

INTERNATIONAL A-LEVEL PSYCHOLOGY

PS04

Unit 4 Approaches and Application

Mark scheme

January 2026

Version: 1.0 Final

Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students' scripts. Alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' 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 from www.oxfordaqa.com

Copyright information

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

Copyright © 2026 OxfordAQA International Examinations and its licensors. All rights reserved.

Level of response marking instructions

Level of response mark schemes are broken down into levels, each of which has a descriptor. The descriptor for the level shows the average performance for the level. There are marks in each level.

Before you apply the mark scheme to a student's answer read through the answer and annotate it (as instructed) to show the qualities that are being looked for. You can then apply the mark scheme.

Step 1 Determine a level

Start at the lowest level of the mark scheme and use it as a ladder to see whether the answer meets the descriptor for that level. The descriptor for the level indicates the different qualities that might be seen in the student's answer for that level. If it meets the lowest level then go to the next one and decide if it meets this level, and so on, until you have a match between the level descriptor and the answer. With practice and familiarity you will find that for better answers you will be able to quickly skip through the lower levels of the mark scheme.

When assigning a level you should look at the overall quality of the answer and not look to pick holes in small and specific parts of the answer where the student has not performed quite as well as the rest. If the answer covers different aspects of different levels of the mark scheme you should use a best fit approach for defining the level and then use the variability of the response to help decide the mark within the level, ie if the response is predominantly level 3 with a small amount of level 4 material it would be placed in level 3 but be awarded a mark near the top of the level because of the level 4 content.

Step 2 Determine a mark

Once you have assigned a level you need to decide on the mark. The descriptors on how to allocate marks can help with this. The exemplar materials used during standardisation will help. There will be an answer in the standardising materials which will correspond with each level of the mark scheme. This answer will have been awarded a mark by the Lead Examiner. You can compare the student's answer with the example to determine if it is the same standard, better or worse than the example. You can then use this to allocate a mark for the answer based on the Lead Examiner's mark on the example.

You may well need to read back through the answer as you apply the mark scheme to clarify points and assure yourself that the level and the mark are appropriate.

Indicative content in the mark scheme is provided as a guide for examiners. It is not intended to be exhaustive and you must credit other valid points. Students do not have to cover all of the points mentioned in the Indicative content to reach the highest level of the mark scheme.

An answer which contains nothing of relevance to the question must be awarded no marks.

Section A: Approaches in Psychology

Total for this section: 30 marks

Question	Marking Guidance	Total Marks
01	<p>Below are five different explanations for human behaviour.</p> <p>Select the two explanations that belong to the biological approach in psychology.</p> <p>Shade two boxes only.</p> <p>Answer key:</p> <p>A – Evolution</p> <p>C – Neurochemistry</p>	<p>2</p> <p>AO1 = 2</p>

Question	Marking Guidance	Total Marks
02	<p>What is meant by the terms genotype and phenotype?</p> <p>Award marks as follows</p> <p>1 mark for each correct definition.</p> <p>Genotype – A person's unique DNA.</p> <p>Phenotype – A person's outward characteristics influenced by the environment.</p> <p>Accept alternative wording.</p>	<p>2</p> <p>AO1 = 2</p>

