

**Psychology**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

Unit **G542**: Core Studies

**Mark Scheme for January 2012**

---

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, OCR Nationals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support, which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the report on the examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme.

© OCR 2012

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications  
PO Box 5050  
Annesley  
NOTTINGHAM  
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622  
Facsimile: 01223 552610  
E-mail: [publications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:publications@ocr.org.uk)

Annotations used in the detailed Mark Scheme (to include abbreviations and subject-specific conventions)

Annotation	Meaning
	Unclear
	Benefit of Doubt
	Cross
	Example / Reference
	Evaluation
	Extendable Horizontal wavy line
	Not answered question
	Tick
	Vague
	Omission Mark
	Left Bracket
	Right Bracket
	Irrelevant
	Slash

**Generic guidance for Section A**

Responses to all questions should relate to the study referred to in the question.

Accuracy of the responses should be checked by referencing the original version of the named study.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	<p>Most likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The mean estimate for participants in the 'smashed' condition was 10.46 mph.</li> <li>• The mean estimate for participants in the 'hit' condition was 8.00 mph.</li> <li>• Participants in the 'smashed' condition gave a higher speed mean speed estimate (10.46 mph) than participants in the 'hit' condition (8.00 mph).</li> <li>• 16/50(32%) participants in the 'smashed' condition / 7/50 (16%) participants in the 'hit' condition / 6/50(12%) participants in the control condition said, "Yes" in response to the question, "Did you see any broken glass" <b>OR</b> 34/50 participants in the 'smashed' condition / 43/50 participants in the 'hit' condition / 44/50 participants <u>in</u> the control condition said, "No" in response to the question,. "Did you see any broken glass?"</li> <li>• More participants from the 'smashed' condition (16) than either the 'hit' (7) or 'control' (6) condition said, "Yes" in response to the question, "Did you see any broken glass?" <b>OR</b> more participants in both the 'control' (44) and 'hit' (43) conditions than the 'smashed' (34) condition said, "No" in response to the question, "Did you see any broken glass?"</li> <li>• Overall more participants (121) said, "No" than, "Yes" (29) to the question, "Did you see any broken glass?"</li> <li>• Other appropriate answer relating to the results listed in the original study.</li> </ul>	2+2 4	<p>This question requires candidates to give results not conclusions.</p> <p>Mph need not be quoted here as the question says 'outline'.</p> <p>Verbs need to be correct.</p> <p>Each condition (smashed, hit, control) can be counted as a separate result BUT if results for the "Yes" condition have been given, responses to the "No" condition cannot be credited and vice versa.</p> <p>Participant numbers need not be quoted.</p> <p>If results for the, "Yes" condition have been given, responses to the, "No" condition cannot be credited and vice versa. If a comparison is made, at least two groups must be referred to..</p> <p>Numbers need not be quoted.</p>

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
		<p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer e.g. findings from Experiment 1.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer e.g. speed estimates given by participants in the ‘smashed’ condition were higher / more participants in the ‘smashed’ condition said, “Yes” to the question about broken glass i.e. no comparison made.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b>- Accurate outline of a finding from Experiment 2, as suggested above.</p>		
2		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Each utterance was classified when it occurred firstly as correct or incorrect and secondly as spontaneous, imitated or structured.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Some creditworthy information e.g. incorrect i.e. identification of category only.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – Partial or vague answer e.g. classified as correct or incorrect / classified as spontaneous / imitated or structured i.e. description of one stage only.</p> <p><b>3 marks</b> – A more accurate description of the process with reference made to both stages.</p> <p><b>4 marks</b> – Clear, accurate description of how utterances were classified, including both stages, as outlined above.</p>	4	This classification can be found on page 216 of the original study.
3	(a)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IV = The three different groups of participants: those with Asperger’s syndrome, those with Tourette’s syndrome, ‘normal’ individuals.</li> <li>DV = Performance on the Eyes Task.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer e.g. only one variable identified.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – Both variables correctly identified, as outlined above.</p>	1+1 2	To gain 1 mark for the IV, all 3 groups of participants must be identified.

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
	(b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A quasi experiment is where the IV occurs naturally, it cannot be manipulated by the researcher. Here Baron-Cohen could not manipulate whether participants were 'normal', had autism/AS or had TS – they were pre-existing conditions.</li> <li>Other appropriate answer. (which may refer to other conditions of a 'true' experiment not fulfilled here)</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.  <b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer e.g. participants were naturally 'normal', autistic/AS or TS; the IV could not be manipulated; explanation of a quasi experiment not contextualised.  <b>2 marks</b> – A clear, accurate description of why the study is a quasi experiment, fully contextualised, as outlined above.</p>	2	Candidates much refer to either the IV in relation to naturally occurring variables and/ or manipulation
4		<p>Most likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Piagetian two-question conservation task may be at least partly due to being asked the same question twice, rather than because they cannot conserve.</li> <li>Children's age increased, it was concluded that the ability to conserve increases with age.</li> <li>It was concluded that the ability to conserve number develops before the ability to conserve volume.</li> <li>Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer e.g results  <b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer e.g. Piaget's methodology was flawed/ limited  <b>2 marks</b> – A clear, accurate conclusion is outlined in the context of this study, as outlined above.</p>	2+2 4	.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5	<p>Most likely answer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (Freud suggested that Hans'fear of horses symbolised his fear of his father) Because Hans was subconsciously experiencing the Oedipus complex so nourished jealous and hostile wishes against his father. This fear was transposed onto horses because the black on horses' mouths and the things in front of their eyes (blinkers) resembled his father's moustache and eyeglasses.</li> <li>• Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><b>1 - 2 marks</b> – Partial or vague answer e.g. because the black on horses' mouths and the blinkers in front of their eyes resembled his father's moustache and glasses.</p> <p><b>3 - 4 marks</b> – An increasingly accurate explanation with a good description of how horses resembled his father, linked to aspects of the Oedipus Complex, such as the explanation outlined above.</p>	4	A theoretical explanation appropriately contextualised is also creditworthy.
6	<p>(a)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An aggressive model male.</li> <li>• An aggressive model female.</li> <li>• A non-aggressive model male.</li> <li>• A non-aggressive model female.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer e.g. the control group, the group that did not observe a model, the aggressive model condition, the non-aggressive model condition.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – For each correctly identified experimental group.</p>	1+1 2	<p><i>If candidates refer to any of the following they should be credited:</i></p> <p>(1) <i>The aggressive girls' condition</i>  (2) <i>The aggressive boys' condition</i>  (3) <i>The non-aggressive girls' condition</i>  (4) <i>The non-aggressive boys' condition</i></p> <p><i>The following suggestions are not creditworthy as they could refer to any study i.e. do not contextualise the experimental group which is required as each identified experimental group can only gain 1 mark</i></p>

