

GCE

Psychology

Unit **G542**: Core Studies

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

Mark Scheme for June 2015

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, 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 2015

1. Annotations

Annotation	Meaning
	Attempts evaluation
	Benefit of doubt
	Context
	Cross
	Evaluation
	Extendable horizontal line
	Expandable horizontal wavy line
	Significant amount of material which doesn't answer the question
	Not answered question
	Tick
	Development of point
	Omission mark
	Unclear
	Good use of research/supporting evidence

SECTION A

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	(a)	<p>Most likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants saw the same (7) film clips (of traffic accidents). • A different ordering of the films was presented to each group of participants. • All participants were asked (after watching each film) to give an account of the accident (they had just seen). • Participants had to answer the same series of questions with the exception of the question containing the critical verb (about speed). • Other appropriate answers should be credited. <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer e.g. controls only applicable to experiment 2 e.g. watching the same video clip (inferring there was only one film clip). 1 mark – Partial or vague answer e.g. all answered questions, <u>answer not contextualised</u>. 2 marks – One appropriate control which is fully contextualised is outlined, such as one of the ones listed above.</p>	[2]	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(b)	<p>Likely answers may cover the following content:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To make it a fair test/non-biased so all participants saw the same films clips and therefore received the same information. • Films were shown in different orders to each group of participants so order effects/fatigue/boredom did not influence the results. • To make it a fair test/non-biased so all participants were asked to write an account of each film after they had seen it. • To make it a fair test/non-biased so all participants answered the same questions with the exception of the question containing the critical verb. • To help establish cause and effect. All participants were asked the same question with the exception of the verb relating to speed, to show that the way a question is phrased can influence the response given. • Making all participants watch the (film) clips would eliminate extraneous/confounding variables so that the only difference would be the question asked thus showing that it was the way the question was asked that influenced speed estimates, not something else. • To make sure that the speed estimates were due to the verb used in the critical question and not any other variable (such as seeing different car crashes). 	[2]	<p><i>The control referred to in this question part does not have to be the same one as the one outlined in part (a) but the candidate must make it clear which control is being referred to in relation to <u>Experiment 1</u>.</i></p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To limit extraneous or confounding variables that may affect the participants' speed estimates for how fast the cars were going when they crashed. • Other appropriate suggestions should be credited references to validity/reliability fully explained and contextualised. <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer. 1 mark – Partial or vague answer e.g. to make it a fair test, to prevent order effects influencing results, to help establish cause and effect, to control extraneous variables i.e. answer not contextualised. 2 marks – A clear, contextualised suggestion of why it was important to use controls in this experiment.</p>		
2	<p>Answer should refer to the following content:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The test was comprised of photographs of the eye region of 25 different faces (male and female). The faces were taken from magazine photos. All faces were standardised to one size (15 x 10 cms) and all were black and white, with the same region of the face selected for each photo – from midway along the nose to just above the eyebrow. Each picture had a forced choice between two mental states printed underneath it. Each photo was shown to the participant for 3 seconds and the experimenter asked the participant' "Which word best describes what this person is feeling or thinking?" The maximum score of this test was 25. • Other appropriate descriptions should be credited. 	[4]	<p><i>Not all fine details have to be included to gain the full 4 marks.</i></p> <p><i>The candidate must make it obvious that they are describing the EYES task. Descriptions that could equally as well be applied to the Basic Emotion Recognition Task or Gender Identity Task can gain a maximum of 2 marks.</i></p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer e.g. description of Happé’s Strange Stories / Gender Recognition Task / Basic Emotion Recognition Task.</p> <p>1-2 marks – Partial or vague answer e.g. participants were shown 25 black and white photos of eyes and had to say how they thought the person in each photo was feeling (for two marks at least 3 elements)</p> <p>3-4 marks – An increasingly accurate and detailed description of the Eyes Task, which contains at least 4 appropriate pieces of information for three marks and 5 for four marks, based on the description outlined above.</p>		
3	<p>Most likely answers will refer to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kanzi, Mulika and the people with them used the pointing board outside by pointing to the lexigram they wished to use. People also commented on and emphasised their activities, both vocally and visually, by pointing to the appropriate lexigrams on the board. Kanzi used the pointing board to announce where he wanted to go in the forest and/or which food he would like to eat after which he was then taken to the appropriate location. Travel was also initiated by people using the pointing board to suggest where they could go in the forest. The pointing board was also used in the ‘blind’ test in which Kanzi either used the board or a photograph to initiate travel around the forest before guiding the experimenter to the location of the food he had selected. Researchers made notes of the pointing board usage and the data was entered onto the computer at the end of each day. • Other appropriate descriptions should be credited. <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer e.g. descriptions of</p>	[4]	<i>Not all fine details have to be included to gain the full 4 marks.</i>

