

**Psychology**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

Unit **G542**: Core Studies

**Mark Scheme for January 2013**

---

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

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

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















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

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

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

© OCR 2013

## Annotations

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

## SECTION A

Generic guidance

- Responses to all questions should relate to the study referred to in the question;
- Accuracy of the responses should be checked by referencing the original version of the named study.

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	(a)	<p>Likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Because the IV – the verb in the critical question (smashed, hit, collided, bumped, contacted) – could be manipulated to observe its effect on the DV – speed estimates – causal relationships could be demonstrated ie Loftus and Palmer were able to show that the verb in the leading question influenced speed estimates given by participants</li> <li>• Because variables can be controlled, cause and effect can be inferred. Here the controlled showing of the videos, standardised format of the questionnaires etc allowed Loftus and Palmer to conclude that it was the verb in the leading question that influenced the speed estimates given</li> <li>• Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer eg mere identification of a strength of a lab experiment <u>not linked to the named study</u> – allows replication, allows cause and effect to be inferred, allows for high levels of control, allows for standardised procedures etc.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – A clear, contextualised description of an appropriate strength, such as the one outlined above /strength identified with appropriate supporting example.</p>	2	<p>Remember the question asks for an <u>outline</u>, so great detail and in-depth explanations are not required i.e. a full justification of the identified strength is not required, just a clear identification with appropriate supporting evidence.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(b)	<p>Likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Because lab experiments lack ecological validity. It is not usual to sit and watch videos of car crashes and then complete questionnaires relating to the car crashes. There is a lack of realism/this does not reflect a real life situation</li> <li>• Because the artificial, contrived environment led the participants to respond to demand characteristics, giving an answer they think the researcher wants rather than their own opinion. Here participants, especially as they saw 7 clips in Experiment 1, may have worked out that Loftus and Palmer were looking to see the effect of leading questions and so gave a speed estimate in accordance with expectations</li> <li>• Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer e.g. mere identification of an appropriate weakness, <u>not linked to the named study</u> – lacks ecological validity, prone to demand characteristics etc.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – A clear, contextualised description of an appropriate weakness, such as the one outlined above / weakness identified with appropriate supporting example.</p>	2	<p><i>Remember the question asks for an <u>outline</u>, so great detail and in-depth explanations are not required i.e. a full justification of the identified weakness is not required, just a clear identification with appropriate supporting evidence</i></p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2	<p>Likely answer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A quasi experiment is an experiment where the investigator either does not manipulate the <u>independent variable</u> (IV) directly/ where the experimental conditions (IVs) already exist, or does not have full control over extraneous variables that might influence results. Here as participants were naturally either autistic/AS or normal or Tourettes, the experimental conditions already existed and could not be manipulated</li> <li>• Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><b>1–2 marks</b> – Partial answer or vague answer eg EITHER a basic explanation of what a quasi experiment is, <u>not linked to the study</u> eg in a quasi experiment the IVs occur naturally so the researcher cannot manipulate them OR a contextualised description without an explanation of the term eg As participants were naturally either autistic/AS or normal or Tourettes, the experimental conditions already existed.</p> <p><b>3–4 marks</b> – An increasingly accurate, detailed and contextualised explanation such as the one outlined above.</p>	4	<i>For the full 4 marks all 3 groups must be referred to.</i>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3	<p>Answers should refer to the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kanzi and Mulika used a visual symbol system consisting of geometric symbols (lexigrams) which brightened when touched. These symbols were on an electronic keyboard, or on a pointing board for use outside. A speech synthesiser was added when it became apparent that Kanzi could comprehend words, so the appropriate words were spoken when a symbol was touched</li> <li>• Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><b>1–2 marks</b> – Partial or vague answer eg a lexigram board made up of geometric symbols, which lit up when pressed.</p> <p><b>3–4 marks</b> – An increasingly accurate and detailed description such as the one outlined above which refers to at least <u>two</u> of: the electronic keyboard (or lexigram)/ the pointing board/ the speech synthesiser.</p>	4	<p><i>The question asks for a description so just referring to a lexigram with symbols on it can only score 1 mark.</i></p> <p><i>Any elaboration in relation to the lexigram keyboard e.g. electronic/lit up when pressed = 2.</i></p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4	<p>Most likely answer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The child was firstly shown two equal and identical Playdoh cylinders. They were then asked if there was the same or amount/ size/ mass of Playdoh in each cylinder. Then, in front of the child one of the cylinders was squashed into either a sausage or a pancake shape. The child was then asked again if there was the same amount of Playdoh in each shape</li> <li>• Other appropriate descriptions.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer eg descriptions of one judgement or fixed array condition/description of number or volume tasks.</p> <p><b>1–2 marks</b> – Vague or partial answer eg two Playdoh shapes were re–formatted in front of the child who was asked the same two conservation questions before and after ie no real details included.</p> <p><b>3–4 marks</b> – An increasingly accurate and detailed description such as the one given above.</p>	4	



Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5	<p>Two from the following likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No (informed) consent could be gained from the children because they were <b>too</b> young /under the age of 16</li> <li>• No (informed) consent was gained from the children's parents no reference to this in the study.</li> <li>• The children could have been stressed /distressed /suffered short-term psychological harm through witnessing physical and verbal acts of aggression</li> <li>• The children could have suffered long-term psychological harm through witnessing physical and verbal words of aggression</li> <li>• The children could have suffered physical harm when given the opportunity to imitate/create acts of aggression</li> <li>• The children did not realise they should have been given the right to withdraw if they did not wish to participate/continue participating in the study</li> <li>• The children were deceived because they were unaware that they were being covertly observed when they were in room 3</li> <li>• No reference is made in the original study that the children were debriefed at the end of the study</li> <li>• Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer eg reference to ecological validity.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer eg EITHER a mere identification of appropriate ethical issue – no consent, deception, etc ie <u>answer not linked to the study</u> OR just a contextualised description of an ethical issue eg the children were exposed to aggressive behaviour.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – A clear identification and contextualised description of a way in which this study could be considered unethical such as one of the ones outlined above.</p>	2+2 4	

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
6	(a)	<p>Most likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Plumber fantasy (1)</u> – Hans was in the bath and a plumber came and unscrewed it. Then he took a big borer and stuck it in his stomach</li> <li>• <u>Plumber fantasy (2)</u> – The plumber came and took away Hans' behind and widdler with a pair of pliers and replaced them with larger ones.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer eg the plumber came when Hans was in the bath and unscrewed it /the plumber came and took away his behind and widdler.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – Clear description of daydream/fantasy as detailed above.</p>	2	<i>To gain 2 marks for fantasy 2, both behind and widdler must be included.</i>
	(b)	<p>Most likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Plumber fantasy (1)</u> – The plumber equates to Hans' father with his big borer (penis) with which he 'bored' Hans and put him in his mother's womb</li> <li>• <u>Plumber fantasy (2)</u> – Hans' small bottom and widdler were replaced by bigger ones, like his father's, indicating Hans wanted to be like his father and so was coming towards the end of the Oedipus stage.</li> <li>• Other appropriate explanation.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer eg the plumber was supposed to be Hans' father, Hans wanted to be like his father.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – Clear, fully contextualised explanation such as one of the ones given above.</p>	2	<i>The candidate does not have to give an explanation for the same fantasy as described in part (a) but to gain the full 2 marks, it must be clear which fantasy is being referred to.</i>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
7	<p>Two from the following most likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (All) participants reported to the lab just before their usual bedtime so their normal daily routine was not disrupted which may have lead to unnatural sleep patterns</li> <li>• (All) participants slept in the same sleep to make it fair and reduce the chance of extraneous variables influencing sleep patterns / (all) participants had to sleep in the lab so they were not affected by surroundings.</li> <li>• (All) participants were asked to abstain from beverages containing alcohol on the day of the experiment as alcohol is known to affect an individual's sleep pattern/ affects REM sleep (so results would be unreliable)</li> <li>• (All) participants were asked to abstain from caffeine – containing beverages on the day of the experiment as caffeine is a known stimulant which can affect an individual's sleep pattern (to make it a fair test)</li> <li>• (All) participants were asked to abstain from beverages containing alcohol or caffeine on the day of the experiment because these substances are known to affect sleep patterns.</li> <li>• (All) participants were awakened by the same ordinary doorbell/woken in the same way by a doorbell so they were all treated in the same way (making it a fair test)</li> <li>• (All) participants spoke into the same recording device so they were all treated in the same way (making it a fair test)</li> <li>• The researcher did not communicate with (any of) the participants until s/he had finished speaking to minimise researcher effects/demand characteristics influencing the results</li> <li>• Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer eg all participants had electrodes attached to their scalp and near their eyes/ reference to 5-15 mins awakenings</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer eg mere identification of an appropriate control – asked to abstain from alcohol, woken by a doorbell.