

Candidate Style Answers June 2009

GCE Psychology

OCR Advanced GCE in Psychology H168

Unit G542: Core Studies

Contents

CONTENTS	2
SECTION A	3
SECTION B	13
IN RELATION TO ROSENHAN: ON BEING SANE IN INSANE PLACES	13
IN RELATION TO BANDURA: TRANSMISSION OF AGGRESSION	19
SECTION C	27
IN RELATION TO THE SOCIAL APPROACH	27
IN RELATION TO THE COGNITIVE APPROACH	34

SECTION A

<u>Question Number</u>	<u>Candidate's Response</u>	<u>Mark(s) Awarded (Against Mark Scheme)</u>	<u>Rationale for Mark(s) Awarded</u>
1(a)	<p>In the study by Baron Cohen, adults with Tourettes syndrome scored significantly higher on the Eyes Task (a pure theory of mind test) with a mean score of 20.4, than adults with autism who had a mean score of 16.3.</p> <p>The autistic adults did not do as well on the theory of mind tests as the Tourette Syndrome adults.</p> <p>Females did better than males on the Gender Recognition Task.</p>	<p>2</p> <p>1</p> <p>0</p>	<p>Full description of difference, reference made to both groups, supported by evidence.</p> <p>Vague answer, not clear which tests were being referred to, no supporting evidence.</p> <p>Irrelevant answer.</p>
1(b)	<p>Adult autistics are less likely to possess advanced theory of mind than either normal or Tourette Syndrome adults, shown through the Eye Task where their average score was 16.3 compared to normal individuals whose average score was 20.3 and Tourettes whose average score was 20.4.</p> <p>This study tells us that adults with autism were impaired on an advanced theory of mind test, which suggests that they have difficulty interpreting emotion.</p> <p>The study tells us that people with autism do not have a theory of mind.</p>	<p>2</p> <p>1</p> <p>0</p>	<p>Clear, contextualised explanation in relation to theory of mind, supported by evidence.</p> <p>Partial answer, contextualised but no supporting evidence</p> <p>Results did not show autistics DO NOT have TOM.</p>

2	<p>All participants (pts) viewed the same clip of a crash in both experiments, despite being part of different groups. The 10 questions asked were all the same, except the critical question where the verb has changed depending on the group they were part of.</p> <p>In the Loftus and Palmer study, the procedure was standardised by making all participants watch the same seven film clips</p> <p>Participants watched films of car crashes and then completed questionnaires</p>	<p>2</p> <p>1</p> <p>0</p>	<p>Full outline of two ways in which the procedure was standardised (use of 'all participants' and 'same')</p> <p>Partial answer as only one way outlined.</p> <p>No indication at all of how the procedure was standardised.</p>
3(a)	<p>Kanzi was taught symbol acquisition because she had observed her mother using a lexigram board, and appeared to have taken an interest in it.</p> <p>Kanzi was taught symbol acquisition as a means of communication as he lacked the capacity to speak</p> <p>One reason why Kanzi was taught symbol acquisition as a means of communication was because the lexigram was a method to test the comprehension and language acquisition of the apes. The use of symbols was a scientific method of testing this as it provided quantitative data.</p>	<p>2</p> <p>1</p> <p>0</p>	<p>Adequate explanation for full marks.</p> <p>Right idea, but too vague for full marks – needed to say 'speak human language'.</p> <p>Irrelevant answer in relation to this study.</p>
3(b)	<p>The lexigrams were recorded by a computer when Kanzi was indoOnly one factor identified.ors.</p> <p>One way in which the researchers recorded</p>	<p>2</p> <p>1</p>	<p>Clear outline of how symbol acquisition was recorded.</p> <p>Vague answer because no</p>

	<p>Kanzi's symbol acquisition was to note down every time she used a symbol whether it was correct or incorrect.</p> <p>Researchers filmed 4 hours worth of footage of Kanzi using symbol acquisition, which was analysed by a blind observer.</p>	0	<p>details of how symbol acquisition was 'noted'.</p> <p>Irrelevant answer as this refers to how the reliability of the results was checked.</p>
4	<p>In the Bandura study the children were matched for their previously shown levels of aggression. This involved the researchers attending the nursery before the experiment to observe and measure the levels of aggression of the children which were chosen to take part.</p> <p>They were marked on 4 five point likert-scales and were then matched with other children who showed similar levels of aggression.</p> <p>Matched by pre-existing levels of aggression.</p> <p>They were matched due to sharing similar behaviours and temperament.</p>	<p>2</p> <p>1</p> <p>0</p>	<p>Full, clear explanation with reference made to pre-existing levels of aggression, who did the aggression ratings, how the aggression was rated, and how the children were then matched.</p> <p>Vague answer but reference made to pre-existing aggression levels.</p> <p>Irrelevant answer,</p>
5(a)	<p>The other two conditions were 'standardised' where the child was asked before and after the transformation, and the other condition was the fixed-array condition, where they did not see the transformation (a control group).</p> <p>Pre Piaget method and post transformation question (asked both before and after</p>	<p>2</p> <p>1</p>	<p>Clear, correct identification of the other two conditions.</p> <p>First example is correct for 1 mark, 2nd example is too</p>

	<p>the transformation took place), and another 1 question condition, where pts were only asked the question once.</p> <p>The children were only asked one question.</p>	0	<p>vague because it could refer to either of the other two conditions.</p> <p>Far too vague as this could refer to either the 'one question' or 'fixed array' condition.</p>
5(b)	<p>What the transformation task was, as children did better at the number task than mass and volume. The age of the child; the ability to conserve comes with age, so older children made less errors than younger children.</p> <p>Age affected the children's ability to conserve, the younger the child the harder conservation task was for them.</p> <p>Whether the children were asked one or two questions and the presence of the experimenter.</p>	2 1 0	<p>Correct identification of the other two factors</p> <p>Only one factor identified.</p> <p>Irrelevant answer.</p>
6(a)	<p>Little Hans fantasised about being married to his mother, and having children with her.</p> <p>One of Little Hans' dreams involved two giraffes; a normal one and a crumpled one. In the dream Hans was unable to take the crumpled giraffe because of the other one.</p> <p>Little Hans had a nightmare about a white horse.</p>	2 1 0	<p>Just adequate for 2 marks because reference made to being married to mother and having her children.</p> <p>Too vague and inaccurate for full marks but a correct fantasy identified.</p> <p>Not one on Hans' dreams or fantasies.</p>
6(b)	<p>Freud interpreted this dream as part of the Oedipus Complex, showing</p>	2	<p>Adequate explanation for full marks.</p>

	<p>Little Hans desire for his mother. Taking her away from his father (the large giraffe) so he could have her all to himself.</p> <p>Freud's explanation of this was that it was Little Hans experiencing the Oedipus conflict</p> <p>Freud's explanation of this was that it was Little Hans resolving the Oedipus conflict</p>	<p>1</p> <p>0</p>	<p>Vague answer, no reference made to Freud's actual explanation for the fantasy.</p> <p>Irrelevant answer.</p>
7(a)	<p>One different in 'split brain' subjects is that they can only identify objects using the hand that is controlled by the same hemisphere that the information is presented to. However, 'normal' people are able to identify objects by touch using both hands and both are able to recognise and identify the object.</p> <p>'Split-brain' patients are able to touch an object with their left hand, but are unable to say what it is (but can find an object that is the same).</p> <p>'Split brain' patients would only be able to identify an object if it was placed in their left hand as the right side of the brain controls language.</p>	<p>2</p> <p>1</p> <p>0</p>	<p>Clear explanation of an appropriate difference, making reference to both groups of participants.</p> <p>Appropriate reference made to 'split-brain' patients but no comparison drawn against 'normal' people.</p> <p>Incorrect answer – the right side of the brain does not control language.</p>
7(b)	<p>One reason for this difference is that 'split-brain' subjects have had the bundle of nerves that connects the two hemispheres of the brain (the corpus callosum) severed, so information is unable to pass from one hemisphere to the other.</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>Clear and adequate answer for full marks.</p>