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
		<p>how the lexigram was used when indoors.</p> <p>1-2 marks – Partial or vague answer e.g. Kanzi used the pointing board to announce where he wanted to go in the forest / which food he would like to eat after which he was then taken to the appropriate location.</p> <p>3-4 marks – An increasingly accurate and detailed description including reference to at least two different ways/or one way in detail in which the pointing board was used, based on the description given above e.g. Kanzi used the pointing board to announce where he wanted to go in the forest. Travel was also initiated by people using the pointing board to suggest where they could go in the forest (3 marks); Kanzi used the pointing board to announce where he wanted to go in the forest and which food he would like to eat after which he was then taken to the appropriate location. The pointing board was also used in the 'blind' test in which Kanzi used the board to initiate travel around the forest before guiding the experimenter to the location of the food he had selected (4 marks).</p>		
4	(a)	<p>Any two from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standard/two question/Piagetian (condition). • One judgement / one question (condition). • Fixed array/fixed array control (condition). <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer e.g. control condition (as this does not show which condition is being referred to), identification of the materials used.</p> <p>1 mark – Only one condition correctly identified.</p> <p>2 marks – Two conditions correctly identified.</p>	[1+1] [2]	<i>Descriptions of a conditions are not creditworthy [see part (b)]</i>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(b)	<p>Most likely descriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Standard/two question/Piagetian condition</u>: the child was asked the same conservation question both before and after witnessing the transformation. • <u>One judgement condition</u>: the child was asked the conservation question once <i>after witnessing</i> the transformation. • <u>Fixed array/Fixed array control condition</u>: the child was asked the conservation question once <i>but did not witness the transformation / only saw the post transformation display</i>. • Other appropriate descriptions should be credited. <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer e.g. descriptions of the conservation tasks. 1 mark - Partial or vague answer e.g. the child was asked the conservation question once after the transformation i.e. answer not clear as to which condition is being referred to. 2 marks – A clear, accurate description of one of the questioning conditions as outlined above.</p>	[2]	<p><i>The candidate does not actually have to state the questioning condition but it must be very clear which one they are referring to as they frequently do not make it clear whether they are describing the one judgement or fixed array condition.</i></p> <p><i>The candidate does not actually have to include the words ‘witnessed/saw/watched’ the transformation but this must be implicit in the response.</i></p>
5	(a)	[2]	<p><i>If candidates refer to observations (of Little Hans) by his father / conversations between Hans and his father, to gain 2 marks they must also include: sent to Freud via letter / correspondence / reported back to / passed to Freud.</i></p> <p><i>If the candidate refers to Little Hans’ father collecting the data/taking notes and sending it to Freud, without including reference to how the data was collected (through</i></p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other descriptions of either of the above should be credited. <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer e.g. any reference to the use of the telephone and/or video recordings.</p> <p>1 mark – Partial or vague answer e.g. through correspondence, through interviews, through observation. Answer not contextualised.</p> <p>2 marks – An accurate, contextualised description of how the data was gathered as described above.</p>		<p><i>observation, interview, conversations, reports by Hans etc) only 1 mark should be awarded.</i></p>
(b)	<p>Most likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hans' father was a follower of Freud and so may have asked leading questions to get answers to support Freud's theories (about child sexuality / the Oedipus complex / the role of the unconscious in influencing behaviour). • Hans was questioned by his father rather than a neutral researcher so emotional involvement may have influenced what he said (leading to demand characteristics, socially desirable responses and so invalid results). • Freud misinterpreted the information sent to him by Hans' father so it supported his theories (about child sexuality / the Oedipus complex / the role of the unconscious in influencing behaviour). • Other appropriate suggestions should be credited. <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p>	[2]	<p><i>As the question only requires the candidate to outline a possible weakness full contextualisation is not required, though it must be clear which study is being referred to e.g. Freud misinterpreted the information sent to him by Hans' father so it supported Freud/ his theories is adequate contextualisation, reference to child sexuality / the Oedipus complex / the role of the unconscious in influencing behaviour is not necessary to gain 2 marks.</i></p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>1 mark – Partial or vague answer e.g. Hans’ father may have used leading questions i.e. mere identification of appropriate weakness / answer not contextualised.</p> <p>2 marks – Clear suggestions such as one of the ones outlined above.</p>		
6	<p>Most likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Boys exhibited more physical imitative aggression <u>than girls</u> after exposure to an aggressive male model • Boys exhibited more verbal imitative aggression <u>than girls</u> after exposure to an aggressive male model • Boys exhibited more non-imitative aggression <u>than girls</u> after exposure to an aggressive male model • Boys engaged in significantly more aggressive gun play <u>than girls</u> after exposure to an aggressive male model • Girls performed considerably more imitative verbal aggression <u>than boys</u> after exposure to an aggressive female model • Girls performed considerably more non-imitative aggression <u>than boys</u> after exposure to an aggressive female model. • Other appropriate answers e.g. descriptions relating to non-aggressive models. <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p>1 mark –Partial or vague answer e.g. boys exhibited more physical aggression after exposure to an aggressive male model (comparison not complete as no reference to ‘than girls’); boys exhibited more physical aggression than girls (model condition – aggressive male model - not referred to).</p>	[2+2] [4]	<p><i>Examiners should check the accuracy of responses by checking carefully against the findings given in the original study.</i></p> <p><i>Note particularly the findings displayed in Table 1 in the original study which refer to both aggressive and non-aggressive models.</i></p>

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
		2 marks –A fully contextualised and accurate description such as one of the ones given above.		
7	(a)	<p>Answers should refer to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (i) Time as taxi driver (months). • (ii) Volume change in the right posterior hippocampus. • Other appropriate wording should be credited e.g. how long they had been a taxi driver, changes in the volume of the right posterior hippocampus. <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer 1 mark – Partial answer e.g. identification of one variable only. 2 marks – Accurate identification of both variables as outlined above.</p>	[2]	<p><i>Referencing the variables as IV and/or DV makes the answer non-creditworthy.</i></p> <p><i>References to 'size' of the right posterior hippocampus are not creditworthy.</i></p>
	(b)	<p>Most likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The volume of the (right) posterior hippocampus increases as the length of time as a taxi driver increases. • The more time a person spends as a taxi driver, the greater the volume of their (right) posterior hippocampus • There is a positive correlation between the volume of the (right) posterior hippocampus and the time a man/person spends as a taxi driver. • Other appropriate outline should be credited. 	[2]	<p><i>References to 'size' of the right posterior hippocampus are not creditworthy e.g. the longer the time spent as a taxi driver the larger the posterior hippocampus.</i></p>

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
		<p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p>1 mark – Partial or vague answer e.g. there was a positive correlation between the two variables i.e. answer not contextualised.</p> <p>2 marks – Clear and accurate conclusion drawn from the scatter graph as outlined above, making reference to both variables.</p>		
8	(a)	<p>Most likely answer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participants reported to the laboratory a little before their usual bedtime (one instruction) they were instructed to eat normally (on the day they had to report to the laboratory) (another instruction) but to abstain from alcoholic or caffeine-containing beverages (on the day they had to report to the laboratory) (another instruction). Other appropriate descriptions should be credited. <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p>1 mark – Partial or vague answer e.g. participants were told not to consume alcohol / caffeine, participants were told to report to the laboratory just before their usual bedtime</p> <p>2 marks - An increasingly accurate and detailed description based on the one given above to include at least 2 of the instructions given to participants.</p>	[2]	<i>Not to drink coffee and not to drink alcohol should be considered as one instruction.</i>
	(b)	<p>Most likely answer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two or more electrodes were attached near their eyes for registering eye movements. Two or three electrodes were attached to their scalps for recording brain waves as a criterion for depth of sleep. The participant then went to bed in a quiet, dark room. 	[2]	<i>Credit can also be given to should candidates refer to instructions given in relation to: how participants would be woken, that participants on awakening should speak into a recording device stating whether or not they had been dreaming and , if they could, to relate the content of their dream, that one participant (WD) was told he would be awakened only when the recording indicated that he was dreaming</i>