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Males watching a male (role )model</i></li> <li>• <i>Females watching a female (role )model</i></li> <li>• <i>Males watching a female (role )model</i></li> <li>• <i>Females watching a male (role )model</i></li> </ul>
	(b)	<p>Most Likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (Overall) boys showed more (imitative) aggression than girls.</li> <li>• Girls showed more (imitative) verbal aggression than boys when they had witnessed a female model.</li> <li>• (Overall) boys showed more mallet aggression than girls.</li> <li>• (Overall) boys punched the bobo doll more than girls.</li> <li>• (Overall) boys showed more aggressive gun play than girls.</li> <li>• Children in the aggressive condition demonstrated more aggressive behaviour than children in the non-aggressive condition</li> <li>• Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.  <b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer e.g. in the aggressive condition boys showed more aggressive gun play.  <b>2 marks</b> – A clear, accurate finding, as outlined above.</p>	2	<p>Other answers should be checked for accuracy against the original study.</p> <p><i>To gain 2 marks the answer must be fully contextualised</i></p>	

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
7	(a)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Technique 1</u>: Voxel-based morphometry / VBM.</li> <li>• <u>Technique 2</u>: Pixel counting.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.  <b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer e.g. mere identification of one technique.  <b>2 marks</b> – Both techniques correctly identified</p>	1+1 2	
	(b)	<p>Most likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The volume of grey matter in the posterior hippocampus was greater in taxi drivers than non-taxi drivers.</li> <li>• The volume of grey matter in the anterior hippocampus was greater in non-taxi drivers than taxi drivers.</li> <li>• Other appropriate answers</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answers.  <b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer e.g. the volume of grey matter in the posterior hippocampus was greater in taxi drivers i.e. no comparison made.  <b>2 marks</b> – A clear, accurate difference is outlined, as suggested above.</p>	2	Reference must be made to the posterior or anterior hippocampus as the overall volume of the hippocampus was the same.
8		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The participant, with one eye covered, centred his/her gaze on a designated fixation point on an upright translucent screen. The visual stimuli on 35-millimetre transparencies were arranged in a standard projector equipped with a shutter and were then back-projected at 1/10 of a second or less – too fast for eye movements to get the material into the other visual field – to either the right or left of the central fixation point.</li> </ul>	4	Candidates are only required to explain how visual information was presented to participants, they are not expected to explain what participants could/could not do once they had received the visual stimuli.

