



## **General Certificate of Education**

# **Psychology 5181**

## *Specification A*

### **Unit 3 (PYA3) Social Psychology and Research Methods**

# **Mark Scheme**

*2008 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.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: [www.aqa.org.uk](http://www.aqa.org.uk)

Copyright © 2008 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

#### COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

**UNIT 3 (PYA3)**  
**QUALITY OF WRITTEN COMMUNICATION (QoWC)**

<b>2 marks</b>	<p>The work is characterised by some or all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• clear expression of ideas</li> <li>• good range of specialist terms</li> <li>• few errors in grammar, punctuation and spelling</li> <li>• errors do not detract from the clarity of the material.</li> </ul>
<b>1 mark</b>	<p>The work is characterised by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• reasonable expression of ideas</li> <li>• use of some specialist terms</li> <li>• errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling</li> <li>• errors detract from the clarity of the material.</li> </ul>
<b>0 marks</b>	<p>The work is characterised by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• poor expression of ideas</li> <li>• limited use of specialist terms</li> <li>• errors and poor grammar, punctuation and spelling</li> <li>• errors obscure the clarity of the material.</li> </ul>

**ASSESSMENT OBJECTIVES ONE, TWO AND THREE**

<b>AO1</b>	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.
<b>AO2</b>	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.
<b>AO3</b>	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**

- 1 (a) Describe the findings and conclusions of **one** study of obedience to authority. (6 marks)

Marking Criteria	Marks	Performance Descriptions
<p>The most likely study to be offered is Milgram's, but any study of obedience is creditworthy (eg Hofling et al; Bickman; Meeus &amp; Raaijmakers).</p> <p>If Zimbardo is offered, both the findings and conclusions must be explicitly linked to obedience.</p> <p>Milgram <u>found</u>: all participants went up to 300 volts and 65% went all the way to 450 volts. Only 5 (12.5%) participants stopped at 300 volts. He also found that his participants showed signs of extreme stress such as sweating, biting fingernails, nervous laughter.</p> <p>He <u>concluded</u>: that given the right circumstances, ordinary people can be ordered to do things that go against their own morals. He suggested that evil deeds are committed due to situational factors and not dispositional factors. That the crimes committed by the Nazis were due to the considerable pressure to obey an authority figure and not because Germans were in any way different from other people.</p> <p>Milgram carried out several variations of his study and findings/conclusions from these can all be credited as if they were one study, since it is often difficult to separate the variations.</p>	<p><b>6</b></p> <p><b>5-4</b></p> <p><b>3-2</b></p> <p><b>1-0</b></p>	<p><b>Accurate and reasonably detailed</b> The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed description of the findings and conclusions of one study of obedience that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, the candidate provides a detailed account of both findings and conclusions (though not necessarily balanced).</p> <p><b>Less detailed but generally accurate</b> The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate description of the findings and conclusions of one study of obedience that demonstrates relevant knowledge and/or understanding. For example, the candidate provides a detailed account of findings, with only a brief mention of conclusions, or a balanced account of both in less detail. <i>Note: if only findings or conclusions are given, maximum mark is 4.</i></p> <p><b>Basic</b> The candidate provides a basic description of the findings and conclusions of one study of obedience that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and/or understanding, but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, only a brief account of either findings or conclusions is given, or a very brief account of both.</p> <p><b>Very brief/flawed or inappropriate</b> The candidate provides a description of the findings and conclusions of one study of obedience which is very brief/flawed and demonstrates very little knowledge and/or understanding. Or it is an inappropriate description which fails to demonstrate any knowledge of one study of obedience.</p>

- 1 (b) Outline the procedures of **one** study of minority influence and give **one** criticism of this study. (3 marks + 3 marks)