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other appropriate descriptions should be credited. <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer. 1 mark – Partial or vague answer e.g. electrodes were attached to their heads before they went to sleep. 2 marks - An increasingly accurate and detailed description based on either the one given above or details given in ‘additional guidance’ to include at least 2 features/or one feature in detail of the process.</p>		
9	(a)	<p>Answer should refer to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The material could be described it in speech and writing (using the right hand). • With their hands out of view, patients could select the object from a pile of objects/grab bag with their <u>right hand</u>. • Other appropriate descriptions should be credited. <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer. 1 mark – Partial or vague answer e.g. they were able to describe / write it, they were able to find the object from a pile of objects with their right hand. 2 marks – Clear description of the two things they were able to do as outlined above.</p>	[2]	
	(b)	<p>Most likely explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Images flashed to the left visual field (LVF) are processed by the right hemisphere which also controls the motor movements of the left side of the body. (Therefore participants were able to <u>point</u> to pictures of images with their left hand) 	[2]	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other appropriate explanations should be credited. <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer. 1 mark – Partial or vague answer e.g. because images flashed to the left visual field (LVF) are processed by the right hemisphere, because the right hemisphere controls the motor movements of the left side of the body i.e. a partial answer (which is not wrong). 2 marks – A clear, accurate explanation similar to the one given above.</p>		
10 (a)	<p>Most likely answer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 'cognitive alternatives' variable was operationalised by introducing a new prisoner/prisoner 10 who had a background as an experienced trade union official. • Other appropriate descriptions should be credited. <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer. 1 mark – Partial or vague answer e.g. a new prisoner was introduced/a trade unionist was introduced. 2 marks - An accurate and detailed description based on the one given above to include at both aspects of how the variable was operationalised.</p>	[2]	
(b)	<p>Most likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The new prisoner was introduced because it was expected (as a result of his trade union background) he would introduce a new perspective to the prison based on notions of group-based negotiation and collective and equal/human rights. • The new prisoner was introduced because it was thought (as a result of his trade union background) that he might provide skills necessary to organise collective action. 	[2]	

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The new prisoner was introduced because it was thought that (as a result of his trade union background) he would enable the prisoners (and the participants more generally) to envisage the achievement of a more equal set of social relations. Other appropriate explanations should be credited. <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer. 1 mark – Partial or vague answer e.g. because it was thought that he may be able to make the prisoners consider cognitive alternatives to the status quo, as a negotiator 2 marks - An increasingly accurate and detailed explanation based on the those given above.</p>		
11	(a)	<p>Answer should cover the following content:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 40 males, between the ages of 20 and 50 years, with a range of occupations and educational backgrounds, drawn from New Haven and the surrounding communities / from USA. Other appropriate description should be credited. <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer e.g. any reference to how the sample was gathered 1 mark – Partial or vague answer e.g. males from the USA i.e. up to two features of the sample are identified 2 marks - A clear, accurate description of the sample, including at least three features, such as the one given above.</p>	[2]	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(b)	<p>Most likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Because the sample was all male / ethnocentric, the findings can possibly be used to support the atrocious behaviour of the German Nazi soldiers in WW2, the majority of whom are presumed to have been men. • Because the sample was all male / ethnocentric a direct comparison could be made with males / Germans so Milgram was able to test the 'Germans are different' hypothesis. • Because the sample included men from a range of occupations and educational backgrounds it was likely to be representative of the target population so findings in <u>relation to obedience</u> were generalisable. • Because it was a relatively large sample (40) it was likely to be representative of the target population so findings in <u>relation to obedience</u> were generalisable. • Other appropriate suggestions should be credited. <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer e.g. any reference to a strength of how the sample was gathered. 1 mark – Partial or vague answer e.g. because the sample was all male results are generalisable (this answer could refer to Reicher & Haslam), because it was a large sample findings can be generalised i.e. answer not contextualised. 2 marks – A clear, contextualised suggestion such as one of the ones made above.</p>	[2]	<i>Strengths that refer to the sampling method are not creditworthy.</i>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
12	<p>There were four different model conditions so answers should refer to any two of the flowing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Critical area early</u> – the model stood in the critical area until passing fourth station/until approximately 70 seconds after collapse before assisting the victim. • <u>Critical area late</u> – the model stood in the critical area until passing sixth station/until approximately 150 seconds after collapse before assisting the victim. • <u>Adjacent area early</u> – the model stood in the adjacent area (to the critical area) (until passing fourth station/until approximately 70 seconds after collapse before assisting the victim. • <u>Adjacent area late</u> – the model stood in the adjacent area (to the critical area) until passing sixth station/until approximately 150 seconds after collapse before assisting the victim. • Other appropriate descriptions should be credited. <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer e.g. reference to who played the models, what the models wore. early/late/critical are/adjacent area..</p> <p>1 mark – Partial or vague answer e.g. critical area early, adjacent area late i.e. mere identification of a model condition; the early (late) model who helped the victim after 70(150) seconds of collapsing if no-one had already helped i.e. no reference as to where the model was positioned.</p> <p>2 marks – A clear, contextualised description of one of the model conditions based on those given above.</p>	<p>[2+2] [4]</p>	<p><i>The model condition - e.g. critical area early - does not need to be identified per se, but the candidate must make it very clear which condition they are describing to gain the full 2 marks.</i></p> <p><i>Mere reference to part of one condition e.g. early / late / critical area / adjacent area is not adequate information to gain any marks.</i></p> <p><i>References to ‘carriage’ rather than ‘area’ cannot gain full marks as both the critical and adjacent areas were in the same carriage.</i></p> <p><i>Descriptions relating to the ‘victim’ rather than the ‘model’ are not creditworthy.</i></p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
13	<p>Most likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apart from initial short-lived nervousness, the pseudopatient behaved on the ward as he 'normally' behaved / after being admitted (or diagnosed).the pseudopatients behaved normally. • The pseudopatient spoke to patients and staff as he might ordinarily. • Because there was little to do on the ward, pseudopatients attempted to engage others in conversation. • When asked by staff how he was feeling, the participant indicated that he was fine, that he no longer experienced symptoms. • (Beyond such activities as were available to him on the admissions ward), pseudopatients spent their time writing down their observations/made extensive notes about the wards, its patients and the staff. • (In four hospitals) the pseudopatients approached staff with such requests as "Pardon me Mr/Dr/Mrs X, could you tell me when I will be eligible for grounds privileges?" (additional questions asked can be found in the original study). • Other appropriate descriptions should be credited. <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p>	<p>[2+2] [4]</p>	<p><i>Although the question refers to the behaviour of the pseudopatients responses that refer to such aspects of the study as: one group of patients sat outside the cafeteria entrance half an hour before lunch time, presumably because they were hungry; one pseudopatient paced the long hospital corridors because he was bored; etc should be credited.</i></p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>1mark – Partial or vague answer e.g. pseudopatients asked questions, pseudopatients made notes, pseudopatients acted normally i.e. answer not fully contextualised /an identification of how pseudopatients behaved, not a description..</p> <p>2marks - A clear fully contextualised description such as one of the ones given above.</p>		
14	<p>Most likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consent: all RGs and NRGs were volunteers so consented to take part in the study. • Consent; the study was conducted with the full support of the arcade’s manager. • Debriefing: participants in the ‘thinking aloud’ condition were asked if they would like to hear a playback of their recording. • Confidentiality: this was maintained as no names / identities of any of the RGs or NRGs have been published. • Other appropriate answers should be credited. <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer e.g. reference to the ethical issues that could be raised against the study.</p> <p>1 mark – Partial or vague answer e.g. consent, confidentiality i.e. mere identification of an appropriate ethical issue; consent: all participants were volunteers so consented to take part in the study; confidentiality: this was maintained as no names / identities of any of the participants have been published i.e. answer not contextualised.</p>	<p>[2+2] [4]</p>	<p><i>If the ethical issue is not specifically identified, for full marks to be awarded, the issue must be clearly recognisable.</i></p>

