate explanations (and provide detail by referring to research support) or may bundle them together as an aspect of a person's behaviour.</p> | 1 | <p>Basic</p> <p>The candidate provides a basic explanation of why people yield to minority influence that demonstrates some relevant knowledge but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, the candidate merely identifies a reason (eg consistency).</p> |
| | 0 | <p>Flawed or inappropriate</p> <p>The candidate provides an explanation which is flawed or an inappropriate explanation that fails to demonstrate any knowledge or understanding of the topic. For example, the candidate may offer an explanation of why people yield to majority influence or the explanation is incorrect.</p> |

2 (b) Describe the aims and procedures of **one** study of obedience to authority.

(6 marks)

| Marking Criteria | Marks | Performance Descriptions |
|---|--------------|---|
| <p>There are several studies that candidates may select, but it is likely that they will choose one of Milgram’s studies, although any study of obedience is creditworthy. The question explicitly asks for aims and procedures, so no credit should be given for findings or conclusions. Candidates do not need to cover both the aims and the procedures in equal depth to achieve high marks, but they do need to explicitly consider the aims. For example,</p> <p><u>Aims:</u> Milgram’s aims were to see whether people would obey an unjust command from a person in a position of authority, whether they would go so far as to harm an innocent person. He also wanted to investigate whether German’s were different.</p> <p>If Zimbardo’s study is offered, candidates must make his aims explicitly relevant to obedience for the procedures to be creditworthy.</p> <p>Variations of Milgram’s studies can be counted as one study.</p> | 6 | <p>Accurate and reasonably detailed</p> <p>The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed description of the aims and procedures of a study of obedience that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, the candidate has covered aims and procedures but not necessarily in the same amount of detail.</p> |
| | 5-4 | <p>Less detailed but generally accurate</p> <p>The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate description of the aims and procedures of a study of obedience that demonstrates relevant knowledge.</p> <p>If only the aims or procedures are outlined, this is accurate and reasonably detailed (Max 4 marks).</p> |
| | 3-2 | <p>Basic</p> <p>The candidate provides a basic description of the aims and procedures of a study of obedience that demonstrates some relevant knowledge but lacks detail and may be muddled.</p> <p>If only the aims or procedures are outlined, this is less detailed but generally accurate.</p> |
| | 1-0 | <p>Very brief/flawed or inappropriate</p> <p>The candidate provides a description which is very brief/flawed or an inappropriate description that fails to demonstrate any knowledge or understanding of the topic. For example, the candidate has described a study which was not concerned with obedience or the description is incorrect.</p> |

2 (c) Discuss **at least two** criticisms that have been made of research into majority influence.

(18 marks)

| Marking Criteria | |
|--|--|
| <p>AO1 credit should be given for a description of two or more criticisms of majority influence research.</p> <p>AO2 credit should be given for the evaluation of these criticisms.</p> <p>There are several criticisms of majority influence research that a candidate might outline.</p> <p><u>Ethics/Deception:</u> For example, Asch’s work was criticised for its use of deception. Participants were not told that it was a study of conformity. However, it could be argued that without deception it would not have been possible to conduct such research. Also, the participants were debriefed and did not come to any harm.</p> <p><u>Ecological validity:</u> Asch’s research was carried out in a laboratory and therefore can be considered artificial.</p> | <p><u>Historical bias:</u> Perrin and Spencer’s research throws doubt on the validity of Asch’s original findings, they claimed that it demonstrated a historical bias; it was “a child of its time”. However, work by Doms and Avermaet found evidence to support Asch, thus disputing the historical bias.</p> <p><u>Population bias:</u> Asch only used males and American males at that, making generalisations to other populations difficult.</p> <p>Candidates could also consider cross-cultural research (for example by Smith and Bond) in their evaluation.</p> <p>Candidates need only offer two criticisms; if these are described in detail and used effectively, then full marks could be awarded. Examiners need to be aware of the breadth/depth trade-off. Some description of the studies is creditworthy as long as they illustrate the criticism.</p> |