Question	Marking Guidance	Total Marks															
03	<p>Explain one strength and one limitation of research into the role of schema.</p> <p>Possible strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported by research such as Piaget’s (1950s) work on cognitive development and Bartlett’s (1932) War of the Ghosts research. Act as cognitive shortcuts allowing us to simplify our complex social world. Allow us to make predictions about future behaviour. Research into how schema affect memory (eg in eyewitness testimony) has been useful in improving the judicial system (Loftus and Palmer, 1972). <p>Possible limitations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schema can contribute to prejudice and discrimination as they lead to generalisations about groups of people based on limited evidence. Research is often laboratory based using artificial tasks (eg serial reproduction, Bartlett, 1932) which does not reflect how schema operate in everyday life. Schema can cause perceptual errors, eg mishearing information. Does not explain how we take in new information without a link to existing schema. <p>Credit other relevant material.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="288 1088 1310 1798"> <thead> <tr> <th>Level</th><th>Description</th><th>Marks</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3</td><td>Explanation of one strength and one limitation of research into the role of schema is detailed and effective. The answer is clear with appropriate use of specialist terminology.</td><td>5–6</td></tr> <tr> <td>2</td><td>Explanation of one strength and/or one limitation of research into the role of schema is relevant but effectiveness is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places. Specialist terminology is occasionally used appropriately. OR just one strength or limitation at level 3.</td><td>3–4</td></tr> <tr> <td>1</td><td>Explanation of one strength and/or one limitation of research into the role of schema is very limited. The answer is vague and/or muddled. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used. OR just one strength or limitation at level 2 or 1.</td><td>1–2</td></tr> <tr> <td>0</td><td>No creditable content.</td><td>0</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Level	Description	Marks	3	Explanation of one strength and one limitation of research into the role of schema is detailed and effective. The answer is clear with appropriate use of specialist terminology.	5–6	2	Explanation of one strength and/or one limitation of research into the role of schema is relevant but effectiveness is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places. Specialist terminology is occasionally used appropriately. OR just one strength or limitation at level 3.	3–4	1	Explanation of one strength and/or one limitation of research into the role of schema is very limited. The answer is vague and/or muddled. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used. OR just one strength or limitation at level 2 or 1.	1–2	0	No creditable content.	0	<p>6</p> <p>AO3 = 6</p>
Level	Description	Marks															
3	Explanation of one strength and one limitation of research into the role of schema is detailed and effective. The answer is clear with appropriate use of specialist terminology.	5–6															
2	Explanation of one strength and/or one limitation of research into the role of schema is relevant but effectiveness is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places. Specialist terminology is occasionally used appropriately. OR just one strength or limitation at level 3.	3–4															
1	Explanation of one strength and/or one limitation of research into the role of schema is very limited. The answer is vague and/or muddled. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used. OR just one strength or limitation at level 2 or 1.	1–2															
0	No creditable content.	0															

Question	Marking Guidance	Total Marks
04	<p>Mr Jarvis is a teacher of 8-year-old children. He is teaching them to stand quietly in the lunch queue.</p> <p>He sends the noisy children to stand at the back of the queue. He gives praise to those who are standing quietly.</p> <p>Describe and evaluate operant conditioning. Refer to Mr Jarvis in your answer.</p> <p>Possible content</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operant conditioning is learning through consequences such as reward and punishment. • Positive reinforcement is the provision of a reward following desired behaviour. • Negative reinforcement is performing a behaviour to avoid an aversive stimulus. • Reinforcement (positive and negative) increases the likelihood that behaviour will be repeated. • Punishment is the addition of an unpleasant consequence following unwanted behaviour. • Punishment decreases the likelihood that behaviour will be repeated. • Description of Skinner's (1948) research into operant conditioning and types of reinforcement. <p>Possible application</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr Jarvis uses positive reinforcement when he praises the children standing quietly in the lunch queue. • This will increase the likelihood of children standing quietly in the future. • He uses punishment when he sends children to the back of the queue if they are noisy. • This will reduce the likelihood of them being noisy in the queue in the future. • They will stand quietly to avoid being sent to the back (negative reinforcement). <p>Possible evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supporting research demonstrating the effectiveness of operant conditioning in shaping behaviour through research studies or real-life application, eg Skinner's (1953) research, token economy systems, phobia treatment. • Good replicability due to highly controlled laboratory experiments, eg number of lever presses required to gain a food reward could be standardised and extraneous variables minimised. • Counter arguments presented to suggest limitations of using operant conditioning, eg support from Skinner's/animals research cannot necessarily be generalised to humans. • Comparison of approaches, eg discussion of the effectiveness of operant conditioning to shape behaviour compared to social learning theory or the cognitive approach for example. • Issue of (environmental) reductionism as it simplifies behaviour into stimulus-response units so it is easy to test scientifically. • Issue of (environmental) determinism as it is a mechanistic view of human behaviour with no room for free will. 	<p>20</p> <p>AO1 = 8 AO2 = 4 AO3 = 8</p>

