

Psychology

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

Unit **G542**: Core Studies

Mark Scheme for June 2011

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of pupils 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 2011

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

Section A

Generic guidance:

- 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	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
1	<p>Describe <u>two</u> of the formal tests conducted by Savage-Rumbaugh to assess Kanzi's language acquisition</p> <p>Two from the following most likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Photograph to lexigram – Kanzi was shown a photograph and asked to select from a set of three alternatives the correct lexigram for that photograph. • Spoken (English) word to photograph – Kanzi listened to the spoken English word and then selected the appropriate photograph from a set of three alternatives. • Spoken (English) word to lexigram – Kanzi listened to the spoken English word and then selected the appropriate symbol on the lexigram board from a set of three alternatives. • Synthesised speech to lexigram – Kanzi listened to the spoken (English) word produced by the synthesised speech system. Four lexigrams were then presented and Kanzi had to point to the lexigram that corresponded to the synthesised word. • Other appropriate answer. <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer. 1 mark – Partial or vague answer eg mere identification of test eg match photograph to lexigram ie no description of the test; no mention of alternatives/no notion of choice. 2 marks – Identification and clear, accurate description of the test, as outlined above.</p>	[2+2=4]	Do not credit reference to the blind test in the forest.

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance												
2	<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 10px; margin-bottom: 10px;"> <p>Responses to the question, “Did you see any broken glass?”</p> <table style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Smashed</th> <th>Hit</th> <th>Control</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>YES</td> <td>16</td> <td>7</td> <td>6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>NO</td> <td>34</td> <td>43</td> <td>44</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> </div> <p>The above table represents the results to the critical question, “Did you see any broken glass?” used in Loftus and Palmer’s second experiment on eyewitness testimony. (There was no broken glass in the film clip).</p>		Smashed	Hit	Control	YES	16	7	6	NO	34	43	44		
	Smashed	Hit	Control												
YES	16	7	6												
NO	34	43	44												
(a)	<p>Use the table above to outline <u>one</u> difference in performance between the <u>three</u> groups.</p> <p>Likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More participants in the ‘smashed’ group(16) said “Yes” to the question “Did you see any broken glass?” than participants in the ‘hit’ group (7)/‘control’ group (6). • More participants in ‘control’ group (44)/‘hit’ group (43) gave a “No” response to the question “Did you see any broken glass?” than the ‘smashed’ group (34). • Other appropriate answer. <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer. 1 mark – Partial or vague answer eg more participants in the ‘smashed’ condition answered “Yes” to the question, reference to only two of the groups, no supporting evidence. 2 marks – A clear description of ONE difference, as outlined above ie all three groups must be mentioned, they need not be named.</p>	[2]	Numbers need not be mentioned.												

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
(b)	<p>Outline one conclusion that can be drawn from the results table above.</p> <p>Likely answers may cover the following content:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verbal labels/leading questions influence memory (for visually presented material) because the verb ‘smashed’ made more participants (16) and the verb ‘hit’ (7) think they had seen broken glass, compared to the control group, who had no verbal label/leading question, which gave 6 “Yes” responses to “Did you see any broken glass?” • Verbal labels/leading questions do not influence the majority of people’s memory for visually presented material because more participants in all three groups accurately recalled that there had been no broken glass in the film clip (“smashed” (34), “hit” (43), “Control” (44). • Other appropriate answer. <p>NB: Actual numbers do not need to be identified.</p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer eg mere identification of results. 1 mark – Partial or vague answer eg leading questions influence memory, leading questions do not necessarily influence memory, words used in questions can influence eyewitness testimony. 2 marks – A clear outline of an appropriate conclusion supported by evidence from the given findings, as outlined above.</p>	[2]	<p>Reference to all three groups is not necessary here.</p> <p><u>NB candidate may EITHER give the findings and then the conclusion OR the conclusion supported by the findings. Both must be provided for 2 marks.</u></p>

Question		Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
3	(a)	<p>From Baron-Cohen, Jolliffe, Mortimore and Robertson's study on autism in adults:</p> <p>Identify the two control groups used.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'Normal'(adults)/participants • (Adults/patients)with Tourette syndrome. <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer eg Autistic/AS adults. 1 mark – Only one group identified. 2 marks – Both control groups identified.</p>	[1+1=2]	NB: The number of participants in each group does not have to be given. If a wrong number is given do not penalise the candidate.
	(b)	<p>Explain why one of these control groups was used.</p> <p>One from the following likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>'Normal' adults:</u> because they had no history of any psychiatric condition differences in performance on the Eyes Task(TOM test) would be due to a psychiatric disorder. • <u>Adults with Tourette Syndrome:</u> because they share similarities with Autistic/AS individuals by having an organic child-hood psychiatric disorder, differences in performance on the Eyes Task (TOM test) would be due to Autism/AS and not any other similar psychiatric disorder. • Other appropriate answer eg reference to intelligence levels. <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer. 1 mark – Partial or vague answer eg 'Normal' adults were used because they had no psychiatric disorder, TS adults were used to show differences in their performance to performance of adults with Autism/AS. 2 marks – A clear, explanation of why one of the groups was used, as outlined above, including reference to mental state/intelligence, performance on the TOM test and both groups.</p>	[2]	'To make a comparison' can be credited for 1 mark.

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
4 (a)	<p>From Freud's study of Little Hans:</p> <p>Describe one of Hans' phobias.</p> <p>Likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hans was afraid of horses, particularly that a white horse would bite him possibly brought on from seeing a horse fall down in the street when he was younger/possibly brought on by watching a girl being told by her father not to touch a horse because it could bite her. • Hans was afraid of white horses. • Hans was afraid of horses with black bits around its mouth and dark circles around its eyes. • Hans was afraid his mother would let go of him in the big bath. • Other appropriate answer. <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer. 1 mark – Partial or vague answer eg Hans was afraid of horses, ie mere identification of a phobia with no elaboration. 2 marks – A full, accurate description of Hans' phobia, as outlined above or similar description/elaboration.</p>	[2]	
(b)	<p>Describe Freud's interpretation of one of Hans' phobias.</p> <p>Likely answers may cover the following content:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hans traced his fear of being bitten by a horse to when he heard a father say to his daughter "Don't put your finger to the white horse or it'll bite you." Freud linked these words, "Don't put your finger to" to those used when he was warned against masturbation by his mother that if he continued to touch his widdler she 	[2]	

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	<p>would send for Dr A to cut it off.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Freud interpreted Hans' fear of horses as a (subconscious) fear of his father because the black around a horse's mouth and the blinkers worn over their eyes represented his father's black moustache and glasses. • Freud thought Hans' fear was because his father had told him that women have no widdlers. This lead Hans to think mother originally had a widdler but as she no longer had one, it must have been cut off. As his mother had previously warned him that his might be cut off if he touched it, his fear of being bitten by a horse was a form of castration anxiety. • Freud interpreted Hans' fear that his mother would let him fall in the bath as an unconscious fear that he would be separated from his mother. • Other appropriate answer eg Freud interpreted the horse as Hans' father and the fear of being bitten by a horse represented a fear that his father might castrate him (for wanting his mother to himself). <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant eg he thought his father looked like a horse. 1 mark – Partial or vague answer eg Freud interpreted Hans' fear as castration anxiety,/a reflection of his fear of his father. 2 marks – A clear, detailed explanation, as outlined above.</p>		

