Piliavin et al. (1969) Topical Past Papers

1 Two ethical guidelines are debriefing and informed consent. 9990/12/F/M/18

Suggest how ethical issues raised in the Piliavin et al. study (subway Samaritans) relate to these two ethical guidelines.

debriefing ....

....

....

....

informed consent ....

....

....

....[4]

2 The study by Piliavin et al. (subway Samaritans) is based on the concept of diffusion of responsibility. 9990/11/M/J/18

(a) Describe what is meant by 'diffusion of responsibility'.

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....[4]

(b) Outline how **one** result from this study does **not** support the concept of diffusion of responsibility.

....

....

....

....[2]

3   Piliavin et al. (subway Samaritans) used four different model conditions. One of these was 'Critical area – early'.   9990/12/M/J/18

   (a) Outline what the model was expected to do in this condition.

....

....

....

....[2]

   (b) Describe **one** quantitative result of the behaviour of participants in the critical area.

....

....

....

....[2]

4   Two friends, Brett and Mia, are discussing the Piliavin et al. study (subway Samaritans) in terms of the debate about individual and situational explanations.   9990/11/O/N/18

   (a) Outline the debate about individual and situational explanations in psychology.

....

....

....

....[2]

(b) Mia believes the Piliavin et al. study supports the individual side of the debate but Brett believes it supports the situational side of the debate.

Outline why you think **either** Brett **or** Mia is correct, using evidence from the study.

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....[4]

5   In the Piliavin et al. study (subway Samaritans), there were a number of confederates playing different roles.

(a) Outline the roles of the confederates in this study.

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....[4]

(b) Explain what psychologists have learned about bystander behaviour using **two** results from the Piliavin et al. study.

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....[8]

6   Evaluate the Piliavin et al. study (subway Samaritans) in terms of **two** strengths and **two** weaknesses. At least one of your evaluation points **must** be about field experiments.

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....[10]

7 From the study by Piliavin et al. (subway Samaritans):   9990/12/F/M/19

   (a) Outline what the model was supposed to do in the 'Adjacent area – early' condition.

        ....

        ....

        ....

        ....[2]

(b) Four victims were used.

    (i) Identify **two** similarities between the victims.

        1 ....

        ....

        2 ....

        ....[2]

    (ii) Identify **one** difference between the victims.

        ....

        ....[1]

8 Evaluate the study by Piliavin et al. (subway Samaritans) in terms of **two** strengths and **two** weaknesses. At least one of your evaluation points **must** be about the use of independent measures.

9990/11/M/J/19

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

.... [10]

9 (a) Describe **two** of the independent variables in the study by Piliavin et al. (subway Samaritans).

1 ....

....

....

....

2 ....

....

....

.... [4]

(b) Explain whether each guideline below was broken in the study by Piliavin et al. (subway Samaritans):
   •   debriefing
   •   deception
   •   confidentiality
   •   protection

debriefing ....

....

....

deception ....

....

....

confidentiality ....

....

....

protection ....

....

....

.... [8]

10 Piliavin et al. (subway Samaritans) studied spontaneous helping of victims on a subway.

Describe **one** result about the spontaneous helping of white victims and **one** result about the spontaneous helping of black victims. You must use data for **one** of these results.   9990/13/M/J/19

spontaneous helping of white victims ....

....

....

....

....

spontaneous helping of black victims ....

....

....

....

....

[5]

11 From the study by Piliavin et al. (subway Samaritans):   9990/11/O/N/19

(a) Outline what the model was supposed to do in the 'Adjacent area – late' condition.

....

....

....

.... [2]

(b) Explain **one** methodological strength of this study.

....

....

....

.... [2]

12 **(a)** Describe what was recorded by the female observers in the study by Piliavin et al. (subway Samaritans).

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....[4]

(b) Explain **two** similarities between the study by Piliavin et al. (subway Samaritans) and the study by Yamamoto et al. (chimpanzee learning).

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

.... [8]

13   From the study by Piliavin et al. (subway Samaritans):

(a) One female observer noted features of every rider (passenger) standing or seated in the critical area.

Identify **two** features she noted about every rider (passenger) in the critical area.

1 ....

2 .... [2]

(b) State **one** reason why the experiment was conducted between the two stations used.

....

.... [1]

(c) Outline **one** conclusion from this study.

....

....

....

.... [2]

14   The study by Piliavin et al. (subway Samaritans) is from the social approach.

(a) Outline **two** assumptions of the social approach, using any example for each.

1 ....

....

....

....

2 ....

....

....

.... [4]

(b) Explain how **one** result from the study by Piliavin et al. supports the situational explanation of behaviour and how **one** result does **not** support diffusion of responsibility.

Result that supports the situational explanation of behaviour: ....

....

....

....

....

Explain how: ....

....

....

....

....

Result that does **not** support diffusion of responsibility: ....

....

....

....

....

....

Explain how: ....

....

....

....

.... [8]

15   From the study by Piliavin et al. (subway Samaritans):   9990/11/M/J/20

    (a) Outline **one** result about helping a victim with no model present.