<b>Marking Criteria</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>Performance Descriptions</b>
<p>The two studies given on the specification are Moscovici et al and Nemeth et al. The former is the most likely one to be offered.</p> <p>Moscovici's <u>procedures</u>: the participants were all female and were divided into groups of 6. Each group had 4 naïve participants and two confederates. They were asked to state the colour of slides, which were in fact all blue, but the brightness of each slide varied. In the consistent condition, the confederates said that the slides were green all the time, in the inconsistent condition they said that slides were green 24 times and that they were blue 12 times.</p>	<p><b>3</b></p>	<p><b>Accurate and reasonably detailed</b> The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed outline of the procedures that demonstrates relevant knowledge. For example, participants were placed into groups of six, with 4 naïve participants and two confederates. They had to state the colour of slides; the slides were all blue but at times the confederates stated that they were green. In the consistent condition, the confederates always said they were green but, in the inconsistent condition they sometimes said they were blue.</p>
	<p><b>2</b></p>	<p><b>Less detailed but generally accurate</b> The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate outline of the procedures that demonstrates relevant knowledge. For example, all the participants were female and were in small groups. In each group were two confederates who sometimes said the slides were blue but sometimes said they were green. Participants had to say what colour the slides were.</p>
	<p><b>1</b></p>	<p><b>Basic</b> The candidate provides a basic outline of the procedures that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and/or understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled.</p>
	<p><b>0</b></p>	<p><b>Flawed or inappropriate</b> The candidate provides an outline which is flawed or an inappropriate outline that fails to demonstrate any knowledge of the procedures.</p>

1 (b)

Marking Criteria	Marks	Performance Descriptions
<p>The criticism will depend on the study chosen. These could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ethical concerns (deception and lack of informed consent).</li> <li>• Practical concerns (lack of ecological validity)</li> </ul> <p>The criticism may be positive or negative, either would be creditworthy.</p>	3	<p><b>Accurate and reasonably detailed</b></p> <p>The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed outline of one criticism that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, in Moscovici's, experiment, the participants were deceived and did not know that two people in their group were confederates; since they were deceived, they could not give their informed consent.</p>
	2	<p><b>Less detailed but generally accurate</b></p> <p>The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate outline of one criticism that demonstrates relevant knowledge and/or understanding. For example, the experiment lacks ecological validity because this is not likely to happen in the real world.</p>
	1	<p><b>Basic</b></p> <p>The candidate provides a basic outline of one criticism that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and/or understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, it was unethical as he deceived the participants.</p>
	0	<p><b>Flawed or inappropriate</b></p> <p>The candidate provides an outline which is flawed or an inappropriate outline that fails to demonstrate any knowledge or understanding of one criticism.</p>

1 (c) Outline and evaluate research into majority influence.

(18 marks)

<p><b>Marking Criteria</b></p>	
<p><b>AO1</b> credit should be given for outline description of research into majority influence.</p> <p><b>AO2</b> credit should be given for an evaluation of this research.</p> <p>There are several studies that candidates might outline, but the most likely ones are those mentioned on the specification, Asch; Perrin &amp; Spencer. Asch carried out a series of experiments investigating the effect a group would have on the behaviour of a naive participant. He varied the conditions, such as group size, task ambiguity and support of a colleague. Perrin &amp; Spencer replicated Asch's experiment in the 1980s. They used different types of participants and found very little evidence of conformity with university students in the UK.</p> <p>Zimbardo's prison simulation study investigated the extent to which participants conformed to social roles.</p> <p>Since the term <i>research</i> includes both studies and theories, any description of relevant theories would be acceptable, for example an outline of normative and informational social influence as reasons why people conform.</p>	<p>The evaluation can consider the methodology used in the studies. For example, some studies were laboratory-based (may lack ecological validity, demand characteristics, gender bias – both Asch and Zimbardo only used males).</p> <p>Ethical issues such as deception and psychological harm can be considered.</p> <p>One of the main criticisms of Asch's study is that it was a "child of its time". The reason for the relatively high level of conformity was the time and the place in which the research was carried out (America in the 1950s).</p> <p>'Positive criticisms' are also acceptable, for example the usefulness of this research.</p>

1 (c)