	A reason for this is that patients that have had the operation have hemisphere disconnection	1	Partial answer as does not explain the effect of hemisphere deconnection.
	'Split brain' patients lack the	0	No actual answer provided!
8(a)	Sample included 16 right handed males, who had passed the knowledge and had been licensed for at least 1.5 years.	2	Two features of the sample clearly identified e.g. right-handed, had passed the Knowledge.
	One feature of the taxi driver sample used by Maguire was that they were all males.	1	Only one feature of the sample identified.
	One feature of Maguire's sample is that they were all taxi drivers.	0	Irrelevant answer as this information is given in the question itself.
8(b)	One limitation of this sample is that it has a gender bias. Because only males were studied, the sample is not generalisable to females, whose brains may be different	2	A full description of an appropriate limitation supported with an implication of the limitation.
	A limitation of this sample was that they were all males.	1	An appropriate limitation is identified but no reference is made as to an implication of this limitation.
	Only taxi drivers were used.	0	Irrelevant answer.
9	One piece of evidence to support the fact that REM only occur in dreaming is that participants were woken randomly, in REM sleep, in non REM sleep, and at the whim of the experimenter in the study, and the majority of dreams were recalled during REM sleep.	2+2 =4	Clear accurate evidence both supporting and challenging the suggestion.
	However, a piece of evidence to challenge this is the fact that some dreams	1	Supporting statement is vague so only worth one

	<p>were recalled during non REM sleep by some of the participants. This challenges the suggestion that REM only occur during dreaming. Also, more recent studies have suggested that dreaming also occurs in non REM sleep, though we are less likely to remember them.</p> <p>When woken during REM sleep, pts could tell the researcher their dream content into a tape recorder. Pts could have lied about having a dream, as they knew they were in an experiment.</p> <p>REM occurs in dreaming because EOG tests have been used to measure eye movement activity, and results show that the eyes are active during dream stages. A challenge to the idea is that there have been times where eye movement has been recorded when the participant was not in dream stage.</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>mark. Challenging evidence is irrelevant.</p> <p>Both supporting and challenging explanations are irrelevant as they do not refer to dreaming.</p>
<p>10</p>	<p>In the Reicher and Haslam Prison study, one reason the prisoners were given a uniform was to cause the prisoners to loose their personal identity (the three digit number on the back of the t-shirts assisted this). Secondly, the prisoners were given a uniform to make the prisoners feel inferior (the guard's uniform was of a much higher quality).</p> <p>Firstly, the prisoners were given uniforms to further</p>	<p>2+2=4</p> <p>1+1=2</p>	<p>Two clearly explained reasons why the PRISONERS were given uniforms.</p> <p>Two appropriate reasons</p>

	<p>separate them from the guards and secondly, Reicher and Haslam hoped this would absorb the prisoners into their role,</p> <p>To make the study real. And to make the guards feel authoritarian.</p>	0	<p>given, but neither reason has been developed adequately to score full marks.</p> <p>First reason far too vague, second reason irrelevant.</p>
11(a)	<p>The sample in Milgram's study was a self selected or volunteer sample recruited from people who responded to adverts in a newspaper in the New Haven area of the USA.</p> <p>Through newspaper advertisements.</p> <p>The sample was obtained by putting up posters around the university.</p>	<p>2</p> <p>1</p> <p>0</p>	<p>Clear description of how Milgram obtained his sample with reference to both where it was advertised and that the sample was a volunteer sample.</p> <p>Vague answer as there is no reference as to which newspaper the advert was displayed in.</p> <p>An incorrect answer.</p>
11(b)	<p>One disadvantage of the way this sample was obtained is that it is very low in generalisability. It is ethnocentric, as all the participants were from one area, and were all the readers of a certain newspaper (which may have targeted a specific audience).</p> <p>The sample is likely not to be representative</p> <p>One disadvantage is</p>	<p>2</p> <p>0</p>	<p>A full , contextualised outline of an appropriate disadvantage.</p> <p>A partial answer. An appropriate disadvantage has been identified but there is no development.</p> <p>No answer actually provided!</p>
12(a)	<p>One of the model conditions in the study by Piliavin was the intervention of a model who was standing in the critical area, immediately after the 'victim' had collapsed – after 70</p>	2	<p>Correct identification of both area and time.</p>

	seconds..		
	One of the model conditions was that the model had to stand in the critical area and assist the victim as quickly as possible	1	Correct identification of area but identification of time is too vague.
	One of the model conditions was the lame condition when the actor dressed up in a suit and carried a cane.	0	Irrelevant answer.
12(b)	The early model results in significantly more help than the late model.	2	Accurate outline of one appropriate finding giving specific reference to the early model.
	The model resulted in more help being given.	1	Vague answer as no reference made to which model condition.
	The lame person received much more help than the drunk model.	0	Irrelevant answer.
13(a)	One psychological test carried out in the Thigpen and Cleckly studied was an IQ test, to reveal whether there was only significant difference between the two alters. Another psychological test used were that projective tests, one of which included the ink blot test (reveal what picture you can see in a blot of ink).	2	Correct identification of two psychological tests used.
	I.Q. test.	1	Only one psychological test identified.
	They carried out hypnosis and it was under hypnosis that they discovered the alter of 'Eve Black' and they monitored her brain patterns in her different alter states.	0	Hypnosis is not a psychological test, therefore an incorrect answer.
13(b)	One finding from the IQ test was that Eve White scored 110 and Eve Black scored 104.	2	Correct findings given in relation to an identified test.

	<p>Eve White had a higher I.Q. than Eve Black.</p> <p>Her brain patterns changed between alters indicating that they were different people.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>0</p>	<p>Partial or vague answer.</p> <p>Irrelevant answer.</p>
14	<p>Griffiths used the 'quasi experimental' method to compare the skill, beliefs and behaviour of regular fruit machine gamblers when compared to non regular fruit machine gamblers. Because Griffiths did not manipulate the independent variable, this was a quasi experiment as it occurred naturally.</p> <p>Griffiths could not randomly allocate participants to the two conditions as the IV occurred naturally.</p> <p>Griffiths used the 'quasi experimental' method to study gambling, as the independent variable was naturally occurring.</p> <p>Griffiths provided the participants with £3 which would give them thirty "goes" but encouraged to play up to sixty times. This is an example of the quasi-experimental approach as the participants have a lot of choice in the matter.</p>	<p>3</p> <p>2</p> <p>1</p> <p>0</p>	<p>Explanation of why a quasi experiment is adequate for 2 marks + identification of the two groups of participants for 1 mark.</p> <p>Adequate description of a quasi experiment for 2 marks.</p> <p>Vague answer: mere identification that the IV could not be manipulated.</p> <p>Irrelevant answer.</p>
15	<p>They began to feel depressed and dehumanised as they were not being treated as people.</p> <p>Made the pseudopatients feel as though they did not matter.</p> <p>This made the</p>	<p>2</p> <p>1</p>	<p>Good description of how the pseudopatients felt.</p> <p>Too vague for 2 marks.</p>

	pseudopatients behave as if they were insane.	0	Incorrect answer.
--	---	---	-------------------