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
		2 marks – A clear, contextualised outline such as one of the ones given above.		
15	(a)	<p>Most likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Wechsler-Bellevue Intelligence Scale / IQ test</u> – Eve White: 110, Eve Black 104. / Eve White had a higher IQ than Eve Black • <u>(Wechsler) Memory Scale / Test</u> – Eve White: far above/superior to IQ, Eve Black: on the same level as IQ / Eve White had a better memory than Eve Black. <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer e.g. findings from the EEG test. 1 mark – Partial or vague answer e.g. IQ test – Eve White: 110, Memory test – Eve Black: on a level with her IQ i.e. findings for only one personality provided, Eve White had a higher IQ (comparison not completed). 2 marks – A clear, accurate outline of the findings of one of the psychometric tests in relation to both Eve White and Eve Black.</p>	[2]	<p><i>If only one Eve has been referred to the candidate can only gain partial marks</i></p> <p><i>The actual test does not need to be identified but a clear difference in the results for Eve White and/or Eve Black must be clear and accurate e.g Eve White had an IQ of 110 whereas Eve Black had an IQ of 104.</i></p> <p><i>If only numbers are stated they must be correct.</i></p> <p><i>Reference to the Rorschach / inkblot test or the personality dynamics/projective tests are not creditworthy as they are not psychometric tests.</i></p>
	(b)	<p>Most likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eve White: 10½-11½ cycles per second, Eve Black: 12 cycles per second, Jane: 10½-11½ cycles per second. • Eve White and Jane had normal electroencephalogram (EEG) readings whereas Eve Black had a slightly fast reading (which is sometimes associated with psychopathic personality). 	[2]	<p><i>If only one or two of the personalities has been referred to the candidate can only gain partial marks.</i></p> <p><i>If there is no indication of measurement i.e. cycles (per second)/frequency, only partial marks can be awarded.</i></p>