Question		Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
5	(a)	<p>From the study by Samuel and Bryant on conservation:</p> <p>Identify two features of the sample used.</p> <p>Any two from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 252 (participants) • Children/boys and girls • An equal number of boys and girls • Aged between 5 and 8½ years • From schools and playgroups • In and around (Crediton) Devon. <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer eg any reference to sampling method. 1 mark for each correctly identified feature, as stated above.</p>	[1+1=2]	<i>Allow an age range of 'between 5 and 8 or 9 years'.</i>
	(b)	<p>Outline one possible strength of the sample used.</p> <p>Likely answers may cover the following content:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As all the participants were drawn from a variety of schools and playgroups around (Crediton) Devon, participants can be considered representative of that area and so results can be generalised to that area. • The sample is fairly large (252) with each age group having 63 participants who are likely to be representative of children in general so results can be generalised (to the British population as a whole). • As the sample contained both boys and girls, findings can be considered representative and therefore generalisable to both genders. • As the age of the children ranged from 5 to 8½ years, the sample was drawn from what Piaget classified the 'preoperational' (up to 7 years of age) and 'concrete operational' stages of cognitive development. This allowed Samuel and Bryant to test whether children in 	[2]	<i>Needs to be contextualised to gain full marks.</i>

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	<p>the preoperational stage as well as the concrete operational stage could conserve and thus show Piaget's methodology may have been flawed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other appropriate answer. <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer eg reference to features of Bandura's study. 1 mark – Partial or vague answer eg all participants were drawn from around Devon – no explanation as to why this may be a strength, Samuel and Bryant had a large sample of 252 children – no explanation of why this may be a strength, answer not contextualised eg he used a large sample so findings can be generalised ie mere identification of a strength. 2 marks – A clear outline of an appropriate possible strength of the sample with an explanation as to why, as outlined above.</p>		
6	<p>(a)</p> <p>One of the independent variables (IVs) in the study of aggression by Bandura, Ross and Ross was the behaviour of the model (aggressive or non-aggressive).</p> <p>Identify the other two independent variables (IVs).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The sex of the child (boy or girl). • The sex of the model (male or female). <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer. 1 mark – Identification of one IV only. 2 marks – Correct identification of both IVs, as stated above.</p>	[2]	These are the only two acceptable answers.

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance	
(b)	<p>Outline how the behaviour of the model was manipulated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The non-aggressive model behaved in a subdued manner with the toys (totally ignoring the Bobo doll), whereas the aggressive model displayed a standardised set of physical and verbal aggressive acts toward the <u>(Bobo) doll</u>. <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer. 1 mark – Partial or vague answer eg the non-aggressive model did not act aggressively whereas the aggressive model did/reference to only one of the model conditions which must be elaborated. 2 marks – An accurate, detailed outline of how the behaviour of both models was manipulated, as outlined above.</p>	[2]	<p><i>Do not penalise candidate if they refer to the wrong toys – the difference between the behaviour of the aggressive and non-aggressive models must be clear.</i></p> <p><i>To gain any marks for the non-aggressive condition toys must be mentioned and to gain any marks for the aggressive condition (Bobo) doll must be mentioned.</i></p>	
7	(a)	<p>From Maguire et al's study of taxi drivers:</p> <p>Identify two controls used in this study.</p> <p>Two from the following likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Taxi drivers and non-taxi drivers were age matched. • Taxi drivers and non-taxi drivers were gender matched/ALL participants were men. • All participants were scanned at the same unit. • The pixel counter was blind to whether a participant was a taxi driver or a non-taxi driver. • The pixel counter was blind as to the VBM results. • All participants came from the same area – London. • All participants were right-handed. • Other appropriate answer. <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p>	[1+1=2]	<p><i>Make certain that the answer refers to CONTROLS and not features of the sample.</i></p>

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	1 mark for each correctly identified control, as outlined above.		
(b)	<p>Explain why it was important to use controls in this study.</p> <p>Likely answers may cover the following content:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To prevent extraneous variables such as age/gender/researcher bias/handedness/environmental differences etc becoming confounding variables which might actually influence results – differences in the distribution of grey matter in the hippocampus being due to a variable other than whether they were a taxi driver or a non-taxi driver. • To make it a fair test so the characteristics of the taxi drivers and non-taxi drivers are similar eg age/handedness etc. • To make it a fair test/non-biased so previous knowledge about whether the participant was a taxi driver or non-driver/the VBM results could not influence the results/pixel counter so they tried to find evidence to support/not support the hypothesis. • Other appropriate answer. <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer. 1 mark – Partial or vague answer eg to prevent other/extraneous variables influencing results, to prevent individual differences affecting results, to make it a fair test, explanation not linked to study. 2 marks – A clear, accurate explanation of why controls were important, as outlined above.</p>	[2]	

Question		Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
8	(a)	<p>Dement and Kleitman used an electroencephalograph (EEG machine) to record sleep activity.</p> <p>Explain what an EEG measures.</p> <p>Likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An EEG measures the (gross) electrical activity of the brain. • An EEG measures the frequency of brain waves (by recording the number of oscillations the wave makes in a second). <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer. 1 mark – Partial or vague answer eg brain waves/brain activity/whether/how long a person has been in REM or NREM sleep/sleep patterns/sleep stages. 2 marks – A full description of what an EEG measures, as described above.</p>	[2]	<i>Electrical and/or frequency must be included to gain full marks.</i>
	(b)	<p>Describe one limitation of using an EEG to investigate dreaming.</p> <p>Likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An EEG indicates the electrical activity in the brain but it does not explain why the activity is taking place. The activity may not be caused by the participant dreaming but by some other factor(s). • An EEG does not establish cause and effect. Here one cannot say the cause of increased brain activity is because the participant is dreaming because other factors may be the cause. • The use of an EEG involves the attachment of electrodes to the participant's scalp. This may interfere 	[2]	

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	<p>with sleep patterns so results may not reflect an individual's normal sleep pattern.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other appropriate answer. <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer. 1 mark – Partial or vague answer eg doesn't show cause and effect, doesn't explain why there is increased electrical activity in the brain, doesn't show what the person is dreaming about ie limitation merely identified/no link to the study or sleep/dreaming (as referred to in the question). 2 marks – A clear, accurate description of an appropriate limitation, linked to dreaming, as outlined above.</p>		
9	<p>Outline <u>two</u> findings from Sperry's study on hemisphere disconnection.</p> <p>Any two from the following most likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If an image/word has been identified and responded to in one visual field it can only be recognised again if it is presented to the same visual field. If an image has been identified and responded to in one visual field is then presented to the other visual field the participant responds as if he had no recollection of the previous exposure. Visual material presented to the RVF can be described in speech and writing. Visual material presented to the LVF cannot be identified in speech or writing but can be identified by pointing with the left hand. If two different images are flashed simultaneously to the R and L VFs, the participant can draw with his L hand out of sight what he saw in his LVF but cannot name it. If two different words are flashed simultaneously to the 	[2+2=4]	<p><i>Examiners are advised to check answers against the original study as candidates may cite information that was already known before Sperry conducted his study and is therefore not creditworthy.</i></p> <p><i>Any reference to eye instead of visual field can not be credited.</i></p> <p><i>Don't discredit wrong objects.</i></p> <p><i>If only a conclusion is given award 0 marks.</i></p>