SECTION B

<u>Question Number</u>	<u>Candidate's Response</u>	<u>Mark(s) Awarded (Against Mark Scheme)</u>	<u>Rationale for Mark(s) Awarded</u>
NB: These are examples of answers given. This is not an all-inclusive set of responses covering all aspects of the mark scheme.			
<u>IN RELATION TO ROSENHAN: ON BEING SANE IN INSANE PLACES</u>			
16(a)	To test the hypothesis that doctors cannot effectively diagnose mental illnesses in patients.	2	Precise statement of the aim, clearly linked to the chosen study.
	The aim of Rosenhan's study was to investigate the validity of admittance to mental institutions and to also investigate the subjective feeling of being a real patient	1	Rather vague though understanding is evident..
16(b)	The method used in this investigation was a field experiment using covert observation. The pseudopatients admitted themselves to different mental institutions in different states, complaining of existential problems. By using a field experiment the experiment was high in ecological validity and by using covert observation the sample was unable to respond with demand	Method = 1 Advantage = 1	Mere identification of method. Link to chosen study vague and no details of how data was gathered using observation. Mere advantage of method identified. No link made to chosen study and no indication made as to how the sample in the chosen study might have responded to demand characteristics.

	<p>patients should have had a right to say whether they wanted to be a part of his investigation. Staff may have been upset by how they were perceived to have treated and may have opted out had the choice.</p> <p>In Rosenhan's study, the researcher needed to break ethical guidelines. By not telling people they were in an experiment and deceiving them and not getting informed consent, Rosenhan avoided the issue of demand characteristics; people did not know they were being observed, so the results are likely to be more reliable than if they were informed. On the other hand, Rosenhan's study was extremely unethical due to deception and no right to withdraw. He should not have broken ethical guidelines, as the pseudopatients may have become distressed and suffered greatly from psychological harm. This was because they had no right to withdraw, meaning they had to stay in the hospital until the staff thought they were well enough to leave. Some pseudopatients were in hospital for over 50 days; being in a hospital for a very long period when they were healthy could have led them to think that perhaps they did have a mental illness as they had not been released.</p>	<p>Reason for = 1 Reason against = 3</p>	<p>Although appropriate reason for breaking ethical guidelines has been identified there is no link/reference to the chosen study. Although the candidate has got confused over who the actual participants were an appropriate reason as to why ethical guidelines should not have been broken has been clearly described and elaborated with appropriate reference to the chosen study.</p>
16(e)	<p>The study could be made more ethical if participants received psychiatric help after the study. This does not avoid the issue of psychological harm, but</p>	6	<p>The study could be made more ethical if participants received psychiatric help after the study. This does not avoid the issue of psychological harm, but would resolve it after the study. (<i>Issue identified and understanding evident, but no link to study at this point</i>). The</p>

<p>would resolve it after the study.</p> <p>The staff could also be informed that they were being observed. This would avoid the issue of deception, and they would have to give consent. To try and avoid demand characteristics, staff could give consent, but not informed consent. This would mean that they would not know the aim of the study, so could not change their behaviour accordingly. Participants could also be given the right to withdraw. This could be done by informing the hospital that pseudopatients were present, but not telling them who they were. If a patient said they wanted to withdraw, the hospital could check with the researcher to see if the person was one of the pseudopatients. All of these points would greatly increase the ethics, but could lead to other implications, such as questioning the reliability and validity of the findings.</p> <p>Rosenhans study could firstly be made more ethical by warning the hospitals before the first study that he was doing an experiment. This way staff would have had the opportunity to opt out, right to withdraw. Secondly, Rosenhan shouldn't have conducted his second study, which led psychiatrists and staff making crucial diagnostic errors. This was unethical and demeaning to staff and could also have jeopardised many lives of those actually mentally ill. The pseudopatients should have</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>staff (link) could also be informed that they were being observed. This would avoid the issue of deception, and they would have to give consent. (Issue identified and understanding evident, but a better link could have been made to chosen study.) To try and avoid demand characteristics, staff (link) could give consent, but not informed consent. This would mean that they would not know the aim of the study, so could not change their behaviour accordingly. Participants could also be given the right to withdraw. This could be done by informing the hospital that pseudopatients (link) were present, but not telling them who they were. If a patient (link) said they wanted to withdraw, the hospital could check with the researcher to see if the person was one of the pseudopatients. (Issue identified and suggestion made for how to improve it). All of these points would greatly increase the ethics, but could lead to other implications, such as questioning the reliability and validity of the findings. (Description of one or more appropriate changes is accurate, understanding is evident and psychological terms are used confidently. However more links should have been made to the chosen study and more detail given in relation to how these issues would be managed.)</p> <p>Rosenhans study could firstly be made more ethical by warning the hospitals (link) before the first study that he was doing an experiment. This way staff (link) would have had the opportunity to opt out, right to withdraw. (Issue identified and understanding evident. Links made to chosen study). Secondly, Rosenhan shouldn't have conducted his second study, which led psychiatrists and staff making crucial diagnostic errors. This was unethical and demeaning to staff and could also have jeopardised many lives of those actually mentally ill. (Issue identified and understanding evident. Links made to chosen study). The pseudopatients (link) should have observed overtly so that people knew they were being watched, making it more ethical. (Issue identified but not expanded). Rosenhan could have conducted the study as a lab experiment, replicating a mental</p>
--	----------	--

	<p>observed overtly so that people knew they were being watched, making it more ethical. Rosenhan could have conducted the study as a lab experiment, replicating a mental institution. This way everyone involved would have agreed to making it a lot more ethical with informed consent.</p>		<p>institution. This way everyone involved would have agreed to making it a lot more ethical with informed consent. (Suggestion made for how ethics could be improved). (Description of one or more appropriate changes is accurate, some understanding is evident and psychological terms are used reasonably well. However more links should have been made to the chosen study and more detail given in relation to how these issues would be managed.)</p>
<p>16(f)</p>	<p>If participants received psychiatric help after the experiment, they could be reassured that they were healthy, and return to the same mental state they were in before the experiment. This could also be done with the staff and doctors, to make sure they do not feel like they have done their job incorrectly, making them suspect further pseudopatients, maybe diagnosing sick people as healthy as a consequence. Although, this would be difficult to do, and very time consuming and costly. Some of the problems may not be able to be completely resolved.</p> <p>If everyone had to give consent, their behaviour is likely to change due to demand characteristics. This would mean the findings would be less reliable and valid, making them less applicable to the real world and lowering ecological validity. This is because people would know of the study, and the findings would have less use due to these problems like reliability.</p> <p>Similar issues are raised with given pseudopatients the right to withdraw, as staff are likely to be suspicious of many patients by knowing pseudopatients are present,</p>	<p>6</p>	<p>If participants received psychiatric help after the experiment, they could be reassured that they were healthy, and return to the same mental state they were in before the experiment. (Repeat of content of 16(e), not linked to chosen study). This could also be done with the staff and doctors (link), to make sure they do not feel like they have done their job incorrectly, making them suspect further pseudopatients (link), maybe diagnosing sick people as healthy as a consequence. (Appropriate implication suggested and developed.) Although, this would be difficult to do, and very time consuming and costly. (Appropriate implications suggested). Some of the problems may not be able to be completely resolved. If everyone had to give consent, their behaviour is likely to change due to demand characteristics. (No implication suggested and no links to chosen study). This would mean the findings would be less reliable and valid, making them less applicable to the real world and lowering ecological validity. (Vague, no links to chosen study) This is because people would know of the study, and the findings would have less use due to these problems like reliability. Similar issues are raised with given pseudopatients (link) the right to withdraw, as staff are likely to be suspicious of many patients by knowing pseudopatients (links) are present, focusing their attention away from trying to treat the ill. (Appropriate implication suggested, linked to chosen study). (Descriptions of one or more implications are accurate, some understanding is evident and psychological terms are used reasonably well. However more should have been made in relation to how the implications may have affected the study's methodology and/or its results).</p>