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eve Black's EEG reading was faster than Eve White's and Jane's which were the same. • Other appropriate EEG findings in relation to all three personalities should be credited. <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer e.g. findings from any of the psychological tests. 1 mark – Partial or vague answer e.g. Eve White: 10½-11½ cycles per second; Eve Black: 12-13 / 12½ cycles per second; Eve White: 10½-11½ cycles per second i.e. findings for only <u>one</u> or <u>two</u> of the personalities is provided; Eve Black's reading was different to Eve White's and Jane's which were the same. 2 marks – A clear, accurate outline of the EEG findings in relation to all <u>three</u> personalities.</p>		
		Section A Total	60	
16	(a)	<p>Most likely answers:</p> <p><u>Piliavin:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To investigate bystander intervention in a natural setting and to see if the type of victim – lame or drunk, or their racial identity – black or white, influenced helping behaviour. • To explore helping behaviour between strangers by using a lame and a drunk victim. • To test the 'Diffusion of Responsibility' hypothesis in a face-to-face, real life setting of a subway train. • To see whether diffusion of responsibility was true and whether or not people would help a lame/drun 	[2]	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>person.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other appropriate reasons should be credited. <p><u>Bandura:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To investigate whether behaviours learnt by children by imitation in one setting could be repeated in a different setting even when the adult model was not present. • To see whether children would imitate aggressive behaviour when given the opportunity, even if they saw the behaviours in a different setting and the original model was no longer present. • To see if watching an aggressive model would lead to aggressive behaviour. • Other appropriate reasons should be credited. <p><u>Milgram:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To investigate the process of obedience and demonstrate the power of a legitimate authority even when the command requires destructive behaviour. • To investigate whether participants would show obedience to an authority figure who told them to administer electric shocks to another person. • To try to explain how authority figures can lead individuals to demonstrate morally and socially unacceptable behaviour by administering electric shocks to another person. • To test the 'Germans are different hypothesis (which 		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>suggests that Germans are more obedient than others) by investigating whether participants would show obedience to an authority figure who told them to administer electric shocks to another person / by investigating the power of a legitimate authority figure even when the command requires destructive behaviour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other appropriate reasons should be credited. <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer e.g. statement of an hypothesis such as ‘people will obey authority figures’. 1 mark – Partial or vague answer e.g. the reason why the study was conducted has no elaboration and / or is not fully contextualised e.g. Piliavin – wanted to see what factors influenced helping behaviour / to test the diffusion of responsibility hypothesis; Bandura – wanted to investigate the social learning process; Milgram – wanted to investigate obedience to authority figures/wanted to investigate the ‘Germans are Different’ hypothesis. 2 marks – The reason why the chosen study was conducted is clear and fully contextualised, as outlined above.</p>		
(b)	<p>Most likely answers will refer to:</p> <p><u>Piliavin:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quantitative data was gathered by two female confederates who took seats outside the critical area and recorded/noted data, through observation, for the duration of the ride. One observer noted the race, sex and location of every passenger seated or standing in the critical area. She also counted the total number of individuals in the car and the total number of individuals who came to the victim’s 	[4]	<p><i>Read the answer through before deciding in which band to place the response: not every fine detail has to be included for the candidate to gain full marks but it must be evident that quantitative data is being referred to.</i></p> <p><i>This can be assessed as a breadth or depth answer i.e. one aspect of how quantitative data was gathered is described in detail e.g. what one of the observers gathered in Piliavin if described in detail = depth/how data was gathered by both observers in Piliavin is briefly described = breadth.</i></p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>assistance. In addition, she recorded the race, sex and location of every helper. The second observer coded the race, sex and location of all passengers in the adjacent area. She also recorded the latency of the first helper's arrival after the victim had fallen and on appropriate trials, the latency of the first helper's arrival after the programmed model had arrived.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other appropriate descriptions should be credited. <p><u>Bandura:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quantitative data was gathered in two parts of the study. Firstly, before the experiment, all children were rated on their aggressive behaviour in social interactions in the nursery school. Composite scores allowed the children to be matched on aggression levels, placed in triplets and assigned at random to one of the two experimental conditions or to the control group. Secondly, quantitative data was gathered in the experimental room / third room / third phase when observers recorded predetermined measures / categories of aggression shown by the children as they played with the toys, including the bobo doll. They recorded (at 5 second intervals for 20 minutes) instances of imitative physical aggression, imitative verbal aggression and imitative non-aggressive verbal responses. They also recorded any instances of mallet aggression, sitting on the bobo doll, punching the bobo doll, non-imitative physical and verbal aggression and aggressive gun play. Recordings were also made of the number of times boys and girls played non-aggressively or sat quietly and did not play with any of the toys. 		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other appropriate descriptions should be credited. <p><u>Milgram:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quantitative data was gathered in two parts of the study. Firstly 14 Yale (psychology) seniors / students and colleagues of Milgram were provided with a detailed description of the experimental situation, to reflect carefully on it and then asked to plot the distribution of obedience of 100 hypothetical participants. This produced an estimate of how far up the voltage scale the real participants might be expected to go. Secondly, quantitative data was gathered by the experimenter noting down the maximum intensity shock – between 0-450 volts – that the participant was willing to administer before he refused to continue. This meant that the degree of obedience was specified / recorded as a numerical value. The latency and duration of shocks were measured by accurate timing devices which also provided quantitative data. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other appropriate descriptions should be credited. <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer e.g. any reference to qualitative data.</p> <p>1-2 marks – Partial or vague answer e.g. Piliavin – through observation and recording the number of passengers who helped the victim; Bandura – by observing and recording the number of imitated physical and verbal acts of aggression performed by the children; Milgram – by recording the maximum intensity shock – up to 450 volts – that the participant was willing to go.</p> <p>3-4 marks – An increasingly accurate, detailed and contextualised description based on those given above.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(c)	<p><u>Strength:</u> answers should give a generic strength of quantitative data supported by appropriate evidence from the chosen study.</p> <p>Generic strengths include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Because it uses numbers (1 mark) it allows identification of patterns of behaviour (1 mark). • Because it uses numbers (1 mark) one can calculate averages (1 mark). • Because it uses numbers (1 mark) patterns of dispersion can be shown (1 mark). • Because it only deals with numbers (1 mark) results are easy to analyse(1 mark). • Because it only deals with numbers (1 mark) it allows comparisons between groups/individuals to be made (1 mark). • It makes results easily to calculate and analyse (1 mark) so conclusions can be drawn (1 mark). • Other appropriate strengths should be credited. <p><u>Supported with evidence from the chosen study.</u></p> <p>0 marks: No or irrelevant answer e.g. any reference to qualitative data. 1 mark – Peripherally relevant strength is either merely identified with little or no elaboration and <u>no link to the</u></p>	[3+3] [6]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The question asks candidates to give a strength of quantitative data so this must be included in the response (1 mark). The strength should also be justified/explained (1 mark) and supported by appropriate evidence from the chosen study (1 mark).</i> • <i>No more than 1 mark can be gained if the strength is not linked to the chosen study.</i> • <i>No more than 1 mark can be awarded if the response is study specific e.g. one strength of quantitative data in Piliavin's study is / it is easy to compare the number of participants who were obedient and the number of participants who were disobedient.</i> • <i>Likewise, the question asks candidates to give a weakness of quantitative data so this must be included in the response (1 mark). The weakness should also be justified/explained (1 mark) and supported by appropriate evidence from the chosen study (1 mark).</i> • <i>Likewise, no more than 1 mark can be gained if the weakness is not linked to the chosen study.</i> • <i>No more than 1 mark can be awarded if the response is study specific e.g. one weakness of quantitative data in Milgram's study is / a weakness is that it does not give reasons for why participants were prepared to go right up to 450 volts.</i>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><u>chosen study</u> e.g. quantitative data allows patterns of behaviour to be identified.</p> <p>2 marks – An appropriate strength is identified but is basic and lacks detail i.e. is not explained / justified. A <u>vague / weak link is made to the chosen study</u> showing some understanding e.g. quantitative data is easy to analyse so Piliavin could see how many passengers helped the victim.