

**GCE**

**Psychology**

Unit **G542**: Core Studies

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

**Mark Scheme for June 2016**

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 2016

## 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

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
1	<p>Most likely answer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Two (<i>Pan paniscus</i>) pygmy chimpanzees – Kanzi (aged 4 years at the time the study was completed) and his (younger) sister Mulika; and two (<i>Pan troglodytes</i>) common chimpanzees – Austin and Sherman (aged 9 and 10 years respectively when the study was completed).</li> <li>• Other appropriate descriptions should be credited.</li> </ul> <p><b>3-4 marks</b> – Clear, accurate description of the sample which includes details of <b>both</b> the pygmy and common chimpanzees e.g. two pygmy chimpanzees named Kanzi and Mulika and two common chimpanzees named Austin and Sherman.</p> <p><b>1-2 marks</b> – Vague or partial answer e.g. two pygmy chimpanzees and two common chimpanzees/two pygmy chimpanzees named Kanzi and Mulika/two common chimpanzees named Austin and Sherman/Kanzi, Mulika, Austin and Sherman.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p>	[4]	<p><i>Reference to 'normal chimpanzees' is not creditworthy.</i></p>
2 (a)	<p>Likely answer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A leading question is simply one that, either by its form or content, suggests to the witness what answer is <b>desired or leads him to the desired answer</b>.</li> <li>• Other appropriate explanations should be credited.</li> </ul> <p><b>2 marks</b> -An accurate explanation of the term as outlined above.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Vague or partial answer e.g. when the participant knows what's wanted, when the question biases the participant's response..</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p>	[2]	<p><i>This answer does not need to be contextualised.</i></p> <p><i>For 'desired' accept: wanted, directed expected, implied</i></p>

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
<b>(b)</b>	<p>Any one from the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (About) how fast were the cars going when they smashed/collided/hit/bumped/contacted each other? (Any one verb is acceptable)</li> <li>• (About) how fast were the cars going when they smashed/hit each other? (Any one verb is acceptable)</li> <li>• Did you see any <u>broken</u> glass?</li> </ul> <p><b>2 marks</b> – Clear accurate example of one of the leading questions as given above.  <b>1 mark</b> – Vague or partial answer e.g. How fast were the cars going?/Did you see (any/the) glass?  <b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer e.g. .Did you see broken glass when the cars 'smashed/hit etc.' each other i.e. combining questions.</p>	<b>[2]</b>	<p><i>Make sure they don't combine questions.</i></p> <p><i>Questions including the verb 'crashed' are not creditworthy</i></p>
<b>3 (a)</b>	<p>Most likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The mean score on the Eyes Task was similar for both the normal and Tourette's adults/ the mean score was similar for both normal and Tourette syndrome adults being 20.3(/25) and 20.4 (/25) respectively.</li> <li>• The range of scores on the Eyes task was the same for both the normal and Tourette's adults/the range of the scores was the same – 9 – for both normal and Tourette syndrome adults..</li> <li>• Other appropriate outlines should be credited.</li> </ul> <p><b>2 marks</b> – Clear, fully contextualised similarity between the two, named groups such as one of the ones outlined above.  <b>1 mark</b> –Vague or partial answer, similarity not clear e.g. the scores were similar for both the normal and Tourette's adults i.e. no real contextualisation to the table.  <b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer e.g. outlining a difference rather than a similarity.</p>	<b>[2]</b>	<p><i>Needs reference from table for 2 (contextualisation)</i></p>

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
(b)	<p>Likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Normal and Tourette syndrome adults have similar theory of mind abilities as shown through the Eyes task in which normal adults had a mean score of 20.3 (/25) and the Tourette's adults a mean score of 20.4 (/25)/ Normal and Tourette syndrome adults have similar theory of mind abilities because they had very similar mean scores..</li> <li>• Adult autistics are less likely to possess a TOM than either normal or Tourette syndrome adults, shown through the Eyes task where their average score was only 16.3 (/25) compared to the normal adults whose mean score was 20.3 (/25) and the Tourette syndrome adults whose mean score was 20.4 (/25)/ Adult autistics are less likely to possess a TOM than either normal or Tourette syndrome adults because their average score was much lower.</li> <li>• There are individual differences in relation to TOM which are more prevalent in adults with autism than either normal or Tourette syndrome adults because there was a greater range of scores in the Eyes task in the autistic group (10) than in the normal and Tourette's group (9 each).</li> <li>• Other appropriate conclusions should be credited.</li> </ul> <p><b>2 marks</b> – Clear, fully contextualised and appropriate conclusion such as one of the ones suggested above.  <b>1 mark</b> – Vague or partial answer e.g. normal and Tourette syndrome adults have similar TOM abilities/Tourette syndrome adults can identify gender from pictures of eyes/autistic adults are less likely to have TOM than either normal or Tourette syndrome adults i.e. answer not fully contextualised./another finding from table=1  <b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p>	[2]	

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
<p><b>4</b> <b>(a)</b></p>	<p>Most likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The way in which Hans reported his fear of being bitten by a horse was a symbolic representation of his (subconscious) fear of castration.</li> <li>• Hans' fear of horses represented his (subconscious) <u>fear of his father</u> because the black around a horse's mouth and the blinkers worn over their eyes represented his father's black moustache and glasses.</li> <li>• Other appropriate outlines should be credited e.g. an explanation clearly linked to the Oedipus complex.</li> </ul> <p><b>2 marks</b> – Clear, fully contextualised outline such as one of the ones given above.  <b>1 mark</b> – Vague or partial answer e.g. because they represent Hans' father as the black around the horses mouths and the blinkers resemble Hans' father's black moustache and glasses i.e. a partial answer because there is no reference to 'fear of father'; because he thought he would have his widdler/penis cut off i.e. <u>answer not fully contextualised.</u>  <b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p>	<p><b>[2]</b></p>	<p><i>Because the question says: 'From Freud's study...' the answer must show some link to this e.g. because horses are big and have big teeth would not be creditworthy as there is no link to the original study.</i>  <i>Fear of horses linked to father- linked to large penises can be credited.</i></p>
<p><b>(b)</b></p>	<p>Most likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (To an impression he had received at Gmunden) when he heard a father address his child with these words of warning: "Don't put your finger to the (white) horse or it'll bite you."</li> <li>• Hans' fear of horses could have been brought on from seeing a horse fall down in the street when he was younger.</li> <li>• Other appropriate descriptions/suggestions should be credited but they must link to the study to gain full marks.</li> </ul> <p><b>2 marks</b> – Clear, fully contextualised outline such as the one given above.  <b>1 mark</b> – Vague or partial answer e.g. because he had heard a girl's</p>	<p><b>[2]</b></p>	<p><i>As the question merely asks for an alternative explanation, other Freudian explanations should be credited.</i></p>

