

Why do Human Beings do Good Things?

Carlos Ramirez, a white man originally from Madrid in Spain, was standing on a subway platform in New York, when a young black man nearby had an epileptic seizure and rolled on to the track.

Hearing a train coming, whilst many American bystanders stood by doing nothing, Carlos impulsively jumped down to try to save the young man, only to realise that the train was approaching too fast.

At great risk to himself, Carlos jumped on top of the young man's body and pushed him down into a drainage ditch between the tracks. The train operator saw them, but it was too late to stop: five cars of the train passed over their bodies. Neither of them were injured but because he was delayed, Carlos missed an important job interview.

When asked why he had done it, Carlos said, 'I just saw someone who needed help. I did what I felt was right.' A great example of altruism.

1. From Piliavin et al.'s (1969) Subway Samaritan study, **outline** what 'diffusion of responsibility' means and **how** it relates to this article. (3)

Mark Scheme

<p>From Piliavin et al.'s (1969) Subway Samaritan study, outline what 'diffusion of responsibility' means and how it relates to this article.</p> <p><u>Diffusion of responsibility:</u></p> <p>Setting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More people present reduces help • Larger groups of bystanders lowers the chance of help <p>Influence on behaviour:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responsibility for helping is spread among those present • Less personal responsibility as expect others to help <p><u>Possible links to article:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Large number of bystanders to the incident which happened at a train station, no one else helped as they believed others present would help the man who had a seizure • The responsibility of helping the man who fell onto the tracks was shared by 'many American bystanders' • Other appropriate outlines/links to the article should be credited. 	<p>3</p>	<p>3 marks – For a good answer that shows A clear understanding of 'diffusion of responsibility' including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference to the situation 'more people reducing help' • Reference to how the setting influences an individual 'responsibility is shared/ expect others to help'. • A clear, accurate link to the article. <p>2 marks – For a reasonable answer that includes two of the three points</p> <p>1 mark – For a basic answer that either shows a basic understanding of diffusion of responsibility Or Implies a link of diffusion of responsibility to the article</p> <p>0 marks – No or incorrect answer.</p>
---	-----------------	--

2. From Levine et al.'s (2001) study of cross-cultural altruism, **outline** what 'simpatia' means and **how** it relates to this article. (3)

Mark Scheme

<p>From Levine et al.'s (2001) study of cross-cultural altruism, outline what 'simpatia' means and how it relates to this article.</p> <p><u>Answers could include:</u></p> <p><u>Simpatia</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Simpatia is a cultural value where a culture favours helping and friendly behaviour • This cultural value is a norm in countries such as in Brazil, Mexico, El Salvador, Costa Rica or Spain • As opposed to non-simpatia countries such as America. <p><u>Possible links to article:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In this article Carlos Ramirez is from Madrid in Spain which has a culture of simpatia which could explain why he was more likely to offer help than someone from New York. <p>Other appropriate outlines/links to the article should be credited.</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>3 marks – For a good answer that shows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A clear understanding of 'simpatia' (<i>cultural value</i> of friendly, nice, agreeable etc., over productivity, self) • Further elaboration of simpatia i.e. cultures with/ without the value • A clear and accurate link to the article. <p>2 marks – For a reasonable answer that shows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An understanding of the term 'simpatia' e.g. friendly/helpful culture • A link to the article. <p>1 mark – For a basic answer that: Either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Merely defines the term 'simpatia', i.e. there is no attempt to link to the article. <p>Or:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shows some understanding of the term 'simpatia' with the use of the article but it is implied rather than explicit. <p>0 marks – No or incorrect answer.</p>
--	-----------------	--

3. **Explain how** this article relates to the social area of psychology. **Support** your answer with evidence from the article. (4)

Mark Scheme

<p>Explain how this article relates to the social area of psychology. Support your answer with evidence from the article.</p> <p><u>Likely answers:</u></p> <p><u>Social area:</u> The social area holds that the thoughts, feelings and behaviours of individuals are influenced by the actual, imagined or implied presence of others (1) Good understanding</p> <p>The social area looks at how people interact with one another and how their behaviour can be influenced by others. (1) Good understanding</p> <p>The social area looks at how people communicate with each other, how they interact and how they behave in groups (1) It therefore looks at the behaviour of the individual within a context of interrelationships with others. (1) Developed understanding</p> <p><u>Possible links to article:</u></p> <p>There were a large number of bystanders on the subway when the man fell (what) and none of the American bystanders helped (who)</p> <p>On the platform in New York a young man had an epileptic seizure and rolled on to the track' (what) This led Carlos to demonstrate altruistic behaviour (who)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other appropriate explanations and links to article should be credited. 	<p>4</p>	<p>2 marks for a clear and accurate explanation showing a developed understanding of the social area</p> <p>1 mark for an explanation showing a good understanding of the social area</p> <p><i>Plus</i></p> <p>2 marks clear and relevant link using supporting evidence of why the article could be placed in the social area (what and who).</p> <p>1 mark for a weak but relevant link using supporting evidence of why the article could be placed in the social area (who or what)</p> <p>0 marks – No creditworthy information.</p>
--	-----------------	---