<p>focusing their attention away from trying to treat the ill.</p> <p>These changes would increase ethics within the study but would have other implications too. By warning the hospital staff, giving the option for them to opt out and give informed consent wouldn't give an accurate representation of the hospitals. Knowing they were involved could lead to them acting significantly differently. If Rosenhan hadn't conducted his second study (telling hospitals he was going to try and admit pseudopatients) Rosenhan would have collected the data that he did on how many ill people were thought to be normal. Proving that psychological symptoms are hard to diagnose and giving vital information that the admittance to mental homes is not always correct. If the sample was observed overtly, the staff and patients would respond with demand characteristics, which would be uncharacteristically like what we would see in a normal unwatched home. It was said patients were fit by staff, but when another was seen coming they would stop showing there would be a huge behaviour difference. Finally if a lab experiment took place the experiment would lose all ecological validity and experimental realisms, getting unreliable results that wouldn't be found the same if done in a real mental institution too.</p>	<p>6</p>	<p>These changes would increase ethics within the study but would have other implications too. (Unnecessary).By warning the hospital staff (link), giving the option for them to opt out and give informed consent wouldn't give an accurate representation of the hospitals (link but very vague).) Knowing they were involved could lead to them acting significantly differently. (Appropriate implication but not linked to the chosen study). If Rosenhan hadn't conducted his second study (telling hospitals he was going to try and admit pseudopatients) Rosenhan would (‘NOT’ needed here) have collected the data that he did on how many ill people were thought to be normal. Proving that psychological symptoms are hard to diagnose and giving vital information that the admittance to mental homes is not always correct. (If ‘not’ inserted, appropriate implication and affect suggested). If the sample was observed overtly, the staff and patients (links) would respond with demand characteristics, which would be uncharacteristically like what we would see in a normal unwatched situation. (Appropriate implication but not developed adequately). It was said patients were fit by staff, but when another was seen coming they would stop showing there would be a huge behaviour difference. (Unclear what is being said here). Finally if a lab experiment took place the experiment would lose all ecological validity and experimental realisms, getting unreliable results that wouldn't be found the same if done in a real mental institution. (Appropriate implication but not developed adequately). (Descriptions of one or more implications are accurate, some understanding is evident and psychological terms are used reasonably well. However more should have been made in relation to how the implications may have affected the study's methodology and/or its results).</p>
---	----------	--

IN RELATION TO BANDURA: TRANSMISSION OF AGGRESSION

16(a)	The aim of the study was to see if aggression was imitated or a learnt response, when faced with an aggressive model.	1	Aim is basic and lacks detail though some understanding is evident.
16(b)	The method was a lab experiment, or lab observation, as participants were in a controlled environment, and their reactions were observed. An advantage of using a lab experiment in the study is that it is highly controlled, which meant that there were no confounding variables, which means that the results are more accurate, and the study is replicable.	Method = 1 Advantage = 1	Mere identification of method. No link to chosen study and no details of what the IVs were, how they were manipulated, the DV or how it was measured. Mere advantage of method identified. No link made to chosen study and no suggestions made as to what confounding variables could influence the study or why a controlled environment made the study replicable.
16(c)	An ethical issue raised is informed consent and an issue of who needs to give consent for the children to take part, because the children would be too young to understand and give consent, and the parents would not willingly allow their children to experience aggression. Another ethical issue raised is possible psychological harm from being subjected to aggression and seeing an adult act aggressively. It could have had future implications on their mental health unless they were debriefed and checked.	Issue 1 = 2 Issue 2 = 3	Appropriate issue is identified but not adequately e.g. why were the children too young? Were the parents even asked to give their consent? Appropriate issue is identified, elaborated and clearly linked to the chosen study.
16(d)	Bandura Ross and Ross needed to break ethical guidelines in order to do the study otherwise parents would not have given consent for their children to be in an experiment that involves aggressive	Reason for = 2 Reason against = 0	Description of why ethical guidelines needed to be broken is accurate and shows some understanding. More could have been made of the implications of not being able to get hold of participants. Incorrect answer. There is no information in the original study that parents were actually aware their children were taking part in the study and the

	behaviour, meaning that they would not have been able to get hold of any participants. This should not have been done because the parents were deceived as to what would happen, meaning that the study could have caused their children psychological harm.		reference to [psychological harm is too vague.
16 (e)	The Bandura study could be made more ethical by using older children in the study; children that are more aware that aggression is unnecessary to continue to use. Another change could be to allow the participants to withdraw and make them aware that they can withdraw at any time that they feel uncomfortable. Also, the informed consent must be made clear. Either by using older children that can make informed consent by themselves, or to allow parents to give consent by fully explaining to the parents what will happen in the experiment so they are not deceived. A further change could be to the method, if the study was changed from a lab experiment to a field study, so it is less controlled.	4	The Bandura study could be made more ethical by using older children in the study; children that are more aware that aggression is unnecessary to continue to use. (No suggestion made as to what age the children should be – if under 16 can't consent) . Another change could be to allow the participants to withdraw and make them aware that they can withdraw at any time that they feel uncomfortable. (Appropriate issue but not linked to chosen study) Also, the informed consent must be made clear. Either by using older children that can make informed consent by themselves (Children's age needed to be identified) , or to allow parents to give consent by fully explaining to the parents what will happen in the experiment so they are not deceived. (Appropriate issue identified and suggestion made as to how this could be effected) A further change could be to the method, if the study was changed from a lab experiment to a field study, so it is less controlled. (NAQ: refers to methodology not ethics). (Description of one or more appropriate changes is reasonable and understanding is evident. Better links should have been made to the chosen study and more detail given in relation to how these issues would be managed.)
16(f)	If older children are used in the study, they will be more aware that violence is unnecessary and that would mean that there would be less developmental / psychological issues as they will know not to imitate aggression after the experiment. However, using older children could mean that they are past the 'developmental stage' of learning through imitation, and the change will mean that they will not have	4	If older children are used in the study, they will be more aware that violence is unnecessary and that would mean that there would be less developmental / psychological issues as they will know not to imitate aggression after the experiment. (Appropriate implication but lacks detail by not suggesting how results might be affected) . However, using older children could mean that they are past the 'developmental stage' of learning through imitation, and the change will mean that they will not have conclusive results. (Vague) If participants were aware of their right to withdraw, then it would make it more ethical as they would be able to withdraw if they were uncomfortable being subjected to aggression. However, this would mean that there could be a