        ....

        ....

        ....

        .... [2]

    (b) Outline **one** methodological strength of this study.

        ....

        ....

        ....

        .... [2]

    (c) Outline **one** ethical weakness of this study.

        ....

        ....

        ....

        .... [2]

16   From the study by Piliavin et al. (subway Samaritans):   9990/13/M/J/20

    (a) Identify **two** characteristics of the sample used in this study.

        ....

        ....

        ....

        .... [2]

(b) Describe how the sample was obtained for this study.

....

....

....

....

....

.... [3]

(c) Outline **one** conclusion from this study.

....

....

....

.... [2]

17   From the study by Piliavin et al. (subway Samaritans):   9990/11/O/N/20

    (a) Describe what the observers recorded about participants in the adjacent area.

....

....

....

....

....

.... [3]

(b) Describe **one** result about the sex of 'spontaneous first helpers'. You **must** use data in your answer.

....

....

....

....

....

.... [3]

18 **(a)** Outline what is meant by individual and situational explanations of behaviour, using any examples. Do **not** refer to the study by Piliavin et al. (subway Samaritans) in your answer.

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

.... [4]

(b) Explain how **one** result from the study by Piliavin et al. supports the individual explanation of helping behaviour and how **one** result supports the situational explanation of helping behaviour.

Result that supports the individual explanation of helping behaviour: ....

....

....

....

....

Explain how: ....

....

....

....

Result that supports the situational explanation of helping behaviour: ....

....

....

....

....

Explain how: ....

....

....

.... [8]

19 From the study by Piliavin et al. (subway Samaritans):

(a) Outline **one** way in which the participants were deceived in this study.

....

....

....

.... [2]

(b) Describe the sample of participants used in this study.

....

....

....

....

....

.... [3]

(c) Explain why this study is from the social approach.

....

....

....

.... [2]

20 In the study by Piliavin et al. (subway Samaritans), one observer watched passengers in the critical area.

(a) Name **two** variables this observer recorded about these passengers.

....

....

....

.... [2]

(b) Piliavin et al. investigated the idea of 'diffusion of responsibility'.

    (i) Outline what is meant by 'diffusion of responsibility'.

        ....

        ....

        ....

        .... **[2]**

    (ii) Outline **one** finding that did **not** support diffusion of responsibility in this study.

        ....

        ....

        ....

        .... **[2]**

21 From the study by Piliavin et al. (subway Samaritans):

(a) Outline **one** aim of the study, other than to test the effect of race on helping behaviour.

    ....

    ....

    ....

    .... **[2]**

(b) Describe **one** result about same-race helping in the cane (ill) condition.

    ....

    ....

    ....

    .... **[2]**

(c) Outline **two** comments made by participants who did **not** help the victim.

1 ....

....

2 ....

.... [2]

22 (a) Research in the laboratory has shown that people are more likely to help someone of a different race to themselves.

Explain **two** ways the study by Piliavin et al. (subway Samaritans) differs from this research.

1 ....

....

....

....

2 ....

....

....

.... [4]

(b) Explain **one** similarity and **one** difference between the study by Piliavin et al. (subway Samaritans) and the study by Milgram (obedience).   9990/12/M/J/21

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

.... [8]

23 From the study by Piliavin et al. (subway Samaritans):   9990/11/O/N/21

(a) Describe what the victim did during a trial.

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

.... [5]

(b) Identify **one** weakness of this study.

....

.... [1]

24 Evaluate the study by Piliavin et al. (subway Samaritans) in terms of **two** strengths and **two** weaknesses. At least one of your evaluation points **must** be about the use of qualitative data.

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

.... [10]

Marking Scheme

1	4	**Two ethical guidelines are debriefing and informed consent.**	4
		Suggest how ethical issues raised in the Piliavin et al. study (subway Samaritans) relate to these two ethical guidelines.	
		For each guideline/issue 1 mark for outlining the ethical guideline/how ethical guideline links to study/only about how the ethical guideline impacts practicality/methodologically 1 mark for explaining the *ethical issue* arising from the ethical guideline	
		Debriefing As the participants did not know they had taken part in a study, this was difficult (1 mark *outline*). Therefore, participants could not have the full aims of the study explained to them/have any questions answered so *psychological harm may have happened* (1 mark *ethical issue*); The large amount of potential participants (4450) that could have witnessed the events made it very difficult to plan for a debrief so *psychological harm may have happened* (1 mark *ethical issue*).	
		Informed consent None of the participants knew that a study was about to take place so this could not happen (1 mark *outline*). Therefore, they could not give their permission to take part in it *and be exposed to a potentially threatening situation* (1 mark *ethical issue*); Therefore they may have been *exposed to a situation that caused psychological harm without permission* (1 mark *ethical issue*).	