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	<p>R and L VFs, the participant can select with their L hand the object from a collection of objects.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If two different words are flashed simultaneously to the R and L VFs the participant can spell with his R hand/say the word presented to his LVF. • Objects put in the R hand for identification by touch alone can be described in speech and writing. • Objects put in the L hand cannot be identified in speech or writing but can be selected with the same hand from a grab bag. • Objects placed in one hand can only be identified through touch alone by the same hand. • Other appropriate answer. <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer eg he discovered that the right side of the brain controls the left side of the body and vice versa, the left side of the brain controls language etc – all this was already known before Sperry did his study. 1 mark =- Partial or vague answer eg could only identify object with same VF/hand, stimuli shown to one side of the brain can't be recognised but drawn whilst if shown to the other side it can be identified and named. 2 marks – A clear outline of a finding, as outlined above.</p>		
10 (a)	<p>The Reicher and Haslam BBC prison study may be considered an experimental case study.</p> <p>Outline why the study may be considered an experiment.</p> <p>Likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was conducted in a specially designed/simulated environment at Elstree Studios, London/it was not conducted in a natural environment – the <i>prison</i> was 	[2]	

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	<p>specially constructed for the experiment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Three IVs were manipulated – permeability, legitimacy and cognitive alternatives. • Cause and effect could be established because the manipulation of the IVs directly influenced the behaviour of both the guards and prisoners – once the group boundaries became impermeable, guards did not develop a group identity whereas prisoners did. • The participants and guards were not real guards or prisoners, they were randomly allocated to their roles. • Other appropriate answer. <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer. 1 mark – Partial or vague answer eg simulated environment, participants were in a controlled environment, IVs were manipulated, DV's were measured ie no link to the actual study. 2 marks – An accurate description of why the study can be considered an experiment, clearly linked to the study, as outlined above.</p>		
(b)	<p>Outline why the study may be considered a case study.</p> <p>Likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Because the behaviour of the members in dominant (guards) and subordinate (prisoners) positions and the developing relations between the two was studied in great depth (giving both qualitative and quantitative data). • Because it was a detailed investigation of a small group of people – 9/10 'prisoners' and 5 'guards'. • Other appropriate answer. <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer eg reference to the fact that the study lasted several days – this refers to a</p>	[2]	<p><i>Reference to:</i> <i>Detailed study = 0 marks</i> <i>Detailed study of a small group/one person = 1 mark</i> <i>Detailed study of 15 people – would count as contextualisation so = 2 marks.</i></p>

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	<p>longitudinal study.</p> <p>1 mark – Partial or vague answer eg an in depth study of a small group, lots of in-depth qualitative and quantitative data was gathered on the participants, rich data on a small sample (no link to study).</p> <p>2 marks – An accurate description as to why the study can be considered a case study, clearly linked to the study, as outlined above.</p>		
11	<p>Identify the <u>four</u> independent variables (IVs) in the subway Samaritan study by Piliavin², Rodin and Piliavin.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Type of victim (drunk or ill/lame). • Race of victim (black or white). • Effect of modelling/whether intervention occurred early or late/position of model in critical or adjacent area. • Effect of group size/number in group. <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer eg reference to ‘helper’. 1 mark for each correctly identified IV, as outlined above.</p>	[1+1+1+1=4]	

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
12	<p>Outline <u>two</u> ways in which Milgram's study of obedience can be said to be low in ecological validity.</p> <p>Likely answers may cover the following content:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The task of shocking another human being because they gave the wrong answer to a question was unrealistic so the study lacked mundane realism/does not reflect what people are normally expected to do in everyday life, making it low in ecological validity. • Participants knew the experiment was being conducted in an unnatural environment as they reported to Yale/prestigious University to participate. Therefore they knew they were in a controlled environment. • Other appropriate answer. <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer eg it was a laboratory <i>experiment</i>. 1 mark – Partial or vague answer eg task was unrealistic, setting unrealistic, conducted in a laboratory so did not reflect real life ie answer not contextualised, participants knew they were taking part in an experiment. 2 marks – A clear, accurate description of why the study may have been low in ecological validity, as outlined above.</p>	[2+2=4]	<i>Reference to controlled environment/lab +Yale/prestigious university =2 marks.</i>
13	<p>Outline <u>two</u> ethical problems in Thigpen and Cleckley's study on multiple personality disorder.</p> <p>Two from the following likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stress: may have been caused to either Eve White and/or Eve black by being interviewed for more than 100 hours. 	[2+2=4]	<i>Reference to the book or the film should not be credited as these were not in the original study</i>

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protection from harm: the use of hypnosis during therapy sessions which puts individuals into an altered state of consciousness could have lead one of the Eves to disclose information she would rather have kept confidential. • Other appropriate answer. <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer eg reference to right to withdraw, deception; consent, physical harm, debriefing, confidentiality.</p> <p>1 mark – Partial or vague answer eg mere identification of an appropriate ethical problem not linked to the study/mere description of an appropriate problem.</p> <p>2 marks – A clear outline of an appropriate ethical problem linked to the study, as outlined above.</p>		
14 (a)	<p>From Griffiths' study into fruit machine gambling:</p> <p>Describe one similarity between the results of regular and non-regular gamblers.</p> <p>Likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Playing times for both RGs and NRGs were similar. • Overall both RGs and NRGs used more rational than irrational verbalisations. • Overall the amount of total winnings between those who thought aloud and those who did not were similar for both the RG and the NRG groups. • Overall the amount of total winnings between RGs and NRGs were similar. • Both RGs and NRGs had similar success/win and failure/loss rates. • Overall the percentage of verbalisations made by both RGs and NRGs was similar. 	[2]	<p><i>NB: the question refers to results/findings not just performance.</i></p> <p><i>EXAMINERS ARE ADVISED TO CHECK ANSWERS AGAINST THE ORIGINAL STUDY.</i></p> <p><i>Actual numbers/percentages need not be given but the similarities between the two groups must be clear and correct.</i></p> <p><i>Allow the use of "both" instead of RG's/NRG's.</i></p>

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both RGs and NRGs showed similar skill levels. • Other appropriate answer. <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer. 1 mark – Partial or vague answer eg more rational decisions made, similar amount of total winnings, similar skill levels ie no reference to both groups/ 2 marks – A clearly described similarity between the results of RGs and NRGs, as outlined above eg Both(RGs and NRGs) had similar success/failure rates ie both groups referred to.</p>		
(b)	<p>Describe one difference between the results of regular and non-regular gamblers.</p> <p>Likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RGs had a higher playing rate per minute (8) than NRGs (6). • RGs spent more time on the fruit machine than NRGs. • RGs stopped speaking aloud more often than NRGs. • More irrational verbalisations were made by RGs (14%) than NRGs (2.5%). • More RGs (14) than NRGs (7) broke even at the end of play. • More RGs (10) than NRGs (2) carried on until they had lost all their money. • NRGs in the thinking aloud condition had more wins than RGs who either thought aloud or did not. • RGs who thought aloud had a lower win rate in number of gambles than NRGs. • RGs personified the machine more than NRGs. • In relation to skill: most NRGs said ‘mostly chance’ whereas most RGs said ‘equal chance and skill’. 	[2]	<p><i>NB: the question refers to results/findings not just performance.</i></p> <p>EXAMINERS ARE ADVISED TO CHECK ANSWERS AGAINST THE ORIGINAL STUDY.</p> <p><i>Actual numbers/percentages need not be given but the difference between the two groups must be clear and correct.</i></p>