	<p>conclusive results. If participants were aware of their right to withdraw, then it would make it more ethical as they would be able to withdraw if they were uncomfortable being subjected to aggression. However, this would mean that there could be a high drop out rate which would affect the results for the number of participants taking part in the study. Giving informed consent would mean that the study would be more ethical, as it would be clear that the participants or participants' parents were willing for the study to take place. If the study was changed from a lab experiment, it would mean that it would have more ecological validity and less demand characteristics. It would also mean that the researchers would be able to not need informed consent, or right to withdraw would be more available. On the other hand, it would be difficult to alter the experiment, and it could lead to other ethical issues if it was a field experiment.</p>		<p>high drop out rate which would affect the results for the number of participants taking part in the study. <i>(Repeat of content of 16(e), but implication of change suggested and linked to chosen study)</i>. Giving informed consent would mean that the study would be more ethical, as it would be clear that the participants or participants' parents were willing for the study to take place. <i>(Repeat of content of 16(e) and no link to chosen study)</i>. If the study was changed from a lab experiment, it would mean that it would have more ecological validity and less demand characteristics. <i>(Not related to ethics, so irrelevant as an implication of an ethical change, and no link to chosen study.)</i> It would also mean that the researchers would be able to not need informed consent, or right to withdraw would be more available. <i>(Methodological change linked to ethics but no link to chosen study)</i>. On the other hand, it would be difficult to alter the experiment <i>(Implication identified but not developed or linked to chosen study)</i> and it could lead to other ethical issues if it was a field experiment. <i>(Descriptions of one or more implications are basic and could have been developed more. Some understanding is evident and psychological terms are used reasonably well. However more should have been made in relation to how the implications may have affected the study's methodology and/or its results)</i>.</p>
<p><u>In relation to Piliavin, Rodin and Piliavin: good Samaritanism</u></p>			
<p>16(a)</p>	<p>The aim of the study by Piliavin was to investigate the factors involved with helping a victim. They wanted to observe whether the invention of a model, the race of the victim and whether the victim was drunk or ill would make a difference to the help they received.</p> <p>The aim of Piliavin's study</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>Clearly stated aim. Understanding is evident and fine details have been included.</p> <p>Aim has been identified and understanding is evident. However description lacks fine details.</p>

	<p>'good Samaritanism' was to investigate whether the appearance and behaviour of a victim would affect a person's willingness to help them.</p>		
16(b)	<p>The method used in Piliavin's study was covert field experiment. The students were split into groups of four with one playing the victim, another playing the model and two observers who were to record the gender, race, number and age of the people in the carriage and then record who went to help and how long it took them. They were then instructed to talk to the person after they immediately after the victim had been helped and to record what they said. An advantage of using a covert field experiment is that it is high in ecological validity as the participants are in a familiar situation and unaware they are being watched.</p> <p>The method in the Piliavin study was a field experiment using covert observation. An advantage of using this method was that it was extremely high in ecological validity, which made the results more valid and useful. Covert observation make that demand characteristics were limited (as passengers were unaware they were being observed), which also increased the validity of the study.</p>	<p>Method = 2</p> <p>Advantage = 1</p>	<p>Method has been identified and how the DV was measured and recorded have been well explained. However no reference has been made as to how the IVs were manipulated. Appropriate advantage has been identified but there is no link to the chosen study.</p>
		<p>Method = 1</p> <p>Advantage = 2</p>	<p>Method merely identified. Appropriate advantage identified to study (passengers) though this should have been developed further.</p>
16(c)	<p>One ethical issue raised by this study is a lack of informed consent. Because the participant was unaware that they were being</p>	<p>Issue 1 = 1</p> <p>Issue 2 = 3</p>	<p>Identification of appropriate issue but not linked to chosen study. Appropriate issue is identified, elaborated and linked to the chosen study. (Victim was not really in need of help).</p>

	<p>observed or taking part in an experiment, they were unable to agree to take part. Another ethical issue raised by the study by Piliavin is lack of debriefing. This meant that participants were not informed that they had taken part in a study, and were not informed of its aims and full nature afterwards. The researchers were also not able to point out because of this that the victim was not really in need of help or harmed, and this lack of information may have caused considerable stress to participants</p> <p>The participants were unaware they were being watched so no informed consent was given. Deception was used as the victim was play-acting and the participants may have been distressed by the fall.</p>	<p>Issue 1 = 1 Issue 2 = 2</p>	<p>Identification of appropriate issue but not linked to chosen study. Appropriate issue is identified and linked to chosen study (victim was play-acting). However further elaboration was needed for full marks.</p>
<p>16(d)</p>	<p>One reason researchers needed to break ethical guidelines in this study by Piliavin was to ensure that the results were valid and not subject demand characteristics. If the study had not been covert observation, the results may have been considerably different, as participants would have acted differently in order to present themselves in the best light (social desirability bias). The study would have also lacked ecological validity if the participants were aware of an observer.</p> <p>However, one reason why the researchers should not have broken ethical guidelines is that it may have caused participants considerable distress. The</p>	<p>Reason for = 1 Reason against = 3</p>	<p>Although an appropriate reason for breaking ethical guidelines has been identified there is no link/reference to the chosen study. Clear, elaborated description of why ethical guidelines should not have been broken appropriately linked to the chosen study. (Victim collapsing may have upset those on the train).</p>

	<p>sight of a victim collapsing may have upset those on the train, and they did not get an explanation informing them that they were not really hurt. Self knowledge may have also been gained that caused distress to participants, as they had to live with the knowledge that they did not help someone in need.</p> <p>The researchers in the Piliavin study needed to break ethical guidelines by not informing the participants that it was an experiment for the experiment to work effectively. If the participants were aware they were being watched they may alter their behaviour to look more favourably upon them such as helping when they may not otherwise have done so. However, this causes the debate as to how far we are entitled to know. Surely a person should be able to board a subway without being observed.</p>	<p>Reason for =2</p> <p>Reason against = 0</p>	<p>Although an appropriate reason for breaking ethical guidelines has been identified and linked to the chosen study (<i>such as helping...</i>) the description is basic and lacks detail. Irrelevant answer in relation to the question asked.</p>
<p>16(e)</p> <p>NB = (e)=(f)</p>	<p>There are a number of ways in which the Piliavin study could be made more ethical. Firstly, the observation could be made overt instead of covert to ensure the participants were aware that they were being observed. Secondly, debriefing could be given to the participants after the experiment had taken place, possibly carried out just before the train stopped (as the train ride was 7.5 minutes, debriefing could take place in the last three minutes so as to cause as little inconvenience as possible to participants). Another change that could be made to my study is the</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>There are a number of ways in which the Piliavin study could be made more ethical. Firstly, the observation could be made overt instead of covert to ensure the participants were aware that they were being observed. (<i>Appropriate suggestion but not linked to study</i>). Secondly, debriefing could be given to the participants after the experiment had taken place, possibly carried out just before the train stopped (as the train ride was 7.5 minutes, debriefing could take place in the last three minutes so as to cause as little inconvenience as possible to participants). (<i>Appropriate issue identified, linked to study but suggestion of how the improvement could be effected</i>). Another change that could be made to my study is the right to withdraw, as this is a key ethical guideline that was not present in the original study. (<i>Appropriate issue identified but no link to chosen study</i>). On informing the participants that they were taking part in an experiment, they could be given the option to withdraw at any time in the experiment.</p>