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Other appropriate descriptions.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer e.g. below the screen was a gap so the participants could reach objects but not see his/her hands.  <b>1 mark</b> – Some creditworthy material e.g. participants had to gaze at a screen.  <b>2 marks</b> – Partial or vague answer e.g. participants had to gaze at a screen onto which visual stimuli were projected at a very fast speed.  <b>3 marks</b> – A more accurate description with some details missing e.g. participants had one eye covered and had to gaze at a screen on which visual stimuli were projected at a very fast speed – too fast for eye movements to get the material into the wrong visual field.  <b>4 marks</b> – A clear, accurate description, as outlined above, including at most of the following features: one eye covered/centred gaze on a designated fixation point/visual stimuli projected onto a screen at a very fast speed /too fast for eye movements to get the material into the wrong visual field/projected to either right or left of the central fixation point.</p>		
9	(a)	<p>Any two from:</p> <p>9 (adults) / 7 male / 2 female / all from USA ..</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.  <b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer i.e. only one feature of the sample identified e.g. 9 (adults) / all from USA.  <b>2 marks</b> – Two features correctly identified e.g. 7 males, 2 females.</p>	2	
	(b)	<p>Most likely answers will refer to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sample size too small (9) so can't draw any meaningful conclusions ..</li> </ul>	2	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sample all from America, so can't generalise the findings to the wider population.</li> <li>• Sample gender biased (7 males, 2 females ), so can't generalise to both genders – females may show different patterns.</li> <li>• Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Appropriate weakness merely identified e.g. small sample; or identified with implication but not linked to the study e.g. small sample so can't generalise.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – Appropriate weakness identified, implication drawn and answer contextualised e.g. small sample(9)so can't generalise.</p>		<p>If the weakness is identified or identified with its implication drawn but not contextualised, no more than 1 mark can be awarded.</p>
10	<p>Most likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The location of the study at a prestigious university (Yale) provided authority.</li> <li>• Participants assumed the experimenter knew what he was doing, so his instructions should be followed.</li> <li>• Participants believed the learner had also voluntarily consented to take part so the situation was 'fair'.</li> <li>• The participant did not want to disrupt the experiment as he felt under obligation to the experimenter due to his voluntary consent to participate.</li> <li>• The participant's sense of obligation was reinforced because he had been paid to take part.</li> <li>• Participants believed the role of the learner was determined by chance, so roles could easily have been reversed.</li> <li>• It was a novel situation for the participant who</li> </ul>	<p>2+2 4</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>therefore had no previous experience on which to base his behaviour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The participant was told the shocks were not harmful and that the scientific gains were important.</li> <li>• There was no obvious point at which participants could stop administering electric shocks because each shock was only a small amount more than the previous one, so they continued.</li> <li>• Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.  <b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer e.g. the study was conducted at a prestigious university, the participant had been paid, it was a novel situation for the participant.  <b>2 marks</b> – A clear, accurate outline of a suggestion elaborated in context, as outlined above.</p>		<p>The suggestion must be one of those made by Milgram and reported in the original study.</p> <p>To gain full marks the suggestion must be elaborated.</p>
11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Applicants went through three phases of screening. First, they completed a battery of psychometric tests that measured both social variables (authoritarianism, social dominance, modern racism) and clinical variables (depression, anxiety, social isolation, paranoia, aggressiveness, demotivation, self-esteem, self-harm, drug dependence). Secondly, they underwent a full weekend assessment by independent clinical psychologists. Third, medical and character references were obtained, and police checks were conducted.</li> <li>• Other appropriate description.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer e.g. reference to ethics.</p> <p><b>1 – 2 marks</b> –Vague or partial answer i.e. EITHER a description of one phase only OR mere identification of</p>	4	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>two or more aspects e.g. they completed psychometric tests, they underwent a weekend assessment.</p> <p><b>3 - 4 marks</b> – An increasingly accurate and detailed description of the screening phases such as the one outlined above.</p>		
12	<p>Most likely answer will refer to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The victim was either drunk – smelled of alcohol and carried a bottle wrapped in a brown paper bag – or lame – appeared sober and carried a black cane. On the train, the victim stood next to a pole in the centre of the critical area. Approximately 70 seconds after departure, the victim staggered forward and collapsed. Until receiving help, the victim remained supine on the floor looking at the ceiling. (If the victim received no assistance by the time the train slowed to a stop, the model helped him to his feet).</li> <li>• Other appropriate description.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer e.g. outline of the procedure in relation to either the model or the observers.  <b>1 mark</b> – Some creditworthy information e.g. the victim collapsed in the centre of the carriage / the victim was either drunk or lame.  <b>2 marks</b> – Partial or vague answer e.g. the victim was either lame or drunk and collapsed in the centre of a train carriage.  <b>3 marks</b> – A more accurate description of the procedure with some details omitted e.g. the victim was either lame or drunk. He stood next to a pole in the critical area and once the train had started collapsed on the floor.  <b>4 marks</b> – A clear, accurate outline of the procedure which contains most of the features identified above.</p>	4	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
13	<p>Most likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Normal note taking was interpreted as a behavioural manifestation of being psychologically disturbed and was noted by staff as, 'patient engages in writing behaviour'.</li> <li>• A pseudopatient found pacing the corridors because he was bored was asked by a nurse if he was nervous.</li> <li>• If a patient was upset by staff it was assumed that the upset derived from his pathology and not from the interactions with staff members.</li> <li>• Patients found sitting outside the cafeteria half an hour before lunchtime were considered to have oral acquisitive syndrome.</li> <li>• Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer e.g. reference to hearing voices (this occurred before pseudopatients were designated abnormal), reference to being released with 'schizophrenia in remission'.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer e.g. writing behaviour, oral acquisitive syndrome.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – A clear, accurate and elaborated description of an appropriate piece of evidence, as outlined above.</p>	2+2 4	
14	(a)	1+1 2	

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EEG test</li> <li>• Interviews with others</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer e.g. interviews with Eve  <b>1 mark</b> – Correct identification of one of the methods listed above.  <b>2 marks</b> – Correct identification of two of the methods listed above.</p>		
	(b)	<p>One from the following most likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questions may be misinterpreted by the participant.</li> <li>• Responses may be misinterpreted intentionally / unintentionally by the researcher(s).</li> <li>• If closed questions are used people may be forced to give inaccurate responses.</li> <li>• If open questions are used, responses are hard to analyse.</li> <li>• Responses may be influenced by social desirability.</li> <li>• Participant may respond to demand characteristics.</li> <li>• Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.  <b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer e.g. mere identification of an appropriate limitation e.g. social desirability response, demand characteristics, outlined not contextualised.  <b>2 marks</b> – A clear outline of an appropriate limitation of the self-report method, clearly linked to the study.</p>	2	If the limitation is not contextualised, no more than 1 mark can be awarded.
15	(a)	<p>Most likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The study used real RGs and NRGs, so the IV occurred naturally.</li> <li>• The study was conducted in a real amusement arcade, in a natural environment</li> </ul>	2	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participants used real gambling/fruit machines (Fruitskill),</li> <li>• Participants gambled with real/genuine money.</li> <li>• Other appropriate answer.</li> <li>• <b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</li> </ul> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer e.g used money, in an arcade.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – A clearly contextualised outline of how the study was high in EV, as outlined above.</p>		<p>If candidates uses 'casino' as an integral part of the answer then the answer cannot gain any marks e.g. the study was conducted in a real casino</p>
(b)	<p>Most likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participants were given the £3 to gamble with, they did not have to use their own money.</li> <li>• Participants were asked to either think aloud/not think aloud which may have required them to behave in an unnatural way.</li> <li>• All participants were asked to gamble on the 'Fruitskill' / same machine whereas in real life they may have preferred an alternative machine.</li> <li>• Participants in the thinking aloud condition had their verbalisations recorded using a lapel microphone (connected to a portable tape recorder), not something one normally does.</li> <li>• Other appropriate answer. Eg subjective, bias, selective</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer e.g. used microphones, had to think aloud i.e. feature merely identified, not outlined/elaborated/fully contextualised.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – A clearly contextualised outline of how the study was low in EV, as outlined above.</p>	2	
	Section A total	60	

**Generic guidance for Section B**

Responses to all parts of this question must be clearly and accurately related to the chosen study.