Marks	Performance Descriptions	Marks	Performance Descriptions
6	<p><b>AO1:</b> Outline of research into majority influence</p> <p><b>Accurate and reasonably detailed</b></p> <p>The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed description of research into majority influence that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, there is a detailed and accurate account of one study into majority influence, or a less detailed account of two or more.</p>	12-10	<p><b>AO2:</b> Evaluation of majority influence research</p> <p><b>Informed commentary</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> <li>• Effective analysis and evaluation of material</li> <li>• Broad range of issues and/or evidence in reasonable depth, or a narrower range in greater depth</li> <li>• The structure is generally clear and coherent.</li> </ul>
5-4	<p><b>Less detailed but generally accurate</b></p> <p>The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate description of research into majority influence that demonstrates relevant knowledge and/or understanding. For example, the candidate may outline two or more studies of majority influence, but with little detail.</p>	9-7	<p><b>Reasonable commentary</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is appropriate selection of material to address the question, but this is not always used effectively to produce a reasonable commentary</li> <li>• Reasonable analysis and evaluation of material</li> <li>• A range of issues and/or evidence in limited depth, or a narrower range in greater depth.</li> </ul>
3-2	<p><b>Basic</b></p> <p>The candidate provides a basic description of research into majority influence that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and/or understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, the candidate may outline just the procedures of one study of majority influence.</p>	6-4	<p><b>Basic commentary</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The selection and use of material provides only a basic commentary</li> <li>• Basic analysis and evaluation of material</li> <li>• Superficial consideration of a restricted range of issues and/or evidence.</li> </ul>
1-0	<p><b>Very brief/flawed or inappropriate</b></p> <p>The candidate provides an outline which is very brief/flawed, or an inappropriate outline that fails to demonstrate any knowledge or understanding of majority influence.</p>	3-0	<p><b>Rudimentary/absent or irrelevant commentary</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The selection and use of material provides only a rudimentary commentary, or commentary is absent or wholly irrelevant</li> <li>• Analysis and evaluation just discernible or absent.</li> </ul>



**2 (a)** Outline **two** explanations of why people yield to majority influence.

(3 marks + 3 marks)

<b>Marking Criteria</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>Performance Descriptions</b>
<p>Majority influence is when a person changes his/her behaviour as a result of real or imagined group pressure. This may be due to several reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• People conform so that they are liked and belong to the group ie normative influence</li> <li>• People conform because they are unsure and want to be correct ie informational influence.</li> </ul> <p>People may also conform because they change their beliefs ie internalisation.</p>	<b>3</b>	<p><b>Accurate and reasonably detailed</b> The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed outline of the explanation that demonstrates relevant knowledge. 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>
	<b>2</b>	<p><b>Less detailed but generally accurate</b> The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate outline of the explanation that demonstrates relevant knowledge. For example, they conform because they are unsure how to behave and look for guidance.</p>
	<b>1</b>	<p><b>Basic</b> The candidate provides a basic outline of the explanation that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and/or understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, the candidate simply states that it is a result of normative influence.</p>
	<b>0</b>	<p><b>Flawed or inappropriate</b> The candidate provides an outline which is flawed or an inappropriate outline that fails to demonstrate any knowledge of the explanation.</p>

- 2 (b) Explain what is meant by the terms internal validity and external validity.

(3 marks + 3 marks)

<b>Marking Criteria</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>Performance Descriptions</b>
<p>Internal validity: whether the observed effect is due to experimental manipulation ie is really due to the effect the IV has on the DV. Milgram's studies on obedience would have lacked internal validity if the participants did not believe the shocks they were giving were real.</p> <p>External validity: whether findings apply to other situations (or populations). Can the findings be generalised to situations beyond the research situation? Much research has been carried out on American undergraduates and may thus lack external (population) validity.</p>	3	<p><b>Accurate and reasonably detailed</b></p> <p>The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed explanation of internal or external validity that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, internal validity is whether the IV, and not some other factor, did affect the DV. In Milgram's experiment, if the participants did not believe the shocks were real, it would lack internal validity.</p>
	2	<p><b>Less detailed but generally accurate</b></p> <p>The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate explanation of internal or external validity that demonstrates relevant knowledge and/or understanding. For example, external validity is the extent to which findings can be generalised to other situations outside the laboratory.</p>
	1	<p><b>Basic</b></p> <p>The candidate provides a basic explanation of internal or external validity that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and/or understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, internal validity is how believable an experiment is OR measures what it says it is measuring.</p>
	0	<p><b>Flawed or inappropriate</b></p> <p>The candidate provides an explanation which is flawed or an inappropriate explanation that fails to demonstrate any knowledge or understanding of internal or external validity. For example, the candidate explains what is meant by reliability.</p>