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	father talking to her about the danger of horses i.e. answer not fully contextualised e.g. traumatic experience of horses (no explanation of what traumatic is so partial answer) <b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.		
5	Most likely answer: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The child was firstly shown two rows of counters of equal length and number. One row was then either spread out or bunched up. After this the child was asked whether the lines/piles of counters were the same in number.</li> <li>• Other appropriate descriptions should be credited.</li> </ul> <p><b>3-4 marks</b> – An increasingly accurate and detailed description such as the one given above.</p> <p><b>1-2 marks</b> –Vague or partial answer e.g. two rows of counters were re-arranged in front of the child who was then asked if they were the same i.e. no real details included.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer e.g. descriptions of standard (two question) or fixed array condition/description of mass or volume tasks.</p>	<b>[4]</b>	<p><i>References to there being only one row of counters cannot gain full marks as Samuel and Bryant used two rows. Therefore maximum mark would be 3.</i></p> <p><i>Answers talking about re-arranging the counters with no question can only gain 1 mark</i></p>
6 (a)	Likely answer: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In the non-aggressive condition the model assembled a tinker-toy set in a quiet, subdued manner <u>and totally ignored the bobo doll.</u></li> <li>• Other appropriate outlines should be credited.</li> </ul> <p><b>2 marks</b> – Clear, accurate outline such as the one given above e.g. including playing non aggressively and ignoring doll</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Vague or partial answer e.g. the model ignored the bobo doll/showed no aggression</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer e.g. outlines of how the model behaved in the aggressive condition.</p>	<b>[2]</b>	<p><i>To gain full marks the candidate must refer to the fact that the model ignored/did not play with the bobo doll.</i></p>



Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
(b)	<p>Most likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participants in the non-aggressive model condition exhibited virtually no imitative aggression.</li> <li>• None of the participants in the non-aggressive model condition made any non-aggressive verbal remarks.</li> <li>• Participants in the non-aggressive model condition produced less mallet aggression <u>than</u> participants in either the aggressive model or no model conditions.</li> <li>• Participants in the non-aggressive model condition were less aggressive <u>than</u> those in the aggressive model condition.</li> <li>• Participants in the non-aggressive model condition sat on the bobo doll less <u>than</u> participants in the aggressive model condition.</li> <li>• <u>In comparison</u> to the control group, participants exposed to the non-aggressive male model performed significantly less imitative physical aggression/less imitative verbal aggression/less mallet aggression/less non-imitative physical and verbal aggression/and they were less inclined to punch the bob doll.</li> <li>• Participants in the non-aggressive model condition engaged in significantly more non-aggressive play with dolls <u>than</u> either participants in the aggressive or control groups.</li> <li>• Participants who observed non-aggressive models spent more than twice as much time <u>than</u> participants who observed aggressive models in simply sitting quietly without handling of the materials.</li> <li>• Other appropriate findings should be credited.</li> </ul> <p><b>2 marks</b> – Clear, fully contextualised outline such as one of the ones given above. Credit implicit comparisons  <b>1 mark</b> – Vague or partial answer e.g. participants in the non-aggressive model condition were less aggressive i.e. comparison incomplete; children in the non-aggressive condition were less likely to display aggressive behaviour than children in the aggressive condition i.e. a vague answer.  <b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer e.g. findings relating to the aggressive model condition</p>	[2]	<p><i>Examiners should be prepared to check candidates' responses against findings recorded in the original study.</i></p> <p><i>Can use gender if related to non-aggressive condition</i></p> <p><i>To gain full marks any comparison must be completed.</i></p>

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
7	<p>Any <u>two</u> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There will be/is a significant <b>association/correlation</b> between REM and (reported) dreaming / dream recall.</li> <li>• There will be/is a significant (positive) correlation/ association between the estimate of time spent dreaming and the measurement of REM sleep / there will be/is a positive correlation between the length of REM periods and subjective dream-duration estimates.</li> <li>• There will be/is a positive <b>correlation</b> between the duration REM sleep and the reported narrative length of the dream</li> <li>• There will be/is a <b>relationship/association</b> between the pattern of eye movements and the reported content of the dream / there will be/is an association between eye movement patterns and visual imagery of the dream. <u>NOT correlation</u></li> <li>• Other appropriate statements should be credited.</li> </ul> <p><b>2 marks</b> – Clear fully contextualised hypothesis such as one of the ones given above.  <b>1 mark</b> – Vague or partial answer e.g. there will be/is a link/association between sleep stages and dreaming i.e. hypothesis not clearly stated/or not completed the comparison  <b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p>	<b>[2+2=4]</b>	<p><i>Accept: More dreams will be recalled when woken from REM sleep than when woken from NREM sleep / more dreams will be recalled from REM than NREM sleep.</i></p> <p><i>N.B. To gain full credit the answer must be provided as an hypothesis. If the answer is written as an aim/purpose, only 1 mark can be awarded for each suggestion.</i></p> <p><i>Any references to findings are not creditworthy</i></p> <p><i>References to ‘types of eye movements’/types of dreams can only gain partial marks.</i></p>

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
8	<p>Most likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Taxi drivers had (significantly) greater grey matter volume in <b>the posterior</b> hippocampus compared to non-taxi drivers/controls (or vice versa).</li> <li>• Controls/non-taxi drivers showed greater grey matter volume in the anterior hippocampus than taxi drivers (or vice versa).</li> <li>• Non-taxi drivers had a higher volume of grey matter in the right hippocampus than taxi drivers.</li> <li>• Other appropriate evidence should be credited.</li> </ul> <p><b>2 marks</b> – Clear, accurate outline of an appropriate piece of evidence which shows a difference between the hippocampal structure of taxi and non-taxi drivers/controls such as one of the ones given above. Need posterior for 2</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Vague or partial answer e.g. taxi drivers had greater grey matter volume in the posterior hippocampus i.e. comparison incomplete.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer e.g. reference to the findings of the correlational analysis.</p>	[2+2=4]	<p><i>References/inferences to 'size' of hippocampus/hippocampi are not creditworthy e.g. bigger/larger</i></p>

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
9 (a)	<p>Most likely answers;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The major (left) hemisphere is equipped with the expressive mechanisms for speech and writing and with the main centres for the comprehension and organisation of language.</li> <li>It is responsible for mental processes centred around the right visual field and control of the right hand, right leg and right side of the body/right side of the body.</li> <li>Other appropriate outlines should be credited.</li> </ul> <p><b>2 marks</b> – Clear, accurate outline to include at least <u>two</u> functions of the major hemisphere such as one of the ones given above.  <b>1 mark</b> – Vague or partial answer e.g. reference to only <u>one</u> function of the major hemisphere.  <b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer e.g. reference to any of the functions of the minor/right hemisphere</p>	<b>[2]</b>	<p><i>The following detail would be adequate for 2 marks:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The left hemisphere controls speech and writing.</i></li> <li><i>The left hemisphere is the main centre for comprehension and language (which includes speech and writing)</i></li> <li><i>The left hemisphere processes information received via the right visual field and controls the (movement) of the right side of the body.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Accept references to reading, logical thought, analytical thought, calculating thought, reasoning.</i></p> <p><i>Language and speech = 1 mark as language includes speech and writing.</i></p>
(b)	<p>Most likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If objects were placed in the left hand, the patient could only make wild guesses as to what the object was and often seemed unaware that they were actually holding anything.</li> <li>If an object was placed in the left hand, the patient was unable to identify it in speech</li> <li>Objects placed in the left hand can only be found from a group of objects (in a grab bag) with the left/same hand</li> <li>Other appropriate descriptions should be credited.</li> </ul> <p><b>2 marks</b> – Clear, fully contextualised description such as one of the ones given above.  <b>1 mark</b> – Vague or partial answer e.g. the patient didn't know what it was/ couldn't identify it i.e. no real contextualisation – no reference to left hand and/or 'object'.  <b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer e.g. patients could describe the object in speech and writing.</p>	<b>[2]</b>	<p><i>Any references to patients being able to write/draw (with either hand) the object are not creditworthy as there is no reference in the original study to these skills being tested as part of the tactile tests. Writing and drawing abilities were only tested in the visual tasks.</i></p>