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
16	(a)	<p>Most likely answers:</p> <p><u>Milgram</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To investigate the process of obedience, to demonstrate the power of a legitimate authority even when the command requires destructive behaviour.</li> <li>• To investigate whether participants would show obedience to an authority figure who told them to administer electric shocks to another person.</li> <li>• Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p><u>Griffiths</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To increase understanding of the cognitive processes and behaviour of persistent fruit machine gamblers.</li> <li>• To examine a number of factors and variables in the cognitive psychology of gambling.</li> <li>• To examine the thought processes and behaviours of regular and non-regular gamblers.</li> <li>• To compare the behaviour of regular and non-regular fruit machine gamblers.</li> <li>• Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p><u>Bandura</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To investigate whether behaviours learnt by children by imitation in one setting could be repeated in a different setting even when the adult model was not present.</li> <li>• To see whether children would imitate aggressive behaviour when given the opportunity, even if they</li> </ul>	2	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>saw the behaviours in a different setting and the original model was no longer present.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer e.g. statement of an hypothesis such as ‘children will imitate same-sex models more than opposite-sex models’.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer i.e. aim has no elaboration and/or is not fully contextualised e.g. Milgram – to investigate obedience; Griffiths – to investigate gambling behaviour; Bandura – to investigate the mechanisms of social learning theory.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – Outline of the aim is clear and fully contextualised, as outlined above.</p>		
(b)	<p><u>The description of the sample may include the following:</u></p> <p><u>Milgram</u> 40 males, between the ages of 20 and 50, with a range of occupations and backgrounds, drawn from New Haven and the surrounding communities/from USA.</p> <p><u>Griffiths</u> 60 participants - 44 males, 16 females, mean age 23.4. Half were regular gamblers – 29 males, 1 female, mean age 21.6 years; and half were non-regular gamblers – 15 males, 15 females, mean age 25.3 years. All from Devon/UK.</p> <p><u>Bandura</u> 72 children – 36 boys, 36 girls, enrolled in the (Stanford University) Nursery School. They ranged in age from 37 to 69 months, with a mean age of 52 months.</p>	3+3 6	<p><i>This requires more than a mere identification of features the sample so examiners should read the whole description and award marks dependant on the quality of the response</i></p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Sample identified, with little or no elaboration e.g. Milgram – 40 males/ Griffiths – 60 RG and NRG/ Bandura – 72 children</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – Description of selected sample is basic and lacks detail. Some understanding is evident though expression is poor e.g. Milgram – 40 males between the ages of 20 and 50, Griffiths – 60 regular and non regular; 44 males, 16 females, Bandura – 72 children, 36 boys and 36 girls</p> <p><b>3 marks</b> - Description of selected sample is accurate, elaborated. Understanding is good and may include reference to numbers, ages, genders, target population etc</p> <p><u>Advantage</u></p> <p>Most likely answers will refer to:</p> <p><u>Milgram</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ethnocentric (all Americans) which allowed for direct comparison with Germans so he could test the ‘Germans are different hypothesis’.</li> <li>• Sample included men from a range of occupations and educational backgrounds so was likely to be representative of the target population so findings in relation to obedience were generalisable.</li> <li>• All were volunteers, recruited via a newspaper advert and direct mailings, so were willing to participate fully and co-operatively in the study.</li> <li>• Other appropriate answer</li> </ul> <p><u>Griffiths</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Although there were 29 regular male gamblers but only 1 regular female gambler, this could be</li> </ul>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>considered a representative sample because fruit machine gambling is very male dominated. Results could therefore be generalised to the gambling population as a whole.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All participants were volunteers, recruited via small poster adverts or a regular gambler known to Griffiths, so were willing to participate fully and cooperatively in the study.</li> <li>• Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p><u>Bandura</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Equal number of boys (36) and girls (36) so the sample was representative of both genders and results in relation to learning aggression from adult models could be generalised to all (American) children.</li> <li>• Participants were all children which allowed Bandura to show how easily youngsters observe and imitate adult models even if the behaviour modelled is generally considered anti-social (with examples from study).</li> <li>• Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.  <b>1 mark</b> – Peripherally relevant advantage is identified with little or no elaboration, appropriate advantage identified but not contextualised.  <b>2 marks</b> – Appropriate advantage identified but description is basic, lacks detail and is only loosely linked to the chosen study.  <b>3 marks</b> – Appropriate advantage is chosen. The description is accurate, elaborated and fully contextualised, as outlined above.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(c)	<p>Most likely answers:</p> <p><u>Milgram</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participants' reactions to being asked to give increasingly severe electric shocks to another person when they answered a question wrongly were measured through observations by both the experimenter and additional observers which allowed both qualitative and quantitative data to be gathered. (Although the latency and duration of each shock was measured by a timing device) the experimenter and observers watched and noted the highest shock level (between 15 – 450 volts) given by each participant. Most sessions were filmed and occasional photographs were taken through one-way mirrors for the effects of the experimenter's commands to be observed clearly. Notes were taken by the observers of any unusual behaviour that occurred during the experiment and, on occasions they were directed to write objective descriptions of the participants' behaviour.</li> <li>• Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p><u>Griffiths</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data was gathered at all stages and in all conditions of the experiment (thinking aloud RGs, thinking aloud NRGs, non-thinking aloud RGs and non-thinking aloud NRGs) by the researcher (Griffiths) standing nearby. He recorded/noted the total time, in minutes, each participant was on the fruit machine; the total number of gambles; the amount of winnings and the results of every gamble.</li> <li>• Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul>	6	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><u>Bandura</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data was gathered by two observers (the male model and another observer) who watched the final 20 minute session, during which the child could play with a variety of toys including a bobo doll. The observers rated the child's behaviour in terms of pre-determined response categories whilst sitting in an adjoining observation room and watching the child through a one-way mirror. The observers recorded what the child was doing every 5 seconds. Responses were recorded in the following categories and provided an aggression score: imitative aggression responses, partially imitative responses, non-imitative responses.</li> <li>Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.  <b>1-2 marks</b> – Outline is very basic and lacks detail and accuracy (e.g. a couple of general statements are made). Some understanding may be evident. Expression is poor with few, if any psychological terms. Answer is not linked to chosen study e.g. Griffiths – Data was gathered by the researcher standing nearby, watching what participants did and noting down their behaviour.  <b>3-4 marks</b> – Outline is accurate with some details missing. A few fine details may be present and understanding is evident. Expression and use of psychological terminology is reasonable and the answer is linked to the chosen study e.g. Bandura – Data was gathered by two observers watching through a one-way mirror to record the child's behaviour when left alone to play with toys including a bobo doll.  <b>5-6 marks</b> – Outline has increasing accuracy and detail. There are some omissions and <u>detail is appropriate for</u></p>		<p>A maximum of <u>2 marks</u> can be gained if the answer is not linked to the chosen study.</p> <p>Examiners' attention should be drawn to the fact that both participants (children) and researchers used observation in the Bandura study and credit should be given accordingly</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><u>the level and time allowed.</u> Understanding, expression and use of psychological terminology are good. There are clear and appropriate links to the chosen study, as outlined above.</p>		