- 2 (c) 'Psychologists deal with ethical issues in a variety of ways but some of these ways are more effective than others.'
- Outline and evaluate ways in which psychologists deal with ethical issues in social influence research. (18 marks)

<p><b>Marking Criteria</b></p>	
<p><b>AO1</b> for this question is an outline description of how psychologists deal with ethical issues.  <b>AO2</b> is an evaluation of these ways.</p> <p>There are several ways of dealing with ethical issues, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prior general consent</li> <li>• Presumptive consent</li> <li>• Using role play</li> <li>• Debriefing</li> <li>• The use of ethical committees.</li> </ul> <p>If candidates describe the guidelines, they do need to make the case that it is <i>following</i> the guidelines which is the way in which ethical issues are dealt with, to be better than basic.</p>	<p>The commentary comes from an evaluation of these ways. For example, while a thorough debriefing is one way of dealing with ethical issues, candidates could also suggest that the "damage" has already been done and thus it is not that effective. Milgram conducted extremely thorough debriefing sessions with his participants; up to a year after the experiment, a significant percentage of his participants said that they were glad to have taken part. This suggests that the debriefing had been successful. With presumptive consent, it is not the real participants themselves who give consent but other people who do not in fact take part in the research. Ethical committees have to weigh up the costs and benefits of the research before deciding whether to allow it to take place. It is not always easy to determine the costs or benefits beforehand.</p> <p>If only one way is offered, it must be in detail in order to meet the requirements of the higher bands.</p>

## 2 (c)

Marks	Performance Descriptions	Marks	Performance Descriptions
6	<p><b>AO1:</b> Outline of ways psychologists deal with ethical issues</p> <p><b>Accurate and reasonably detailed</b></p> <p>The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed description of ways in which psychologists deal with ethical issues that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, there is a detailed and accurate account of two ways of dealing with ethical issues, or a less detailed account of three or more ways.</p>	12-10	<p><b>AO2:</b> Evaluation of how psychologists deal with ethical issues.</p> <p><b>Informed commentary</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> <li>• Effective analysis and evaluation of material</li> <li>• Broad range of issues and/or evidence in reasonable depth, or a narrower range in greater depth</li> <li>• The structure is generally clear and coherent.</li> </ul>
5-4	<p><b>Less detailed but generally accurate</b></p> <p>The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate description of ways psychologists deal with ethical issues that demonstrates relevant knowledge and/or understanding. For example, the candidate may outline two or more ways of dealing with ethical issues but with little detail.</p>	9-7	<p><b>Reasonable commentary</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is appropriate selection of material to address the question, but this is not always used effectively to produce a reasonable commentary</li> <li>• Reasonable analysis and evaluation of material</li> <li>• A range of issues and/or evidence in limited depth, or a narrower range in greater depth.</li> </ul>
3-2	<p><b>Basic</b></p> <p>The candidate provides a basic description of ways of dealing with ethical issues that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and/or understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, the candidate may outline just the ethical guidelines.</p>	6-4	<p><b>Basic commentary</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The selection and use of material provides only a basic commentary</li> <li>• Basic analysis and evaluation of material</li> <li>• Superficial consideration of a restricted range of issues and/or evidence.</li> </ul>
1-0	<p><b>Very brief/flawed or inappropriate</b></p> <p>The candidate provides an outline which is very brief/flawed, or an inappropriate outline that fails to demonstrate any knowledge or understanding of ways of dealing with ethical issues.</p>	3-0	<p><b>Rudimentary/absent or irrelevant commentary</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The selection and use of material provides only a rudimentary commentary, or commentary is absent or wholly irrelevant.</li> <li>• Analysis and evaluation just discernible or absent.</li> </ul>

**SECTION B: RESEARCH METHODS****3****Total for this question: 30 marks**

A pilot study has indicated that boys and girls play differently. Boys have been shown to engage more in rough and tumble play (eg pushing, hitting) and girls have been shown to engage more in co-operative play (eg clapping games, skipping games).

A psychologist wished to study the differences in boys' and girls' play in primary schools. She asked the Head Teachers of several schools for permission to observe children playing. She observed the children from a window and recorded the way boys and girls were playing.