Credit other relevant strengths.		
Level	Description	Marks
4	Knowledge of operant conditioning is accurate and generally well detailed. Evaluation is effective. Application is appropriate. Minor detail and/or expansion of argument is sometimes lacking. The answer is clear and focused. Specialist terminology is used effectively.	16–20
3	Knowledge of operant conditioning is evident but there are occasional inaccuracies and/or omissions. There is some effective evaluation. There is some appropriate application. The answer is mostly clear and organised but occasionally lacks focus. Specialist terminology is used appropriately.	11–15
2	Limited knowledge of operant conditioning is present. Any evaluation/application is of limited effectiveness. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is occasionally used appropriately.	6–10
1	Knowledge of operant conditioning is very limited. Evaluation/application 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.	1–5
0	No creditable content.	0

Section B: Issues and Debates in Psychology**Total for this section: 30 marks**

Question	Marking Guidance	Total Marks
05	<p>What is meant by holism?</p> <p>Award marks as follows 1 mark for a clear definition of holism.</p> <p>Possible content The idea that behaviours cannot be fully explained by reducing them to explanations at lower levels, but must be explained at the highest, holistic level.</p> <p>Credit alternative wording.</p>	1 AO1 = 1

Question	Marking Guidance	Total Marks
06	<p>What is meant by reductionism?</p> <p>Award marks as follows 1 mark for a clear definition of reductionism.</p> <p>Possible content The idea that complex behaviours can be reduced to and explained by looking at the individual components that make up that behaviour at a lower level.</p> <p>Credit alternative wording.</p>	1 AO1 = 1

Question	Marking Guidance	Total Marks															
07	<p>According to psychologists, there are different levels of explanation for the same behaviour.</p> <p>Explain how attending an exercise class can be understood at both a reductionist level and a holistic level.</p> <p>Possible application Reductionist level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internal mental processing occurs to pay attention and retain the movements performed by the instructor (cognitive level). • Mastering the moves is rewarding and so they are repeated (behavioural level). • Neurotransmitters in the brain send messages to the muscles to perform the exercises (biological level). <p>Holistic level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attending the exercise class with a friend could be explained with regards to meeting social/friendship needs. • Exercise has holistic (health and wellbeing) benefits which cannot be explained by looking at one element alone. • The benefits of exercise can be perceived differently, which can only be explained in terms of the whole individual experience. <p>Credit other relevant material.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Level</th><th>Description</th><th>Marks</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3</td><td>Application of knowledge of holistic and reductionist levels of explanation is appropriate. The answer is clear with appropriate use of specialist terminology.</td><td>5–6</td></tr> <tr> <td>2</td><td>Application of knowledge of holistic and/or reductionist levels of explanation is relevant but appropriateness is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places. Specialist terminology is occasionally used appropriately. OR just holism or reductionism at level 3.</td><td>3–4</td></tr> <tr> <td>1</td><td>Application of knowledge of holistic and/or reductionist levels of explanation is very limited. The answer is vague and or muddled. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used. OR just holism or reductionism at level 2 or 1.</td><td>1–2</td></tr> <tr> <td>0</td><td>No creditable content.</td><td>0</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Level	Description	Marks	3	Application of knowledge of holistic and reductionist levels of explanation is appropriate. The answer is clear with appropriate use of specialist terminology.	5–6	2	Application of knowledge of holistic and/or reductionist levels of explanation is relevant but appropriateness is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places. Specialist terminology is occasionally used appropriately. OR just holism or reductionism at level 3.	3–4	1	Application of knowledge of holistic and/or reductionist levels of explanation is very limited. The answer is vague and or muddled. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used. OR just holism or reductionism at level 2 or 1.	1–2	0	No creditable content.	0	<p>6</p> <p>AO2 = 6</p>
Level	Description	Marks															
3	Application of knowledge of holistic and reductionist levels of explanation is appropriate. The answer is clear with appropriate use of specialist terminology.	5–6															
2	Application of knowledge of holistic and/or reductionist levels of explanation is relevant but appropriateness is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places. Specialist terminology is occasionally used appropriately. OR just holism or reductionism at level 3.	3–4															
1	Application of knowledge of holistic and/or reductionist levels of explanation is very limited. The answer is vague and or muddled. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used. OR just holism or reductionism at level 2 or 1.	1–2															
0	No creditable content.	0															