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
10	<p>Most likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The variable '<u>type of victim</u>' was whether the victim appeared drunk/smelling of alcohol and carrying (a brown paper bag containing) a bottle or lame/ill/carrying a cane.</li> <li>• The variable '<u>race of victim</u>' was whether the victim was black or white.</li> <li>• The variable '<u>impact of modelling</u> (in everyday situations)' was whether the model intervened after 70 or 150/early or late seconds (or whether there was no model at all).</li> <li>• Other appropriate descriptions of the above should be credited.</li> </ul> <p><b>2 marks</b> – Clear, fully contextualised description of one of the manipulated variables as described above.  <b>1 mark</b> – Vague or partial answer e.g. drunk or lame/race of victim/impact (effect) of modelling i.e. mere identification of a variable so <u>answer not contextualised</u>.  <b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant response e.g. reference to the effect of group size as this variable was not manipulated.</p>	[2+2=4]	<p><i>As the question asks candidate to 'describe' such references as 'whether the victim was black or white' are only worth 1 mark. To gain 2 marks the IV must be identified AND described.</i></p> <p><i>The number of seconds does not have to be totally accurate but dependant on time.</i></p> <p><i>If the IV has been identified but only one part of the variable has been referred to only 1 mark can be awarded.</i></p>
11	<p>Most likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential participants went through 3-phase clinical, medical and background screening (to ensure they were neither psychologically vulnerable nor liable to put others at risk).</li> <li>• Participants signed a comprehensive consent form (which informed them that they may be subject to a series of factors which may involve risk).</li> <li>• Two independent psychologists monitored the study throughout.</li> <li>• A paramedic was on constant standby in case of illness or injury.</li> <li>• On-site security guards were provided with detailed protocols clarifying when and how to intervene in cases of dangerous behaviour by the participants.</li> <li>• Guards told (the night before) no physical violence would be tolerated</li> </ul>	[2+2=4]	<p><i>There appears to be no reference in the original study to participants having the right to withdraw so references to this consideration are not creditworthy.</i></p> <p><i>Any references to participants being continually monitored can gain 1 mark e.g. through the use of cameras/saliva swabs</i></p>

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An independent (5-person) ethics committee monitored the study throughout. (This committee had the right to demand changes to the study's set-up or to terminate it at any time).</li> <li>• The study was stopped on day 8 as the researchers considered the potential for harm had developed.</li> <li>• Other appropriate outlines should be credited.</li> </ul> <p><b>2 marks</b> – Clear, fully contextualised outline of how the ethical guideline was upheld such as one of the ones given above.  <b>1 mark</b> – Vague or partial answer e.g. participants were screened/participants gave their consent/clinical psychologists were present i.e. safeguard merely identified so answer not fully contextualised.  <b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p>		
<p><b>12</b> <b>(a)</b></p>	<p>Most likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The self-selecting (volunteer) sampling technique was used by placing an advertisement in a newspaper and/or making direct mail drops (leaflet) asking for people (males) to participate in a study of memory and learning (at Yale University).</li> <li>• Milgram used the self-selecting (volunteer) sampling technique by advertising for men (from the New haven area) to take part in a study of memory and learning.</li> <li>• Volunteers were recruited through a newspaper article and/or direct mail advertising asking for men to take part in a study on memory and learning (at Yale University).</li> <li>• Other appropriate descriptions should be credited.</li> </ul> <p><b>2 marks</b> – Clear, fully contextualised description such as one of the ones given above.  <b>1 mark</b> – Vague or partial answer e.g. by advertising/by placing advertisements in a newspaper/ through direct mailing i.e. <u>answer not fully contextualised</u> – no reference to memory and learning.  <b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p>	<p><b>[2]</b></p>	<p><i>To gain full marks the candidate does NOT have to refer to both advertising in a newspaper AND direct mailing but the response must be contextualised through reference to 'memory' and/or 'learning'.</i></p>

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
(b)	<p>Most likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The sample gathered is fundamentally biased / unrepresentative of the population as a whole because only those who saw the newspaper advertisement/received a direct mail advert in the Newhaven area/America had the opportunity to put themselves forward.</li> <li>The sample is usually unrepresentative of the population as a whole as the newspaper advertisement and direct mail adverts were only received in the New Haven area (of America).</li> <li>Other appropriate outlines should be credited.</li> </ul> <p><b>2 marks</b> – Clear, fully contextualised outline such as one of the ones given above.  <b>1 mark</b> – Vague or partial answer e.g. the sample will be fundamentally <b>biased</b>/the sample will be unrepresentative i.e. <u>answer not contextualised</u>.  <b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer e.g. a strength of the sampling technique.</p>	<b>[2]</b>	<p>An appropriate weakness needs to be identified for 1 mark and then qualified to gain second mark e.g. sample <b>unrepresentative</b> as it was advertised in <b>local</b> newspaper</p>
13	<p>Most likely answer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One way in which the self-report method was used was by asking RGs and NRGs in the ‘thinking aloud’ condition. to verbalise all their thoughts <u>whilst playing on the fruit machine./gambling</u></li> <li>A second way the self-report method was used was by conducting post-experimental semi-structured interviews in which participants were asked a number of <u>skill-related questions</u> / after the study, asking participants <u>skill-related questions</u>.</li> <li>Other appropriate descriptions should be credited.</li> </ul> <p><b>2 marks</b> – A clear, accurate and fully contextualised outline of how the self-report method was used, such as the ones given above.  <b>1 mark</b> – Vague or partial answer e.g. mere identification of one of the ways the self-report method was used e.g. through the ‘thinking aloud’ / through semi-structured interviews.  <b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p>	<b>[2+2=4]</b>	<p><i>There is no reference in the original study to participants being asked to complete a questionnaire so answers that refer to questionnaires are not creditworthy.</i></p> <p><i>References to particular questions asked e.g. participants were asked if they thought a certain level of skill was needed to play fruit machines, can only gain 1 mark AND only be awarded once i.e. 2 examples of questions asked can only be awarded 1 mark.</i></p>

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
14 (a)	<p>Most likely answer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participants, acting as pseudopatients, got themselves admitted to (psychiatric) hospitals/wards. They then observed the behaviour of the <u>staff and patients</u> both on the wards and around the hospitals and recorded their findings in a diary/recorded their observations on standard tablets of paper.</li> </ul> <p><b>2 marks</b> – Clear, accurate description including reference to how the participants <b>took part as patients</b>, what they observed and how it was recorded.  <b>1 mark</b> – Vague or partial answer e.g. Participants acted as patients and observed what went on in the hospitals.  <b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer. e.g. use of the covert method</p>	<b>[2]</b>	<i>The candidate must make it clear that they are referring to ‘participant observation’ and not merely ‘covert observation’/how the data was collected.</i>
(b)	<p>Most likely answer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• /As this was a covert participant observation, the pseudopatients were able to join in with ward life /activities and observe the behaviour of the staff and patients in the hospitals without them knowing so natural/genuine/real behaviour was observed (and recorded).</li> <li>• A participant observation allows the researcher to actually experience the situation from the participants’ point of view. The researchers, by becoming pseudopatients, were able to experience life in the psychiatric hospitals and were therefore able to observe (and record) the realistic/genuine behaviour of the staff and patients.</li> <li>• Other appropriate suggestions should be credited.</li> </ul> <p><b>2 marks</b> – Clear, <b>contextualised</b> outline of an appropriate advantage, such as one of the ones outlined above.  <b>1 mark</b> – Vague or partial answer e.g. in a covert participant observation, those being observed will act naturally because they don’t know the researcher is taking part and that they are being watched/</p>	<b>[2]</b>	<i>To gain full marks, the candidate must make it clear that they are referring to ‘participant observation’ and not merely ‘covert observation’</i>



Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	<p>the researcher becomes a real participant and experiences the situation for themselves so observes genuine behaviour i.e. an advantage merely identified so the <u>answer is not contextualised</u>.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p>		
15	<p>Most answers will refer to the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demure, retiring, in some respects saintly, neat, colourless, tendency to stoop or slump, reads and composes poetry, softly spoken, conservative, honest, serious, conscientious, IQ 110, memory far above IQ, repressive, EEG of 10½ - 11½ cycles <b>per second</b>.</li> <li>• Other appropriate descriptions should be credited.</li> </ul> <p><b>3-4 marks</b> – Clear, and full description based on the description above to include reference to both psychological/physiological tests <u>and</u> character/personality features.</p> <p><b>1-2 marks</b> – Vague or partial answer e.g. demure, retiring, neat and honest i.e. no reference to any of the psychological or physical tests/IQ 110, memory above IQ, EEG 10½ - 11½ <b>cycles per second</b> i.e. no reference to any character features.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer e.g. descriptions of either Eve Black or Jane.</p>	[4]	<p><i>Examiners should be prepared to refer to the original article to check for accuracy of responses.</i></p> <p><i>Descriptions referring to: timid, calm, dull (although not the same as in the original study) can be credited.</i></p>
	<b>Section A Total</b>	<b>[60]</b>	

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
<p><b>16</b> <b>(a)</b></p>	<p>Likely answers:</p> <p><u>Freud</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The case study of Hans gave Freud the opportunity to test his theory of infantile sexuality / the Oedipus complex.</li> <li>• Hans' phobia of horses allowed Freud to test his explanation of the genesis/origin of phobias.</li> <li>• Other appropriate aims should be credited e.g. to document the case of a young boy/child who had a fear/phobia of horses.</li> </ul> <p><u>Griffiths</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To increase understanding of the cognitive processes and behaviour of persistent (fruit machine) gamblers.</li> <li>• To examine a number of factors and variables in the cognitive psychology of (fruit machine) gambling.</li> <li>• To examine the thought processes and behaviours of regular and non-regular (fruit machine) gamblers.</li> <li>• To compare the behaviour of regular and non-regular (fruit machine) gamblers.</li> <li>• Other appropriate aims should be credited.</li> </ul> <p><u>Reicher and Haslam</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To carry out a prison study with ethical procedures that would ensure no harm to the participants.</li> <li>• To develop practical and ethical procedures for conducting important, large-scale studies in social psychological research.</li> <li>• To provide data on developing interactions between groups of unequal power and privilege.</li> <li>• To study the conditions that lead individuals to (i) identify with their group; (ii) accept or challenge intergroup inequalities.(iii) tyranny</li> <li>• To examine the role of social, organisational and clinical factors in group behaviour.</li> <li>• Other appropriate aims should be credited.</li> </ul>	<p><b>[2]</b></p>	<p><i>If the answer refers merely to being able to find out about phobias only 1 mark can be awarded as there is no contextualisation.</i></p>

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	<p><b>2 marks</b> – Outline of an appropriate aim is clear and fully contextualised, as outlined above.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Vague or partial answer e.g. Freud – so he could test his theory of infantile sexuality,; Griffiths – to investigate gambling behaviour; Reicher &amp; Haslam – to conduct a better prison study than the SPE.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p>		
<b>(b)</b>	<p>Likely answers:</p> <p><u>Freud</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data was gathered mainly through observations of Little Hans and conversations with Hans about his fears and fantasies/(phobic behaviours) conducted by Hans' father and sent to Freud via letter. In his letters Hans' father also reported about conversations and observations made by Hans' mother and his own observations about Hans' behaviour. Freud also met and interviewed/questioned/talked with Hans on two occasions.</li> <li>• Other appropriate descriptions should be credited.</li> </ul> <p><u>Griffiths</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data (qualitative) was gathered in the thinking aloud condition when RGs and NRGs were asked to verbalise every thought that passed through their minds whilst playing on the fruit machines. Data (also qualitative) was also gathered in the post-experimental semi-structured interviews in which participants were asked about such things as what skills they thought were involved in fruit machine playing. Other data (quantitative) was gathered, through observation, by the researcher being near the fruit machine so he could record such things as total number of gambles, amount of winnings and the results of every gamble.</li> <li>• Other appropriate descriptions should be credited.</li> </ul>	<b>[4]</b>	

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	<p><u>Reicher and Haslam</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data (qualitative) was gathered through observations and self-reports using video- and audio-recordings made by the BBC over the entire period of the study. Data (both quantitative and qualitative) was also gathered during the initial screening process where potential participants underwent a variety of psychometric tests and assessments. During the study data was also gathered through the daily psychometric tests and daily saliva swabs.</li> <li>Other appropriate descriptions should be credited.</li> </ul> <p><b>3-4 marks</b> – Increasingly accurate and detailed description, such as one of the ones given above which includes <u>either</u> reference to at least <u>two</u> ways in which data was gathered <u>or</u> a detailed description of <u>one</u> way the data was gathered e.g. a really detailed description of how data was gathered in the ‘thinking aloud’ condition in Griffiths’ study.</p> <p><b>1-2 marks</b> – Vague or partial answer e.g. Freud – through observations of Little Hans and conversations with Hans conducted by Hans’ father; Griffiths – through the thinking aloud condition when RGs and NRGs were asked to verbalise every thought that passed through their minds whilst playing on the fruit machines.; Reicher &amp; Haslam – through the video- and audio-recordings made by the BBC throughout the period of the study.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer</p>		<p><i>No more than 2 marks can be awarded if the answer has not been contextualised to the chosen study.</i></p> <p><i>To reach the top band candidates must <b>either</b> refer to more than one way in which data was gathered <b>or</b> provide a detailed description of one way in which data was gathered.</i></p>
(c)	<p><u>Strength</u></p> <p>Most likely answers will include a generic strength supported/illustrated by a specific example from the chosen study.</p> <p><u>Generic strength</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Qualitative data allows the researcher to gather rich, in-depth, detailed information about an individual or small, organised group. Then linked to the chosen study.</li> </ul>	<b>[3+3=6]</b>	<p><i>Examiners should be prepared to check original studies for the accuracy/validity of examples given.</i></p> <p><i>To get the full 3 marks an appropriate strength / weakness must be:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Identified and explained/justified.</i></li> <li><i>Linked to the chosen study.</i></li> <li><i>Supported by a specific example.</i></li> </ul>