The results of the observations are presented in **Table 1** below.

**Table 1: Frequency of types of play observed in boys and girls**

<b>Behaviours</b>	<b>Boys</b>	<b>Girls</b>
Pushing	85	45
Hitting	115	70
Clapping games	3	132
Skipping games	0	127
Running	189	176

**3 (a)** Outline **one** advantage and **one** disadvantage of an observational study.

(2 marks + 2 marks)

Marking Criteria	Marks	Performance Descriptions
<p><b>AO2</b></p> <p>Advantages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is possible to study behaviour in situations where it is not possible to manipulate variables (sufficient for 2 marks)</li> <li>• It is likely to have high ecological validity; people are likely to behave as they would normally do, especially if they do not know they are being observed (sufficient for 2 marks)</li> <li>• Has high ecological validity (sufficient for 1 mark).</li> </ul> <p>Disadvantages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is very difficult to control possible confounding variables so it is difficult to ensure reliability (2 marks)</li> <li>• If the participants see the observer, they may change their behaviour and not act in a natural manner (2 marks)</li> <li>• Difficult to replicate (1 mark)</li> <li>• Ethical issues, such as invasion of privacy (1 mark).</li> </ul> <p>Advantage/disadvantage of participant or non-participant observations are also creditworthy.</p>	<p><b>2</b></p>	<p><b>Accurate and detailed</b> The advantage or disadvantage is both accurate and detailed, as given in the marking criteria.</p>
	<p><b>1</b></p>	<p><b>Basic</b> The advantage or disadvantage is basic, as given in the marking criteria.</p>
	<p><b>0</b></p>	<p><b>Inappropriate/incorrect</b> The advantage or disadvantage is inappropriate or incorrect. For example, the advantage applies to an experiment and not an observation.</p>

- 3 (b) Explain how a naturalistic observation is different from a field experiment. (2 marks)

Marking Criteria	Marks	Performance Descriptions
<p><b>AO2</b></p> <p>A field experiment is any experiment that is conducted outside of the laboratory. In a field experiment, the researcher manipulates the IV and measures the effect on the DV. In an observation, the researcher does not manipulate the IV, but 'merely' watches the behaviour of the participants.</p>	2	<p><b>Accurate and detailed</b></p> <p>The explanation is both accurate and detailed. For example, in a field experiment, the IV is manipulated but in an observation it is not, the behaviour is just looked at.</p>
	1	<p><b>Basic</b></p> <p>The explanation is basic, lacking detail and may be muddled and/or flawed. For example, a field experiment is an experiment but in an observation you just look at behaviour.</p>
	0	<p><b>Inappropriate/incorrect</b></p> <p>The explanation is inappropriate: for example, the candidate may state that a field experiment lacks ecological validity and an observation does not.</p>

- 3 (c) (i) Write an appropriate hypothesis for this study. (2 marks)  
 (ii) State whether the hypothesis is directional or non-directional. (1 mark)

Marking Criteria	Marks	Performance Descriptions for the hypothesis
<b>AO3</b> A possible directional hypothesis might be: Boys play in a more rough and tumble way than girls OR Girls play more co-operatively than boys.	<b>2</b>	<b>Accurate and detailed</b> The hypothesis is both appropriate and detailed, for example as given in the marking criteria.
	<b>1</b>	<b>Basic</b> The hypothesis is basic and lacks some details.
	<b>0</b>	<b>Inappropriate/incorrect</b> The hypothesis is inappropriate or incorrect.
A non-directional hypothesis might be:		
There is a difference in the ways in which boys and girls play.	<b>1</b>	<b>Appropriate</b> The correct direction is given for the hypothesis stated.
The direction does not have to be explained or justified, but it must relate to the hypothesis offered in (i).	<b>0</b>	<b>Inappropriate/incorrect</b> The direction is not related to the hypothesis.