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – A clear and accurate identification and explanation of why one of the controls was used, as described above.</p>	2+2 4	<p><i>To gain full marks the candidate must infer to <u>both</u> the fact that participants were treated in the same way <u>and</u> why.</i></p> <p><i>Reference the abstinence of alcohol + the purpose of the control = 2 marks and if the candidate then says participants were asked to abstain from caffeine + the purpose of the control, they can gain a further 2 marks. The question asks candidates to 'describe the purpose of any two controls so each reference to abstinence must be fully explained i.e. mere reference to 'participants were asked to abstain from alcohol. Participants were also asked to abstain from caffeine' is a mere identification of two controls so would score 1+1=2. If a candidates states 'participants were asked not to have any caffeine or alcohol because these are known to affect sleep patterns' award 2 marks.</i></p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
8	<p>Likely answer will include the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 16 right-handed male London taxi drivers, mean age 44 (range 32–62). There was an even spread of participants in each age group (eg 31–40, 41–50, 51–60). All had been licenced London taxi drivers for more than 1.5 years (mean time as a taxi driver =14.3 years, range 1.5–42 years). All of the taxi drivers had healthy medical, neurological and psychiatric profiles. There was a control group of 50 men, none of whom were taxi drivers. The mean age and age range were the same for the control group as for the experimental group.</li> <li>• Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><b>1–2 marks</b> – Partial or vague answer eg 16 right-handed London taxi drivers who had passed the Knowledge.</p> <p><b>3–4 marks</b> – An increasingly accurate and detailed description including the control group such as the one outlined above.</p>	4	<p><i>Taxi drivers' on its own cannot count as a piece of information as it is in the strap line.</i></p> <p><i>No more than 2 marks can be gained without reference to the control group.</i></p> <p><i>For 4 marks the answer should include a clearly contextualised reference to the control group, as well as an accurate description of the experimental group.</i></p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9	<p>Likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When shown an image to the right visual field: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Patients could describe it in speech and writing</li> <li>- Patients could point to it with their <b>right</b> hand</li> <li>- Patients could find it from an array of objects with their <b>right</b> hand</li> </ul> </li> <li>• When an image was shown to the left visual field: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Patients were unable to name it/said they didn't see anything/said there was just a flash of light on the left side</li> <li>- Patients could draw it with the <b>left</b> hand</li> <li>- Patients could find it from an array of object with their <b>left</b> hand</li> </ul> </li> <li>• If an image was shown and responded to in one visual field, patients could only recognise it again if it was presented to the same visual field</li> <li>• If a \$ sign was flashed simultaneously to the LVF and a ? sign to the RVF, the patient drew (with the left hand) the figure (\$) shown to the LVF but said he saw the sign shown to the RVF (?)</li> <li>• Patients were able to select objects, with the left hand, that were related to an image presented to the LVF</li> <li>• If, with hands out of sight, two objects were placed simultaneously one in each hand and then hidden in a pile of objects, both hands searched for and selected their own object</li> <li>• Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer eg reference to EYE as opposed to visual field.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer eg When shown an image to one visual field only patients could describe it in speech and writing ie no clear identification of visual field/ no reference to initial presentation of the stimulus to a hand</p> <p><b>2 mark</b> – A clear, contextualised outline of a way having a split-brain affected the patients, as outlined above.</p>	4	<p><i>NB: Examiners should be prepared to check answers against the original study to make sure that information given by candidate is accurate.</i></p> <p><i>If a candidate writes: 'when an image is presented to the RVF the participant can describe it in speech and writing. Also when an image is presented to the RVF participants were able to point to it with their right hand. i.e. describes two distinctly different ways having a split-brain affected participants: 2+2=4</i></p>



Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
	(b)	<p>Most likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Because 26/40 / 65% /over half / most of the participants were prepared to give 450 volts, the majority of people will be obedient</li> <li>Because 14/40 / only a few / less than half of the participants were not prepared to go up to the 450 volt level, not everyone is obedient</li> <li>Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer eg another finding.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer eg people are obedient/ are likely to administer electric shocks ie <u>no actual link to the table.</u></p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – A clear, fully contextualised <u>conclusion</u> drawn from the given table, as outlined above.</p>	2	<i>Remember the question asks for an <u>outline</u>, so great detail and in-depth explanations are not required BUT the response must relate to the given table.</i>
11	(a)	<p>Likely answer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A field experiment is an experiment conducted in the participants' natural environment. An experiment has at least one <u>independent</u> variable which is manipulated to see its effect on a dependent variable. (Participants are usually unaware that they are taking part in a field experiment)</li> <li>Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer eg an experiment done in a natural environment./ i.e no reference to IV.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – A clear, accurate description of the term such as the one outlined above.</p>	2	<i>This answer does not have to be contextualised as the question does not include 'in this study'. Therefore a generic explanation of the term 'field experiment as given in the mark scheme is what is required. Therefore any reference to saying that a field experiment takes place in the participant's natural environment which in this study was the New York subway only gains 1 mark as the candidate has only given a partial answer.</i>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(b)	<p>Most likely answer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Because a field experiment is conducted in a natural environment where participants are usually unaware that they are participating, they are likely to behave in a natural way. Here travellers on the New York subway were unaware they were part of an experiment and so their helping behaviours can be considered natural</li> <li>• Because a field experiment takes place in a natural setting the study has high ecological validity. This study took place on the New York subway which is a natural setting (so findings relate to real life).</li> <li>• Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer eg results will be ecologically valid, participants will behave naturally, participants won't respond to demand characteristics etc ie <u>answer not contextualised</u>.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – A clear, contextualised outline of an appropriate advantage, such as the one outlined above.</p>	2	<p><i>Remember the question asks for an <u>outline</u>, so great detail and in-depth explanations are not required.</i></p>



Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
12	<p>Answers should refer to the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The BBC was asked to create a prison environment at Elstree Studios in line with Reicher and Haslam's guidelines. The entrance and delivery areas were separated from the main prison areas by sliding, lockable steel mesh grilles. Within the main prison area lockable, 3-person cells were constructed, together with showers, off a central atrium. This area was separated by a lockable steel mesh fence from the guards' quarters which consisted of a dormitory, bathroom and mess room. The guards also had an observation post above the main atrium from where they could monitor the prisoners. Within the guards' area there was an exercise area and an isolation cell</li> <li>• Other appropriate description.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer eg description of Zimbardo's prison environment.</p> <p><b>1–2 marks</b> – Partial or vague answer eg lockable cells for the prisoners and a special area for the guards were built.</p> <p><b>3–4 marks</b> – An increasingly accurate description of the prison environment, such as the one outlined above.</p>	4	<p><i>Note that the question requires candidates to describe <u>the</u> prison environment created for this study. Therefore references to such things as 'prisoners weren't allowed to go home / the guards had better food than the prisoners / the prisoners had poorer clothing than the guards are not relevant and should not be credited</i></p> <p><i>Credit can be given for EITHER the breadth AND/OR the depth of the answer.</i></p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