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	<p><u>Freud</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Freud gathered lots of detail about Hans' fears and phobias. For example he found that Hans had a fear of being bitten by a horse.</li> <li>• Other appropriate strengths and supporting evidence should be credited.</li> </ul> <p><u>Griffiths</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Griffiths was able to gather rich data about the thoughts of both regular and non-regular gamblers whilst they played on fruit machines. For example he found they personified the machine /said such things as, "This machine likes me."</li> <li>• Other appropriate strengths and supporting evidence should be credited.</li> </ul> <p><u>Reicher and Haslam</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reicher and Haslam were able to gather in-depth information about the thoughts and actions of both the prisoners and guards. For example one prisoner (JE) threw his lunch plate to the ground and demanded better food</li> <li>• Other appropriate strengths and supporting evidence should be credited.</li> </ul> <p><b>3 marks</b> – An appropriate strength is explained and is accurate and elaborated. There is a <u>clear, fully contextualised link with the chosen study</u> showing good understanding, such as the ones given above.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – An appropriate strength is explained but is basic and lacks detail. A <u>vague/weak link is made to the chosen study</u> showing some understanding e.g. Freud – qualitative data provides great insight into why people behave the way they do. For example Freud gathered lots of in-depth information about Hans' fears and fantasies; Griffiths – qualitative data gave rich in-depth information about the thoughts and actions of both regular and non-regular and non-regular gamblers;</p>		<p><i>N.B. As the question asks candidates to suggest a strength/weakness of the qualitative data gathered in the chosen study, study-specific answers are creditworthy. However, the answer should still:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Identify an appropriate strength/weakness</i></li> <li>• <i>Justify/explain the strength/weakness</i></li> <li>• <i>Have a specific supporting example.</i></li> </ul>

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	<p>Reicher and Haslam – qualitative data gave lots of rich in-depth information about the thoughts and behaviours of both the guards and prisoners.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Peripherally relevant strength is identified, <u>not linked to the chosen study</u> and with little or no elaboration e.g. gives great understanding/gives insight of how and why people behave the way they do.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer e.g. a strength of quantitative data.</p> <p><u>Weakness</u></p> <p>Most likely answers will include a generic weakness supported/illustrated by a specific example from the chosen study.</p> <p><u>Generic weakness</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Qualitative data is frequently unique making it difficult to analyse / make comparisons / see differences in behaviour between individuals. Then linked to the chosen study.</li> </ul> <p><u>Freud</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Freud only reported about the fears and phobias of Little Hans. Many children have a fear of being bitten by a horse but Freud only traced the origin of this fear to an incident when Hans had overheard a father warning his daughter, “Don’t put your finger to the white horse or it will bite you.” The origin of this fear may be different in other children.</li> <li>• Other appropriate weaknesses and supporting evidence should be credited.</li> </ul>		<p><i>References to a weakness of qualitative data being time-consuming because of the large amount of in-depth data should be considered as only identification.</i></p>

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	<p><u>Griffiths</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Griffiths found that one regular gambler showed a completely erroneous perception when he said, “I’m gonna put one quid in to start with because psychologically I think it’s very important .....it bluffs the machine ..... it’s my own psychology.” Other gamblers may have different thoughts and reasons for putting just £1 into the machine to begin with.</li> <li>Other appropriate weaknesses and supporting evidence should be credited.</li> </ul> <p><u>Reicher and Haslam</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Although Reicher and Haslam found that some of the guards identified with the high-status and positive values associated with their role within the prison, others were wary of assuming and exerting their powers. For example, after the prisoner had thrown his lunch plate on the floor and demanded better food, some guards wanted to take a disciplinary line whilst others wanted to make concessions as a way of managing the situation. Therefore although Reicher and Haslam concluded that the guards were weak and ineffective as a group, there were individuals within the group who showed strong, dominant characteristics.</li> <li>Other appropriate weaknesses and supporting evidence should be credited.</li> </ul> <p><b>3 marks</b> – An appropriate weakness is explained and is accurate and elaborated. There is a <u>clear, fully contextualised link with the chosen study</u> showing good understanding, such as the ones given above.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – An appropriate weakness is explained but is basic and lacks detail. A <u>vague/weak link is made to the chosen study</u> showing some understanding e.g. Freud – qualitative data is often unique so comparisons between individuals are difficult or impossible. Freud only studied Little Hans’ fears and fantasies; Griffiths – qualitative data is difficult to analyse because people experience the same things</p>		

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	<p>differently. Griffiths found regular and non-regular gamblers showed many different cognitive biases; Reicher and Haslam – participant variables may make it difficult to draw valid and meaningful conclusions. For example Reicher and Haslam found some guards identified with their role whilst others didn't.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Peripherally relevant weakness is identified, <u>not linked to the chosen study</u> and with little or no elaboration e.g. participant variables may make analysis of findings and conclusions difficult.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer e.g. a weakness of quantitative data.</p>		
(d)	<p>Most likely answers will refer to:</p> <p><u>Freud</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Little Hans' fear of horses was considered by Freud as a subconscious fear of his father. This because the dark around the mouth of a horse + the blinkers resembled the moustache and glasses worn by his father. He was fearful of his father because he was experiencing the Oedipus complex.</li> <li>• Hans' fascination with his 'widdler' was because he was experiencing the Oedipus complex.</li> <li>• Hans' daydream about giraffes was a representation of him trying to take his mother away from his father so he could have her to himself – another feature of the Oedipus complex.</li> <li>• Hans' fantasy of becoming a father, again linked to his experiencing the Oedipus complex.</li> <li>• Hans' fantasy about the plumber was interpreted as him now identifying with his father and having passed through the Oedipus complex.</li> <li>• Other appropriate findings should be credited.</li> </ul>	<b>[8]</b>	<p><i>Examiners are reminded they should be prepared to check the original studies to verify findings.</i></p> <p><i>Conclusions are not creditworthy.</i></p> <p><i>Fine detail does not mean that specific numbers/quantitative data must be provided. Qualitative findings can be considered as fine details i.e. fine details refer to more than just basic findings such as 'more' or 'less'.</i></p> <p><i>If the answer refers merely to descriptions of Hans' fears, fantasies and experiences, the answer is capped at 4 marks.</i></p>



Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	<p><u>Griffiths</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RGs had a playing rate of 8 gambles per minute.</li> <li>• NRGs had a playing rate of 6 gambles per minute.</li> <li>• 14 RGs managed to 'break even' in their 60 gambles.</li> <li>• 7 NRGs 'broke even' in their 60 gambles.</li> <li>• 10 RGs stayed on the machine until they lost all their money.</li> <li>• 2 NRGs stayed on the machine until they lost all their money.</li> <li>• RGs who 'thought aloud' had a lower win rate in number of gambles than NRGs who 'thought aloud'.</li> <li>• RGs made significantly more irrational verbalisations (14%) than NRGs (2.5%).</li> <li>• Other appropriate findings should be credited – check carefully against the original study.</li> </ul> <p><u>Reicher and Haslam</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Guards failed to internalise their role and failed to develop a group identity</li> <li>• Initially prisoners acted individually, to be promoted to the role of guard. Two prisoners (JE and KM) made particular efforts to be promoted.</li> <li>• Once group impermeability was introduced, the prisoners began to develop a much stronger sense of shared identity and to develop more consensual norms. There was a move from compliance to conflict with the guards e.g. to see how the guards would respond, prisoner JE threw his lunch plate to the ground and demanded better food. They also began to envisage changes to the existing hierarchy and believe they could achieve them.</li> <li>• The natural development of insecure relations between the groups meant the planned intervention of legitimacy was not necessary, so was not implemented.</li> <li>• The introduction of the new prisoner on Day 5 (a trade union official) was not needed to suggest cognitive alternatives as they had already surfaced, rather he was able to suggest additional</li> </ul>		