	<p>right to withdraw, as this is a key ethical guideline that was not present in the original study. On informing the participants that they were taking part in an experiment, they could be given the option to withdraw at any time in the experiment.</p> <p>It could have been made more ethical by informing the participants that the experiment was going to take place but not informing them when it would. However, this creates demand characteristics as the participants would be expecting it and may not act in a way that they previously or ordinarily would have acted. It could also have been more ethical by informing the participants after the experiment took place. Though this would have to occur after the experiment was repeated and by that point the participants would have seen the fall a time before and any stress or distress caused by it would have already occurred. Also, some participants may refuse consent after this and the results would have to be scrapped which would waste time, money and effort. If the participants were told beforehand that the investigation was going to occur, they may not take any real falls seriously and the person could get hurt. The same applies to participants told afterwards who may also suspect that any falls were part of an investigation so this is not really an option anyway.</p>	<p>NB: 16 (e) = 2 16(f) = 3</p>	<p><i>(Appropriate issue identified but, again, no link to chosen study). (Descriptions of one or more implications are basic and could have been developed more. Some understanding is evident and psychological terms are used reasonably well. However more should have been made in relation to how the implications may have affected the study's methodology and/or its results).</i></p> <p><i>The answer below has combined both 16(e) and 16(f). The examiner therefore has to separate the two answers and then award marks accordingly</i></p> <p>It could have been made more ethical by informing the participants that the experiment was going to take place but not informing them when it would. (= 16(e).<i>Appropriate issue identified but not linked to chosen study.</i>) However, this creates demand characteristics as the participants would be expecting it and may not act in a way that they previously or ordinarily would have acted. (= 16(f).<i>Appropriate implication identified but not linked to chosen study.</i>) It could also have been more ethical by informing the participants after the experiment took place. (= 16(e).<i>Appropriate issue identified but not linked to chosen study</i>) Though this would have to occur after the experiment was repeated and by that point the participants would have seen the fall (link) a time before and any stress or distress caused by it would have already occurred. (= 16(f).<i>Appropriate implication identified and linked to chosen study.</i>) Also, some participants may refuse consent after this and the results would have to be scrapped which would waste time, money and effort. (= 16(f).<i>Appropriate implication identified but not linked to chosen study.</i>) If the participants were told beforehand that the investigation was going to occur, they may not take any real falls seriously and the person could get hurt.(= 16(f).<i>Appropriate implication identified but not linked to chosen study.</i>) The same applies to participants told afterwards who may also suspect that any falls were part of an investigation so this is not really an option anyway. (= 16(f).<i>Appropriate implication identified but not linked to chosen study.</i>) (<i>One or two changes have been suggested which are very basic, lack detail and are not linked to the chosen study. One or two implications have been described. Some understanding is evident but there is little/no elaboration and there is</i></p>
--	--	--	---

			<i>only one link to the chosen study).</i>
16(f)	<p>All the changes listed above would improve the ethics in the study by Piliavin. A covert observation would remove the element of deception in the study, and give the participants a right to withdraw, and would also inform them that they had been involved. Debriefing would also protect the welfare of participants as it would show them that their behaviour was normal and remove any distress from observing a victim collapse. However, there are also other implications on the experiment of these changes. Although they would make the study more ethical, they would also open up the study to demand characteristics and social desirability bias. Participants would guess the aims of the study and act according to what they believed the researcher wanted or the way which would portray them in the best light. This would reduce the validity of the results, and limit the usefulness of the study to bring any benefits.</p>	4	<p>All the changes listed above would improve the ethics in the study by Piliavin. A covert (<i>error here, candidate means 'overt'</i>) observation would remove the element of deception in the study, and give the participants a right to withdraw, and would also inform them that they had been involved. <i>(Appropriate implication as not mentioned in 16(e), but not linked to chosen study).</i> Debriefing would also protect the welfare of participants as it would show them that their behaviour was normal and remove any distress from observing a victim <i>(link)</i> collapse. <i>(Appropriate implication as not mentioned in 16(e), linked to chosen study).</i> However, there are also other implications on the experiment of these changes. Although they would make the study more ethical, they would also open up the study to demand characteristics and social desirability bias. Participants would guess the aims of the study and act according to what they believed the researcher wanted or the way which would portray them in the best light. This would reduce the validity of the results, and limit the usefulness of the study to bring any benefits. <i>(Appropriate implications but not linked to chosen study). (Descriptions of one or more implications are reasonable, some understanding is evident and psychological terms are used reasonably well. However more links to the chosen study should have been made and more consideration made as to how the implications may have affected the study's methodology and/or its results).</i></p>

SECTION C

<u>Question Number</u>	<u>Rationale for Mark(s) Awarded</u>	<u>Mark(s) Awarded (Against Mark Scheme)</u>	<u>Rationale for Mark(s) Awarded</u>
<u>IN RELATION TO THE SOCIAL APPROACH</u>			
17(a)	An assumption of the social approach is that people's behaviour is affected by other people, or that their behaviour is influenced by group activity.	2	Description of assumption is accurate and there is adequate detail to gain full marks.
	One assumption of the social approach is that society and how we see ourselves in society has an effect on our behaviour	2	Description of assumption is accurate and there is adequate detail to gain full marks.
17(b)	The social approach could explain helping behaviour as psychologists believe that in a group situation, if an accident occurs we employ diffusion of responsibility. That is, we look to others for guidance and instruction on what to do whereas if we were by ourselves, we may be faster to help.	2	Generic explanation, not linked to a known study on helping behaviour.
	The social approach could explain helping behaviour by the idea that people are influenced by others, and that they help other	2	Description is generally accurate and although Piliavin is mentioned the supporting evidence lacks any detail, showing little real understanding.

	<p>people (like in the Piliavin study) because they are being judged and observed by other people in society, so people feel the need to look good in front of others, by helping those in need.</p>		
17(c)	<p>A similarity between the Piliavin study and the Milgram study is that they both have problems of ethical issues. The Piliavin study has issues of psychological harm from moral dilemmas of whether we should help those in need of help and has a lack of right to withdraw as the participants are stuck in the carriage. The Milgram study also has problems of psychological harm, from the idea of physically harming someone and the feeling of a lack of right to withdraw from the money reward and the prods used. A difference between the Piliavin study and the Milgram study is the methods used. The Piliavin study was a field experiment, where the sample is opportunistic, whereas the Milgram study is a lab experiment, where the sample is self-selected.</p> <p>One similarity between Piliavin's and Milgram's studies is that participants were unaware that a study was taking place. While the participants in Milgram's study were aware they were being</p>	<p>Similarity = 3 Difference = 1</p> <p>Similarity = 2 Difference = 1</p>	<p>Description of similarity is accurate and elaboration in relation to both studies is detailed, showing good understanding. Difference is merely identified and there is no real elaboration in relation to either study.</p> <p>Appropriate similarity has been identified. Elaboration in relation to the Milgram study is detailed and accurate but in relation to Piliavin these points needed greater development. Difference is merely identified and there is</p>