</p> <p>3 marks – An appropriate strength is identified, explained / justified and elaborated through appropriate evidence from the chosen study, showing good understanding e.g. quantitative data is numerical data so results are easy to analyse. For example it was easy for Milgram to see that all participants – 40/40 – were prepared to give electric shocks up to 300 volts in order to obey an authority figure.</p> <p><u>Weakness:</u> answers should give a generic weakness of quantitative data supported by appropriate evidence from the chosen study.</p> <p>Generic weaknesses include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Because it only involves numbers (1mark).it gives no explanation for why the behaviour occurred (1 mark). • Because it only involves numbers (1 mark) it lacks detail and ‘richness’ / is fairly superficial (1 mark). • It lacks rich, in depth detail that can be gathered through qualitative data (1 mark) so one does not find out why individuals behave the way they do (1 mark). • Other appropriate weaknesses should be credited. 		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><u>Supported by evidence from the chosen study.</u></p> <p>0 marks: No or irrelevant answer e.g. any reference to qualitative data.</p> <p>1 mark – Peripherally relevant strength is either merely identified with little or no elaboration and <u>no link to the chosen study</u> e.g. quantitative data is numerical data so it lacks detail and richness.</p> <p>2 marks – An appropriate strength is identified but is basic and lacks detail i.e. is not explained / justified. I. <u>A vague / weak link is made to the chosen study</u> showing some understanding e.g. quantitative data is fairly superficial so Bandura was not able to discover why children behaved the way they did.</p> <p>3 marks – An appropriate strength is identified, explained / justified and elaborated through appropriate evidence from the chosen study, showing good understanding e.g. quantitative data (because it only involves numbers) gives no explanation for why certain behaviours occur. For example, Milgram did not find out why 26/40 participants were prepared to give electric shocks up to 450 volts just because a man got a question wrong.</p>		
(d)	<p>Most likely answers will refer to:</p> <p><u>Piliavin</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The cane victim received spontaneous help 95% of the time (62/65 trials) whereas the drunk victim was spontaneously helped 50% of the time (19/38 trials). • On 49/81 (60%) of the trials when the victim was given help, the help was given by 2 or more helpers. 	[8]	<p><i>A maximum of 3 marks can be gained if only ONE result is considered and/or the answer is not linked to the chosen study.</i></p> <p><i>All examiners are reminded that they should refer to the original studies to check findings.</i></p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On 21/103 (20%) of the trials (with and without a model) 34 people left the critical area after the victim collapsed. • Help was slower to be forthcoming in the drunk condition: only 17% of the drunk victims were helped before the model stepped in, whereas 87% of the cane victims were helped before the model acted. • The median latency for cane trials (non-model condition) was 5 seconds whereas it was 109 seconds for drunk trials. • 90% of first helpers were males. • Black victims received help less quickly than white victims, especially in the drunk condition. • In the drunk condition there was slight 'same race' effect - whites were more likely to help whites than blacks. • More comments from subway passengers were obtained in the drunk condition than in the cane condition. • Most of the comments were made on the trials where no help was given within the first 70 seconds. • The more passengers who were in the immediate vicinity of the victim the more likely help was to be given. • On 21/103 trials, 34 people left the critical area (though a higher proportion in drunk than cane condition). 		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was a slight amount of same-race helping but this was only in the drunk condition (though this was not significant). • Other appropriate findings should be credited. <p><u>Bandura:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Children who saw an aggressive model reproduced more aggressive acts resembling the acts of the model than all the other children / than those who observed a non-aggressive model or no model at all. • Children who saw the aggressive model showed more partial imitation of the role model or non-imitative physical and verbal aggression than those who saw the non-aggressive or no model. • Children who saw the non-aggressive model showed low levels of aggression (though they were not significantly lower than the group that had no model). • Boys imitated male role models more than girls for physical and verbal imitative aggression, non-imitative aggression and gun play. • Girls imitated female models more than boys for verbal aggression. • Overall boys showed more imitative aggression than girls. • Overall boys showed more imitative aggression than girls, except when they saw an aggressive female model. 		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other appropriate findings should be credited. <p><u>Milgram:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All 40 participants (100%) gave shocks up to 300 volts. • 26/40 participants (65%) went all the way to 450 volts and were considered obedient. 14 participants were therefore considered disobedient. • Many participants showed signs of nervousness. • Participants were observed to sweat, tremble, stutter, bite their lips, groan and dig their fingernails into their flesh. • One sign of tension was the regular occurrence of nervous laughing fits. • Full blown uncontrollable seizures were observed for three participants, in one case so violent that the study had to be stopped. • Other appropriate findings should be credited e.g. findings in relation to the pre-test predictions made by 14 Yale seniors. <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer e.g. Bandura – children will imitate behaviour modelled by adults i.e. conclusions as opposed to findings.</p> <p>1-3 marks – Description of results is very basic and lacks detail e.g. some general statements are identified. Some understanding may be evident. Expression is poor, with few, if any, psychological</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>terms. No fine details have been included and/or <u>The answer is not linked to the chosen study.</u></p> <p>4-6 marks – Description of results is mostly accurate. There are some omissions but some understanding is evident. Details e.g. numbers/comments occasionally present, but often absent. There is some use of psychological terminology and the answer has some structure and organisation. The answer has <u>some</u> clear links to the chosen study.</p> <p>7-8 marks – Description of results is increasingly accurate and detailed (with several details) included. Detail is appropriate to level and time allowed. Understanding, expression and use of psychological terminology is good. There are <u>clear and appropriate links</u> to the chosen study, as outlined above.</p>		
(e)	<p>Answers are likely to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggestions, with examples of how the chosen study upheld ethical guidelines. • Suggestions, with examples of how the chosen study contravened ethical guidelines. <p>Answers are likely to refer to the following ethical issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consent. • Informed consent. • Deception. • Physical harm. (long and /or short term, including stress). 	[8]	<i>No more than 3 marks gain be gained if the answer is not linked to the chosen study.</i>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Right to withdraw. • Debriefing. • Confidentiality. <p>Example answer:</p> <p><u>In relation to Milgram:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although all participants were volunteers and so had <i>consented</i> to participate in the study, they had not given <i>informed consent</i> because they were <i>deceived</i> about the actual purpose of the study. (They believed they were taking part in a study on memory and learning when in fact it was to see how obedient a person would be when asked by an authority figure to administer electric shocks to another individual). Participants were further <i>deceived</i> because they thought they had equal chance of being the teacher or the learner (when this was rigged so they were always the teacher), thought the shock machine was genuine (because they had received a sample shock themselves), and thought the learner was really suffering (when their cries of help etc were actually tape recordings). These <i>deceptions</i> can however be justified because if the participants had been fully informed they would most probably have not taken the study seriously and responded to demand characteristics making the findings invalid i.e. the ends justify the means. Milgram claimed the <i>right to withdraw</i> was upheld throughout, shown because 14/40 participants chose to leave before the end of the study, however as there was no obvious point at which they could stop administering the shocks this right was not evident and Milgram / the experimenter 		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>did not remind participants that did not need to continue if they didn't want to. However, again, had this issue been addressed more overtly, Milgram would not have been able to show so significantly how far people will obey authority figures even when what they are asked to do goes against their better judgement. Many participants suffered extreme <i>stress</i> throughout the study shown through their obvious distress, with three even having violent convulsions. To overcome this issue and the other ethical issues, Milgram thoroughly <i>debriefed</i> his participants at the end of the study, introducing them to the learner and telling the 'obedient' ones that their behaviour was normal. All participants were also subsequently followed up by both Milgram and an independent psychiatrist. <i>Confidentiality</i> was maintained as no participant names were disclosed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other appropriate discussions relevant to the chosen study should be credited. <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer</p> <p>1-3 marks –Discussion is very basic and lacks detail e.g. some suggestions of how ethical guidelines were upheld / some suggestions as to how ethical guidelines were contravened. Some understanding may be evident. Expression is poor, with few, if any, psychological terms and/or <u>the answer is not linked to the chosen study.</u></p> <p>4-6 marks –Discussion is reasonable and shows understanding. EITHER supporting (at least two pieces) OR challenging evidence (at least two pieces) in relation to ethical issues is provided which is <u>clearly</u></p>		<p><i>NB: To reach the top band candidates must include both supporting and challenging evidence.</i></p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><u>linked</u> to the chosen study elaborating understanding / one piece of supporting AND one piece of challenging evidence is provided, both <u>clearly linked</u> to the chosen study. Expression and use of psychological terminology is reasonable.</p> <p>7-8 marks – Discussion is increasingly accurate and detailed. This is supported by EITHER two or more appropriate suggestions / pieces of evidence clearly linked to the chosen study showing how ethical guidelines were upheld and one appropriate suggestion / piece of evidence clearly linked to the chosen study showing how ethical guidelines were contravened OR one appropriate suggestion / pieces of evidence clearly linked to the chosen study showing how ethical guidelines were upheld and two or more appropriate suggestions / pieces of evidence clearly linked to the chosen study showing how ethical guidelines were contravened. Detail is appropriate to level and time allowed. Understanding, expression and use of psychological terminology are good.</p>		