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	<p>alternatives to the status quo.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On Day 6, dissention came to a head and some prisoners broke out of their cell and occupied the guards' quarters. The guards' regime therefore became unworkable.</li> <li>• Terms for a new commune were drawn up but within a day this was in crisis because two ex-prisoners broke communal rules.</li> <li>• A further harsher prisoner-guard regime was proposed but for ethical reasons could not be implemented so the study was stopped.</li> <li>• Other appropriate findings should be credited e.g. reference to the findings from the psychometric tests / self reports.</li> </ul> <p><b>7-8 marks</b> – Description of findings is increasingly accurate and detailed with <u>at least two fine details</u> included. Detail is appropriate to level and time allowed. Understanding, expression and use of psychological terminology is good. <u>There are clear and appropriate links to the chosen study</u>, as outlined above e.g. Freud: Little Hans' fear of horses was considered by Freud as a subconscious fear of his father. This because the dark around the mouth of a horse + the blinkers resembled the moustache and glasses worn by his father. He was fearful of his father because he was experiencing the Oedipus complex. Hans' fascination with his 'widdler' was considered to be because he was experiencing the Oedipus complex and his daydream about giraffes was a representation of him trying to take his mother away from his father so he could have her to himself – another feature of the Oedipus complex. His fantasy about the plumber taking away his 'widdler' and bottom and replacing them with larger ones was interpreted as him now identifying with his father and having passed through the Oedipus complex.</p> <p><b>4-6 marks</b> – Description of findings is accurate. There are some omissions but some understanding is evident. There is some use of psychological terminology and the answer has some structure and organisation. The answer has <u>some clear</u> links to the chosen study e.g. Griffiths: RGs had a faster playing rate of 8 gambles per minute compared to NRGs had a playing rate of 6 gambles per minute. RGs made more irrational verbalisations than NRGs and RGs saw fruit</p>		

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	<p>machine gambling as relying more on skill than NRGs did. More RGs than NRGs who managed to stay on for 60 gambles then stayed on until they lost all their money</p> <p><b>1-3 marks</b> – <u>EITHER</u>: Description of findings is very basic and lacks detail e.g. some general statements are identified e.g. Reicher &amp; Haslam: guards failed to internalise their role and failed to develop a group identity. Initially prisoners acted individually but once permeability was stopped they became a more united group and challenged the guards. Some understanding may be evident. Expression is poor, with few, if any, psychological terms. OR: <u>The answer is not linked to the chosen study.</u></p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer e.g. Freud – young boys experience the Oedipus complex as they pass through the phallic stage of psychosexual development i.e. conclusion as opposed to findings.</p>		
<b>(e)</b>	<p>Improvements are likely to refer to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improving ecological validity e.g. Reicher and Haslam – conduct the study in a real prison building.</li> <li>• Reducing the chance that demand characteristics will influence results e.g. Reicher and Haslam – not let participants know they are being filmed so they cannot work out the purpose of the study and behave accordingly..</li> <li>• Reducing the chance that socially desirable behaviour will influence results e.g. Freud – reduce the use of leading questions so Hans will not answer in a way that makes him look good.</li> <li>• Improving ethical issues e.g. Reicher and Haslam – participants showing visible signs of stress/discomfort or have high cortisol levels indicating stress should be asked if they want to withdraw.</li> <li>• Improving the sample e.g. Freud – have a larger sample so findings are more generalisable /study a girl going through the Electra complex so comparisons can be made.</li> <li>• Improving how the sample was gathered e.g. Griffiths gather a random sample (possibly more representative because everyone</li> </ul>	<b>[8]</b>	<p><i>If there is no link to the chosen study, no more than 2 marks can be awarded.</i></p> <p><i>If only <b>one</b> improvement has been described, a maximum of 4 marks can be awarded.</i></p>

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	<p>from the target population has an equal chance of being picked) from RGS who regularly go to a local casino and NRGs from a local factory.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improving aspects of the method e.g. Freud – instead of relying on Hans’s father to pass appropriate information to Freud, use independent researchers ‘blind’ to the purpose of the study to gather the data and pass it on to Freud.</li> <li>• Other appropriate suggestions should be considered and, if appropriate, accepted.</li> </ul> <p><b>7-8 marks</b> - Description of two or more improvements appropriate to the study have been provided <b>and</b> justified. Thought has been given to how the improvements could be implemented. Description is detailed with good understanding and clear expression. 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> <p><b>5-6 marks</b> – Description of at least two improvements is appropriate to the study. Description is reasonable with some understanding i.e. some justification for the improvements has been considered <b>and/or</b> some thought has been given to how the suggestions could be implemented, though expression may be somewhat limited. <u>The answer has some links to the chosen study.</u></p> <p><b>3-4 marks</b> – Description of improvement(s) is appropriate to the study. Description is basic and lacks detail. Some justification for the improvements may have been considered <b>and/or</b> some thought may have been given to how the suggestions could be implemented though expression may be limited. and some thought may have been given to how the suggestions could be implemented ,Some understanding is evident though expression may be limited. The answer is <u>loosely linked to the chosen study. No more than 4 marks can be awarded if only one improvement has been described.</u></p> <p><b>1-2 marks</b> – Description of improvement(s) are peripheral to the study. Description is basic and lacks detail. Understanding is limited and no thought has been given as to how the suggestions could be implemented/justified. The answer is unstructured, muddled, probably</p>		

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	list-like and <u>not linked to the chosen study</u> . <b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.		
(f)	<p>The evaluation of suggested improvements are likely to refer to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More/less natural/realistic behaviour will be recorded.</li> <li>• Improved/decreased reliability.</li> <li>• Improved/decreased generalisability.</li> <li>• Improved usefulness.</li> <li>• Changes in findings/results.</li> <li>• Advantages/disadvantages of improving ethical issues.</li> <li>• Sampling problems.</li> <li>• Cost and time implications.</li> <li>• Other appropriate suggestions should be considered and, if appropriate, credited.</li> </ul> <p><b>7-8 marks</b> – Evaluation of improvements is appropriate to the study. Considerations are effective and informed and include both supporting and challenging issues. There are <u>clear links to the chosen study</u> throughout. Literacy is sound throughout and the answer is competently structured and organised.</p> <p><b>5-6 marks</b> – Evaluation of improvements is appropriate to the study. Considerations are reasonable and understanding is obvious, though expression may be somewhat limited. The answer has <u>some links to the chosen study</u>.</p> <p><b>3-4 marks</b> – Evaluation of improvement(s) is appropriate to the study. Considerations are basic and lack details with some understanding, though expression may be limited. The answer is <u>loosely linked to the chosen study/there is only one link to the chosen study. No more than 4 marks can be awarded if only one improvement has been evaluated.</u></p> <p><b>1-2 marks</b> – Evaluation of improvement(s) are peripheral to the study. Considerations are basic and lack detail. Understanding is limited. The answer is unstructured, muddled, probably list-like and <u>not linked to the chosen study</u>.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p>	<b>[8]</b>	<p><i>No more than 2 marks can be gained if the answer is not linked to the chosen study.</i></p> <p><i>If only one improvement is evaluated the answer is capped at 4.</i></p> <p><i>To reach the top band the evaluation must include consideration of both supporting and challenging issues.</i></p>
	<b>Section B Total</b>	<b>[36]</b>	