4. **Outline** the results from Piliavin et al.'s (1969) Subway Samaritan study and **briefly explain how** these results may relate to the article. **Support** your answer with evidence from the article. (7)

Mark Scheme

<p>Outline the results from Piliavin et al.'s (1969) Subway Samaritan study and briefly explain how these results may relate to the article. Support your answer with evidence from the article.</p> <p>The cane victim received spontaneous help 95% of the time (62/65 trials) The drunk victim received spontaneous help 50% of the time (19/38 trials). White victims received spontaneous help 100% / Black victims spontaneous help 86% In all but 3 cane trials the victim received help before the model stepped in, Less spontaneous help was given in drunk condition/more spontaneous help was given in cane condition Median time for help in non-model trials was 5 seconds for cane and 109 seconds for drunk Results differed between teams of models and victims In 60% of (81) cane trials the victim received help from more than one person (no difference in race or drunk/ill victims) 90% of first helpers were males (60% of those in CA were male) 64% of first helpers were white Slight same race helping: 68% of spontaneous helper with white victims were white/ 50% of spontaneous helpers of black victims were white In drunk condition mostly black people helped the black victim. The early model elicited more help (9 times) than the later model (3) The critical area model elicited the same as the adjacent area model No one left the car on any trial On 21 of 103 trials (22%) someone left the critical area No diffusion of responsibility was found, response times were faster with larger groups. People left the area in a higher proportion of drunk trials than cane trials People were more likely to leave area if help not given before 70 seconds Slightly more people left the area with the black victim than white victim</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examples of comments (mostly from women): 'It's for men to help him', 'I wish I could help him—I'm not strong enough', 'I never saw this kind of thing before—I don't know where to look'. You feel so bad that you don't know what to do • More comments from passengers in the drunk than the cane trials. • More comments were made if no help was given within 70 seconds. <p><i>Links to article:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individuals are often willing to help those they see in need of help, regardless of race or colour. Carlos Ramirez was a white man who put himself at tremendous risk as he tried to save a young black man who fell on the train track. (links to results about race) • Spontaneous help was seen in the article as Carlos 'impulsively jumped down to save the young man', (links to results about spontaneous help found) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other appropriate results /links to the article should be credited. 	<p>7</p>	<p><u>For the outline of the results of Piliavin al.'s study:</u></p> <p>5 marks – For an accurate outline of at least 5 different results or up to 3 results (2 elaborated)</p> <p>4 marks – For an accurate outline of at least 4 different results (or 2 elaborated)</p> <p>3 marks - For an accurate outline of at least 3 different results (or two results with one elaborated)</p> <p>2 marks - For an accurate outline of at least 2 different results or one elaborated result</p> <p>1 mark - For an accurate outline of at least one result</p> <p>0 marks – no creditworthy response.</p> <p>PLUS</p> <p><u>For application to the article:</u></p> <p>2 marks - For a relevant link which is clearly, if briefly explained.</p> <p>1 mark - For a relevant link which is briefly explained</p> <p>0 marks – no creditworthy response.</p> <p>NB. Exact quantitative findings are not required if suitable descriptions of the findings are given.</p>
---	----------	--

5. (a) Using your psychological knowledge, suggest and explain at least two ways in which individuals may be encouraged to help others from diverse social and cultural backgrounds. (8)