Question	Marking Guidance	Total Marks						
08	<p>Psychologists carried out a twin study to find out the relative importance of heredity in developing a fear of spiders.</p> <p>The results are shown in Table 1.</p> <p>Table 1 Percentage rates where both twins share a fear of spiders.</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <th></th><th>Identical twins</th><th>Non-identical twins</th></tr> <tr> <td>Percentage rates for sharing a fear of spiders</td><td>55%</td><td>32%</td></tr> </table> <p>Suggest two conclusions the psychologist could make about the relative importance of heredity in developing a fear of spiders.</p> <p>Refer to the data in Table 1 in your answer.</p> <p>For each conclusion, award marks as follows 2 marks: for a clear conclusion about the importance of heredity in developing a fear of spiders. 1 mark: for a muddled or vague conclusion.</p> <p>Possible content</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heredity has a large role to play in developing a fear of spiders. This is because the percentage rates for sharing a fear of spiders are higher (55% versus 32%) in identical twins compared with non-identical twins. • The environment also plays a part in developing a fear of spiders as the percentage rates for sharing a fear of spiders are not 100%. This suggests that some aspects of developing a fear of spiders must be learned. <p>Credit other relevant material, eg reference to interactionist approach.</p>		Identical twins	Non-identical twins	Percentage rates for sharing a fear of spiders	55%	32%	<p>4</p> <p>AO2 = 2 AO3 = 2</p>
	Identical twins	Non-identical twins						
Percentage rates for sharing a fear of spiders	55%	32%						

Question	Marking Guidance	Total Marks															
09	<p>Justify the argument that our behaviour is best explained by our nurture rather than our nature.</p> <p>Possible justification</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for the role of learning (nurture) in shaping behaviour, eg Skinner's (1953) work on rats and pigeons. • Support for nurture from behavioural treatments, eg systematic desensitisation for the treatment of phobias. • A nurture view allows for cause and effect to be established as behaviour can be directly observed and measured giving it scientific credibility. • It has (face) validity as people can see the results of learning, eg lever pressing increasing in rats given a reward, and so a nurture view is widely accepted. • Use of examples from psychology to support nurture arguments. <p>Credit other relevant material.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Level</th><th>Description</th><th>Marks</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3</td><td>Justification of the argument that our behaviour is best explained by our nurture rather than our nature is detailed and effective. The answer is clear with appropriate use of specialist terminology.</td><td>5–6</td></tr> <tr> <td>2</td><td>Justification of the argument that our behaviour is best explained by our nurture rather than our nature is relevant but effectiveness is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places. Specialist terminology is occasionally used appropriately.</td><td>3–4</td></tr> <tr> <td>1</td><td>Justification of the argument that our behaviour is best explained by our nurture rather than our nature is very limited. The answer is vague and/or muddled. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.</td><td>1–2</td></tr> <tr> <td>0</td><td>No creditable content.</td><td>0</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Level	Description	Marks	3	Justification of the argument that our behaviour is best explained by our nurture rather than our nature is detailed and effective. The answer is clear with appropriate use of specialist terminology.	5–6	2	Justification of the argument that our behaviour is best explained by our nurture rather than our nature is relevant but effectiveness is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places. Specialist terminology is occasionally used appropriately.	3–4	1	Justification of the argument that our behaviour is best explained by our nurture rather than our nature is very limited. The answer is vague and/or muddled. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.	1–2	0	No creditable content.	0	<p>6</p> <p>AO3 = 6</p>
Level	Description	Marks															
3	Justification of the argument that our behaviour is best explained by our nurture rather than our nature is detailed and effective. The answer is clear with appropriate use of specialist terminology.	5–6															
2	Justification of the argument that our behaviour is best explained by our nurture rather than our nature is relevant but effectiveness is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places. Specialist terminology is occasionally used appropriately.	3–4															
1	Justification of the argument that our behaviour is best explained by our nurture rather than our nature is very limited. The answer is vague and/or muddled. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.	1–2															
0	No creditable content.	0															