13 (a)	<p>Most likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Because the study was carried out in 12 real psychiatric hospitals/ wards (located in five different states on the East and West coasts of America)</li> <li>• Because the participants were the staff at the 12 (psychiatric) hospitals who were unaware they were being observed so behaved as they did normally</li> <li>• Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer eg conducted in a real hospital wards i.e. conducted in a natural environment i.e. <u>no link to the named study</u>.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – A clear, contextualised outline of one way the study can be considered high in ecological validity, such as one of the ones outlined above.</p>	2	
(b)	<p>Likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Because the pseudopatients were not genuine. Although they tried to behave normally this may have been difficult in the strange hospital environments</li> <li>• Because the pseudopatients spent a lot of their time writing down their observations about the ward, staff and patients – an activity not normally indulged in by genuine patients</li> <li>• Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer eg pseudopatients were not genuine ie mere identification of how the study lacked ecological validity.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – A clear, contextualised outline of one way the study can be considered low in ecological validity, such as one of the ones outlined above.</p>	2	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
14	<p>Likely answers will cover the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Eve White: neat, colourless, demure, conservative, honest, serious, conscientious, anxious, reads poetry and likes to compose verse herself, voice always softly modulated, an industrious worker, no allergy to nylon, IQ=110, memory above IQ, repressive, EEG 10½–11½ cycles per sec. etc</li> <li>• Eve Black: a party, girl mischievous, childish, egocentric, vain, voice a little coarsened, a devotee to pranks, allergy to nylon, IQ=104, memory on par with IQ, regressive, EEG 12–13 cycles per sec. etc</li> <li>• Jane: mature, sensible, capable, interesting, EEG 10½–11½ cycles per sec. etc</li> <li>• Other appropriate descriptions.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><b>1-2 marks</b> -Partial answer or vague answer eg Eve White had an IQ=110 and a memory above IQ, Eve Black had an IQ=104 and a memory on a par with IQ, Jane was mature and an EEG of 10½–11½ cycles per sec. ie <u>one or two pieces of information</u>.</p> <p><b>3–4 marks</b> – An increasingly accurate and detailed description eg Eve White was neat, had an IQ of 110 and an EEG reading of 10½–11½ cycles per sec. Eve Black was mischievous, was regressive and had an EEG reading of 12–13 cycles per sec, Jane was mature, capable and had an EEG reading of 10½–11½ cycles per sec. ie <u>several pieces of information with reference being made to at least two of: personality traits / psychometric measures / physiological measures.</u></p>	4	<p><i>NB: Examiners should be prepared to check answers against the original study to make sure that information given by candidates is accurate.</i></p> <p><i>Fine details need not be included but the description should be accurate eg Eve White had an above average IQ.</i></p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
15	<p>Answers should refer to the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Half the participants in each group of RGs and NRGs were randomly assigned to the thinking aloud condition. They were then given the following instructions: ‘The thinking aloud method consists of verbalising every thought that passes through your mind while you are playing. It is important to remember the following points: (1) Say everything that goes through your mind. Do not censor any of your thoughts even if they seem irrelevant to you; (2) Keep talking as continuously as possible, even if your ideas are not clearly structured; (3) Speak clearly; (4) Do not hesitate to use fragmented sentences if necessary. Do not worry about speaking in complete sentences; (5) Do not try to justify your thoughts’. The verbalisations were tape recorded using a lapel microphone and later transcribed</li> <li>• Other appropriate description.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><b>1–2 marks</b> – Partial or vague answer eg participants were asked to verbalise all their thoughts whilst playing/ verbalisations were tape recorded using a lapel microphone and later transcribed.</p> <p><b>3–4 marks</b> – An increasingly accurate description of how the ‘thinking aloud’ condition was operationalised, such as the one outlined above.</p>	4	<p><i>Not all details are required to gain 4 marks. Read the response through carefully and award marks in relation to the bandings given in the left-hand column.</i></p> <p><i>To gain 4 marks reference must be made to the fact that participants were ‘playing’ on the machine</i></p>
<b>Section A Total</b>		<b>60</b>	