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
<p><b>17</b> <b>(a)</b></p>	<p>Likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The individual differences approach sees everyone to be genetically/experientially unique so every individual's behaviour will be unique.</li> <li>• The individual differences approach holds that as everyone inherits different personal characteristics/ has different experiences we must expect everyone to behave differently.</li> <li>• The individual differences approach sees everyone as genetically and psychologically different so everyone's behaviour is unique/different.</li> <li>• Other appropriate outlines should be credited.</li> </ul> <p><b>2 marks</b> – Outline is accurate. Detail is appropriate and understanding is very good. There is a clear link to behaviour. Expression and use of psychological terminology is good.  <b>1 mark</b> – Outline is basic and lacks detail. Some understanding may be evident. Expression is generally poor. There is no link to behaviour.  <b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p>	<p><b>[2]</b></p>	<p><i>The outline must be:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Linked to the individual differences approach.</i></li> <li>• <i>Linked to behaviour.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>(b)</b></p>	<p>Likely answer may cover the following content:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The pseudopatients in Rosenhan's study were misdiagnosed because the doctors and staff at the psychiatric hospitals did not see them as individuals. The individual differences approach assumes everyone is different and that, as a result of this, everyone will behave differently. However as all the pseudopatients reported hearing voices that said, "empty", "hollow" and "thud" the staff just saw this and other subsequent behaviours such as writing notes and queuing early for lunch as symptoms which fitted with the criteria set down in the DSM IV manual (current at the time of the study) for diagnosing people as either schizophrenic or manic depressive. The staff looked at the pseudopatients in the light of the labels they were given and the criterion laid down for diagnosing mental illness and did not look beyond these to see that they were individuals acting normally.</li> </ul>	<p><b>[4]</b></p>	<p><i>To gain full marks there must be a balance between the link to the individual differences approach and evidence from the Rosenhan study.</i></p>

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other appropriate descriptions should be credited.</li> </ul> <p><b>3-4 marks</b> – Description is accurate. Detail is appropriate and understanding is good. Elaboration (specific detail or example) is evident. Expression and use of psychological terminology is sound.</p> <p><b>1-2 marks</b> – Description is generally accurate, but is basic and lacks detail. Some understanding and/or elaboration may be evident. Expression is generally poor.</p> <p><u>NB: A maximum of 1 mark can be gained for a generic explanation not linked to the named study/explanation linked to the study with no link to the ID approach</u></p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p>		
(c)	<p>Likely answers:</p> <p>Similarity:</p> <p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both Thigpen and Cleckley and Rosenhan used observation to gather data .....</li> <li>• Both Thigpen and Cleckley and Griffiths used self-reports to gather data .....</li> <li>• Both Rosenhan and Griffiths collected their data in natural environments ....</li> <li>• Other appropriate similarities should be credited.</li> </ul> <p><b>3 marks</b> – An appropriate similarity in the way data was gathered is identified and supported by <u>relevant</u> evidence from <u>two</u> appropriate individual differences approach studies.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – An appropriate similarity in the way data was gathered is identified and supported by <u>relevant</u> evidence from <u>one</u> appropriate</p>	<p><b>[3+3]</b> <b>[6]</b></p>	<p><i>Evidence must come from the following three studies: Thigpen &amp; Cleckley, Rosenhan, Griffiths.</i></p> <p><i>The similarity/difference must be:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Clearly identified and linked to the way <b>data</b> was gathered.</i></li> <li>• <i>Supported by evidence from one appropriate study</i></li> <li>• <i>Supported by another piece of evidence from a second appropriate study.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>N.B Mere similarities/differences without any clear reference to how data was gathered between two appropriate studies are not creditworthy.</i></p>

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	<p>individual differences approach study/an appropriate difference is described but not actually identified</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – An appropriate similarity in the way data was gathered in two appropriate individual differences approach studies is merely identified.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p>Difference:</p> <p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rosenhan used participant observation to gather data whereas Griffiths used non-participant observation .....</li> <li>• Rosenhan and Thigpen and Cleckley collected data in different environments/settings .....</li> <li>• Thigpen and Cleckley and Griffiths used different research methods to gather data .....</li> <li>• Other appropriate differences should be credited.</li> </ul> <p><b>3 marks</b> – An appropriate difference in the way data was gathered is identified and supported by <u>relevant</u> evidence from <u>two</u> appropriate individual differences approach studies.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – An appropriate difference in the way data was gathered is identified and supported by <u>relevant</u> evidence from <u>one</u> appropriate individual differences approach study.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – An appropriate difference in the way data was gathered in two appropriate individual differences approach studies is merely identified.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p>		



Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
(d)	<p><u>Strengths may include:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What people say/are expected to do is often different to what they actually do so using observation to gather data gives a different slant on behaviour</li> <li>• Using observation to gather data allows spontaneous and unexpected behaviour to be captured which is useful when studying behaviour</li> <li>• Using observation to gather data often allows studies to be high in ecological validity as they can be conducted in real-life situations</li> <li>• If participants are unaware they are being observed, they will behave naturally so valid data can be gathered</li> <li>• If participants are unaware of the real reason they are being observed they will not respond to demand characteristics so valid data can be gathered</li> <li>• If participants are unaware they are being observed they will not behave unnaturally to meet socially desirable values</li> <li>• Using observation means both quantitative and qualitative data can be gathered so in-depth, detailed information can be gathered</li> <li>• Other appropriate strengths should be credited.</li> </ul> <p><u>Weaknesses may include:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The observer may 'see what they want/expect to see' thus showing observer/researcher bias so findings may not be valid</li> <li>• If participants do not know they are being observed there are ethical problems such as deception, lack of consent, invasion of privacy</li> <li>• If participants know they are being observed they may alter their natural behaviour to respond to demand characteristics so the data gathered may not be valid</li> <li>• If participants know they are being observed the ethical issue of stress may occur as participants may feel uncomfortable knowing they are being watched.</li> </ul>	[12]	<p><i>Evidence must <b>clearly</b> come from Thigpen &amp; Cleckley, Rosenhan, Griffiths.</i></p> <p><i>The candidate must make it clear why their suggestion is a strength / weakness e.g. studies can be conducted in natural/real life environments so have high ecological validity.</i></p> <p><i>The supporting evidence must actually support the identified strength / weakness i.e. be appropriately contextualised / linked to a named study that can take the individual differences approach.</i></p> <p><i>References such as 'In Griffiths' study...' should not be considered as evidence i.e. there must be some actual link to the study e.g. gamblers/non-gamblers.</i></p> <p><i>Read through the mark bands carefully before allocating marks.</i></p> <p><i>Study specific and/or methodology specific answers are not creditworthy.</i></p> <p><i>Approach specific answers are also not creditworthy.</i></p> <p><i>Responses with only one appropriate strength and one appropriate weakness/only strengths or weaknesses can gain a <u>maximum of 6 marks</u>.</i></p>

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Using observation to gather data does not provide information about what/how people think or feel so the researcher cannot find out why people behave the way they do</li> <li>• Other appropriate weaknesses should be credited.</li> </ul> <p><b>10-12 marks</b> – There is a good range of 2 or more strengths <i>and</i> 2 or more weaknesses of using observation to gather data 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> <p><b>7-9 marks</b> – There may be a range of strengths <i>and</i> weaknesses of using observation to gather data 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><b>4-6 marks</b> – There may be some strengths <i>and/or</i> weaknesses of using observation to gather data 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><b>1-3 marks</b> – There may be some strengths <i>and/or</i> weaknesses of using observation to gather data 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>		