2	5(a)	**The study by Piliavin et al. (subway Samaritans) is based on the concept of diffusion of responsibility.**	4
		Describe what is meant by 'diffusion of responsibility'.	
		1 mark per correct point made. An example can gain a maximum of one mark as elaboration.	
		This is when a person is less likely to take responsibility for their actions/inactions when others are present; That is, the more people are present, the less likely a person may help someone who is in need; There is also an idea that responsibility is shared (in the group); Also, if they do decide to help then they will take more time to do so; People have the belief that 'other people' will help someone out if they are around; An example was seen in the Kitty Genovese case where some people believed others would help her	

	5(b)	**Outline how <u>one</u> result from this study does <u>not</u> support the concept of diffusion of responsibility.**	2
		1 mark for the result 1 mark for stating how it does not support diffusion of responsibility Result, e.g. The (small) correlation between group size and helping behaviour was positive (rather than negative) People in groups of seven or more were consistently faster at responding than those in groups of 3 Not supporting, e.g. The correlation should have been negative as when group size increases, helping should decrease (if diffusion of responsibility was happening) Speed of helping should *decrease* with *increased* group size (if diffusion of responsibility was happening)	

3	4(a)	**Piliavin et al. (subway Samaritans) used four different model conditions. One of these was 'Critical area – early'.** **Outline what the model was expected to do in this condition.**	2
		1 mark per correct statement made. The model would **stand** in the critical area; They would wait until passing the fourth station before helping (the victim); This was approximately 70s **after** collapse	

	4(b)	**Describe <u>one</u> quantitative result of the behaviour of participants in the critical area.**	2
		2 marks for one quantitative result with a comparison 1 mark for one quantitative result without a meaningful comparison e.g. On 5% of trials with a white victim people left the critical area compared to 9% for a black victim (2 marks); Of the spontaneous helpers/first helpers, 90% were male/64% were white (1 mark) ORA In 20% of trials people moved away (from the critical area)/in total 34 people left the area (1 mark) (together = 2 marks) Males helped more than females (1 mark) 'Early' models were more likely to elicit other helpers (n=4) more than 'late' models (n=2) (2 marks)	

4	8(a)	**Two friends, Brett and Mia, are discussing the Piliavin et al. study (subway Samaritans) in terms of the debate about individual and situational explanations.** **Outline the debate about individual and situational explanations in psychology.**	2
		1 mark for the individual side of the debate, 1 mark for the situational side of the debate e.g. The individual side refers to behaviours from factors within the person (dispositional) (e.g. personality) The situational side refers to behaviour from factors in the external environment (e.g. home life)	

| 8(b) | Mia believes the Piliavin et al. study supports the individual side of the debate but Brett believes it supports the situational side of the debate.

Outline why you think <u>either</u> Brett <u>or</u> Mia is correct, using evidence from the study.

1 mark per point made x4

e.g. Brett
When no model was present, every trial with the cane/ill victim, someone came to help (1 mark). This suggests that the situation of seeing an 'ill' victim triggered helping behaviour (1 mark).

People did leave the critical area when no help was provided (1 mark) which shows that the situation was too distressing so they left to decrease arousal (1 mark)

e.g. Mia
When no model was present, every trial with the cane/ill victim, someone came to help (1 mark). This could suggest that there is a certain type of person(ality) who is willing to help out an 'ill' victim (1 mark). | 4 |

5

| 9(a) | In the Piliavin et al. study (subway Samaritans), there were a number of confederates playing different roles.

Outline the roles of the confederates in this study.

1 mark for each correct point x4

The females (confederates) sat in the adjacent area (to record data);
The males (confederates) acted as if they were 'drunk' or 'ill' in the critical area;
The confederate (victim) had to collapse/fall over;
One of the males acted as a model and helped the victim (depending on the condition);
The model was positioned in either the adjacent or critical area;
One female (confederate) counted the number of individuals/total who helped/race, sex of helper;
The other female (confederate) coded the race/sex/location of people in the adjacent area. | 4 |

| 9(b) | Explain what psychologists have learned about bystander behaviour using <u>two</u> results from the Piliavin et al. study.

e.g.
The (small) correlation between group size and helping behaviour was positive (rather than negative); People in groups of seven or more were consistently faster at responding than those in groups of 3. The correlation should have been negative as when group size increases, helping should decrease (if diffusion of responsibility was happening); Speed of helping should *decrease* with *increased* group size (if diffusion of responsibility was happening)

e.g.
In the no model present trials, 100% of the passengers came to help the victim who had a cane; This was irrespective of race of victim. This shows that people are willing to help someone who is perceived as being 'ill'; Therefore, people are likely to help others who look like they *need* help (and the problem is not self-inflicted). | 8 |

Level	Criteria for each result	Marks
4	The result presented has a meaningful comparison **and** the candidate clearly explains what we have learned about bystander behaviour	4
3	The result presented has a meaningful comparison **and** there is a brief attempt at explaining what we have learned about bystander behaviour; The result presented has **no** meaningful comparison **but** the candidate clearly explains what we have learned about bystander behaviour	3
2	The result presented has a meaningful comparison **but** there is no attempt at explanation; The result presented is not clear **but** there is an implicit attempt at explaining what we have learned about bystander behaviour	2
1	The result presented has **no** meaningful comparison **or** there is a basic attempt at explaining	1
0	No creditworthy answer	0