Question	Marking Guidance	Total Marks
10	<p>There is a lot of disagreement about whether or not psychology can be considered a science.</p> <p>Discuss the idea that psychology is a science.</p> <p>Possible content</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Psychology makes use of the scientific method, which includes stating a question, forming a theory, and conducting experiments to test a hypothesis. • Psychology makes use of empirical methods to collect and interpret data, eg a cognitive psychologist might use a brain scanner (fMRI) to measure brain activity. • Psychology makes use of controlled experiments which can be replicated to check for reliability, eg Asch's (1951) work on conformity using standard length lines. • Psychology makes use of objective measurements which can be validated, eg the volume of the hippocampus in Maguire's (2000) taxi driver study. • Psychology follows the notion of falsifiability, creating null hypotheses which must be tested and, ultimately, rejected. • Psychology allows causation to be established as it involves isolating an independent variable to see its effects on a dependent variable. <p>Possible discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Psychologists sometimes use non-scientific methods, such as questionnaires, interviews and case studies, when looking at complex behaviour, eg Milner's (1966) study of HM. This is because it sometimes relies on self-report methods which are subjective. • Psychologists conduct correlational research which cannot be considered scientific because cause and effect cannot be established. • Psychologists sometimes make inferences and these are not scientific because the jump from data to explanations of behaviour might be flawed, eg the assumption that chemical imbalances cause rather than might be the effect of disordered behaviours such as depression. • Taking a scientific stance is reductionist; by isolating a single variable, we often fail to understand the role of other factors like family, trauma or drug use in developing disorders. • The scientific focus on cause and effect is deterministic as it removes the idea that humans have agency/free will. This is a problem for psychological concepts such as self-actualisation (Maslow, 1987). • Taking a scientific approach allows the development of successful treatments, eg drug therapy for depression and anxiety. <p>Credit other relevant material.</p>	<p>12</p> <p>AO1 = 6 AO3 = 6</p>

	Level	Description	Marks	
	4	Knowledge of the idea that psychology is a science is accurate and generally well detailed. Discussion is effective. Minor detail and/or expansion of argument is sometimes lacking. The answer is clear and focused. Specialist terminology is used effectively.	10–12	
	3	Knowledge of the idea that psychology is a science is evident but there are occasional inaccuracies and/or omissions. There is some effective discussion. The answer is mostly clear and organised but occasionally lacks focus. Specialist terminology is used appropriately.	7–9	
	2	Limited knowledge of the idea that psychology is a science is present. Any discussion is of limited effectiveness. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is occasionally used appropriately.	4–6	
	1	Knowledge of the idea that psychology is a science is very limited. Discussion 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.	1–3	
	0	No creditable content.	0	

Section C: Applied Psychology: Work and the Individual**Total for this section: 30 marks**

Question	Marking Guidance	Total Marks
11	<p>Psychologists asked workers in a factory and an office about the main way they communicated with colleagues at work. Workers in the factory used face-to-face communication. Workers in the office used email.</p> <p>Both groups were interviewed. Workers in the factory reported good relationships with colleagues. However, they felt they could not always say exactly what they meant. Workers in the office reported that the meaning behind their email messages was not always well understood.</p> <p>Using your knowledge of the effects of email communication, explain these findings.</p> <p>Possible application</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Workers in the factory were able to see the recipient's non-verbal cues, such as gaze and posture, which gives immediate feedback about how their messages are being received. Being able to see non-verbal cues allows workers in the factory to moderate their communication as they go. This allows for misunderstandings to be dealt with quickly which helps to build relationships. Workers in the factory are less able to be direct because normal gating processes will modify their message, eg if they are shy. Workers in the office may have felt that the intention behind their message was misunderstood because of the absence of non-verbal cues in email communication. This means that they lack feedback about how their message is being received and therefore, cannot moderate it. Workers in the office may have felt that the intention behind their message was misunderstood due to egocentric bias. This is because emails are much more likely to reflect the opinions of the sender rather than considering the position of the receiver. Workers in the office were able to be more direct because email communication lacks normal gating processes and therefore, they feel less intimidated, especially if they are shy. <p>Credit other relevant material.</p>	<p>6</p> <p>AO2 = 6</p>

	Level	Description	Marks
	3	Application of knowledge of the effects of email communication is appropriate. The answer is clear with appropriate use of specialist terminology.	5–6
	2	Application of the effects of email communication is relevant but appropriateness is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places. Specialist terminology is occasionally used appropriately.	3–4
	1	Application of the effects of email communication is very limited. The answer is vague and/or muddled. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.	1–2
	0	No creditable content.	0