	<p>observed for research having volunteered to participate themselves, they were deceived and unaware of their true reason for being there – to test how far a person would go doing something morally wrong purely because an authority figure instructed them to do so. So it could be argued that they were in the same position as participants in Piliavin’s study who were completely unaware that a study was taking place. One difference between Milgram’s study and Piliavin’s study is that Milgram’s study took place in a laboratory whereas Piliavin’s study used covert field research which is higher in ecological validity as it does not create demand characteristics.</p>		<p>no elaboration to show any real understanding.</p>
<p>17(d)</p>	<p>One strength of the social approach is that it takes into consideration how society influences our behaviour. For example, one psychologist conducted a study in which smoke was blown through the air vents of a room containing one person. Within minutes the person sounded the alarm and got help. However, this was repeated in a room containing confederates and one person who was unaware it was research. The confederates were instructed to continue as if everything was normal. In this situation it took</p>	<p>NB: S = strength W = weakness</p> <p>9</p>	<p>One strength of the social approach is that it takes into consideration how society influences our behaviour. (S1) For example, one psychologist conducted a study in which smoke was blown through the air vents of a room containing one person. Within minutes the person sounded the alarm and got help. However, this was repeated in a room containing confederates and one person who was unaware it was research. The confederates were instructed to continue as if everything was normal. In this situation it took longer for the participant to call for help. This is an example of the diffusion of responsibility. (S1) We look to others to guide our behaviour in an unfamiliar situation and ‘share out’ the responsibility between us. (S1) Another strength of the social approach is that it provides possible explanations for human catastrophes. (S2) For example, Milgram’s study on obedience provided shocking results when 65% of participants administering electric shock to a learner</p>

<p>longer for the participant to call for help. This is an example of the diffusion of responsibility. We look to others to guide our behaviour in an unfamiliar situation and 'share out' the responsibility between us.</p> <p>Another strength of the social approach is that it provides possible explanations for human catastrophes. For example, Milgram's study on obedience provided shocking results when 65% of participants administering electric shock to a learner continued up to a lethal 400J despite showing signs of great distress, because an authority figure instructed them to do so. The results of this study can potentially explain, or at least widen our understanding as to why things like the Holocaust occur.</p> <p>Another strength of the social approach is that it considers how our status affects our behaviour. In Reicher and Haslam's BBC prison experiment, they randomly allocated the roles of prisoner and guard to 15 carefully chosen men. At first they were reluctant to embrace their roles, concerned about the meagre portions of food provided for the prisoners, the guards offered to share theirs. However, once an opportunity was given to one prisoner to become</p>	<p>continued up to a lethal 400V despite showing signs of great distress, because an authority figure instructed them to do so. (S2)The results of this study can potentially explain, or at least widen our understanding as to why things like the Holocaust occur. (S2)</p> <p>Another strength of the social approach is that it considers how our status affects our behaviour. (Links back to first strength. Therefore S1). In Reicher and Haslam's BBC prison experiment, they randomly allocated the roles of prisoner and guard to 15 carefully chosen men. At first they were reluctant to embrace their roles, concerned about the meagre portions of food provided for the prisoners, the guards offered to share theirs. However, once an opportunity was given to one prisoner to become a guard, there were notable changes in their behaviour. The prisoners took to openly mocking the guards and made every attempt to undermine them.</p> <p>The experiment was cut short after eight days after the dissolution of the prisoner-guard structure. (Links back to first strength. Therefore S1). This considers how our position in society affects how we act and behave as the allocation of prisoner status to one previously mild-mannered businessman saw a complete 360 degree change to his behaviour. (Links back to first strength. Therefore S1).</p> <p>However, a weakness of the social approach is that it assumes everyone is the same and does not account for individual differences such as mental illness and personal factors like home life which can have a profound effect on how we behave and why we do the things we do. (W1).</p> <p>It also does not happen to be very representative as a whole. In Milgram's study, only men from New Haven participated in the experiment. (Vague). This might not represent the behaviour of others and therefore is not valid. (Vague)</p> <p>However, a strength of the social approach is that it is very reliable as it is easy to repeat. While other approaches may rely on people with particular temperaments, the social approach uses samples that are easily accessible.</p> <p>A weakness is that it may only represent the</p>
---	--

<p>a guard, there were notable changes in their behaviour. The prisoners took to openly mocking the guards and made every attempt to undermine them. The experiment was cut short after eight days after the dissolution of the prisoner-guard structure. This considers how our position in society affects how we act and behave as the allocation of prisoner status to one previously mild-mannered businessman saw a complete 360 degree change to his behaviour. However, a weakness of the social approach is that it assumes everyone is the same and does not account for individual differences such as mental illness and personal factors like home life which can have a profound effect on how we behave and why we do the things we do. It also does not happen to be very representative as a whole. In Milgram's study, only men from New Haven participated in the experiment. This might not represent the behaviour of others and therefore is not valid. However, a strength of the social approach is that it is very reliable as it is easy to repeat. While other approaches may rely on people with particular temperaments, the social approach uses samples that are easily</p>		<p>behaviours of people during a particular time. (W₂) For example, a woman in the 1950s would most likely be less eager to help an injured or fallen person than a woman now as it would not have been considered a feminine thing to do. (Vague, generic statement). (9 marks given because although 2 x strength and 2 x weakness have been identified there is a definite imbalance between the two).</p>
--	--	--

<p>accessible. A weakness is that it may only represent the behaviours of people during a particular time. For example, a woman in the 1950s would most likely be less eager to help an injured or fallen person than a woman now as it would not have been considered a feminine thing to do.</p> <p>An advantage of the social approach is that it favours lab experiments as the method. This is shown as in the Milgram study where the participants are in a highly controlled environment, where they have to administer electric shocks to a victim. Lab experiments are highly controlled which means that they have no confounding variables, which means that the results are reliable and accurate. The social approach is useful when it comes to observing behaviours of people in society. In the Reicher and Haslam study, the participants were observed as a group, and their group actions. This gave information to show that people in general conform to roles in society, and develop group identities. This helps researchers of the social approach acknowledge and understand how and why people act the way they do in groups.</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>An advantage of the social approach is that it favours lab experiments as the method. (Not necessarily). This is shown as in the Milgram study where the participants are in a highly controlled environment, where they have to administer electric shocks to a victim. Lab experiments are highly controlled which means that they have no confounding variables, which means that the results are reliable and accurate. The social approach is useful when it comes to observing behaviours of people in society. (S1) In the Reicher and Haslam study, the participants were observed as a group, and their group actions. This gave information to show that people in general conform to roles in society, and develop group identities. (S1) This helps researchers of the social approach acknowledge and understand how and why people act the way they do in groups.</p> <p>A disadvantage of the social approach is due to the experiments mainly being lab experiments. The BBC prison study is a lab experiment, where participants are set up in an artificial prison environment. Due to it being a lab experiment, the fact that they are highly controlled makes it a weakness. Being highly controlled means that the studies often lack ecological validity, (where the participants in the Reicher and Haslam study did not feel like they were in a real</p>
--	----------	--

<p>A disadvantage of the social approach is due to the experiments mainly being lab experiments. The BBC prison study is a lab experiment, where participants are set up in an artificial prison environment. Due to it being a lab experiment, the fact that they are highly controlled makes it a weakness. Being highly controlled means that the studies often lack ecological validity, (where the participants in the Reicher and Haslam study did not feel like they were in a real prison, so did not act like they were in one) so participants may display demand characteristics, and the results cannot be applied to the real world, therefore making results of lab experiments in the social approach less useful. A further weakness of the social approach is that the studies look at behaviours of groups or only looks at how groups or other people affect a person's behaviour. In the Piliavin study, the conclusion is that if there are more people around, a person is more likely to help (which goes against previous research). This study looks at how other people affect our behaviour. The social approach does not look to other factors that could affect a person's behaviour, which makes it reductionist, being a weakness; that does not count the individual</p>		<p>prison, so did not act like they were in one) so participants may display demand characteristics, and the results cannot be applied to the real world, therefore making results of lab experiments in the social approach less useful. A further weakness of the social approach is that the studies look at behaviours of groups or only looks at how groups or other people affect a person's behaviour. (W1) In the Piliavin study, the conclusion is that if there are more people around, a person is more likely to help (which goes against previous research). This study looks at how other people affect our behaviour. (W1) The social approach does not look to other factors that could affect a person's behaviour, which makes it reductionist, being a weakness; that does not count the individual differences of people, but only looks at people as a whole. (4 marks given as only one strength and one weakness identified and although discussion is reasonable showing some understanding, analysis and argument are limited).</p>
--	--	---