6	10	Evaluate the Piliavin et al. study in terms of <u>two</u> strengths and <u>two</u> weaknesses. At least one of your evaluation points <u>must</u> be about field experiments. Strengths include: ecological validity, replicability, quantitative data, qualitative data Weaknesses include: ethics, qualitative data, quantitative data, controls	10
		Level 4 (8–10 marks) ☐ Evaluation is comprehensive. ☐ Answer demonstrates evidence of careful planning, organisation and selection of material. ☐ Analysis (valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments) is evident throughout. ☐ Answer demonstrates an excellent understanding of the material. **Level 3 (6–7 marks)** ☐ Evaluation is good. ☐ Answer demonstrates some planning and is well organised. ☐ Analysis is often evident but may not be consistently applied. ☐ Answer demonstrates a good understanding of the material. **Level 2 (4–5 marks)** ☐ Evaluation is mostly appropriate but limited. ☐ Answer demonstrates limited organisation or lacks clarity. ☐ Analysis is limited. ☐ Answer lacks consistent levels of detail and demonstrates a limited understanding of the material. **Level 1 (1–3 marks)** ☐ Evaluation is basic. ☐ Answer demonstrates little organisation. ☐ There is little or no evidence of analysis. ☐ Answer does not demonstrate understanding of the material. **Level 0 (0 marks)** No response worthy of credit.	

7	2(a)	**From the study by Piliavin et al. (subway Samaritans):** **Outline what the model was supposed to do in the 'Adjacent area – early' condition.** 1 mark for each correct statement. Model stood in middle of adjacent car; Waited until passing the fourth station/waited for approximately 70s; Then began to help the victim.	2
	2(b)(i)	**Four victims were used.** **Identify <u>two</u> similarities between the victims.** 1 mark per correct similarity. (All) males Eisenhower jackets (were the same); Old slacks (worn); No tie.	2

	2(b)(ii)	**Identify <u>one</u> difference between the victims.** 1 mark for correct difference. Different ages Different races Cane (ill) versus drunk Item 'carried' (e.g. cane/bottle).	1

8	10	Evaluate the study by Piliavin et al. in terms of <u>two</u> strengths and <u>two</u> weaknesses. At least one of your evaluation points <u>must</u> be about the use of independent measures.		10

	Additional guidance – to be deleted for publication
Level 4 (8–10 marks) • Evaluation is comprehensive. • Answer demonstrates evidence of careful planning, organisation and selection of material. • Analysis (valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments) is evident throughout. • Answer demonstrates an excellent understanding of the material.	10 marks is reserved for: The candidate has given four evaluation points (two strengths and two weakness) that are in depth, in the context of the study, and include the named evaluation point. Max 8 if: The candidate has given three evaluation points (at least one strength **and** one weakness) and they are in the context of the Piliavin study and it includes the named evaluation point, in depth.
Level 3 (6–7 marks) • Evaluation is good. • Answer demonstrates some planning and is well organised. • Analysis is often evident but may not be consistently applied. • Answer demonstrates a good understanding of the material.	Max 6: if the answer does not include the named evaluation point. Max 6: if The candidate has given one strength **and** one weakness and they are in the context of the Piliavin study and indepth.
Level 2 (4–5 marks) • Evaluation is mostly appropriate but limited. • Answer demonstrates limited organisation or lacks clarity. • Analysis is limited. • Answer lacks consistent levels of detail and demonstrates a limited understanding of the material.	Max 5: The candidate has given either two strengths or two weaknesses (contextualised). Max 4: if The candidate has given one strength or weakness that is in the context of the Piliavin study which is indepth

Level 1 (1–3 marks) • Evaluation is basic. • Answer demonstrates little organisation. • There is little or no evidence of analysis. • Answer does not demonstrate understanding of the material.	Max 3: The candidate has given two evaluation points that are generic/brief. Max 2: The candidate has given one evaluation point that is generic/brief.

10	**Level 0 (0 marks)** No response worthy of credit.	If the answer is a description of the study

9	9(a)	Describe <u>two</u> of the independent variables in the study by Piliavin et al. (subway Samaritans). **1 mark for identifying an IV** **1 mark for operationalising the IV** e.g. Type/responsibility/condition/behaviour of victim (1 mark); ill versus drunk (1 mark) Race of victim/stooge (1 mark); black versus white (1 mark) The size of the group of bystanders (1 mark); how many people were present (1 mark) Early or late model/The behaviour of the model (1 mark); (help) 70 seconds or 150 seconds after collapse (1 mark)	4

	9(b)	**Explain whether each guideline below was broken in the study by Piliavin et al. (subway Samaritans):** ☐ **debriefing** ☐ **deception** ☐ **confidentiality** ☐ **protection** **Use the following Levels marking for each guideline <u>separately</u>**	8

Level	Descriptor	Marks
2	The answer explicitly describes the ethical guideline *and* the example is contextualised from the named study **OR** The ethical guideline is *implicit* from the use of a well argued example contextualised from the named study	2
1	The answer explicitly describes the ethical guideline *without* correct contextualisation/no contextualisation **OR** The ethical guideline is *implicit* from the use of a brief example contextualised from the named study **OR** The ethical guideline is incorrectly described but the contextualised example from the named study is correct	1
0	The description of the ethical guideline is incorrect and/or the contextualised example is incorrect **OR** no answer given	0

| 10 | 7 | Piliavin et al. (subway Samaritans) studied spontaneous helping of victims on a subway.