(f)	<p>Answers are likely to refer to the following ethical issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consent. • Informed consent. • Deception. • Physical harm (long and /or short term, including stress). • Right to withdraw. 	[8]	<i>No more than 2 marks can be gained if the answer is not linked to the chosen study.</i>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Debriefing. • Confidentiality. <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p>1-2 marks – Description of improvement(s) are peripheral to the study. Description is basic and lacks detail. Evaluation may be just discernible. Understanding is limited. The answer is unstructured, muddled, probably list-like and <u>not linked</u> to the chosen study.</p> <p>3-4 marks – Description of improvement(s) is appropriate to the study. Description is basic and lacks details with some understanding, though expression may be limited. Some evaluation may be evident. The answer <u>is loosely linked</u> to the chosen study.</p> <p>5-6 marks – Description of improvement(s) is appropriate to the study. Description is reasonable with some understanding though expression may be somewhat limited. Some evaluation is evident. There may be an imbalance between description and evaluation. The answer has <u>some links</u> to the chosen study.</p> <p>7-8 marks - Description of <u>two or more</u> improvements is appropriate to the study. Description is detailed with good understanding and clear expression. Evaluation is effective and informed. There is a good balance between description and evaluation. The answer is competently structured and organised, appropriate to the level and time allowed and has <u>clear links to the chosen study throughout</u></p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	Section B Total	36	
17 (a)	<p>Likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The physiological approach sees behaviour and experiences being caused by activity in the brain and nervous system. • All things psychological are first physiological. All thoughts, feelings and behaviours therefore have a biological base such as genes, DNA and how the brain works. • Other appropriate outlines should be credited. <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer. 1 mark – Vague or partial answer e.g. all behaviour is due to a person's biological make-up 2 marks –An appropriate outline is accurately described, such as the ones given above.</p>	[2]	<p><i>The outline must be;</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Linked to the physiological approach</i> • <i>Linked to behaviour</i>
(b)	<p>Likely answers will refer to sleep stages, REM and the relationship between these and dream occurrence, supported by evidence from the Dement and Kleitman study e.g.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sleep is (normally) a biologically induced behaviour. A sleep cycle involves an individual's brain moving up and down through four distinct sleep stages. Once asleep, when an individual returns to the first stage they enter a different kind of sleep known as rapid eye movement (REM) sleep. This is an active stage of sleep in which the brainwaves and eye movements are rapid. Using an EEG and EOG machine, Dement and Kleitman were able to identify when participants were 	[4]	<p><i>A maximum of 1 mark can be gained if there is no link to the named study.</i></p> <p><i>To gain more than 2 marks there must be a clear link to the physiological approach.</i></p> <p><i>For full marks the description should be supported by at least one example from the named study.</i></p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>in REM. When woken in REM, on most occasions, participants reported that they had been dreaming, showing a link between the physiological state of sleep and the occurrence of dreams. In addition, Dement and Kleitman found that there was a strong association between the physical directions of eye movement in REM and dream content e.g. one participant who was observed experiencing horizontal eye movements reported watching two people throwing tomatoes at each other.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other appropriate descriptions should be credited. <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 is generally poor. <u>NB: A maximum of 1 mark can be gained for a generic explanation not linked to the named study.</u> 3-4 marks – Description is accurate. Detail is appropriate and understanding is good. Elaboration is evident and there are clear links to both the named study and the approach. Expression and use of psychological terminology is sound.</p>		
(c)	<p>Answers are likely to refer to: the type of data gathered (quantitative/qualitative), the materials or equipment used, the method used.</p> <p>Similarity:</p> <p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Both Dement and Kleitman and Sperry used technical equipment to gather data Both Dement and Kleitman and Maguire gathered data 	[6]	<p><i>Likely studies include: Dement & Kleitman, Sperry, Maguire.</i></p> <p><i>The similarity/difference needs to be</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>(a) Identified (1 mark)</i> <i>(b) Supported by evidence from one appropriate study (1 mark)</i> <i>(c) Supported by evidence from a second appropriate study(1 mark)</i>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>using quantitative measures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other appropriate similarities should be credited. <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer. 1 mark – An appropriate similarity in the way data was gathered in two appropriate physiological approach studies is merely identified. 2 marks – An appropriate similarity in the way data was gathered is identified and supported by <u>relevant</u> evidence from <u>one</u> appropriate physiological approach study. 3 marks – An appropriate similarity in the way data was gathered is identified and supported by <u>relevant</u> evidence from <u>two</u> appropriate physiological approach studies.</p> <p>Difference:</p> <p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dement and Kleitman and Maguire used different types of equipment to gather data • Dement and Kleitman and Sperry used different samples to gather data • Other appropriate differences should be credited. <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer. 1 mark – An appropriate difference in the way data was gathered in two appropriate physiological approach studies is merely identified. 2 marks – An appropriate difference in the way data was gathered is identified and supported by <u>relevant</u> evidence from <u>one</u> appropriate physiological approach study. 3 marks – An appropriate difference in the way data was gathered is identified and supported by <u>relevant</u> evidence from <u>two</u> appropriate physiological approach studies.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(d)	<p>Answers may refer to ethical issues such as (informed) consent, protection of participants - short term psychological harm/stress, long-term psychological harm, physical harm, deception, right to withdraw, confidentiality, debriefing.</p> <p><u>Strengths of the approach in relation to ethical issues may include:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As studies taking the physiological approach are frequently conducted in laboratories using technical equipment, participants are aware they are being studied and therefore give their consent • As studies taking the physiological approach are frequently conducted in laboratories participants are unlikely to be deceived as to the aim of the study • As studies taking the physiological approach are frequently conducted in laboratories participants are aware they are being studied and can exercise their right to withdraw if, at any time, they feel they do not want to continue • Taking the physiological approach to study behaviour allows researchers to maintain confidentiality • Taking the physiological approach to study behaviour lends itself to the use of snap shot studies/laboratory experiments so researchers can debrief participants either immediately after the study has been completed or as soon as the findings have been analysed..... • Other appropriate strengths should be credited. <p><u>Weaknesses of the approach in relation to ethical issues may include:</u></p>	[12]	<i>Evidence is likely to come from Sperry, Dement & Kleitman, Maguire.</i>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As studies taking the physiological approach are frequently conducted in laboratories using technical /scientific equipment, participants may be put at the risk of physical harm • As studies taking the physiological approach are frequently conducted in laboratories using technical / scientific/mechanical equipment, participants may suffer short-term psychological harm in the form of stress • Taking the physiological approach allows researchers identify biological explanations for human behaviour. This may cause participants long-term psychological harm • If researchers who take the physiological approach do not inform their participants about the full nature and purpose of the study, deception may be an issue • Other appropriate weaknesses should be credited. <p>1-3 marks – There may be some ethical issues (strengths <i>and/or</i> 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. <u>Sparse or no use of supporting examples.</u></p> <p>4-6 marks – There may be some ethical issues (strengths <i>and/or</i> 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. <u>Sparse use of /weak supporting</u></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/ i.e. be appropriately contextualised/ linked to a named study that can be viewed from the behaviourist perspective.</i></p> <p><i>Study specific answers are not creditworthy.</i></p> <p><i>Read through the mark bands carefully before allocating marks.</i></p> <p><i>Responses with only one appropriate strength and one appropriate weakness / only appropriate strengths or only appropriate weaknesses can gain a <u>maximum of 6 marks.</u></i></p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><u>examples.</u></p> <p>7-9 marks – There may be a range of ethical issues (strengths <i>and</i> weaknesses) which are appropriate to the question, or there may be an imbalance between the two. Discussion is good with some understanding and good expression. Analysis is reasonably effective and argument is informed. <u>Some use of appropriate supporting examples.</u></p> <p>10-12 marks – There is a good range of ethical issues (2 or more strengths <i>and</i> 2 or more weaknesses) 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. <u>Appropriate use of supporting examples.</u> The answer is competently structured and organised. Answer is mostly grammatically correct with few spelling errors.</p>		