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RGs claimed they were at least of 'average skill', 'above average skill' or 'totally skilled' whereas NRGs viewed themselves as 'below average skill' or 'totally unskilled'. • Other appropriate answer (Reminder: refer to original study to check responses). <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer. 1 mark – Partial or vague answer eg RGs had a higher playing rate, RGs made more irrational verbalisations ie no reference made to NRGs/other group. 2 marks – A clearly described difference between the results of RGs and NRGs, as outlined above eg RGs believed they had more skill than NRGs ie both groups referred to.</p>		

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
15 (a)	<p>Rosenhan in his study, 'On being sane in insane places', suggested mental patients experienced powerlessness and depersonalisation.</p> <p>Outline one example which supports this suggestion.</p> <p>Likely answers may cover the following content :</p> <p>In reference to powerlessness:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Personal privacy was at a minimum eg patients' personal hygiene and waste evacuation were often monitored, water closets had no doors. • Patient quarters and possessions could be examined by any staff member (for whatever reason). • Other appropriate answer. <p>In reference to depersonalisation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On admission, the pseudopatients were examined in a semi-public room where staff members went about their own business as if the pseudopatients were not there. • On the ward, attendants delivered verbal and occasionally serious physical abuse to patients in the presence of others. • A nurse unbuttoned her uniform to adjust her bra in the presence of an entire ward of viewing men. • A group of staff might point to a patient in the dayroom and discuss him, as if he were not there. • When pseudopatients tried to talk to staff they were ignored as if they did not exist/staff moved on with their head averted/staff avoided eye contact/staff avoided speaking with them. • Other appropriate answer. 	[2]	<p><i>If candidates state wrong %s etc but the overall gist of the answer is correct give the answer full credit</i></p> <p><i>Reference to being ignored can count as contextualisation.</i></p>

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	<p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer. 1 mark – Vague or partial answer eg the lack of respect shown to the pseudopatients, the lack of personal space in bathrooms and toilets, no matter what they said they were ignored. 2 marks – for a clear, fully contextualised, appropriate example given, as outlined above.</p>		
(b)	<p>Outline one possible explanation for the way hospital staff behaved towards the patients in this study.</p> <p>Likely answers may cover the following content:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Once a person is designated abnormal, all of his other behaviours and characteristics are coloured by that label. • A patient's behaviour is distorted by staff to achieve consistency with a determined medical condition. • Because an individual is in a psychiatric ward/hospital, he must be psychologically disturbed, so any behaviour must be a manifestation of that disturbance. • Other appropriate answer eg reference to being scared because they might get hurt/frustrated because they were continually being asked questions. <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer. 1 mark – Partial or vague answer eg because of the stickiness of labels/labelling, a patient's behaviour can be misinterpreted. 2 marks – A clear, accurate explanation for the behaviour of hospital staff, as outlined above.</p>	[2]	
	Section A Total	[60]	

Section B

Read and answer **all** parts of the question in Section B.

Generic guidance:

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

Question		Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
16	(a)	<p>Choose <u>one</u> of the core studies below</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rosenhan: ‘On being sane in insane places’ • Reicher and Haslam : ‘BBC prison study’ • Dement and Kleitman: ‘Sleep and dreaming’ and answer parts (a) – (f) on your chosen study. <p>Briefly outline how qualitative data was gathered in your chosen study.</p> <p>Likely answers may cover the following content:</p> <p>Rosenhan: Once the pseudopatients had gained admittance to hospital, they spent their time writing down their observations about the ward, its patients and the staff, gathering information about the patients and themselves were treated, interpersonal communications etc.</p> <p>Reicher and Haslam: Qualitative data was gathered through observations made by the researchers via the audio and video recordings made by the BBC which allowed them to gather information both about the guards’ and prisoners’ thoughts, feelings and behaviours.</p> <p>Dement and Kleitman: Qualitative data was gathered by waking participants and instructing them to first state whether or not they had been dreaming, and then, if they could, to relate the content of the dream into a tape recorder. This information was later analysed.</p>	[2]	<i>No marks for referring to ‘interview’ in Reicher & Haslam.</i>

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	0 marks – No or irrelevant answer. 1 mark – Partial or vague answer eg Rosenhan: pseudopatients made notes, Reicher and Haslam: observed participants, Dement and Kleitman: Participants recalled the content of their dreams, no link to the chosen study eg qualitative data was gathered through observations. 2 marks – The outline of how qualitative data was gathered is accurate and clearly related to the chosen study, as outlined above.		
(b)	<p>Describe two examples of qualitative data recorded in your chosen study.</p> <p>Likely answers:</p> <p><u>Rosenhan:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the patients' personal privacy was invaded because the water closets had no doors/their personal hygiene and waste evacuation was often monitored/their quarters and possessions could be examined by any staff members. • On admission the patients were examined in a semi-public room. • On the ward, attendants delivered verbal and occasionally serious physical abuse to patients. • When pseudopatients tried to talk to staff they were ignored as if they did not exist/staff moved on with head averted/staff avoided eye contact/staff avoided speaking with them. • Other appropriate answer. <p><u>Reicher and Haslam:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the guards failed to identify with each other as a group and to cohere collectively. • That after the promotion on day 3 the prisoners increasingly identified as a group and worked 	[2+2=4]	<i>This answer requires examples of qualitative data taken from the original study.</i>

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	<p>collectively to challenge the guards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That once participants had decided to work as a self-governing 'commune' they were unable to deal with internal dissent and lost confidence in the communal system. • That before promotion two prisoners worked conscientiously to improve their position by displaying behaviour required to become a guard. • That several guards were wary of assuming and exerting their authority. • Other appropriate answer, eg extra food was given to the prisoners. <p><u>Dement and Kleitman:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One participant dreamed of standing at the bottom of a tall cliff operating some sort of hoist and looking up at climbers at various levels and down at the hoist machinery. • One participant dreamed of climbing up a series of ladders looking up and down as he climbed. • One participant dreamed he was watching someone throwing basketballs at a net, first shooting and then looking up at the net/hoop, and then looking down to pick another ball off the floor. (Allow netball/ball) • One participant was watching two people throwing tomatoes at each other. • Other appropriate answer (from the original study). <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer. 1 mark – Partial or vague answer eg Rosenhan: patient's privacy was invaded, patients were abused; Reicher and Haslam: guards didn't form a group, prisoners became a group; Dement and Kleitman: example merely identified not described.</p>		