Describe <u>one</u> result about the spontaneous helping of white victims and <u>one</u> result about the spontaneous helping of black victims. You must use data for <u>one</u> of these results.

Max. 4 for answers without data presented.
Max. 1 mark for correct data in *one* of the answers.

e.g. white victims:
The highest incidence of help was for white victims being helped by white helpers in the cane condition (1 mark). This happened 34 times during the study (1 mark: data). Also, there was only one instance of a black participant helping a white drunk victim (1 mark: data). 68% of helpers were white (1 mark: data);
There were the same levels of helping when the victim was drunk or ill (2 marks: comparison). This was 100% of the time (1 mark: data).

e.g. black victims:
More drunk black victims were helped by black helpers than white helpers (2 marks: comparison). Only two white helpers helped a black victim with a cane (1 mark: data). Overall, half of helpers were white though (1 mark: data);
Black ill victims were helped more often than black drunk victims (2 marks: comparison). The latter was for 73% of trials (1 mark: data). | 5 |
| 11 | 5(a) | From the study by Piliavin et al. (subway Samaritans):

Outline what the model was supposed to do in the 'Adjacent area – late' condition.

1 mark per correct statement

Model stood in (the middle of) adjacent car;
Waited until passing the sixth station/waited for approximately 150s;
Then began to help the victim; | 2 |
| | 5(b) | Describe <u>one</u> methodological strength of this study.

1 mark – identifying strength
1 mark – linking it to the study

e.g.
The study has ecological validity (1 mark);
This is because the setting was a real-life subway carriage (1 mark);

The study has mundane realism (1 mark);
This is because the 'task' of seeing a person collapse does happen in the real world (1 mark);

The procedure was standardised (1 mark);
The models only helped out after a set time (e.g. 70s) so the study could be replicated/tested for reliability (1 mark); | 2 |

12	9(a)	Describe what was recorded by the female observers in the study by Piliavin et al. (subway Samaritans).	4
		1 mark per correct statement made	
		One noted race/sex/location of passengers in the critical area/adjacent areas/in the carriage; She also counted the number of passengers in the critical area/in the carriage; She also counted the total number of people who came to help the victim; The race/sex/location of every helper was recorded by her; Another recorded the latency time of the first helper; She also recorded the latency time of help *after* the model began to help (if necessary); Both noted comments made by the passengers; Spontaneous/elicited comments from passengers;	
	9(b)	Explain <u>two</u> similarities between the study by Piliavin et al. (subway Samaritans) and the study by Yamamoto et al. (chimpanzee learning).	8

4 marks available for each similarity

e.g. 4 marks
Both the studies were about 'helping' behaviour. In the Piliavin study this was helping a victim who was ill or drunk and had collapsed on a subway train whereas in the Yamamoto study this was helping a chimp solve a puzzle or getting some juice or being able to drink some juice.

e.g. 3 marks
Both the studies were about 'helping' behaviour. In the Piliavin study this was helping a victim (who was ill or drunk) whereas in the Yamamoto study this was helping a chimp solve a puzzle.

e.g. 2 marks
Both the studies were about 'helping' behaviour. In the Piliavin study this was helping a victim (who was ill or drunk).

e.g. 1 mark
Both studies were about 'helping' behaviour.

Level	Criteria for each result	Marks
4	The similarity is well explained using both studies as examples.	4
3	The similarity is well explained but only one study is used as an example OR both studies used briefly.	3
2	The similarity is brief with an attempt at using at least one study as an example OR The similarity is well explained but there is no study evidence.	2
1	The similarity is brief with no attempt at using studies as examples.	1
0	No creditworthy material.	0

13	1(a)	**From the study by Piliavin et al. (subway Samaritans):** **One female observer noted the race of every rider (passenger) standing or seated in the critical area.** **Name <u>two</u> features she noted about every rider (passenger) in the critical area.** **1 mark per correct answer** Sex (of each rider); Location (of each rider); Race (of each rider);	2
	1(b)	**State <u>one</u> reason why the experiment was conducted between the two stations used.** **1 mark for a valid reason** e.g. It lasted for 7.5 minutes/long so enough time to run the trial; To aid replicability; To aid standardisation;	1
	1(c)	**Outline <u>one</u> conclusion from this study.** **1 mark – brief conclusion** **2 marks – detailed conclusion** e.g. People help ill victims more often (1 mark); A person who is 'ill' is more likely to receive help than a person who is 'drunk' (2 marks);	2