Mark Scheme

<p>Using your psychological knowledge, suggest and explain at least two ways in which individuals may be encouraged to help others from diverse social and cultural backgrounds.</p> <p><u>Likely suggestions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of positive reinforcement (rewards)/a token economy, e.g., medals, certificates, tokens to show helping others from diverse social and cultural backgrounds acceptable • Vicarious reinforcement, e.g., adverts/websites, TV programmes, books, etc showing how individuals may be encouraged to help others from diverse social and cultural backgrounds. • Use of observational learning/modelling, e.g., using popular celebrities and characters to show how individuals may be encouraged to help others from diverse social and cultural backgrounds. • Punishment, e.g., punishing individuals/children who fail to give help to others from diverse social and cultural backgrounds., e.g. fine those who don't help, prevent play times, deny those who don't help going on school/works trips, etc. • CBT/changing attitudes/schemas, e.g., individuals see that the benefits of being helping those from diverse social and cultural backgrounds outweigh the costs. • Other appropriate suggestions based on psychological knowledge should be credited. 	<p>8</p>	<p>7-8 marks - A good standard of knowledge and understanding of what could be done/methods to encourage individuals to help others from diverse social and cultural backgrounds (<i>what</i>). There is very effective application of psychological knowledge within these suggestions to explain the purpose of the suggestions (<i>why</i>). The suggestions are largely accurate and several details have been included about how they could be implemented and developed (<i>how</i>). At least two suggestions are covered.</p> <p>5-6 marks - A reasonable standard of knowledge and understanding of what could be done/methods to encourage individuals to help others from diverse social and cultural backgrounds (<i>what</i>). There is effective application of psychological knowledge within these suggestions to explain the purpose of the suggestions (<i>why</i>). The suggestions are mostly accurate and some vague details have been included about how they could be implemented and developed (<i>how</i>). Two suggestions are covered.</p> <p>3-4 marks – A limited knowledge and understanding of what could be done/methods to encourage individuals to help others from diverse social and cultural backgrounds (<i>what</i>). There is some application of psychological knowledge within these suggestions to explain the purpose of the suggestions (<i>why</i>). This may be implicit rather than explicit. The suggestions are somewhat vague and lack in detail relation to how they might be implemented (<i>how</i>).</p> <p>1-2 marks – A basic knowledge and understanding of what could be done/methods to encourage individuals to help others from diverse social and cultural backgrounds (<i>what</i>). There is weak application of psychological knowledge within these suggestions, possibly with little or no information relating to either the (<i>why</i>) or the (<i>how</i>). The suggestions will have limited accuracy.</p> <p>0 marks – No creditworthy information.</p> <p>N.B. To reach the top two bands the candidate must refer to the <i>what, how and why</i> aspects of any suggestions. If only <u>one</u> suggestion is made then a maximum of 4 marks to be awarded. Award marks in line with the descriptors above.</p>
--	-----------------	--

(b) Evaluate the suggestions you have made in part (a) using your knowledge of psychology. (10)

Mark Scheme

<p>Evaluate the suggestions you have made in part (e) using your knowledge of psychology.</p> <p>Evaluation might refer to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Usefulness (including practicality, funding issues, effectiveness, appropriateness). • Ecological validity/validity. • Reliability. • Ethics. • Social sensitivity. • Scientific methodology. • Nature/nurture. • Freewill/determinism. • Individual/situational. • Other appropriate issues should be considered and credited accordingly. 	<p>10</p>	<p>GOOD 9-10 marks for demonstrating good evaluation that is relevant to the demand of the question. The arguments are coherently presented with clear understanding of the points raised. A range of appropriate evaluation points are considered. The evaluation points are in context and supported by relevant evidence of the description given in 10e. More than one suggestion is evaluated.</p> <p>REASONABLE 6-8 marks for demonstrating reasonable evaluation that is mainly relevant to the demand of the question. The arguments coherently presented in the main with reasonable understanding of the points raised. A range of appropriate evaluation points are considered. The evaluation points are mainly in context and supported by relevant evidence of the description given in 10e.</p> <p>LIMITED 3-5 marks for demonstrating limited evaluation that is sometimes relevant to the demand of the question. The arguments may lack clear structure/organisation and show limited understanding of the points raised. The evaluation points are occasionally in context and supported by relevant evidence of the description given in 10e.</p> <p>BASIC 1-2 marks for demonstrating basic evaluation that is rarely relevant to the demand of the question. Any arguments lack clear structure/organisation and show a very basic understanding of the points raised. The evaluation points are not necessarily in context and are not supported by relevant evidence of the description given in 10e.</p> <p>0 marks – No creditworthy response.</p> <p>N.B.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If only one suggestion is evaluated then a maximum of 6 marks to be awarded. If only one evaluation point is made but is done well it can achieve a maximum of 4 marks. Award marks in line with the descriptors. • Make sure points credited in 10(e) are not double-credited in this question part, e.g. double-crediting the purpose of the suggested improvement. • Make sure evaluation points refer to improvements that have been suggested in 10(e), i.e. are not new suggestions which the candidate then evaluates.
---	------------------	--