(d)	<p><b>Strength:</b> Most likely answers will give a generic strength of the observation method supported by appropriate evidence from the chosen study.</p> <p>Generic strengths include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One is able to capture spontaneous and unexpected behaviour.</li> <li>• If the participant is not aware they are being observed they will not respond to demand characteristics and so show natural behaviour.</li> <li>• If the participant is not aware they are being observed they will not behave in a socially desirable way but in a natural way.</li> <li>• Observations in natural environments have high ecological validity so represent real life.</li> <li>• Observations can produce 'rich' qualitative and/or quantitative data which gives a lot of detail.</li> <li>• Other appropriate strength supported by appropriate example from chosen study.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.  <b>1 mark</b> – Peripherally relevant strength is identified, not linked to the chosen study and with little or no elaboration e.g. observations where participants do not know they are being watched have low demand characteristics.  <b>2 marks</b> – An appropriate strength is explained but is basic and lacks detail. A vague/weak link is made to the chosen study showing some understanding e.g. observations can capture spontaneous and unexpected</p>	3+3 6	<p>NB: no more the <u>1 mark</u> for the strength if it is not linked to the chosen study.</p> <p>Likewise, no more than <u>1 mark</u> can be gained if the weakness is not linked to the chosen study.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>behaviour as shown in Milgram's study where participants got upset because they did not want to do what they were asked.</p> <p><b>3 marks</b> – An appropriate strength is accurately explained and elaborated. There is a clear, developed link to the chosen study showing good understanding e.g. observations can gather rich qualitative and quantitative data giving a good insight into a situation. For example, in Milgram's study observers were able to record quantitative data in reference to how high up the voltage scale participants were prepared to go in order to obey the authority figure. They were also able to collect rich qualitative data such as when participants showed signs of extreme tension by sweating, stuttering, laughing etc.</p> <p><u>Weakness:</u></p> <p>Most likely answers will give a generic weakness of the observation method supported by appropriate evidence from the chosen study.</p> <p>Generic weaknesses include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Observers may 'see' what they expect/want to see/observer bias making the validity of the findings questionable.</li> <li>• If the participant knows they are being observed they behave in a way they think the researchers want them to behave/respond to demand characteristics so they will not show genuine behaviour.</li> <li>• If the participant knows they are being observed they respond in a socially desirable way rather than showing their preferred behaviour.</li> <li>• Observers may unintentionally misinterpret</li> </ul>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>behaviour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Other appropriate weakness supported by relevant example from chosen study.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.  <b>1 mark</b> – Peripherally relevant weakness is identified, not linked to the chosen study and with little or no elaboration e.g. observations are open to observer bias because researchers see what they want to see making the validity of the findings questionable.  <b>2 marks</b> – An appropriate weakness is explained but is basic and lacks detail. A vague/weak link is made to the chosen study showing some understanding e.g. If a participant knows they are being observed they may respond in a socially desirable way and not behave naturally. For example in Griffiths participants may not have said what they were really thinking because they knew it was wrong.  <b>3 marks</b> – An appropriate weakness is accurately explained and elaborated. There is a clear, developed link to the chosen study showing good understanding e.g. if the participant knows they are being observed they may behave in a way they think the researcher wants them to so their behaviour is not natural and results may not be reliable or valid. For example, the participants in Milgram’s study knew the experimenter was watching them so they may have responded to demand characteristics by giving higher electric shocks than they would naturally have done because they had worked out the purpose of the study.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(e)	<p>Most likely answers will refer to:</p> <p><u>Milgram</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All 40 participants (100%) gave shocks up to 300 volts.</li> <li>• 26/40 participants (65%) went all the way to 450 volts and were considered obedient. 14 participants were therefore considered disobedient.</li> <li>• Many participants showed signs of nervousness.</li> <li>• Participants were observed to sweat, tremble, stutter, bit their lips, groan and dig their fingernails into their flesh.</li> <li>• One sign of tension was the regular occurrence of nervous laughing fits.</li> <li>• Full blown uncontrollable seizures were observed for 3 participants, in one case so violent that the study had to be stopped.</li> <li>• Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p><u>Griffiths</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RGs had a playing rate of 8 gambles per minute.</li> <li>• NRGs had a playing rate of 6 gambles per minute.</li> <li>• 14 RGs managed to 'break even' in their 60 gambles.</li> <li>• 7 NRGs 'broke even' in their 60 gambles.</li> <li>• 10 RGs stayed on the machine until they lost all their money.</li> <li>• 2 NRGs stayed on the machine until they lost all their money.</li> <li>• RGs who 'thought aloud' had a lower win rate in number of gambles than NRGs who 'thought aloud'.</li> <li>• RGs made significantly more irrational</li> </ul>	6	<p>Examiner information: The following is unlikely to be included but just in case -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5 participants stopped at 300 volts, 4 at 315 volts, 2 at 330 volts, 1 at 345 volts, 1 at 360 volts and 1 at 375 volts.</li> </ul>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>verbalisations (14%) than NRGs (2.5%).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p><u>Bandura</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Children who saw an aggressive model reproduced more aggressive acts resembling the acts of the model <u>than</u> all the other children / <u>than</u> those who observed a non-aggressive model or no model at all.</li> <li>• Children who saw the aggressive model showed more partial imitation of the role model or non-imitative physical and verbal aggression <u>than</u> those who saw the non-aggressive or no model.</li> <li>• Children who saw the non-aggressive model showed low levels of aggression though they were not significantly lower <u>than</u> the group that had no model.</li> <li>• Boys imitated male role models more <u>than</u> girls for physical and verbal imitative aggression, non-imitative aggression and gun play.</li> <li>• Girls imitated female models more <u>than</u> boys for verbal aggression.</li> <li>• Overall boys showed more imitative aggression <u>than</u> girls.</li> <li>• Overall boys showed more imitative aggression <u>than</u> girls, <u>except</u> when they saw an aggressive female model.</li> <li>• Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.  <b>1-2 marks</b> – Outline of findings is very basic and lacks detail and accuracy (e.g. some general statements are identified). Some understanding may be evident. Expression is poor with few, if any, psychological terms. No fine details have been included. The answer is not</p>		<p>A maximum of <u>2 marks</u> can be gained if only one finding is considered and/or the answer is not linked to the</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>linked to the chosen study e.g. boys were generally more aggressive than girls, boys were more physically aggressive than girls who were more verbally aggressive (2 general statements).</p> <p><b>3-4 marks</b> – Outline is accurate. Fine details are occasionally present and understanding is evident. Expression and use of psychological terminology is reasonable and the answer is linked to the chosen study e.g. RGs had a faster playing rate at 8 gambles per minute than NRGs whose rate was 6 gambles per minute. More RGs than NRGs stayed on the machine until they lost all their money. RGs made more irrational verbalisations than NRGs.</p> <p><b>5-6 marks</b> – Outline has increasing accuracy and detail with several fine details included. Detail is appropriate for the level and time allowed. Understanding, expression and use of psychological terminology is good. There are clear and appropriate links to the chosen study, as outlined above.</p>		chosen study.
(f)	<p><u>Changes:</u></p> <p>Answers are likely to refer to ways of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improving ecological validity.</li> <li>• Reducing the chance that demand characteristics will influence results.</li> <li>• Reducing the chance that socially desirable behaviour will influence results.</li> <li>• Improving ethical issues.</li> <li>• Improving the sample.</li> <li>• Improving how the sample was gathered.</li> <li>• Improving aspects of the method.</li> <li>• Other appropriate suggestions should be considered` and accepted.</li> </ul>	10	If there is no link to the chosen study, no more than 2 marks can be awarded