Question	Marking Guidance	Total Marks
12	<p>Jack is a musician. He finds that he performs his old songs better in front of an audience than when he is playing the same songs alone. However, if he is playing a new song, he performs better when he is alone than in front of an audience.</p> <p>Using your knowledge of social facilitation, explain the differences in Jack's performance.</p> <p>Award marks as follows 3 marks: the application of social facilitation to Jack is detailed. The answer is clear with appropriate use of specialist terminology. 2 marks: the application of social facilitation to Jack lacks detail. The answer lacks clarity in places. 1 mark: the application of social facilitation to Jack is briefly presented. The answer is very limited, vague and/or muddled.</p> <p>Possible application</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When Jack performs his old songs in front of an audience it positively affects his performance. As the task is easy or well-practiced, the audience enhances his performance due to increased arousal, eg better concentration or anxiety related to the importance of getting it right. • When Jack performs new songs in front of an audience it negatively affects his performance. As the task is difficult/unfamiliar, the audience impairs his performance due to anxiety or over thinking about getting it wrong/making mistakes. <p>Credit other relevant material.</p>	<p>3</p> <p>AO2 = 3</p>

Question	Marking Guidance	Total Marks
13	<p>Sameera and three of her colleagues are set a group project. Sameera lets her colleagues do most of the work on the project. When the manager checks their progress, he finds that they have not done as much as he would have expected.</p> <p>Using your knowledge of social loafing, explain the lack of progress by Sameera's group.</p> <p>Award marks as follows 3 marks: the application of social loafing to Sameera is detailed. The answer is clear with appropriate use of specialist terminology. 2 marks: the application of social loafing to Sameera lacks detail. The answer lacks clarity in places. 1 mark: the application of social loafing to Sameera is briefly presented. The answer is very limited, vague and/or muddled.</p> <p>Possible application</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social loafing will cause Sameera to expend less effort when working on a project in a group situation than she would when working on the same task alone. • The progress is less than the manager expected because social loafing has made the group of four less productive than would be expected from the combined potential performance of its individual members. • Social loafing occurs because of a diffusion of responsibility as Sameera feels less accountable than she would if she was working alone. <p>Credit other relevant material.</p>	<p>3</p> <p>AO2 = 3</p>

Question	Marking Guidance	Total Marks															
14	<p>Evaluate research into group decision-making.</p> <p>Possible evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support from research into group polarisation. Women who held moderately feminist views tended to demonstrate heightened pro-feminist beliefs following group discussion (Myers, 1975). • Support for the same effects when using social media. Demonstrating the group does not have to be physically present for group polarisation to occur (Yardi, 2010). • Support for risky shift. Stoner (1961) group decisions amongst a group of management students were riskier than the average of the individual members. • Management students might perceive risk as an attribute and may not want to appear too cautious in front of their peers. Therefore, the findings may lack validity. • Wallach, Kogan and Bem (1962) replicated the research using a sample for whom risk was not important. They found the same results, that group decisions were riskier than the average of individual ones. This suggests that risky shift is a robust phenomenon. • Anecdotal support for groupthink, that the desire for group cohesiveness results in dysfunctional outcomes. Seen in Watergate (1972) and the invasion of Iraq (2003). • As groupthink is based on real-life and very specific groups, it is very difficult to test empirically. Park's (1990) meta-analysis found only 16 studies published on groupthink and most of those found little or no support for the concept. • Groupthink may be a phenomenon specific to groups having leaders with high power motivation, who create atmospheres more susceptible to groupthink, including group homogeneity and group insulation (Fodor and Smith, 1982). <p>Credit other relevant material.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Level</th><th>Description</th><th>Marks</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3</td><td>Evaluation of research into group decision-making is detailed and effective. The answer is clear with appropriate use of specialist terminology.</td><td>5–6</td></tr> <tr> <td>2</td><td>Evaluation of research into group decision-making is relevant but effectiveness is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places. Specialist terminology is occasionally used appropriately.</td><td>3–4</td></tr> <tr> <td>1</td><td>Evaluation of research into group decision-making is very limited. The answer is vague and/or muddled. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.</td><td>1–2</td></tr> <tr> <td>0</td><td>No creditable content.</td><td>0</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Level	Description	Marks	3	Evaluation of research into group decision-making is detailed and effective. The answer is clear with appropriate use of specialist terminology.	5–6	2	Evaluation of research into group decision-making is relevant but effectiveness is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places. Specialist terminology is occasionally used appropriately.	3–4	1	Evaluation of research into group decision-making is very limited. The answer is vague and/or muddled. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.	1–2	0	No creditable content.	0	<p>6</p> <p>AO3 = 6</p>
Level	Description	Marks															
3	Evaluation of research into group decision-making is detailed and effective. The answer is clear with appropriate use of specialist terminology.	5–6															
2	Evaluation of research into group decision-making is relevant but effectiveness is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places. Specialist terminology is occasionally used appropriately.	3–4															
1	Evaluation of research into group decision-making is very limited. The answer is vague and/or muddled. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.	1–2															
0	No creditable content.	0															