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	2 marks – A clear description of an example of qualitative data drawn explicitly from the chosen study, as outlined above.		
(c)	<p>With reference to your chosen study, suggest one strength and one weakness of qualitative data.</p> <p>Strength:</p> <p>Most likely answers should have a generic introduction and then include details specific to the chosen study eg:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generic strength: qualitative data allows the researcher to gather rich, in-depth detail about an individual or small, organised group. Then linked to chosen study: • Rosenhan: was able to get a large amount of detail about how staff interacted with and treated their patients eg when asked the question “Pardon me Mr/Mrs/Dr could you tell me when I am likely to be discharged?” only 2% of psychiatrists and nurses actually paused and chatted. • Reicher and Haslam: were able to found out that one prisoner said “I’d like to be a guard because they get all the luxuries and we are not.” • Dement and Kleitman: were able to find out that when a participant was awakened from REM after his eyes had recorded very little or no movement for at least one minute, he reported dreaming that he had been watching something in the distance or just staring fixedly at some object. • Other appropriate generic strength supported by relevant example from chosen study. <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p>	[3+3=6]	<i>If there is no obvious generic strength/weakness the ceiling is 2 marks.</i>

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	<p>1 mark – Peripherally relevant strength is identified, not linked to the chosen study and with little or no elaboration eg gives great understanding/insight of how and why people behave the way they do.</p> <p>2 marks – An appropriate strength is explained but is basic and lacks detail. A vague/weak link is made to the chosen study showing some understanding,</p> <p>3 marks – An appropriate strength is explained and is accurate and elaborated. There is a clear, developed link eg example/evidence to the chosen study showing good understanding, as outlined above.</p> <p>Weakness:</p> <p>Most likely answers should have a generic introduction and then include details specific to the chosen study eg:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generic weakness: qualitative data is frequently unique making it difficult to analyse. Then linked to chosen study: • Rosenhan: reported only one psychiatrist who saw a group of patients sitting outside the cafeteria ½ hour before lunchtime suggested that such behaviour was characteristic of the oral-acquisitive nature of schizophrenia. • Reicher and Haslam: found that some of the guards identified with the high-status and positive values associated with the role within a prison whereas several were wary of assuming and exerting their authority. • Dement and Kleitman: reported that only three participants eye movements during REM showed a predominance of vertical eye movements and that in each case they claimed to have been dreaming about something different – one participant reported 		

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	<p>dreaming of standing at the bottom of a cliff, another of climbing a series of ladders and another of throwing basketballs at a net. So although their eye movements were similar, their dreaming had totally different contents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other appropriate generic weakness supported by relevant example from chosen study. <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer. 1 mark – Peripherally relevant weakness is identified, not linked to chosen study and with little or no elaboration eg participant variables may influence results rather the independent variable. 2 marks – An appropriate weakness is explained but is basic and lacks detail. A vague/weak link is made to the chosen study showing some understanding. 3 marks – An appropriate weakness is explained and is accurate and elaborated. There is a clear, developed link to the chosen study showing good understanding, as outlined above.</p>		
(d)	<p>Describe how your chosen study was conducted.</p> <p>Likely answers may cover the following content:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rosenhan: Experiment 1 – Rosenhan arranged for 8 pseudopatients to present themselves to 12 different US psychiatric hospitals. On arrival they each reported they had been hearing voices which included the words ‘empty’, ‘hollow’ and ‘thud’. The voices were unfamiliar but of the same sex as the pseudopatient. Beyond alleging the symptoms and falsifying name, vocation and employment, no further alterations of person, history or circumstances was made. Immediately upon admission to the psychiatric ward, the pseudopatients 	[8]	

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	<p>ceased simulating any symptoms of abnormality. The pseudopatients interacted with hospital staff and genuine patients as a 'normal' person would. Beyond trying to engage others in conversation, responding to instructions from attendants and to dining-hall instructions, the pseudopatients spent their time writing down their observations about the ward, its patients and the staff. Initially these notes were written 'secretly' but as it soon became clear that no-one much cared they were subsequently written in public places and no secret was made of them. Experiment 2 – was arranged at a hospital whose staff had heard about the findings from Experiment 1. The staff were informed that at some time during the following three months, one or more pseudopatients would attempt to be admitted to the psychiatric hospital. Each staff member was asked to rate each patient who presented himself at admissions or on the ward as to the likelihood that the patient was a pseudopatient. No pseudopatients presented themselves during the stated period.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>NB because this is an 8 mark question more than one experiment should be referred to. If only one is mentioned, maximum of 6 marks.</u> • Reicher and Haslam: worked with the BBC who built a simulated prison environment at Elstree Studios in London, filmed and broadcast the study. Over 8 days Reicher and Haslam examined the behaviour of 15 men who were sought through national newspapers and leaflets. The initial pool of 332 applicants was reduced to 27 through screening using psychometric tests, assessments by clinical psychologists, and medical and character references. The final 15 were chosen to ensure a diversity of age, social class and ethnic origin. They were then divided into 5 groups of 3 people, matched on personality variables. From each 		

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	<p>group of 3, one individual was randomly selected to be a guard and the other 2 prisoners, one of whom was not involved at the beginning of the study. The 5 guards were invited to a hotel the evening before the study began. They were shown the prison timetable and were told their responsibility was to ensure the prison ran as smoothly as possible, and that the prisoners performed all their tasks. They were then asked to draw up a series of prison rules and punishments. No other guidance was given except that they had to abide by the predetermined ethical rules and that no physical violence could be used. On the morning of the study they were taken in a blacked-out van to the prison and then briefed on the prison layout and the resources available to them. They then changed into swell-made 'guards' uniforms. The 9 prisoners then arrived one at a time and on arrival had their hair shaved off. They were given no information apart from the prison rules, a list of prisoner rights and a prisoner's uniform. They were assigned 3 to a cell after which an announcement was made which introduced the permeability intervention. This was created by telling the prisoners that the guards had been selected because of certain personality characteristics but that if they showed similar traits they might be promoted to guards. One prisoner was promoted but after that they were told no more promotions were possible. After 3 days participants were told there were no actual differences between guards and prisoners but it would be impractical to re-assign participants. The groups were therefore not legitimate. On day 4, prisoner 10 was introduced to provide cognitive alternatives. Being a trade union official it was thought he might provide the skills to negotiate and organise collectivist action. By Day 8 an authoritarian system of inequality was about to be</p>		

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	<p>initiated but because of ethical constraints this could not be imposed so the study was stopped.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dement and Kleitman: 9 adults (7 males, 2 females) of which 5 were studied intensively were used. The participants reported to the sleep laboratory a little before their usual bedtime. They were instructed to eat normally but abstain from alcoholic or caffeine-containing beverages on the day of the experiment. Two or more electrodes were attached near their eyes to record eye movements and two or three electrodes were fixed to their scalp to record brain waves as criteria for depth of sleep. The participants then went to bed in a quiet, dark room. At various times during the night they were awakened to tell their dream recall. For all awakenings participants were roused by the ringing of an ordinary door bell placed near their bed. They then spoke into a recording device near the bed. They were instructed to first state whether or not they had been dreaming, and then, if they could, to relate the content of their dream. When they had finished speaking the experimenter occasionally entered the room to further question them on some particular point of the dream. They were then allowed to go back to sleep. Of the 5 participants who were studied intensively: 2 were woken using a table of random numbers, 1 during 3 REM periods and 3 NREM periods, 1 was told he would be woken only during REM but in fact was woken randomly during REM and NREM. None were however told whether or they had just been having REM activity when they were woken. <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer. 1-3 marks – Description of how the chosen study was conducted is very basic and lacks detail and accuracy (eg two or three general statements are identified). Some understanding may be evident. Expression is generally poor</p>		