14

8(a)	The study by Piliavin et al. (subway Samaritans) is from the social approach. Outline <u>two</u> assumptions of the social approach, using any example for each. One mark for appropriate assumption (×2) One mark for any relevant example (×2) e.g. Behaviour/cognitions/emotions can be influenced by other individuals (1). For example, in Milgram the experimenter in the lab coat used prods to get them to continue to give electric shocks (1) Behaviour/cognitions/emotions can be influenced by groups (1). For example, in emergency situations people may believe other people are giving/calling for help so just walk on by when they usually help (1).	4

	8(b)	Explain how <u>one</u> result from the study by Piliavin et al. supports the situational explanation of behaviour and how <u>one</u> result does <u>not</u> support diffusion of responsibility.		8

Level	Criteria for each result	Marks
4	The result presented has a meaningful comparison **and** the candidate clearly explains why it supports/does not support the named concept	4
3	The result presented has a meaningful comparison **and** there is a brief attempt at explaining why it supports/does not support the named concept The result presented has no meaningful comparison **but** the candidate clearly explains why it supports/does not support the named concept	3
2	The result presented has a meaningful comparison **but** there is no attempt at explanation; The result presented is not clear **but** there is an implicit attempt at explaining why it supports/does not support the named concept	2
1	The result presented has no meaningful comparison **or** there is a basic attempt at explaining	1
0	No creditworthy answer	0

e.g. does not support diffusion
The median latency time for help when a group had 1–2 males in it (critical area) was around 300s whereas the median for groups of 7+ was around 80s (2). With diffusion of responsibility, the larger the group the less likely people will help. However, this clearly shows that larger groups responded faster giving help (more often) (2)

e.g. does support situational
Only around 3/4 of the time did a black drunk victim get help, compared to 100 per cent of white drunk victims (or any other condition) (2). Therefore, the situation participants found themselves in – someone needing help who was black and appeared drunk – stopped some people helping who may have helped in a different situation (2).

15	3(a)	**From the study by Piliavin et al. (subway Samaritans):**	2
		Outline <u>one</u> result about helping a victim with no model present.	
		2 marks = full result (compares two relevant conditions) 1 mark = partial result (e.g. one condition)	
		e.g. When the victim was black and drunk, help was only given on 73% of trials whereas when the victim was white and drunk this was 100% (2 marks). When the victim was white with a cane the rate of help was 100% (1 mark)	
	3(b)	**Outline <u>one</u> methodological strength of this study.**	2
		1 mark = an appropriate methodological strength 1 mark = applied to Piliavin	
		e.g. The study was in a natural setting so has increased levels of ecological validity (1 mark). People were travelling on a subway car which is a normal everyday event (1 mark).	
		The sample size was large meaning results could be generalisable (1 mark). Over 4,400 people 'participated' from a wide range of backgrounds meaning that the behaviours probably represent a wide range of people/society (1 mark).	
	3(c)	**Outline <u>one</u> ethical weakness of this study.**	2
		1 mark = an appropriate/possible ethical issue 1 mark = applied to Piliavin	
		e.g. The participants were deceived by the whole set up (1 mark). The victim was acting ill/drunk but the participants never knew this (1 mark).	
		As there were so many participants, debriefing never happened so not everyone knew it was a fake set up/had taken part in a study (1 mark). Debriefing after the event happened would have ensured people knew it was fake (1 mark).	
16	6(a)	**From the study by Piliavin et al. (subway Samaritans):**	2
		Identify <u>two</u> characteristics of the sample used in this study.	
		1 mark per characteristic.	
		Males and females; 45% black; 55% white; Travellers on a subway (in New York);	
	6(b)	**Describe how the sample was obtained for this study.**	3
		1 mark per correct point	
		They were unsolicited people on a New York Subway; They would be travelling between 11 am and 3 pm; From Harlem to the Bronx; On a weekday; Between April and June; Recruited/obtained via opportunity sampling/from those available at the time;	

6(c)	Outline **one** conclusion from this study.	2
	2 marks = full conclusion 1 mark = partial conclusion 0 marks = purely results e.g. People help ill victims more often (1 mark); A person who is 'ill' is more likely to receive help than a person who is 'drunk' (2 marks) 100% of the white drunk victims got help when no model was present (0 marks)	

17

2	From the study by Piliavin et al. (subway Samaritans):	
2(a)	Describe what the observers recorded about participants in the adjacent area. **1 mark per correct point** Coded race, sex, location of people (any 2 gets **1** mark); Latency/time taken for first helper to arrive if no model present; Latency/time taken for (extra) help to arrive after model helped; Spontaneous comments from people; Elicited comments from people.	3
2(b)	Describe **one** result about the sex of 'spontaneous first helpers'. You **must** use data in your answer. **3** marks = comparison result with correct data **2** marks = comparison result with no data or using qualitative data as comparison or implicit **1** mark = one result (e.g. for just males) or basic result e.g. **3** marks More males were spontaneous first helpers compared to females as 90% of spontaneous first helpers were male. e.g. **2** marks More males were spontaneous first helpers compared to females. e.g. **1** mark More males helped.	3

| 18 | 8(a) | Outline what is meant by individual and situational explanations of behaviour, using any examples. Do **not** refer to the study by Piliavin et al. (subway Samaritans) in your answer.

