

# Activity 6

## Mark scheme – Paper 1

From the study by Laney et al. (false memory): Explain why the study was carried out. [2]
<p>Award 1 mark for partial explanation. Award 2 marks for full explanation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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)</li> <li>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)</li> </ul>
Discuss at least two strengths and two weaknesses of the Piliavin et al. study. [8 marks]
<p><b>Strengths</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>The data collection included both qualitative and quantitative data, so was informative about how much helping there was (or wasn't) and why.</li> </ul> <p><b>Weaknesses</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Participants may have been distressed by the events on the train, which goes against the guideline of protecting participants from harm.</li> </ul> <p>Mark according to the levels of response criteria below:</p> <p><b>Level 4 (7–8 marks)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The candidate has discussed at least two strengths and two weaknesses of the study.</li> <li>Accurate knowledge and understanding is applied.</li> <li>There is a clear line of reasoning which is logically structured and thoroughly evaluated.</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 3 (5–6 marks)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The candidate has given at least one strength and at least one weakness of the study.</li> <li>Knowledge and understanding is applied.</li> <li>There is evidence of some structured reasoning and some evaluation.</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 2 (3–4 marks)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The candidate has given one of the required strengths or weaknesses of the study.</li> </ul>

- Some evidence that knowledge and understanding is applied but this may be limited.
- There is evidence of some reasoning with limited evaluation.

Level 1 (1–2 marks)

- 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.

Level 0 (0 marks)

No response worthy of credit.

## Mark scheme – 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]

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]

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.