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	<p>with few, if any, psychological terms and few, if any, links to the chosen study.</p> <p>4-6 marks – Description of how the study was conducted is accurate though there will be some omissions. Fine details are occasionally present and understanding is evident. Expression and use of psychological terminology is reasonable and there are some clear, appropriate links to the chosen study.</p> <p>7-8 marks – Description of how the chosen study was conducted is accurate and detailed with few or no omissions. The detail is appropriate to the level and time allowed. Understanding, expression and use of psychological terminology are very good. There are many, clear and appropriate links to the chosen study.</p>		
(e)	<p>Suggest how your chosen study could be improved.</p> <p>Answers are likely to refer to ways of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improving ecological validity. • Reducing the chance that demand characteristics/social desirability will influence results. • Making the study longitudinal rather than snapshot • Improving any ethical issues. • Other appropriate suggestions should be considered and accepted. <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p>1-3 marks – Some improvements are suggested which are very basic and lack detail (one or two general statements are identified eg do the study in a natural environment). There are few, if any, suggestions as to how the improvements could be implemented. Some understanding may be evident. The answer is unstructured, muddled, and grammatical structure is poor. There are few, if any, links to the chosen</p>	[8]	<p><i>This question part requires candidates to describe <u>what</u> they would improve and <u>how</u> they would do it. Suggestions here may not be practical or ethical but they should still receive credit. Implications mentioned in this question part do not gain credit.</i></p> <p><i>EACH ISSUE RAISED, REGARDLESS OF THE NUMBER OF IMPROVEMENTS SUGGESTED SHOULD ONLY BE CONSIDERED AS ONE CHANGE EG REGARDLESS OF HOW MANY ETHICAL IMPROVEMENTS ARE SUGGESTED THIS COULD ONLY COUNT AS 1 CHANGE SO CANNOT GAIN MORE THAN 6 MARKS WITHOUT ANOTHER ISSUE BEING CONSIDERED EG IMPROVEMENT TO METHODOLOGY</i></p>

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	<p>study. The answer is very list-like. <u>NB: A maximum of 3 marks can be gained if the answer is not linked to the chosen study.</u> 4-6 marks – Description of one or more appropriate changes is accurate. Detail is good and basic suggestions are made as to how the improvements could be implemented. Understanding is evident. Expression and use of psychological terminology is reasonable. The answer has some structure and organisation, is mostly grammatically correct and has few spelling errors. There are some clear, appropriate links to the chosen study. 7-8 marks – Description of at least two appropriate changes is accurate and clear links to the chosen study are evident throughout. Sound suggestions are made as to how the improvements could be implemented. Detail is appropriate to level and time allowed. Understanding, expression, literacy and use of psychological terminology are good. The answer is competently structured and organised and is grammatically correct with only occasional spelling errors.</p>		
(f)	<p>Outline the implications of the improvements you have suggested for your chosen study.</p> <p>Answers are likely to refer to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More natural/realistic behaviour will be recorded. • Improved reliability. • Improved generalisability. • Improved usefulness. • Changes in findings/results. • Advantages/disadvantages of improving possible ethical issues. • Sampling problems. • Cost and time implications. 	[8]	

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other appropriate suggestions should be considered and accepted. <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer eg repetition of suggestions made in part (e).</p> <p>1-3 marks – Implications are very basic and lack detail (eg one or two general statements are identified such as increased EV, no demand characteristics). Some understanding may be evident. Expression is generally poor. The answer is unstructured, lacks organisation, grammatical structure is poor and there are many spelling errors. There are few, if any, links to the chosen study.</p> <p><u>NB: A maximum of 3 marks can be gained if the answer is not linked to the chosen study or relate to only one implication.</u></p> <p>4-6 marks – Description of implications is accurate. Detail is good and some understanding is evident. Expression and use of psychological terminology is reasonable. The answer has some structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with some spelling errors. There are some clear, appropriate links to the chosen study.</p> <p>7-8 marks – Description of implications is accurate and clear links to the chosen study are evident throughout. Detail is appropriate to level and time allowed. Understanding is very good. Expression and use of psychological terminology is good. The answer is competently structured and organised. The answer is grammatically correct with occasional spelling errors.</p>		
	Section B Total	[36]	

Section C

Answer **one** question from Section C

Generic guidelines:

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

EITHER:

Question		Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
17	(a)	<p>Outline <u>one</u> assumption of the developmental approach.</p> <p>Likely answer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It assumes there are clearly identifiable systematic changes that occur in an individual's behaviour from conception to death. • Other appropriate answer. <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer eg a mere description of the approach. 1 mark – Assumption is identified. Description is basic and lacks detail. Some understanding may be evident. Expression is generally poor. 2 marks – 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><i>The assumption must be:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Linked to the developmental approach</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Linked to behaviour</i>

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
(b)	<p>With reference to Samuel and Bryant’s study, describe how the developmental approach could explain why one child can conserve whilst another cannot.</p> <p>Likely answer may cover the following content:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As children grow up and mature mentally, their cognitive abilities develop so they can cope with and understand increasingly complex phenomena. This was shown through Samuel and Bryant’s conservation experiment where the mean number of errors made by children in all three conditions (standard, one judgement, fixed array) decreased with age, showing their ability to conserve got increasingly better as they got older. The study also showed that conservational abilities develop gradually as the child’s cognitive abilities develop because children were able to conserve number before they were able to conserve mass or volume. • Other appropriate answer. <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer. 1-2 marks – Description is generally accurate, but is basic and lacks detail. Some understanding and or elaboration may be evident. Expression generally poor. <u>NB: A maximum of 1 mark can be gained for a generic explanation not linked Samuel and Bryant’s study into conservation.</u> 3-4 marks – Description is accurate. Detail is appropriate and understanding is good. Elaboration (eg specific detail or example) is evident. Expression and use of psychological terminology is good.</p>	[4]	

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
(c)	<p>Describe <u>one</u> similarity and <u>one</u> difference between any core studies that take the developmental approach.</p> <p>Answers are likely to refer to: Sample, methodology, ethics.</p> <p>Possible answers:</p> <p>Similarity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both Bandura and Samuel and Bryant used a laboratory experiment which allowed them a high level of control. Bandura controlled their experiment by having the same number of boys and girls see either an aggressive or a non-aggressive model, by using the same 3 rooms, and by displaying the toys in exactly the same way for every child. Every child also witnessed the same stylised acts of either aggressive or non-aggressive behaviour acted out by the models. Samuel and Bryant controlled their experiment by having an equal number of 21 children of equal mean age in each subgroup – standard, one question, fixed array. In addition every child had 4 attempts with each type of material – counters, playdough, liquid, and the order in which the children undertook the tasks was systematically varied to prevent order effects. • Other appropriate answer. <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer. 1 mark – Similarity is identified, with little or no elaboration. 2 marks – Description of similarity is basic and lacks detail. Some understanding may be evident. Expression is generally poor. 3 marks – Description of similarity is accurate and has elaboration. Understanding is good.</p> <p>Difference:</p>	[3+3=6]	<p><i>This question requires candidates to refer to the 3 developmental approach core studies ie Freud, Samuel and Bryant, Bandura</i></p> <p><i>Guidance for allocating marks:</i></p> <p><i>1 mark – An appropriate similarity/difference between two appropriate studies is merely identified.</i></p> <p><i>2 marks – An appropriate similarity/difference is identified and supported by relevant evidence from one appropriate study OR an appropriate</i></p>