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><u>Evaluation of changes:</u></p> <p>Answers are likely to refer to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More natural/realistic behaviour will be recorded.</li> <li>• Improved reliability.</li> <li>• Improved generalisability.</li> <li>• Improved usefulness.</li> <li>• Changes in findings/results.</li> <li>• Advantages/disadvantages of improving ethical issues.</li> <li>• Sampling problems.</li> <li>• Cost and time implications.</li> <li>• Other appropriate suggestions should be considered and accepted.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><b>1-2 marks</b> – Description of change(s) are peripheral to the study. Description is basic and lacks detail. Evaluation may be just discernible. Understanding is limited, the answer is unstructured, muddled, probably list-like and <u>not linked to the chosen study</u>.</p> <p><b>3-4 marks</b> – Description of change(s) is appropriate to the study. Description is basic and lacks details with some understanding, though expression may be limited. Some evaluation may be evident.</p> <p><b>5-6 marks</b> – Description of change(s) is appropriate to the study. Description is reasonable with some understanding though expression may be limited. Some evaluation is evident. There <u>may be an imbalance</u> between description and evaluation.</p>		<p>If there is no attempt at evaluation, no more than 4 marks can be awarded</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><b>7-8 marks</b> - Description of two or more changes is appropriate to the study. Description is detailed with understanding and clear expression. Evaluation is reasonably effective and informed. There <u>may be</u> a balance between description and evaluation. The answer has some structure and organisation.</p> <p><b>9-10 marks</b> - Description of two or more changes is appropriate to the study. Description is detailed with good understanding and clear expression. Evaluation is effective and well informed. There is a good balance between description and evaluation. The answer is competently structured and organised. Answer is mostly grammatically correct with occasional spelling errors.</p>		
	Section B total	36	