Question	Marking Guidance	Total Marks									
15	<p>Describe and evaluate research into the effects of workload and control in relation to workplace stress.</p> <p>Possible content</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Karasek (1979) job demands-control (J D-C) model predicted that high strain jobs, with high demands and little control, would be most associated with workplace stress. • Marmot (1997) longitudinal study demonstrated the relationship between lack of control and stress-related illness in Whitehall executives. • Johansson (1978) sawmill study. Finishers, who depended on the work rate of others and therefore had little control over their work, had more stress-related absenteeism than workers with more control over their work rate. • Karasek (1990) demonstrated that increasing control in the workplace led to lower levels of stress-related health problems. • Animal studies of control and illness, eg Brady (1958) executive monkeys study. <p>Possible evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little support for the interaction between demands and control, eg Karasek's model would suggest that reducing the demands of a job would reduce stress. This has not been the case as control has been seen as the key factor in workplace stress (Jones and Bright, 2001). • Marmot's study was a large-scale longitudinal study with 7000 participants over 5 years, increasing the validity of the findings. • Methodological issues with Marmot's study, eg it was self-report, possible sample bias, ignored other factors that might have contributed to stress. • Led to improvements in the workplace with bosses tasked with increasing autonomy to improve productivity and worker health. • Led to the development of more sophisticated models such as the job demands-resources (J D-R) model. This is a more complex and realistic model that can deal with a range of workplace and individual variables. <p>Credit other relevant material.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="304 1525 1302 2040"> <thead> <tr> <th>Level</th><th>Description</th><th>Marks</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>4</td><td>Knowledge of research into the effects of workload and control is accurate and generally well detailed. Evaluation is effective. Minor detail and/or expansion of argument is sometimes lacking. The answer is clear and focused. Specialist terminology is used effectively.</td><td>10–12</td></tr> <tr> <td>3</td><td>Knowledge of research into the effects of workload and control is evident but there are occasional inaccuracies and/or omissions. There is some effective evaluation. The answer is mostly clear and organised but occasionally lacks focus. Specialist terminology is used appropriately.</td><td>7–9</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Level	Description	Marks	4	Knowledge of research into the effects of workload and control is accurate and generally well detailed. Evaluation is effective. Minor detail and/or expansion of argument is sometimes lacking. The answer is clear and focused. Specialist terminology is used effectively.	10–12	3	Knowledge of research into the effects of workload and control is evident but there are occasional inaccuracies and/or omissions. There is some effective evaluation. The answer is mostly clear and organised but occasionally lacks focus. Specialist terminology is used appropriately.	7–9	<p>12</p> <p>AO1 = 6 AO3 = 6</p>
Level	Description	Marks									
4	Knowledge of research into the effects of workload and control is accurate and generally well detailed. Evaluation is effective. Minor detail and/or expansion of argument is sometimes lacking. The answer is clear and focused. Specialist terminology is used effectively.	10–12									
3	Knowledge of research into the effects of workload and control is evident but there are occasional inaccuracies and/or omissions. There is some effective evaluation. The answer is mostly clear and organised but occasionally lacks focus. Specialist terminology is used appropriately.	7–9									

	2	Limited knowledge of research into the effects of workload and control is present. Any evaluation is of limited effectiveness. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is occasionally used appropriately.	4–6
	1	Knowledge of research into the effects of workload and control is very limited. Evaluation 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.	1–3
	0	No creditable content.	0

PS04 grid

	AO1	AO2	AO3	Total
Section A				
01	2			2
02	2			2
03			6	6
04	8	4	8	20
Section B				
05	1			1
06	1			1
07		6		6
08		2	2	4
09			6	6
10	6		6	12
Section C				
11		6		6
12		3		3
13		3		3
14			6	6
15	6		6	12
Unit total	26	24	40	90