- 3 (d) What is a pilot study? (2 marks)

Marking Criteria	Marks	Performance Descriptions
<p><b>AO2</b></p> <p>A pilot study is a small study that is carried out before the main study. It allows the researcher to discover any potential problems in the design and make suitable changes. For example, in this study, it would allow the psychologist to practise using the behavioural categories, to make sure that she could see the children playing easily, etc.</p> <p>There is no need to contextualise the answer, but this is one way of elaborating the answer.</p>	2	<p><b>Accurate and detailed</b></p> <p>The explanation of what is meant by a pilot study is detailed but generally accurate: for example, it is a small scale study that is done before the main one to check for any problems, such as whether the behavioural categories work.</p>
	1	<p><b>Basic</b></p> <p>The explanation of what is meant by a pilot study is basic but lacks detail and is muddled: for example, to practise observing beforehand.</p>
	0	<p><b>Inappropriate/incorrect</b></p> <p>The explanation for a pilot study is incorrect.</p>

- 3 (e) (i) Explain what is meant by the term *reliability* in the context of this study. (2 marks)
- (ii) Describe **one** way in which the reliability of the observations of the play of boys' and girls' groups could have been improved. (2 marks)

Marking Criteria	Marks	Performance Descriptions for reliability	
<p><b>AO3</b></p> <p>Reliability refers to whether a measurement or the findings from a study can be repeated if conducted at a later date. In terms of this observation, it means whether she would obtain similar observations using her behavioural categories if she were to repeat the study.</p> <p><b>AO3</b></p> <p>There are several ways to improve the reliability of the observations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training the observer, so that the behavioural categories are used in a consistent way</li> <li>• Making sure that the behavioural categories are precisely stated, so that it is clearly defined: for example, what is meant by a hit or a push.</li> </ul> <p>Since a pilot study has already been carried out, this is not an appropriate answer and would not receive credit.</p>	<p><b>2</b></p>	<p><b>Accurate and detailed</b></p> <p>The explanation is accurate and detailed: for example, reliability refers to consistency; if the observation was repeated, similar results in the way in which children play would be found.</p>	
	<p><b>1</b></p>	<p><b>Basic</b></p> <p>The explanation is basic, lacking detail and may be muddled and/flawed: for example simply saying that it is whether the results are consistent.</p>	
	<p><b>0</b></p>	<p><b>Inappropriate/incorrect</b></p> <p>The explanation is inappropriate or incorrect.</p>	
			<p><b>Performance Descriptions for improvement of reliability</b></p>
	<p><b>2</b></p>	<p><b>Appropriate</b></p> <p>The description is appropriate: for example, explaining that the psychologist should practise using the behavioural categories so that she is consistent in their use.</p>	
<p><b>1</b></p>	<p><b>Basic</b></p> <p>The description is basic, lacking detail, and may be muddled and/or flawed: for example, simply explaining that she should practise.</p>		
<p><b>0</b></p>	<p><b>Inappropriate/incorrect</b></p> <p>The description is inappropriate or is incorrect.</p>		

3 (f) Explain how **two** factors might have affected the validity of this study.

(2 marks + 2 marks)

<b>Marking Criteria</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>Performance Descriptions</b>
<b>AO3</b> Features that might affect the validity of this study could include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• whether or not the children know they are being observed (1 mark) because they may then change their behaviour (elaboration for 2 marks)</li> <li>• restricted position of the observer</li> <li>• very narrow definition of rough and tumble play</li> <li>• correct identification of gender (if the children are wearing hoods, it may be difficult to identify whether they are boys or girls!)</li> </ul>	<b>2</b>	<b>Accurate and Detailed</b> The description is accurate and detailed: for example, it might be difficult for the observer to decide if a child is a boy or girl, because at primary age they can look quite similar.
	<b>1</b>	<b>Basic</b> The description is basic, lacking detail and may be muddled and/or flawed: for example, if the children know they are being watched.
	<b>0</b>	<b>Inappropriate/incorrect</b> Validity is inappropriate or incorrect.