**Generic guidance for Section C**

Answers throughout must be clearly linked and referenced to the selected approach.

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
17	(a)	<p><b>THE COGNITIVE APPROACH</b></p> <p>Likely answer:</p> <p>Internal mental processes such as memory, thinking, reasoning, problem-solving and language, are important features influencing human behaviour.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.  <b>1 mark</b> – Assumption is identified. Description is basic and lacks detail. Some understanding may be evident. Expression is generally poor.  <b>2 marks</b> – Description of assumption is accurate. Detail is appropriate and understanding is very good. Fine details may be added. Expression and use of psychological terminology is good.</p>	2	<p>The assumption must be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Linked to the cognitive approach.</li> <li>• Linked to behaviour.</li> </ul> <p><i>It is not necessary for the assumption to be unique to the cognitive approach.</i></p>
	(b)	<p>Likely answer may cover the following content:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The cognitive approach could explain the difficulties experienced by individuals with autism because they seem to have a core cognitive deficit – an impaired theory of mind – which leaves them with social, communicative and imaginative abnormalities. For example, in Baron-Cohen et al's study, adults with autism/AS were significantly less able to cope with the Eyes Task (an advanced test for theory of mind) than either 'normal' adults or adults with TS. Not being able to read emotions from eyes may explain why those with autism have difficulties inferring mental states in other people.</li> <li>• Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul>	4	<p>NB:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A comprehensive generic explanation should be appropriately credited.</li> <li>• Reference to other studies on autism (e.g. Baron-Cohen et al's 'Sally-Anne Test') are also creditworthy.</li> </ul>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.  <b>1-2 marks</b> – Description is generally accurate, but is basic and lacks detail. Some understanding and/or elaboration may be evident. Expression is generally poor.  <b>3-4 marks</b> – Description is accurate. Detail is appropriate and understanding is good. Elaboration (specific detail or example) is evident. Expression and use of psychological terminology is sound.</p>		
(c)	<p><b>Similarity:</b>  E.g. Both Loftus and Palmer and Baron-Cohen used laboratory experiments to investigate how cognitive processes influence behaviour...</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> No or irrelevant answer.  <b>1 mark</b> – Similarity is identified, with little or no elaboration.  <b>2 marks</b> – Description of similarity is basic and lacks detail. Some understanding may be evident. Expression is generally poor.  <b>3 marks</b> – Description of similarity is accurate and has elaboration. Understanding is good.</p> <p><b>Difference:</b>  E.g. Loftus and Palmer used American whereas Savage-Rumbaugh studied pygmy and common chimpanzees...</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> No or irrelevant answer.  <b>1 mark</b> –Difference is identified, with little or no elaboration.  <b>2 marks</b> – Description of difference is basic and lacks detail. Some understanding may be evident. Expression is generally poor.  <b>3 marks</b> – Description of difference is accurate and has elaboration. Understanding is good.</p>	3+3 6	<p>Credit should be given to any appropriate studies that can take the cognitive approach.</p> <p>Guidance for allocating marks:  1 mark –An appropriate similarity / difference between two appropriate studies is merely identified.  2 marks –An appropriate similarity / difference is identified and supported by <u>relevant</u> evidence from <u>one</u> appropriate study.  3 marks – An appropriate similarity / difference is identified and supported by <u>relevant</u> evidence from <u>two</u> appropriate studies.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(d)	<p>Strengths may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It has useful applications</li> <li>• It uses scientific/objective methods which provide accurate unbiased data....</li> <li>• Tend to gather quantitative data which therefore makes it easy to analyse and compare</li> </ul> <p>Weaknesses may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is often over simplistic and ignores the complexity of human functioning...</li> <li>• It is unrealistic and ignores biological influences and the grounding of mental processes...</li> <li>• Usually studied through either laboratory experiments or case studies....</li> <li>• It raises particular ethical issues such as.....</li> </ul> <p><b>1-3 marks</b> – There may be some strengths or weaknesses which are appropriate or peripheral to the question, or there may be an imbalance between the two. Discussion is poor with limited or no understanding. Expression is poor. Analysis is sparse and argument may be just discernible. Sparse or no use of supporting examples.</p> <p><b>4-6 marks</b> – There may be some strengths and weaknesses which are appropriate to the question, or there may be an imbalance between the two. Discussion is reasonable with some understanding though expression may be limited. Analysis is effective sometimes and argument limited. Sparse use of supporting examples.</p> <p><b>7-9 marks</b> – There may be a range of strengths and weaknesses which are appropriate to the question, or there may be an imbalance between the two. Discussion is good with some understanding and good expression. Analysis is reasonably effective and argument is</p>	12	<p>The candidate must make it clear why their suggestion is a strength / weakness e.g. it is often over simplistic/reductionist <u>because it ignores other factors that influence behaviour such as biology and emotions.</u></p> <p>The supporting evidence must actually support the identified strength / weakness i.e. be appropriately contextualised.</p> <p>Study specific answers are not creditworthy.</p> <p>Responses that refer to methodology <b>MUST</b> be directly related to the strengths and weaknesses of the approach. Methodology specific responses are therefore <b>NOT</b> creditworthy.</p> <p><u>Read through the mark bands carefully before allocating marks.</u></p> <p>Responses with only one appropriate strength and one appropriate weakness/ only strengths or only weaknesses can only gain 6 marks</p>