1 mark = defining individual + 1 mark example (non-Piliavin)
1 mark = defining situational + 1 mark example (non-Piliavin)

e.g.:
The individual explanation states that we behave because of our personality (**1 mark**). For example, a person wants to go snowboarding because they are an extravert (**1 mark**);

The situational explanation states that we behaviour because of the environment we find ourselves in / our surroundings / other people around us (**1 mark**). For example, in the Bandura study the children imitated the model later on because they had already witnessed/observed the model acting aggressively (so they did). | 4 |

| | 8(b) | Explain how **one** result from the study by Piliavin et al. supports the individual explanation of helping behaviour and how **one** result supports the situational explanation of helping behaviour.

For each result: | 8 |

Level	Criteria	Marks
4	The result presented has a meaningful comparison and the candidate clearly explains how the result supports individual/situational.	4
3	The result presented has a meaningful comparison and there is a brief attempt at explaining how the result supports individual/situational; The result presented has **no** meaningful comparison but the candidate clearly explains how the result supports individual/situational.	3
2	The result presented has a meaningful comparison, but there is no attempt at explanation or explanation is not about individual/situational; The result presented is not clear but there is an attempt at explaining how the result supports individual/situational.	2
1	The result presented has **no** meaningful comparison or there is a basic attempt at explaining.	1
0	No creditworthy answer.	0

e.g. individual:
The observers recorded comments from people about their helping or non-helping behaviour. Examples of these were 'I wish I could help him but I am not strong enough' or 'It's for men to help'.
These are individual beliefs about the incident and can help to explain helping/non-helping behaviour. Each person had a different 'take' on the incident and decided what to do based on that.

e.g. situational:
Only on 73% of trials did people help a black drunk victim whereas for the other three conditions (e.g. white drunk victim), on 100% of trials was help given when no model as present.
Clearly, the situation that involved an interaction between a particular race and condition of victim stopped some people from helping. This situation had decreased helping behaviour in people in those trials.

19	4(a)	**Outline one way in which the participants were deceived in this study.** **2** marks = full answer **1** mark = partial answer e.g.: The incident of someone falling over was not real (**1** mark). The 'participants' witnessing it did not know that it was part of a study (**1** mark). They thought the victim was drunk (**1** mark). They thought that the model was just another person (like them) (**1** mark).	2
	4(b)	**Describe the sample of participants used in this study.** **1** mark per correct point (Approximately) 4450; Travelling on a (New York) subway; 45% black / 55% white; Unsolicited / never knew / never asked to participate; Males **and** females; between X and Y stations / between X and Y times / in either direction.	3
	4(c)	**Explain why this study is from the social approach.** **2** marks = clearly linked to social approach (either through example or assumption) **1** mark = partially linked to social approach / assumption of the social approach only e.g.: One of the assumptions of the social approach is that behaviour is influenced by other individuals. This was clearly shown here as fewer people helped when a model had already offered help (compared to when no model was present (**2** marks). They were affected by the social context of witnessing a drunk person needing help (**1** mark). When there was a larger group, it affected their behaviour as they were faster at helping (**1** mark).	2

20	2(a)	In the study by Piliavin et al. (subway Samaritans), one observer watched passengers in the critical area. **Name two variables this observer recorded about these passengers.** 1 mark per correct point made Race; Sex; Location; Number of individuals; Number who came to help.	2
	2(b)(i)	**Piliavin et al. investigated the idea of 'diffusion of responsibility'.** **Outline what is meant by 'diffusion of responsibility'.** 2 marks detailed definition 1 mark brief definition e.g. People are less likely to help in an emergency when there are more people around as they believe other people will help out instead (2 marks); When there are more people around we help less (1 mark); Responsibility is shared amongst the group/people (1 mark); There are other creditworthy responses.	2
	2(b)(ii)	**Outline one finding that did not support diffusion of responsibility in this study.** 2 marks detailed answer including evidence from the study 1 mark brief answer or no evidence from the study e.g. 2 marks The seven person groups responded faster than the three person groups; The seven person groups were faster to respond than the hypothetical seven person groups; The majority of participants helped the victim before the model had a chance to step in and help first; 60% of trials had more than one person helping the victim. e.g. 1 mark Larger groups responded faster (than smaller groups); Three people groups responded slower; Most people helped before the model; More than one person helped most of the time.	2