- 3 (g) Identify a suitable type of graph or chart that could have been used to illustrate the data in **Table 1** and explain why this would be appropriate. (2 marks)

Marking Criteria	Marks	Performance Descriptions for identifying the graph
<b>AO1 + AO3</b> Identification of graph: bar chart, pie chart.  Reasons: The most appropriate graph would be a bar chart since the data is nominal and non-continuous. As a bar chart is on the specification, this is the most likely one to be chosen. However, candidates could also justify the use of pie charts, as they too are appropriate for nominal data.	1	<b>Appropriate</b> The identification of the graph is correct.
	0	<b>Inappropriate/incorrect</b> The identification of the graph is inappropriate or incorrect.
As this is one question, if the identification of the graph is incorrect, then no credit can be given to the explanation.		<b>Performance Descriptions for explanation</b>
	1	<b>Appropriate</b> The explanation is appropriate: for example, the data is in categories.
	0	<b>Inappropriate/incorrect</b> The explanation is inappropriate or incorrect.

3 (h) Describe conclusions that could be drawn from the data in **Table 1**. (3 marks)

Marking Criteria	Marks	Performance Descriptions
<p><b>AO3</b> They could conclude that there is a difference in the way boys and girls play.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Boys tend to play in a more physical way, but very seldom behave co-operatively</li> <li>• Girls tend to play more co-operatively although sometimes engage in rough and tumble</li> <li>• Both boys and girls engage in running about, so this does not differentiate between them.</li> </ul>	<p><b>3</b></p>	<p><b>Accurate and reasonably detailed</b> For example, using some of the material given in the marking criteria. Boys tend to play in a more physical way but very seldom behave co-operatively, whereas girls tend to play more co-operatively.</p>
	<p><b>2</b></p>	<p><b>Less detailed but generally accurate</b> For example, girls tend to play more co-operatively although sometimes engage in rough and tumble play.</p>
	<p><b>1</b></p>	<p><b>Basic</b> For example, boys do not do much clapping.</p>
<p>No partial performance.</p>	<p><b>0</b></p>	<p><b>Very brief/flawed or inappropriate</b> The conclusion is inappropriate or incorrect.</p>

- 3** (i) Identify **two** ethical issues associated with this study. (1 mark + 1 mark)  
 (ii) For each ethical issue identified in your answer to (i) (i), explain how it could be dealt with. (2 marks + 2 marks)

Marking Criteria	Marks	Performance Descriptions for identifying the ethical issue
<p><b>AO3</b></p> <p>Possible ethical issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (lack of) informed consent from the children (although as they are primary school children, it is debatable whether they can truly give informed consent)</li> <li>• (lack of) informed consent from their parents</li> <li>• confidentiality</li> <li>• anonymity.</li> </ul>	<p><b>1</b></p>	<p><b>Appropriate</b> The ethical issue is correct.</p>
<p><b>0</b></p>	<p><b>0</b></p>	<p><b>Inappropriate/incorrect</b> The ethical issue is inappropriate or incorrect.</p>
<p>Deception is not an issue, as the children were not deceived.</p>		<p><b>Performance Descriptions for each feature that could have affected validity</b></p>
<p><b>AO3</b></p> <p>The way of dealing with the ethical issue identified must be appropriate to the issue given.</p>	<p><b>2</b></p>	<p><b>Accurate and Detailed</b> The explanation is accurate and detailed. For example, make sure that any data collected is kept confidential and only the researchers have access to it.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They could gain consent from parents by writing a letter explaining what the study was about and asking permission</li> <li>• They could ensure anonymity by not identifying any child by name, nor the school at which the observation took place.</li> </ul>	<p><b>1</b></p>	<p><b>Basic</b> The explanation is basic, lacking detail and may be muddled and/or flawed: for example, get parents' permission.</p>
	<p><b>0</b></p>	<p><b>Inappropriate/incorrect</b> The explanation is inappropriate or incorrect.</p>

---

**Assessment Grid**

<b>Question</b>	<b>Part</b>	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>
<b>1</b>	(a)	6		
	(b)	6		
	(c)	6	12	
<b>Total for Question 1</b>		<b>18</b>	<b>12</b>	
<b>2</b>	(a)	6		
	(b)	6		
	(c)	6	12	
<b>Total for Question 2</b>		<b>18</b>	<b>12</b>	
<b>3</b>	(a)		4	
	(b)		2	
	(c)			3
	(d)	2		
	(e)			4
	(f)			4
	(g)	1		1
	(h)			3
	(i)			6
<b>Total for Question 3</b>		<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>QoWC</b>		2		
<b>Total for unit</b>		<b>39</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>21</b>