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
		<p>informed. Some use of supporting examples.</p> <p><b>10-12 marks</b> – There is a good range of strengths (2 or more) and weaknesses (2 or more) which are appropriate to the question. There is a good balance between the two. Discussion is detailed with good understanding and clear expression. Analysis is effective and argument well informed. Appropriate use of supporting examples. The answer is competently structured and organised. Answer is mostly grammatically correct with occasional spelling errors.</p>		
18	(a)	<p><b>OR THE PHYSIOLOGICAL APPROACH</b></p> <p>Likely answer:</p> <p>All that is psychological is first physiological – that since the mind appears to reside in the brain, all thoughts, feelings and behaviours ultimately have a physiological cause.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.  <b>1 mark</b> – Assumption is identified. Description is basic and lacks detail. Some understanding may be evident. Expression is generally poor.  <b>2 marks</b> – Description of assumption is accurate. Detail is appropriate and understanding is very good. Fine details may be added. Expression and use of psychological terminology is good.</p>	2	<p>The assumption must be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Linked to the physiological approach.</li> <li>• Linked to behaviour.</li> </ul> <p><i>It is not necessary for the assumption to be unique to the physiological approach.</i></p>
	(b)	<p>Likely answer may cover the following content:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The physiological approach could explain the difficulties experienced by individuals with a ‘split-brain’ because their brains work differently to those of ‘normal’ people. As a result of having their corpus callosum severed, the two hemispheres of the brain</li> </ul>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NB: A comprehensive generic explanation should be appropriately credited.</li> </ul>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>work independently and unlike a 'normal' brain do not transfer information from one side to another. This inability to transfer information means 'split-brain' patients cannot do certain things a 'normal' person can. This was demonstrated in Sperry's study which showed that, if an object was presented to the left visual field which was registered by the right hemisphere of 'split-brain' patients, they were unable to name what they had seen. A 'normal' person would have no difficulty naming the object. This is because the language centre of the brain is in the left hemisphere and in 'split-brain' patients information presented to the right hemisphere cannot be transferred to the left for identification through language.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.  <b>1-2 marks</b> – Description is generally accurate, but is basic and lacks detail. Some understanding and elaboration may be evident. Expression is generally poor.  <b>3-4 marks</b> – Description is accurate. Detail is appropriate and understanding is good. Elaboration (specific detail or example) is evident. Expression and use of psychological terminology is good.</p>		
(c)	<p><b>Similarity:</b>  E.g. Both Maguire and Sperry showed how differences in brain structure (Maguire = hippocampi of taxi and non-taxi drivers, Sperry = patients with severed corpus callosum and individuals with corpus callosum intact)) resulted in differences in behaviour....</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> No or irrelevant answer.  <b>1 mark</b> – Similarity is identified, with little or no</p>	3+3 6	Credit should be given to any appropriate studies that can take the physiological approach.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>elaboration.  <b>2 marks</b> – Description of similarity is basic and lacks detail. Some understanding may be evident. Expression is generally poor.  <b>3 marks</b> – Description of similarity is accurate and has elaboration. Understanding is good.</p> <p><b>Difference:</b>  E.g. Maguire used British (London-based) participants whereas Dement and Kleitman used American (Chicago area) participants....</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> No or irrelevant answer.  <b>1 mark</b> –Difference is identified, with little or no elaboration.  <b>2 marks</b> – Description of difference is basic and lacks detail. Some understanding may be evident. Expression is generally poor.  <b>3 marks</b> – Description of difference is accurate and has elaboration. Understanding is good.</p>		<p>Guidance for allocating marks:  1 mark – An appropriate similarity / difference between two appropriate studies is merely identified.  2 marks –An appropriate similarity / difference is identified and supported by <u>relevant</u> evidence from <u>one</u> appropriate study.  3 marks – An appropriate similarity / difference is identified and supported by <u>relevant</u> evidence from <u>two</u> appropriate studies</p>
(d)	<p>Strengths may include:  * It provides strong counter-arguments to the nurture side of the nature-nurture debate...  * Its research methods are very reliable...  * It uses scientific/objective methods which provide accurate unbiased data....</p> <p>Weaknesses may include:  * It is very reductionist...  * Research methods have low ecological validity...  * It raises particular ethical issues such as.....</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.  <b>1-3 marks</b> – There may be some strengths or weaknesses which are appropriate or peripheral to the question, or there may be an imbalance between the two.</p>	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The candidate must make it clear why their suggestion is a strength / weakness e.g. it provides a strong counter-argument to the nurture side of the nature-nurture debate <u>indicating that behaviour is the result of more than mere environmental influences</u></li> </ul> <p>The supporting evidence must actually support the identified strength / weakness i.e. be appropriately contextualised.</p> <p>Study specific answers are not creditworthy.</p> <p>Responses that refer to methodology <b>MUST</b> be directly</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Discussion is poor with limited or no understanding. Expression is poor. Analysis is sparse and argument may be just discernible. Sparse or no use of supporting examples.</p> <p><b>4-6 marks</b> – There may be some strengths and weaknesses which are appropriate to the question, or there may be an imbalance between the two. Discussion is reasonable with some understanding though expression may be limited. Analysis is effective sometimes and argument limited. Sparse use of supporting examples.</p> <p><b>7-9 marks</b> – There may be a range of strengths and weaknesses which are appropriate to the question, or there may be an imbalance between the two. Discussion is good with some understanding and good expression. Analysis is reasonably effective and argument is informed. Some use of supporting examples.</p> <p><b>10-12 marks</b> – There is a good range of strengths (2 or more) and weaknesses (2 or more) which are appropriate to the question. There is a good balance between the two. Discussion is detailed with good understanding and clear expression. Analysis is effective and argument well informed. Appropriate use of supporting examples. The answer is competently structured and organised. Answer is mostly grammatically correct with occasional spelling error.</p>		<p>related to the strengths and weaknesses of the approach. Methodology specific responses are therefore NOT creditworthy.</p> <p><u>Read through the mark bands carefully before allocating marks.</u></p> <p>Responses with only one appropriate strength and one appropriate weakness/ only strengths or only weaknesses can only gain 6 marks</p>
	<b>Section C total</b>	<b>24</b>	
	<b>Paper Total</b>	<b>120</b>	

**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)**  
1 Hills Road  
Cambridge  
CB1 2EU

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**Education and Learning**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: [general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

**[www.ocr.org.uk](http://www.ocr.org.uk)**

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

**Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations**  
is a Company Limited by Guarantee  
Registered in England  
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU  
Registered Company Number: 3484466  
OCR is an exempt Charity

**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)**  
Head office  
Telephone: 01223 552552  
Facsimile: 01223 552553

© OCR 2012