2 (c)

| Marks | Performance Descriptions | Marks | Performance Descriptions |
|-------|---|-------|---|
| 6 | <p>AO1: Outline of two or more criticisms of majority influence</p> <p>Accurate and reasonably detailed The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed outline of two or more criticisms of research into majority influence that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, the candidate has offered a range of criticisms (breadth) or two but in detail (depth).</p> | 12-10 | <p>AO2: Evaluation of these criticisms</p> <p>Informed commentary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within the time constraints for this part of the question, there is effective use of material to address the question and provide an informed commentary. • Effective analysis and evaluation of material. • Broad range of issues and/or evidence in reasonable depth, or a narrower range in greater depth. • The structure is generally clear and coherent. |
| 5-4 | <p>Less detailed but generally accurate The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate outline of two or more criticisms of research into majority influence that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, the candidate has only outlined a few criticisms briefly. If only one criticism is outlined, this is accurate and reasonably detailed (Max 4 marks).</p> | 9-7 | <p>Reasonable commentary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is appropriate selection of material to address the question, but this is not always used effectively to produce a reasonable commentary. • Reasonable analysis and evaluation of material. • A range of issues and/or evidence in limited depth, or a narrower range in greater depth. • If only criticism one is considered, this is informed (Max 8 marks). |
| 3-2 | <p>Basic The candidate provides a basic outline of two or more criticisms of research into majority influence that demonstrates some relevant knowledge but lacks detail and may be muddled. If only one criticism is outlined, this is less detailed but generally accurate.</p> | 6-4 | <p>Basic commentary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The selection and use of material provides only a basic commentary. • Basic analysis and evaluation of material. • Superficial consideration of a restricted range of issues and/or evidence. • If only one criticism is considered, this is reasonable. |
| 1-0 | <p>Very brief/flawed or inappropriate The candidate provides an outline which is very brief/flawed or an inappropriate outline that fails to demonstrate any knowledge or understanding of the topic. For example, the candidate has described criticisms relating to minority influence or the description is incorrect.</p> | 3-0 | <p>Rudimentary/absent or irrelevant commentary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The selection and use of material provides only a rudimentary commentary, or commentary is absent or wholly irrelevant. • Analysis and evaluation just discernible or absent. |

Section B – Research Methods

3

Total for this question: 30 marks

Every January lots of people join a gym to get fit, but then stop going after a few months. A team of psychologists decided to investigate why this happens. The psychologists contacted several gyms and asked permission to interview those people who joined during January. They put up posters in each of the gyms asking for people to take part in their study.

Every person who agreed to take part was told the purpose of the study and their full, informed consent obtained. In January, each participant was interviewed to find out why they joined, and what they hoped to achieve.

Each participant was also informed that a psychologist would interview them again in a few months time to see how they were getting on.

Mark scheme for Question 3: where the word *one* appears in a question positive marking does not apply and only the first answer is credited.

(a) State the aim of this study.

(2 marks)

| Marking Criteria | Marks | Performance Descriptions |
|--|-----------------|---|
| <p>AO3 The aim of this study was to see the reasons why people join a gym and also the reasons why they stop going within a few months.</p> | <p>2</p> | <p>Accurate and detailed Statement of the aim is both accurate and detailed. For example, mentioning both finding out the reasons why people join in the first place and why they leave a gym, or one of these factors with elaboration (eg why they join and the factors that influence this reason for joining).</p> |
| | <p>1</p> | <p>Basic Statement of the aim is basic, lacking detail and may be muddled and/or flawed. For example, simply stating to find why they join.</p> |
| | <p>0</p> | <p>Inappropriate/incorrect Statement of the aim is inappropriate (for example, the candidate may describe the procedure) or the aim is incorrect.</p> |

(b) Outline **two** advantages of using interviews in psychological research.