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A difference between two developmental studies is that Bandura's and Samuel and Bryant's samples were drawn from different places. Bandura's sample was drawn from Stanford University Nursery School in California, America whereas Samuel and Bryant's participants came from various schools and playgroups in Crediton, Devon, England. • Other appropriate answer. <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer. 1 mark – Difference is identified, with little or no elaboration, topic of study is merely reiterated. 2 marks – Description of difference is basic and lacks detail. Some understanding may be evident. Expression is generally poor. 3 marks – Description of difference is accurate and has elaboration. Understanding is good.</p>		<p><i>similarity/difference is merely described without actual identification of the similarity/difference.</i></p> <p><i>3 marks – An appropriate similarity/difference is identified and supported by relevant evidence from two appropriate studies.</i></p>
(d)	<p>Discuss strengths <u>and</u> weaknesses of the developmental approach using examples from any core studies that take this approach.</p> <p>Strengths may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It offers and explanation on why individuals of differing ages demonstrate different intellectual abilities, social skills and emotional responses.... • It adds to the continuing nature versus nurture debate.... <p>Weaknesses may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is often claimed to be reductionist.... • Many proposals in relation to age-related development have been shown to be too rigid.... 	[12]	<p><i>This question again requires candidates to refer to the 3 developmental approach core studies.</i></p> <p><i>The candidate must make it clear why their suggestion is a strength/weakness.</i></p> <p><i>The supporting evidence must actually support the identified strength/weakness ie be appropriately contextualised.</i></p> <p><i>Study-specific/methodology-specific answers are NOT creditworthy.</i></p>

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relies heavily on the use of children which raise ethical issues. <p>Possible answer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One strength of the developmental approach is that it offers an explanation as to why individuals of differing ages demonstrate different intellectual abilities, social skills and emotional responses. [S] For example Samuel and Bryant's showed how as children get older their ability to conserve increases and that conservational abilities develop gradually with the ability to conserve number developing before that of mass or volume.[E] Likewise, Freud showed how young boys pass, subconsciously, through various psychosexual stages of development, one being the phallic stage during which they experience the Oedipus Complex where a boy has sexual desires for his mother and recognises a competition with his father. He fears his father will punish him by castrating him. This subconscious complex can become evident through the development of a phobia – here being bitten by a horse which is seen to represent his fear of his father castrating him. As they overcome the Oedipus Complex, they identify with their father who is then no longer deemed a threat and frequently the phobia is overcome. [E] • Another strength of the developmental approach is that it adds to the continuing nature versus nurture debate. [S]The study by Bandura shows the influence of nurture on the development of aggressive behaviour. Those children exposed to the aggressive model reproduced more acts of aggression than those children exposed to a non-aggressive model or no model at all, suggesting children can learn (nurture) to 		

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	<p>imitate behaviour. However, although the children's natural aggressive tendencies were controlled for as they were pre-matched for aggression and equally distributed between the groups, one cannot be certain children in the aggressive group were not naturally more pre-disposed to aggression. [E] Likewise, although Samuel and Bryant's study showed conversational skills develop with age, suggesting this is due to a child's natural (biologically determined) developing cognitive abilities, one cannot be certain that the environment (nurture) they were brought up in at home and/or school did not significantly influence these abilities. [E]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="394 651 1205 1358">• A weakness of the developmental approach is that it is often claimed to be reductionist as it attempts to provide a complete explanation for a complex behaviour by focusing on one single factor.[W] Bandura in his Bashing Bobo experiment tried to show that children can learn aggressive behaviour simply by watching and then imitating aggressive behaviour displayed by a significant model. However other factors are also likely to influence whether or not a child will become aggressive eg biological influences such as testosterone levels which are known to affect aggression levels. [E] Likewise, Freud tried to claim that Little Hans' fear of horses was a subconscious fear of his father as he was experiencing the Oedipus Complex. This is reducing the development of complex phenomena of phobias down to one basic factor whereas other influences such as the biological need to survive and the influence of past experiences eg seeing someone being bitten by a horse, are also likely to influence whether or not an individual develops such a phobia. [E] 		

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Another weakness of this approach is that because research frequently involves the study of children, ethical guidelines are often breached. [W] For example, although Bandura needed to use children to show how easily they can learn to imitate behaviour, many of them suffered distress during the experiment: one girl was distressed by the behaviour of the aggressive female model and said, "Who is that lady? That's not the way for a lady to behave." [E] The children were also distressed when they were taken into the second room, allowed to play with attractive toys and then had them taken off them. [E] It is unethical to cause participants distress and researchers should be aware that children become distressed more easily than adults. [C] • Other appropriate answer. <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer. 1-3 marks – 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. 4-6 marks – 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>IF NO REFERENCE TO TWO APPROPRIATE STRENGTHS AND TWO APPROPRIATE WEAKNESSES A MAXIMUM OF 6 MARKS CAN BE AWARDED</p>		

Question		Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
		<p>7-9 marks – There may be a range of strengths (2 or more) and weaknesses (2 or more) 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>10-12 marks – 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>		

OR

Question		Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
18	(a)	<p>Outline <u>one</u> assumption of the psychodynamic perspective.</p> <p>Likely answer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many important influences on behaviour come from a part of the mind individuals have no direct awareness of, the unconscious. • Personality is shaped by relationships, experience and conflict over time, particularly during childhood. • Different parts of the mind are in constant dynamic struggle with each other (often unconsciously) and the consequences of this struggle are often shown through behaviour. 	[2]	<p><i>The assumption must be:</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>Linked to the psychodynamic perspective</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>Linked to behaviour</i></p>

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The mind is like an iceberg. We have conscious, subconscious and unconscious thought, all of which can influence our behaviour. <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer. 1 mark – Assumption is identified. Description is basic and lacks detail. Some understanding may be evident. Expression is generally poor. 2 marks – 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>		
(b)	<p>Describe how the psychodynamic perspective could explain multiple personality disorder.</p> <p>Likely answer may cover the following content:</p> <p>The psychodynamic perspective, as shown through the Thigpen and Cleckley study, could explain multiple personality disorder as behaviour in such disorders, comes from a part of the mind of which individuals, initially at least, have no direct awareness. Eve White was first referred to Thigpen and Cleckley because she was suffering unaccountable severe and blinding headaches. During therapy behavioural changes of which Eve White was initially unaware were identified by the researchers as a second personality, Eve Black, who ‘came out’ during Eve White’s blackouts and which accounted for her amnesia and confusion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other appropriate answer including a generic explanation, supported by psychological theory eg the development of defence mechanisms as a way of coping with traumatic experiences, especially in childhood. 	[4]	