	<p>hypothesis illustrates how the cognitive approach can explain memory, as this suggests that memory is made up of both information received at the time and information received after an event.</p> <p>Inaccuracy of eye witness testimony would be explained in terms of how the mind works. People may only remember certain things, or their memories could be altered by leading questions. This is demonstrated in Loftus and Palmer's study, by changing the verb in the critical question, and asking if broken glass was seen even though none was present.</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>Although the description is generally accurate and shows some understanding, the supporting evidence is basic and lacks detail</p>
<p>18(c)</p>	<p>One similarity between the Savage Rumbaugh study of Ape language and the Baron Cohen study on autism is that they are both quasi experiments. In both studies, the independent variable is not manipulated by the researcher, but is naturally occurring. This causes both studies to be high in ecological validity but low in experimental control. One difference between the two studies is the sample used. The study by Savage Rumbaugh is a case study with a very small sample, consisting of 4 chimps (2 bonobos and 2 common chimps) and focuses specifically on Kanzi, who was 2 years six months old</p>	<p>Similarity = 1 Difference = 3</p>	<p>Appropriate similarity identified but there is no elaboration in relation to either named study. Description of similarity is accurate and elaboration in relation to both studies is detailed, showing good understanding.</p>

	<p>when the study began. Contrastingly, the Baron Cohen study on theory of mind uses a much larger sample of 76 participants, all aged 18 – 49. 16 of these were autistic, 50 were ‘normal’ and 10 suffered from Tourettes syndrome.</p> <p>The cognitive approach generally uses lab experiments that are highly controlled; this is a similarity between Loftus and Palmer and Baron Cohen. A difference is in the independent variable (I.V.) in Loftus and Palmer and Baron-Cohen. In Baron-Cohen’s study, the I.V. was quasi, meaning it was naturally occurring. However, in Loftus and Palmer’s study the researcher manipulated the I.V., the verb.</p>	<p>Similarity =1 Difference =1</p>	<p>Similarity is merely identified and there is no elaboration to show any real understanding. Difference is merely identified and there is no elaboration to show any real understanding.</p>
<p>18(d)</p>	<p>There are many strengths of the cognitive approach to psychology. Firstly, the studies produced here have many useful applications in the real world and are of high value. For example, Loftus and Palmer’s study shared the effects of leading questions on memory and highlighted the inaccuracy of eyewitness testimony, which has many consequences in courts of law and showed the dangers of using this alone to convict a criminal. Secondly, cognitive studies often provide highly scientific, objective data which can</p>	<p>NB: S = strength W = weakness 5</p>	<p>There are many strengths of the cognitive approach to psychology. Firstly, the studies produced here have many useful applications in the real world and are of high value. (S1) For example, Loftus and Palmer’s study shared the effects of leading questions on memory and highlighted the inaccuracy of eyewitness testimony, (S1) which has many consequences in courts of law and showed the dangers of using this alone to convict a criminal. (S1). Secondly, cognitive studies often provide highly scientific, objective data which can be easily analysed and used to draw conclusions. (S2). This is shown in the Baron Cohen study which gave quantitative data in relation to mean scores on the Eyes Task. (S2) In many senses this type of data could be judged as more valid, as it involves no interpretation. (S2) However, the cognitive approach also has some weaknesses. Firstly, studies from this approach are often carried out in a laboratory setting and can therefore lack</p>

<p>be easily analysed and used to draw conclusions. This is shown in the Baron Cohen study which gave quantitative data in relation to mean scores on the Eyes Task. In many senses this type of data could be judged as more valid, as it involves no interpretation. However, the cognitive approach also has some weaknesses. Firstly, studies from this approach are often carried out in a laboratory setting and can therefore lack ecological validity. This is illustrated in the study by Loftus and Palmer, which involving showing participants video clips of car crashes. This lacks ecological validity as this does not occur often in real life and the participants were aware that the car crashes were staged. Secondly, a further weakness of the cognitive approach is that it can sometimes provide a reductionist or simplistic approach to behaviour, that does not take account of other factors such as social or personal factors. This is shown in the study by Savage Rumbaugh, that only took account of whether the chimps were common or bonobos.</p> <p>A weakness of the cognitive approach is that it is difficult to study, as it is looking at the minds of people. Although, this could also</p>		<p>ecological validity. (W1) This is illustrated in the study by Loftus and Palmer, which involving showing participants video clips of car crashes. (W1). This lacks ecological validity as this does not occur often in real life and the participants were aware that the car crashes were staged. (W1) Secondly, a further weakness of the cognitive approach is that it can sometimes provide a reductionist or simplistic approach to behaviour, that does not take account of other factors such as social or personal factors. (W2) This is shown in the study by Savage Rumbaugh, that only took account of whether the chimps were common or bonobos. (W2)</p> <p><i>(There is a good range and adequate balance of strengths and weaknesses showing sound understanding. Analysis is effective and argument is well informed. A little more elaboration could have been made in relation to the identified weaknesses).</i></p> <p>A weakness of the cognitive approach is that it is difficult to study, as it is looking at the minds of people. (W1). Although, this could also be a strength, as the cognitive approach</p>
--	--	---

<p>be a strength, as the cognitive approach can be seen as quite scientific, using objective measures to get results (Baron-Cohen). Cognitive studies usually take place in a lab setting. This is a big strength; lab experiments are highly controlled, so there are less likely to be confounding variables that could affect the results, increasing the reliability of findings. Lab experiments can also be negative. People know they are in an experiment, which may lead to demand characteristics. The experiment is also not in the real world, so lacks ecological validity. This is demonstrated by Loftus and Palmer, as the crashes they viewed were only videoclips, watching a video is completely different to being an actual witness. Loftus and Palmer's study demonstrates another weakness; the cognitive approach doesn't take into account emotional factors. If the participants were real witnesses to an accident, they would have emotion, altering their memories. This also shows that the cognitive approach can be reductionist by not looking at emotion, just how the mind works.</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>can be seen as quite scientific, using objective measures to get results (W1) (Baron-Cohen). (Vague!)</p> <p>Cognitive studies usually take place in a lab setting. This is a big strength; lab experiments are highly controlled, so there are less likely to be confounding variables that could affect the results, increasing the reliability of findings. (S2) Lab experiments can also be negative. People know they are in an experiment, which may lead to demand characteristics. The experiment is also not in the real world, so lacks ecological validity. (Weaknesses of methodology, not approach). This is demonstrated by Loftus and Palmer, as the crashes they viewed were only videoclips, watching a video is completely different to being an actual witness. Loftus and Palmer's study demonstrates another weakness; the cognitive approach doesn't take into account emotional factors. (W2). If the participants were real witnesses to an accident, they would have emotion, altering their memories. This also shows that the cognitive approach can be reductionist by not looking at emotion, just how the mind works. (W2)(5 marks given as although one strength and two weaknesses identified, and discussion is reasonable showing some understanding, analysis and argument are limited).</p>
--	----------	---