(2 marks + 2 marks)

| Marking Criteria | Marks | Performance Descriptions (for each advantage) |
|---|-----------------|---|
| <p>AO2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allows the interviewer to focus their questions on the topic that is of specific interest to them. • Interviews allow the interviewer to obtain lots of information from the participant and to make sure that they understand the answer given. • Participants can ask questions and clarify anything that they don't understand. • In unstructured interviews particularly, a wide range of topics can be covered and the interviewer can investigate issues that they had not previously considered. • Interviews can consider sensitive issues that might be personal and which a participant might not wish to divulge if more impersonal methods were used. <p>These answers do not need to be contextualised in order to gain full marks, although setting the answer within the context of this study is one way of elaborating their answer and gaining marks.</p> | <p>2</p> | <p>Accurate and detailed The advantage is both accurate and detailed. For example, interviewers can make sure that the participant really understands the question by clarifying the question or explaining it to the participant.</p> |
| | <p>1</p> | <p>Basic The advantage is basic, lacking in detail and may be muddled and/or flawed. For example, interviews are a flexible way of getting data.</p> |
| | <p>0</p> | <p>Inappropriate/incorrect The advantage is inappropriate (for example, the candidate describes what an interview is rather than the advantage) or the advantage is incorrect.</p> |

(c) (i) What is meant by the term demand characteristics?

(2 marks)

| Marking Criteria | Marks | Performance Descriptions |
|--|-----------------|--|
| <p>AO1</p> <p>Demand characteristics are cues in the environment that might alter participants behaviour (the environment can include the investigator's behaviour). They change their behaviour and act according to the cues they pick up. Demand characteristics can include such things as: the participant trying to guess what the researcher is trying to find out, so the participant tries to behave in a helpful (or unhelpful) manner. Other demand characteristics may result in participants behaving in ways that they don't usually behave, feeling that they are being evaluated and then feeling stressed or nervous. Participants may also want to show themselves in the best light and show a social desirability in their answers to interviews.</p> <p>No need to contextualise the answer.</p> <p>Examiners should note that material cannot be double credited, but can be imported or exported between (i) and (ii).</p> | <p>2</p> | <p>Accurate and detailed</p> <p>The explanation of demand characteristics is both accurate and detailed. For example, these are cues in the environment that cause a participant to alter their behaviour in some way as they try to make sense of the situation they are in.</p> |
| | <p>1</p> | <p>Basic</p> <p>The explanation of demand characteristics is basic, lacking detail, and may be muddled and/or flawed. For example, demand characteristics make participants change their behaviour.</p> |
| | <p>0</p> | <p>Inappropriate/incorrect</p> <p>The explanation is inappropriate or it is incorrect.</p> |

(c) (ii) Explain **one** way in which demand characteristics might affect this study.

(3 marks)

| Marking Criteria | Marks | Performance Descriptions |
|--|-----------------|--|
| <p>AO3 One possible way in which demand characteristics might affect this study is that the participants know what the aim is and that they will be re-interviewed in a few months. This may cause them to change their behaviour and motivate them to try harder when attending the gym. Or the way in which the interviewer asks the questions (leading questions, tone of voice, body language) may influence the participants when answering the questions.</p> | <p>3</p> | <p>Accurate and reasonably detailed The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed explanation of a way in which demand characteristics might affect this study that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, the candidate has explained how the participants might change their behaviour and located it within the context of the study. Participants know that the psychologists will interview them again and this acts a motivator and they change their behaviour, they try hard and do not drop out.</p> |
| <p>For full marks the answer must be contextualised.</p> | <p>2</p> | <p>Less detailed but generally accurate The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate explanation of a way in which demand characteristics might affect this study that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, the way the interviewer asks questions causes participants to give certain answers.</p> |
| | <p>1</p> | <p>Basic The candidate provides a basic explanation of a way in which demand characteristics might affect this study that demonstrates some relevant knowledge but lacks detail and may be muddled.</p> |
| | <p>0</p> | <p>Flawed or inappropriate The candidate provides an explanation which is flawed or an inappropriate explanation that fails to demonstrate any knowledge or understanding of the topic. For example, the candidate describes experimenter bias or the explanation is incorrect.</p> |

(d) (i) Identify the sampling method used to select participants in this study. Justify your answer.