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	<p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p>1-2 marks – Description is generally accurate, but is basic and lacks detail. Some understanding and or elaboration may be evident. Expression is generally poor.</p> <p>3-4 marks – Description is accurate. Detail is appropriate and understanding is good. Elaboration (eg specific detail or example) is evident. Expression and use of psychological terminology is good.</p>		
(c)	<p>Describe <u>one</u> similarity and <u>one</u> difference between any core studies that can be viewed from the psychodynamic perspective.</p> <p>Answers are likely to refer to: Sample, methodology, ethics.</p> <p>Possible answers may cover the following content:</p> <p>Similarity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A similarity between two studies that take the psychodynamic perspective is that both Freud and Thigpen and Cleckley are both case studies which gathered a lot of rich in-depth detail about one individual. Freud studied Little Hans, gathering information on his fears and fantasies, particularly his fear of horses, which he was able to use to support his ideas about psychosexual development and the Oedipus complex. Thigpen and Cleckley studied Eve White and during 100 hours of interviewing discovered she had multiple personality disorder, having three different personalities – Eve White, Eve Black and Jane who all co-existed in the one physical body. • Other appropriate answer. <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p>	[3+3=6]	<p><i>Candidates are likely to refer to – Freud, Thigpen and Cleckley.</i></p> <p><i>Guidance for allocating marks:</i></p>

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	<p>1 mark – Similarity is identified, with little or no elaboration. 2 marks – Description of similarity is basic and lacks detail. Some understanding may be evident. Expression is generally poor. 3 marks – Description of similarity is accurate and has elaboration. Understanding is good.</p> <p>Difference:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A difference between two studies that take the psychodynamic perspective is that Thigpen and Cleckley conducted the study themselves whereas Freud conducted his study through a third person – Little Hans’ father. Eve White was initially referred to Dr Thigpen because she was experiencing severe headaches and blackouts. Over time Thigpen became puzzled by some of events she reported during interviews about which she had no memory. He therefore called in his colleague Cleckley and together they personally interviewed and filmed Eve White and Eve Black for over 100 hours. On the other hand, Little Hans’ father, a friend and supporter of Freud, wrote to him because he was concerned over his son’s increasing fear of horses. Hans’ father recorded events and conversations with Hans and sent these regularly to Freud who then interpreted the information and sent further instructions to Hans’ father as to what to do next. Freud himself only met Hans on one occasion. • Other appropriate answer. <p>NB: Credit should be given if the candidate makes a clear link between the perspective and a known study eg Bandura.</p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer. 1 mark – Similarity is identified, with little or no elaboration,</p>		<p><i>1 mark – An appropriate similarity/difference between two appropriate studies is merely identified.</i></p> <p><i>2 marks – An appropriate similarity/difference is identified and supported by relevant evidence from one appropriate study OR an appropriate similarity/difference is merely described without actual identification of the similarity/difference.</i></p> <p><i>3 marks – An appropriate similarity/difference is identified and supported by relevant evidence from two appropriate studies.</i></p>

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	<p>topic of study is merely reiterated.</p> <p>2 marks – Description of similarity is basic and lacks detail. Some understanding may be evident. Expression is generally poor.</p> <p>3 marks – Description of similarity is accurate and has elaboration. Understanding is good.</p>		
(d)	<p>Discuss strengths <u>and</u> weaknesses of the psychodynamic perspective using examples from any core studies that can be viewed from this perspective.</p> <p>Strengths may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allows psychologists to suggest causes of mental disorders. • Allows psychologists to suggest why individuals behave in ways they cannot easily explain or understand. • Allows psychologists to see how behaviour can develop over time as a result of subconscious forces. <p>Weaknesses may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Studies which take this approach often use unrepresentative samples. • Methodology may not be objective and therefore open to bias. • The perspective is based on concepts that are difficult to test and verify scientifically. • Ethical concerns may be raised. <p>Possible answer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One strength of the psychodynamic perspective is that it allows psychologists to suggest causes for mental disorders (S). For example, Freud was able to suggest 	[12]	<p><i>This question also requires candidates to refer to appropriate core studies</i></p> <p><i>The candidate must make it clear why their suggestion is a strength/weakness.</i></p> <p><i>The supporting evidence must actually support the identified strength/weakness ie be appropriately contextualised.</i></p> <p><i>Study-specific answers are NOT creditworthy.</i></p>

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	<p>that Little Hans' phobia of horses was because he was unconsciously going through the phallic stage of psychosexual development which is characterised by experiencing the Oedipus complex. His fear of being bitten by a horse was really a fear of castration by his father (who resembled a horse) who was angry with him for having sexual desires for his mother (E). One must however be cautious about generalising such findings because this was a study conducted on only one individual and such symptoms are unlikely to be found in other individuals whose experiences will be different (C).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Another strength of this perspective is that it allows psychologists to suggest why individuals behave in ways they cannot easily explain or understand (S). Eve White was referred to Thigpen and Cleckley because she was suffering from inexplicable headaches and blackouts. Over time they were able identify the existence of two other personalities – Eve Black and Jane – who co-existed in Eve White's one physical body and accounted for behaviour she could not understand like finding her wardrobe full of uncharacteristic clothes (E). Likewise, Freud was able to suggest to Little Hans that the origin of his fear of horses was because he had a subconscious fear his father would castrate him because he subconsciously wanted to have sex with his mother, making his father angry (E). • One weakness is that the methodology used in studies that take the psychodynamic perspective is not always objective and is therefore open bias (W). For example, Thigpen and Cleckley have been criticised for becoming too involved with their participant, Eve White, thus misinterpreting some of her behaviour to support their theory of MPD. The therapists themselves 		

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	<p>acknowledged that there “was something distinctively attractive” about Eve Black and they recognised that their role in ‘creating’ Jane since her emergence were really due to the process of therapy (E). The conclusions of such studies may therefore be questionable as they may suffer from subjective bias from the researchers making one wonder if such disorders actually exist (C).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A further weakness of the psychodynamic perspective is that studies that take this perspective often raise considerable ethical issues (W). For example, Freud and Little Hans’ father may have caused Hans considerable distress by continually asking him about his fears, phobias, dreams and fantasies (E). Hans was also deceived because he was not informed that his data was being used to support Freud’s ideas about psychosexual development and the Oedipus Complex (E). Likewise Thigpen and Cleckley may have caused Eve White distress when they suggested she had two alters – Eve Black and Jane (E). • Other appropriate answer. <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer. 1-3 marks – 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. 4-6 marks – 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>		

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	<p>IF NO REFERENCE TO TWO APPROPRIATE STRENGTHS AND TWO APPROPRIATE WEAKNESSES A MAXIMUM OF 6 MARKS CAN BE AWARDED</p> <p>7-9 marks – There may be a range of strengths (2 or more) and weaknesses (2 or more) 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>10-12 marks – 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.</p> <p>The answer is competently structured and organised. Answer is mostly grammatically correct with occasional spelling errors.</p>		
	Section C Total	[24]	
	Paper Total	[120]	

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

14 – 19 Qualifications (General)

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

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 2011