18 (a)	<p>Likely answer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The psychodynamic perspective sees behaviour being determined by past experiences which have been stored in the unconscious mind. • The psychodynamic perspective sees behaviour being caused by inner conflicts of the mind of which the individual is unaware. • The psychodynamic perspective sees behaviour being caused by unconscious psychological processes e.g. wishes and fears of which we are not fully aware • The psychodynamic perspective sees behaviour being influenced by childhood experiences of which the individual is no longer consciously aware. 	[2]	<p><i>The outline must be;</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Linked to the psychodynamic perspective</i> • <i>Linked to behaviour</i> <p><i>NB: Answers based around the id, ego and superego cannot gain full marks unless they are linked to inner conflicts of the mind and behaviour.</i></p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other appropriate outlines should be credited. <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer. 1 mark – Vague or partial answer e.g. behaviour is caused by the unconscious, childhood experiences are crucial in shaping adult personality. 2 marks –An appropriate outline is accurately described, such as the one given above.</p>		
(b)	<p>Answers are likely to refer to the way Freud linked his psychoanalytic theory relating to infant sexuality to the development of phobic behaviour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> According to the psychodynamic perspective the development of a phobia comes from a part of the mind of which individuals, initially at least, have no direct awareness/comes from the unconscious mind. Freud in his study linked Little Hans' phobia of horses to him unconsciously experiencing the Oedipus complex which involves a young boy having unconscious sexual feelings for his mother and fearing his father as a rival. Freud suggested that Hans projected this unconscious fear of his father onto horses because they resembled his father – the black on the horses' mouths and the things in front of their eyes (blinkers) resembled his father's moustache and glasses. Other appropriate descriptions should be credited. <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 is generally poor. <u>NB: A maximum of 1 mark can be gained for a generic explanation not linked to either a specific study or a</u></p>	[4]	<p><i>Although candidates are most likely to refer to Freud, a clear well described generic answer should be credited.</i></p> <p><i>To gain more than 2 marks there must be a clear link to the psychodynamic perspective.</i></p> <p><i>For a full answer the description should be supported by either a specific detail from a known study and/or an appropriate generic example.</i></p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><u>specific example.</u> 3-4 marks – Description is accurate. Detail is appropriate and understanding is good. Elaboration is evident and there are clear links to the perspective. Expression and use of psychological terminology is sound.</p>		
(c)	<p>Answers are likely to refer to: the type of data gathered(quantitative/qualitative), the materials or equipment used, the method used.</p> <p>Similarity:</p> <p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both Freud and Thigpen and Cleckley used the case study method to gather data • Both Freud and Thigpen and Cleckley used quantitative measures to gather data..... • Other appropriate similarities should be credited. <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer. 1 mark – An appropriate similarity in the way data was gathered in two appropriate psychodynamic perspective studies is merely identified. 2 marks – An appropriate similarity in the way data was gathered is identified and supported by <u>relevant</u> evidence from <u>one</u> appropriate psychodynamic perspective study/a similarity is clearly described without the similarity being identified. 3 marks – An appropriate similarity in the way data was gathered is identified and supported by <u>relevant</u> evidence from <u>two</u> appropriate psychodynamic perspective studies.</p> <p>Difference:</p>	[6]	<p><i>Likely studies will include: Thigpen and Cleckley, Freud, Bandura</i></p> <p><i>The similarity/difference needs to be</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>(a) Identified (1 mark)</i> <i>(b) Supported by evidence from one appropriate study (1 mark)</i> <i>(c) Supported by evidence from a second appropriate study(1 mark)</i>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The types of data gathered were different. Freud only gathered qualitative data whereas Thigpen and Cleckley gathered both quantitative and qualitative data • The samples used by Thigpen and Cleckley and Freud were different • Other appropriate differences should be credited. <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer. 1 mark – An appropriate difference in the way data was gathered in two appropriate psychodynamic perspective studies is merely identified. 2 marks – An appropriate difference in the way data was gathered is identified and supported by <u>relevant</u> evidence from <u>one</u> appropriate psychodynamic perspective study / a difference is clearly described without the difference being identified. 3 marks – An appropriate difference in the way data was gathered is identified and supported by <u>relevant</u> evidence from <u>two</u> appropriate psychodynamic perspective studies.</p>		
(d)	<p>Answers may refer to ethical issues such as (informed) consent, protection of participants - short term psychological harm/stress, long-term psychological harm, physical harm, -deception, right to withdraw, confidentiality, debriefing.</p> <p><u>Strengths of the perspective in relation to ethical issues may include:</u></p>	[12]	<i>Evidence is likely to come from Freud, Thigpen & Cleckley, Bandura</i>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As studies taking the psychodynamic perspective frequently use the case study method, participants are aware they are being studied and therefore give their consent • As studies using the psychodynamic perspective are frequently conducted in natural environments are unlikely to feel uncomfortable or stressed • As studies using the psychodynamic perspective are frequently conducted in clinics or surgeries, participants are aware they are being studied and can exercise their right to withdraw if, at any time, they feel they do not want to continue • As studies using the psychodynamic perspective are frequently conducted in clinics or surgeries, participants can easily be debriefed at the end of any session..... • Taking the psychodynamic perspective to study behaviour allows researchers to maintain confidentiality • Other appropriate strengths should be credited. <p><u>Weaknesses of the perspective in relation to ethical issues may include:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As studies taking the psychodynamic perspective are frequently conducted in clinics or surgeries, participants may feel uncomfortable and so suffer short-term psychological harm in the form of stress..... • Taking the psychodynamic perspective allows researchers identify that behaviour may be caused by unconscious forces. This may cause participants long-term psychological harm • As researchers who study behaviour through the psychodynamic perspective often investigate unusual 		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>or rare behaviours/often want to find evidence to support their own theories and hypotheses, confidentiality may become an issue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If researchers who take the psychodynamic perspective do not inform their participants about the full nature and purpose of the study, deception may be an issue • Other appropriate weaknesses should be credited. <p>1-3 marks – There may be some ethical issues (strengths <i>and/or</i> 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. <u>Sparse or no use of supporting examples.</u></p> <p>4-6 marks – There may be some ethical issues (strengths <i>and/or</i> 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. <u>Sparse use of /weak supporting examples.</u></p> <p>7-9 marks – There may be a range of ethical issues (strengths <i>and</i> weaknesses) which are appropriate to the question, or there may be an imbalance between the two. Discussion is good with some understanding and good expression. Analysis is reasonably effective and argument is informed. <u>Some use of appropriate supporting examples.</u></p> <p>10-12 marks – There is a good range of ethical issues (2 or more strengths <i>and</i> 2 or more weaknesses) which are</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/ i.e. be appropriately contextualised/ linked to a named study that can be viewed from the behaviourist perspective.</i></p> <p><i>Study specific answers are not creditworthy.</i></p> <p><i>Read through the mark bands carefully before allocating marks.</i></p> <p><i>Responses with only one appropriate strength and one appropriate weakness / only appropriate strengths or only appropriate weaknesses can gain a <u>maximum of 6 marks.</u></i></p>

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance
			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. <u>Appropriate use of supporting examples.</u> The answer is competently structured and organised. Answer is mostly grammatically correct with few spelling errors.		
			Section C Total	24	
			Paper Total	[120]	

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Education and Learning

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

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 2014