(2 marks)

| Marking Criteria | Marks | Performance Descriptions |
|--|-----------------|--|
| <p>AO3 The participants were selected by putting up posters in the gyms and using all those who responded, they were a volunteer or self-selected sample. The important thing is that candidates <i>justify</i> the method they have identified and do not simply identify the sampling method.</p> | <p>2</p> | <p>Accurate and detailed Identification and justification of the method of sampling is both accurate and detailed. For example, using some of the material on the left and putting it in context; putting up posters in the gyms and using those people who volunteered to take part.</p> |
| | <p>1</p> | <p>Basic Identification and justification of the method of sampling is basic, lacking detail, and may be muddled and/or flawed. For example, it was a self-selected sample of people who volunteered.</p> |
| | <p>0</p> | <p>Inappropriate/incorrect Identification and justification of the method of sampling is inappropriate (for example, the candidate may describe the interview method) or the explanation is incorrect.</p> |

(d) (ii) Outline **one** weakness of the sampling method used to select participants for this study.

(2 marks)

| Marking Criteria | Marks | Performance Descriptions |
|---|-----------------|--|
| <p>AO3</p> <p>Weaknesses of both self-selected samples/volunteer samples: the people who respond may not be typical of the target population so the sample will not be representative; volunteers are often more motivated and perform better than other people.</p> <p>For full marks the answer must be contextualised.</p> <p>If more than one weakness is given, only the first one can be credited.</p> | <p>2</p> | <p>Accurate and detailed</p> <p>Weakness of the method of sampling is both accurate and detailed. For example, correctly identifying the weakness and elaborating it. Such as, the sample might not be representative; people who volunteer are not the same as others.</p> |
| | <p>1</p> | <p>Basic</p> <p>Weakness of the method of sampling is basic, lacking detail, and may be muddled and/or flawed. For example, simply identifying the weakness: it might not be representative.</p> |
| | <p>0</p> | <p>Inappropriate/incorrect</p> <p>Weakness of the method of sampling is inappropriate (for example, the candidate may describe a strength) or the explanation is incorrect.</p> |

(e) Outline **one** reason why a pilot study should have been carried out in this investigation.

(3 marks)

| Marking Criteria | Marks | Performance Descriptions |
|--|-----------------|---|
| <p>AO1 + AO3 A pilot study allows the researchers to discover any potential problems in the design before the main study is carried out. For example, in this case, it would enable the researchers to check the clarity of the questions before they start the interviews. They would be able to ensure that participants are willing to answer their questions.</p> | <p>3</p> | <p>Accurate and reasonably detailed The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed explanation of why a pilot study should be used, in the context of this study that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, the psychologists would carry out some interviews before hand to make sure that their questions are clear so give them useful information as well as allowing them to modify any questions if necessary.</p> |
| <p>For 3 marks, the answer must be located within the context of the study.</p> | <p>2</p> | <p>Less detailed but generally accurate The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate explanation of why a pilot study should be used, in the context of this study, that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, the psychologists try out their questions before hand and make changes if they need to. Or the explanation is accurate and detailed but not within the context of the study.</p> |
| | <p>1</p> | <p>Basic The candidate provides a basic explanation of why a pilot study should have been used, that demonstrates some relevant knowledge but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, they try out the questions beforehand.</p> |
| | <p>0</p> | <p>Flawed or inappropriate The candidate provides an explanation which is flawed or an inappropriate explanation that fails to demonstrate any knowledge or understanding of the topic.</p> |

(f) At the end of 4 months, the psychologists re-interviewed all the participants.

- (i) Write **one** question that the psychologists might have asked that would generate quantitative data. Explain why responses to this question would generate quantitative data. *(1 mark + 2 marks)*
- (ii) Write **one** question that the psychologists might have asked that would generate qualitative data. Explain why responses to this question would generate qualitative data. *(1 mark + 2 marks)*