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
<p><b>18</b> <b>(a)</b></p>	<p>Likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The social approach holds that other people and the surrounding environment are major influences on an individual's behaviour (thought processes and emotions).</li> <li>• The social approach sees an individual's behaviour as being shaped/influenced by the social context they are in and the people around them at the time.</li> <li>• Other appropriate implications should be credited.</li> </ul> <p><b>2 marks</b> – Outline is accurate. Detail is appropriate and understanding is very good. There is a clear link to behaviour. Expression and use of psychological terminology is good.  <b>1 mark</b> – Outline is basic and lacks detail. Some understanding may be evident. Expression is generally poor. There is no link to behaviour.  <b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p>	<p><b>[2]</b></p>	<p><i>The outline must be:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Linked to the social approach.</i></li> <li>• <i>Linked to behaviour.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>(b)</b></p>	<p>Likely answer may cover the following content:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The social approach holds that other people in any individual or group's immediate environment are major influences on their behaviour. Therefore, if a person or group who is considered to be more powerful or of higher status than another person or group does not effectively and efficiently demonstrate their powers, subordinates in the same environment may seize the opportunity to rebel and overturn/upset the power balance. This was shown in Reicher and Haslam's prison study when the guards failed to identify with each other as a group and to cohere collectively. For example, social identification scores showed that when the guards had to implement the disciplinary regime, their identification fell and they never reached consensus about the group's norms and priorities. This led to a shift in power and ultimately to the collapse of the prisoner-guard system. The prisoners saw that the guards failed to adopt their roles and exert their authority so they seized the opportunity to rebel and proposed that the prison should be run as a single self-governing 'commune'.</li> </ul>	<p><b>[4]</b></p>	<p><i>To gain full marks there must be a balance between the link to the social approach and evidence from the Reicher and Haslam study.</i></p>

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Other appropriate descriptions should be credited e.g. answers linked to the cognitive alternatives offered by the introduction of the new prisoner.</li> </ul> <p><b>3-4 marks</b> – Description is accurate. Detail is appropriate and understanding is good. Elaboration (specific detail or example) is evident. Expression and use of psychological terminology is sound.</p> <p><b>1-2 marks</b> – Description is generally accurate, but is basic and lacks detail. Some understanding and/or elaboration may be evident. Expression is generally poor.</p> <p><u>NB: A maximum of 1 mark can be gained for a generic explanation not linked to the named study/explanation linked to the study but not the social approach.</u></p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p>		
(c)	<p>Likely answers:</p> <p>Similarity:</p> <p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Both Milgram and Reicher and Haslam gathered data in an artificial/laboratory setting</li> <li>Both Milgram and Reicher and Haslam gathered data using male participants only</li> <li>Both Milgram and Piliavin deceived their participants to gather data</li> <li>Other appropriate similarities should be credited.</li> </ul> <p><b>3 marks</b> – An appropriate similarity in the way data was gathered is identified and supported by <u>relevant</u> evidence from <u>two</u> appropriate social approach studies.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – An appropriate similarity in the way data was gathered is identified and supported by <u>relevant</u> evidence from <u>one</u> appropriate social approach study.</p>	<p><b>[3+3]</b> <b>[6]</b></p>	<p><i>Evidence must come from: Milgram, Piliavin, Reicher &amp; Haslam.</i></p> <p><i>The similarity/difference must be:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Clearly identified and linked to the way data was gathered</i></li> <li><i>Supported by evidence from one appropriate study</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Supported by another piece of evidence from a second appropriate study.</i></p> <p><i>N.B any references to Milgram’s study being a laboratory experiment are not creditworthy.</i></p> <p><i>N.B Mere similarities/differences without any clear reference to how data was gathered between two appropriate studies are not creditworthy.</i></p>

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	<p><b>1 mark</b> – An appropriate similarity in the way data was gathered in two appropriate social approach studies is merely identified.  <b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p>Difference:</p> <p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Milgram gathered data using a snapshot study whereas Reicher and Haslam gathered data using a longitudinal study</li> <li>• Milgram and Piliavin used different sample sizes to gather data</li> <li>• Piliavin and Reicher and Haslam used different research methods to gather data</li> <li>• Other appropriate differences should be credited.</li> </ul> <p><b>3 marks</b> – An appropriate difference in the way data was gathered is identified and supported by <u>relevant</u> evidence from <u>two</u> appropriate social approach studies.  <b>2 marks</b> – An appropriate difference in the way data was gathered is identified and supported by <u>relevant</u> evidence from <u>one</u> appropriate social approach study.  <b>1 mark</b> – An appropriate difference in the way data was gathered in two appropriate social approach studies is merely identified.  <b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p>		
(d)	<p><u>Strengths may include:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What people say/are expected to do is often different to what they actually do so using observation to gather data gives a different slant on behaviour .....</li> <li>• Using observation to gather data allows spontaneous and unexpected behaviour to be captured which is useful when studying behaviour .....</li> <li>• Using observation to gather data often allows studies to be high in ecological validity as they can be conducted in real-life situations ..</li> </ul>	<b>[12]</b>	<p><i>Evidence must come from Milgram, Piliavin, Reicher &amp; Haslam.</i></p> <p><i>The candidate must make it clear why their suggestion is a strength / weakness e.g. studies can be conducted in natural/real life environments so have high ecological validity.</i></p>

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If participants are unaware they are being observed, they will behave naturally so valid data can be gathered .....</li> <li>• If participants are unaware of the real reason they are being observed they will not respond to demand characteristics so valid data can be gathered .....</li> <li>• If participants are unaware they are being observed they will not behave unnaturally to meet socially desirable values .....</li> <li>• Using observation means both quantitative and qualitative data can be gathered so in-depth, detailed information can be gathered.....</li> <li>• Other appropriate strengths should be credited.</li> </ul> <p><u>Weaknesses may include:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The observer may ‘see what they want/expect to see’ thus showing observer/researcher bias so findings may not be valid .....</li> <li>• If participants do not know they are being observed there are ethical problems such as deception, lack of consent, invasion of privacy .....</li> <li>• If participants know they are being observed they may alter their natural behaviour to respond to demand characteristics so the data gathered may not be valid .....</li> <li>• If participants know they are being observed the ethical issue of stress may occur as participants may feel uncomfortable knowing they are being watched ....</li> <li>• Using observation to gather data does not provide information about what/how people think or feel so the researcher cannot find out why people behave the way they do ....</li> <li>• Other appropriate weaknesses should be credited.</li> </ul> <p><b>10-12 marks</b> – There is a good range of 2 or more strengths <i>and</i> 2 or more weaknesses of using observation to gather data which are appropriate to the question. There is a good balance between the two. Discussion is detailed with good understanding and clear expression.</p>		<p><i>The supporting evidence must actually support the identified strength / weakness i.e. be appropriately contextualised / linked to a named study that can take the social approach. References such as ‘In Reicher and Haslam’s study...’ should not be considered as evidence i.e. there must be some actual link to the study e.g. prisoners/guards.</i></p> <p><i>Read through the mark bands carefully before allocating marks.</i></p> <p><i>Study specific and/or methodology specific answers are not creditworthy.</i></p> <p><i>Approach specific answers are also not creditworthy.</i></p> <p><i>Responses with only one appropriate strength and one appropriate weakness/only strengths or weaknesses can gain a <u>maximum of 6 marks</u>.</i></p>

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	<p>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> <p><b>7-9 marks</b> – There may be a range of strengths <i>and</i> weaknesses of using observation to gather data 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><b>4-6 marks</b> – There may be some strengths <i>and/or</i> weaknesses of using observation to gather data 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><b>1-3 marks</b> – There may be some strengths <i>and/or</i> weaknesses of using observation to gather data 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>		

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

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**Education and Learning**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

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

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

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

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

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

© OCR 2016

