

Mark schemes

Q1.

[AO2 = 3]

Award marks as follows:

1 mark for identification of an appropriate ethical issue in this study: lack of the right to withdraw, lack of informed consent, lack of confidentiality, lack of protection from harm etc.

Plus

1 mark for an explanation of why it should have been addressed, eg the teachers have the right to know full details of what they are agreeing to do so they are not deceived; the teachers should have the right to withdraw from the study at any point and without penalty, etc.

Plus

1 mark for a practical description of how it could have been dealt with, eg the teachers could be told the aim of the study and full details of their involvement so they can make an informed decision as to whether to take part; the teachers could have been told beforehand, afterwards and reminded throughout that they have the right to withdraw at any time, etc.

Note: these three marks should match so that the issue that has been identified is then explained and dealt with providing a coherent response.

[3]

Q2.

[AO1 = 4]

Outline content:

Up to 2 marks for the outline of the ethical issue

Award 1 mark for identification of the ethical issue, and 1 further mark for elaboration

- Deception; protection from harm; the right to withdraw
- Participants in a study should not be knowingly misled or lied to
- Participants should not be exposed to any more risk than they would encounter in everyday life
- Participants should be able to leave the investigation at any time

If more than one ethical issue is outlined credit the best

Up to 2 marks for reference to one or more social influence studies

2 marks for clear and effective reference to one or more social influence studies

1 mark for limited / muddled reference to one or more social influence studies

- In Milgram's obedience study, participants did not know the shocks were not real; in Asch's conformity study, participants were not aware the other participants were confederates of the experimenter
- In Milgram's study, participants exhibited signs of extreme stress – sweating, shaking, etc.; in Zimbardo's study, prisoners showed signs of disorganised thinking and behaviour
- Milgram's participants were encouraged to continue through the use of verbal prods; Zimbardo's participants were denied requests to leave.

Credit other valid points.

[4]

Q3.

[AO1 = 3 AO3 = 5]

Level	Marks	Description
4	7-8	Outline of social sensitivity is accurate with some detail. Explanation of how researchers in psychology could deal with issues related to social sensitivity is thorough and effective. Minor detail and/or expansion of argument is sometimes lacking. The answer is clear, coherent and focused. Specialist terminology is used effectively.
3	5-6	Outline of social sensitivity is evident but there are occasional inaccuracies/omissions. Explanation of how researchers in psychology could deal with issues related to social sensitivity is mostly effective. The answer is mostly clear and organised but occasionally lacks focus. Specialist terminology is used appropriately.
2	3-4	Outline of social sensitivity is present. Focus is mainly on description. Any explanation of how researchers in psychology could deal with issues related to social sensitivity is of limited effectiveness. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is used inappropriately on occasions.
1	1-2	Outline of social sensitivity is very limited. Explanation of how researchers in psychology could deal with issues related to social sensitivity is limited, poorly focused or absent. The answer as a whole lacks clarity, has many inaccuracies and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.
	0	No relevant content.

Possible content:

- research which has potential implications or consequences, eg leading to prejudice and discrimination
- where a group of people represented in the research might be negatively affected as a result of a study, eg women affected by Bowlby's work on attachment
- where a study leads to changes in public policy affecting individuals/groups, eg research into IQ in the 1950s leading to educational changes.

Possible explanation points:

- submit research proposals to ethics committees and abide by any recommendations

- weigh up the possible costs and benefits before conducting any research. Only proceed where the benefits (to many) outweigh the costs (to a few)
- take care when formulating the aim/framing the question so as not to misrepresent certain groups
- be alert to the possibility of misuse of findings and take steps to present findings in a value-free way
- consider the wider effects of publication of the findings eg Sieber and Stanley's recommendations as part of the peer review process
- take steps to avoid prejudicial/biased/sensational media presentation of findings
- consider the possible reactions of participants to any research procedure they experience and take account of ethical issues in the design of any studies
- use of examples to illustrate specific ways in which social sensitivity can be taken into account.

Credit other relevant material.