| Marking Criteria | Marks | Performance Descriptions (for each question) |
|---|----------|---|
| <p>AO3</p> <p>Candidates could offer any question that would be appropriate for an interview of this nature and examiners should take a fairly tolerant approach here. For each type of question it is important that it generates the appropriate type of data. Quantitative data is concerned with the quantity, how much there is of something. This data is represented in numerical form. Qualitative data is concerned with the quality of behaviour or of an experience. It is concerned with feelings and emotions and is represented in words.</p> <p>An example of a question generating quantitative data would be: “On average how many times do you go to the gym each week?” It is quantitative because the answer would be in the form of a number; ie number of times per week.</p> <p>An example of a question generating qualitative data would be: “What have you achieved by going to the gym?” It is qualitative because the answer would be in the form of words, it would be an explanation of the participants own expectations.</p> | 1 | <p>Appropriate The question is appropriate.</p> |
| | 0 | <p>Inappropriate/incorrect The question is inappropriate or incorrect.</p> |
| | | <p>Performance Descriptions (for the explanation)</p> |
| | 2 | <p>Accurate and Detailed The explanation of why the question would generate the type of data is both accurate and detailed. For example, the question would allow participants to describe their feelings and attitudes and so would be in words (qualitative).</p> |
| | 1 | <p>Basic The explanation of why the question would generate the type of data is basic, lacking detail, and may be muddled and/or flawed. For example, simply saying its numbers.</p> |
| | 0 | <p>Inappropriate/incorrect The type of question is inappropriate or is incorrect.</p> |

(g) One ethical issue that was taken into account in this study was informed consent.

(i) Identify **two** other ethical issues that the psychologists should have taken into account in this study. (2 marks)

(ii) For **each** of the ethical issues you have given in (i) above, outline how this study could have been carried out in an ethically acceptable way. (2 marks + 2 marks)

| Marking Criteria | Marks | Performance Descriptions (for the ethical issue) |
|---|---|--|
| <p>AO2 & AO3</p> <p>There are several issues that could be taken into account: right to withdraw, privacy, confidentiality.</p> <p>Candidates should be able to show how the study could be conducted to ensure it is ethical. These could include ensuring that the participants' privacy is not invaded, informing all participants that they have the right to withdraw from the study, making sure all the information collected remains confidential (some of their answers might concern sensitive issues).</p> <p>In this particular study the participants are not being deceived and their informed consent has been obtained, so these issues are not creditworthy. No mention is made in the stimulus material of the age of the participants and a candidate might justifiably consider the issue of participants being under age and therefore needing parental consent.</p> <p>(A case could (just) be made for the issue of protection from harm, if as a result of taking part, participants spend too long in the gym, they might cause some damage to themselves!)</p> <p>There is a follow-through in this question, if a candidate identifies an issue in (i), but the solution is not appropriate to that issue, credit can only be given to (i) and not to (ii).</p> | <p>2</p> <p>1</p> <p>0</p> | <p>Accurate Identification of two ethical issues is accurate. For example, right to withdraw, ensuring confidentiality of responses.</p> <p>Identified Only one ethical issue is identified.</p> <p>Inappropriate/incorrect Identification of ethical issues is inappropriate or incorrect.</p> |
| | | <p>Performance Descriptions (for each way of dealing with the issue)</p> |
| | <p>2</p> | <p>Accurate and Detailed The way of dealing with the ethical issue is both accurate and detailed. For example, explaining to all participants that anything they say during the interview will be treated in confidence and all the information will be kept securely. Or if the issue is right to withdraw, telling participants that they can leave at any time and giving them the opportunity to do so at the first and second interview.</p> |
| | <p>1</p> | <p>Basic The way of dealing with the ethical issue is basic, lacking detail. For example, telling each participant at the start of the study that they have the right to withdraw.</p> |
| | <p>0</p> | <p>Inappropriate/incorrect The way of dealing with the ethical issues is inappropriate or is incorrect.</p> |

Assessment Grid

| Question | Part | AO1 | AO2 | AO3 |
|-----------------------------|-------------|------------|------------|------------|
| 1 | (a) | 6 | | |
| | (b) | 6 | | |
| | (c) | 6 | 12 | |
| Total for Question 1 | | 18 | 12 | |
| 2 | (a) | 6 | | |
| | (b) | 6 | | |
| | (c) | 6 | 12 | |
| Total for Question 2 | | 18 | 12 | |
| | (a) | | | 2 |
| | (b) | | 4 | |
| | (c) | 2 | | 3 |
| | (d) | | | 4 |
| | (e) | 1 | | 2 |
| | (f) | | | 6 |
| | (g) | | 2 | 4 |
| Total for Question 3 | | 3 | 6 | 21 |
| QoWC | | 2 | | |
| Total for unit | | 39 | 30 | 21 |
| % weighting AS | | 20.4 | 12.9 | |
| % weighting A2 | | 10.2 | 6.5 | |