2(a)	**From the study by Piliavin et al. (subway Samaritans):** **Outline <u>one</u> aim of the study, other than to test the effect of race on helping behaviour.** 2 marks full aim 1 mark brief/partial aim e.g. To investigate bystander behaviour in a realistic setting/where there is a clear view of victim (2 marks); To investigate if a person is more likely to help an ill or drunk victim (2 marks); To investigate bystander behaviour (1 mark); To investigate diffusion of responsibility (1 mark) which states that the more people present in an emergency the less likely they are to help (1 mark); To test the idea of a Good Samaritan (1 mark);	2
2(b)	**Describe <u>one</u> result about same-race helping in the cane (ill) condition.** 2 marks meaningful comparison 1 mark no comparison e.g. There was a slight tendency for same-race helping in this condition, but it was not a significant result (2 marks) Overall, people were more likely to help an ill victim of their own race compared to a different race (2 marks) White helpers were more likely to help a white victim compared to black helpers (2 marks) Black helpers were less likely to help a black victim compared to white helpers (2 marks) Overall, people helped out same race more often (1 mark)	2
2(c)	**Outline <u>two</u> comments made by participants who did <u>not</u> help the victim.** 1 mark per comment 'It is for men to help him'; 'I wish I could help him'; 'I am not strong enough'; 'I never saw this kind of thing before'; 'I don't know where to look'; 'You feel so bad when you don't know what to do';	2

22	8(a)	**Research in the laboratory has shown that people are more likely to help someone of a different race to themselves.**	4
		Explain two ways the study by Piliavin et al. (subway Samaritans) differs from this research.	
		1 mark for identifying a difference 1 mark for describing the element of the study supporting the difference	
		e.g. Piliavin's study was not in a laboratory/controlled setting (1 mark: identify) as it took place in a subway car in New York (1 mark: describe) The different race helping was not seen as much in Piliavin (1 mark: identify) as people were more likely to help same race victim when <u>drunk</u> (1 mark: describe) 68% of spontaneous helpers of a white victim were white which is higher than racial distribution in the car (1 mark: describe)	

	8(b)	**Explain one similarity and one difference between the study by Piliavin et al. (subway Samaritans) and the study by Milgram (obedience).**	8
		4 marks available for the similarity, e.g. ethics, situational, controls, quantitative data 4 marks available for the difference, e.g. setting, participants, use of a stooge.	
		Creditworthy points include ethics, situational, controls, quantitative data, setting, participants, use of a stooge.	
		Similarity e.g. 4 marks Both the Piliavin and Milgram studies have ethical issues of deception. In the Milgram study, participants believed they were giving real electric shocks to a stranger who could not remember word pairs. In the Piliavin study, the participants were led to believe that the drunk or ill victim was actually in need of help.	
		e.g. 3 marks Both the Piliavin and Milgram studies have ethical issues of deception. In the Milgram study, participants believed they were giving real electric shocks to a complete stranger who could not remember word pairs.	
		e.g. 2 marks Both the Piliavin and Milgram studies have ethical issues of deception, as in both, participants never knew that the scenarios were fake.	
		e.g. 1 mark Both the Piliavin and Milgram studies had ethical issues.	

The similarity/difference is well explained using both studies as examples.	**4 marks**	
The similarity/difference is well explained but only one study is used as an example OR both studies used briefly.	**3 marks**	
The similarity/difference is brief with an attempt at using at least one study as an example OR The similarity/difference is well explained but there is no study evidence.	**2 marks**	
The similarity/difference is brief with no attempt at using studies as examples.	**1 mark**	
No creditworthy material.	**0 marks**	

4(a)	**From the study by Piliavin et al. (subway Samaritans):** **Describe what the victim did during a trial.** 1 mark per correct procedural point Always stood at the pole; In the critical area; After passing the first station (70s in); The victim was to stagger forward and collapse; They remained supine / face up / laid there until receiving help; If no help received they were helped up by the model; They then left the car at the next station.	**5**	
4(b)	**Identify <u>one</u> weakness of this study.** 1 mark for the identification e.g. **Lacks** generalisability (1 mark) Generalisability (0 marks) **Difficult** to replicate (1 mark) Replication (0 marks) **Difficult** to control (extraneous) variables (1 mark) Control of variables (0 marks) **Broke** ethical guideline of deception / informed consent / harm / debriefing (1 mark) Ethical issues (0 marks) There are other creditworthy responses.	**1**	

| 24 | 9 | Evaluate the study by Piliavin et al. (subway Samaritans) in terms of two strengths and two weaknesses. At least one of your evaluation points must be about the use of qualitative data. | 10 |

Suitable strengths include: Qualitative data, quantitative data, reliability, validity (ecological)

Suitable weaknesses include: Ethics, field experiments, validity, generalisations

Level	Criteria	Marks
4	• Evaluation is comprehensive. • Answer demonstrates evidence of careful planning, organisation and selection of material. • Analysis (valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments) is evident throughout. • Answer demonstrates an excellent understanding of the material.	8–10
3	• Evaluation is good. • Answer demonstrates some planning and is well organised. • Analysis is often evident but may not be consistently applied. • Answer demonstrates a good understanding of the material.	6–7
2	• Evaluation is mostly appropriate but limited. • Answer demonstrates limited organisation or lacks clarity. • Analysis is limited. • Answer lacks consistent levels of detail and demonstrates a limited understanding of the material.	4–5
1	• Evaluation is basic. • Answer demonstrates little organisation. • There is little or no evidence of analysis. • Answer does not demonstrate understanding of the material.	1–3
0	No response worthy of credit.	0