## SECTION B

Generic guidance

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

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
16 (a)	<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 and the Oedipus complex</li> <li>• Hans' phobia of horses allowed Freud to test his explanation of the genesis of phobias</li> <li>• Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p><u>Rosenhan:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At the time of the study there was growing concern over the ability of psychiatrists to accurately diagnose and treat mental disorders. Rosenhan therefore decided to test whether psychiatrists could differentiate between the sane and the insane by seeing if pseudopatients would be diagnosed as insane</li> <li>• Rosenhan wanted to see if sane individuals who presented themselves to a psychiatric hospital would be diagnosed as insane and therefore admitted</li> <li>• Other appropriate answer eg reference to testing the reliability of the DSM.</li> </ul> <p><u>Thigpen and Cleckley:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Eve White was referred to Dr Thigpen because she was experiencing severe headaches and blackouts that had no physical cause and they wanted to investigate the cause</li> <li>• Although MPD was a rare but reasonably well known illness at this time, Eve's case allowed Thigpen and Cleckley to research and develop their theories and treatments concerning this disorder</li> <li>• Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul>	2	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer – An aim is vaguely identified with little or no elaboration eg Freud – so he could test his theory of infantile sexuality, Rosenhan – to see if psychiatrists could tell the sane from the insane, Thigpen and Cleckley – to see if Eve White had MPD.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – EITHER Outline of an aim of the chosen study is clear and contextualised, such as one of those outlined above OR two aims are vaguely identified with little or no elaboration eg Freud – so he could test his theory of infantile sexuality and to test his origin of phobias, Rosenhan – to see if psychiatrists could tell the sane from the insane and to test the reliability of the DSM, Thigpen and Cleckley – to see if Eve White had MPD and to treat MPD.</p>		
(b)	<p>Likely answers:</p> <p><u>Freud</u>: Freud's study started when Little Hans was 3 years old and continued until he was 5 years old.</p> <p><u>Rosenhan</u>: Pseudopatients were kept in hospital for an average of 19 days (range 7–52 days).</p> <p><u>Thigpen and Cleckley</u>: Thigpen and Cleckley spent 14 months (approximately 100 hours) interviewing Eve White, Eve Black and Jane.</p>	2	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer eg EITHER an explanation of a longitudinal study with <u>no link to the chosen study</u> OR-a vague reference e.g <u>Freud</u> –studied Little Hans for two years / several months; <u>Rosenhan</u> – Pseudopatients were kept in hospital for weeks; <u>Thigpen and Cleckley</u> – Thigpen and Cleckley over a year studying the three personalities.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – Explanation of why the chosen study is considered a longitudinal study is clear and <u>contextualised</u>.</p>		
(c)	<p><u>Strength</u>: Likely strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One can see development/changes in the participant's/individuals' behaviour</li> <li>• One can see if behaviour is consistent/similar/remains constant over a period of time.</li> <li>• A large amount of in-depth data can be gathered....</li> <li>• Frequently gathers rich qualitative data.....</li> </ul>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Supporting evidence:</p> <p><u>Freud:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Freud had the time to study Hans' phobia of horses and suggest that this was a subconscious fear of his father whose moustache and glasses resembled the black around a horse's mouth and the blinkers worn over a horse's eyes. Hans saw his father as a threat because he was experiencing the Oedipus complex</li> <li>• Freud had the time to analyse Hans' daydreams and fantasies eg the plumber fantasy in which Hans' bottom and widdler were replaced by larger ones which indicated he was identifying with his father; and therefore explain them in relation to his Oedipus complex theory</li> <li>• Other appropriate evidence.</li> </ul> <p><u>Rosenhan:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rosenhan had the time to discover that both pseudo and genuine psychiatric patients were frequently treated with little respect eg they were punished for small incidents, they were beaten and sworn at, their questions and requests were frequently ignored etc</li> <li>• Rosenhan and his colleagues were in the hospitals long enough (one as long as 52 days) to learn that because they and genuine patients were treated poorly, psychiatric patients become depersonalised and powerless</li> <li>• Other appropriate evidence.</li> </ul> <p><u>Thigpen and Cleckley:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thigpen and Cleckley were able to discover that Eve White had more than one personality: Eve Black appeared soon after therapy began and Jane appeared after 8 months after Eve White began seeing the psychiatrists</li> <li>• Thigpen and Cleckley were able to spend over 100 hours interviewing and testing the 3 personalities – Eve White, Eve Black and Jane – so clear differences in the personalities emerged</li> <li>• Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul>		



Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><b>1–2 marks</b> – Description of strength is basic and lacks detail. Some understanding is evident though expression is poor eg One can see development/changes in the participant's /individuals' behaviour: <u>Freud</u> – was able to study the development of Hans' phobia, <u>Rosenhan</u> – was able to see how pseudo and genuine patients were treated in the hospitals; <u>Thigpen and Cleckley</u> – were able to study the 3 personalities in detail.</p> <p><b>3–4 marks</b> – Description of strength increasingly accurate, elaborated and contextualised. Understanding is good and there is good use of appropriate psychological terminology. eg One can see development/changes in the participant's /individuals' behaviour: <u>Freud</u> – Freud had the time to study Hans' phobia of horses and suggest that this was a subconscious fear of his father who he saw as a threat because he was experiencing the Oedipus complex; <u>Rosenhan</u> – Rosenhan had the time to discover that both pseudo and genuine psychiatric patients were frequently treated with little respect and often badly treated; <u>Thigpen and Cleckley</u> – Thigpen and Cleckley were able to discover that Eve White had more than one personality: Eve White, Eve Black and Jane.</p> <p><u>Weakness</u>: Likely weakness:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The researcher may become so involved in the study they lose objectivity making the findings subjective/suffer from researcher bias.</li> <li>• Longitudinal studies are often case studies which limits generalisability.</li> </ul> <p>Supporting evidence:</p> <p><u>Freud</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Freud studied Hans for a long time and received many reports about his phobia, fears and fantasies eg Hans' phobia of horses which, because he had become so involved with the study and his wish to find evidence to support his theories was interpreted as a subconscious fear of his father because Hans saw him as a threat as he was experiencing the Oedipus complex.</li> </ul>		<p><i>If the answer is not linked to the chosen study no more than 1 mark can be gained.</i></p> <p><i>Study-specific responses are creditworthy as the candidate has been asked in the Section to focus on a chosen study.</i></p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>In fact, Hans may just have been fearful of horses because they are large and threatening.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hans saw a horse fall over which could be terrifying for a young child to witness and this is perhaps a more valid reason for his phobia than the a fear of castration by his father, as suggested by Freud</li> <li>• Other appropriate evidence.</li> </ul> <p><u>Rosenhan:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The pseudopatients, because they had not expected to be admitted so easily may have been nervous, anxious, over-sensitive and therefore subjective to the happenings within the psychiatric wards eg one patient who was never questioned about his writing had 'patient engaged in writing behaviour' entered in his notes. This may have been misinterpreted by Rosenhan when he claimed writing behaviour was seen as an aspect of the pseudopatients' pathological behaviour whereas, in reality, in may merely have been recorded by staff as part as their regular, general patients observations (Obs)</li> <li>• Other appropriate evidence.</li> </ul> <p><u>Thigpen and Cleckley:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By their own admission, Thigpen and Cleckley found Eve Black more appealing and attractive than Eve White. Eve White was reported as a 'retiring and gently conventional figure' ie a rather dull and boring person. However when Eve Black first appeared she showed a 'reckless smile, had a bright voice that sparkled and a buoyant repose' ie a much more interesting personality. Thigpen and Cleckley may therefore have warmed to this personality and misinterpreted some of her behaviours making her seem more childish, daredevil and carefree than she really was so they could claim there were two distinct personalities</li> <li>• Other appropriate evidence.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><b>1–2 marks</b> – Description of weakness is basic and lacks detail. Some understanding is evident though expression is poor eg The researcher may become so involved in the study they lose objectivity making the findings subjective/suffer from researcher bias: <u>Freud</u> – Freud became so involved with Hans’ case and studied many reports about his phobia, fears and fantasies so he had the opportunity to misinterpret them to fit with his theories; <u>Rosenhan</u> – The pseudopatients, may have been nervous, anxious, over-sensitive and therefore subjective to the happenings within the psychiatric wards; <u>Thigpen and Cleckley</u> – Thigpen and Cleckley found Eve Black more appealing and attractive than Eve White and so they may therefore have warmed to this personality and misinterpreted some of her behaviours.</p> <p><b>3–4 marks</b> – Description of weakness is increasingly accurate, elaborated and contextualised. Understanding is good and there is good use of appropriate psychological terminology. eg The researcher may become so involved in the study they lose objectivity making the findings subjective/suffer from researcher bias: <u>Freud</u> – Freud studied Hans for a long time and received many reports about his phobia, fears and fantasies which gave him the opportunity to misinterpret information so he could find evidence to support his theory of the Oedipus complex; <u>Rosenhan</u> – The pseudopatients, because they had not expected to be admitted so easily may have been nervous, anxious, over-sensitive and therefore subjective to the happenings within the psychiatric wards so they may have recorded the behaviour of the staff as more extreme than it really was eg the way they were treated when they asked the staff questions; <u>Thigpen and Cleckley</u> – Thigpen and Cleckley found Eve Black more appealing and attractive than Eve White and so they may therefore have warmed to this personality and misinterpreted some of her behaviours so they could claim there were two distinct personalities.</p>	<p>4+4 8</p>	<p><i>If the candidate identifies an acceptable generic weakness of longitudinal studies, even if it is inappropriate for their chosen study, they should be awarded 1 mark eg a weakness of longitudinal studies is that they may suffer from participant attrition.</i></p> <p><i>If the answer is not linked to the chosen study only 1 mark can be gained.</i></p> <p><i>Study-specific responses are creditworthy as the candidate has been asked in the Section to focus on a chosen study</i></p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(d)	<p>Most likely answers/content from:</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 answers.</li> </ul> <p><u>Rosenhan:</u></p> <p><u>Study 1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All (8) pseudopatients were admitted to psychiatric wards</li> <li>• 7 Were diagnosed as schizophrenic and 1 was diagnosed as manic-depressive psychosis/all bar one were diagnosed as schizophrenic. All pseudopatients were discharged with a diagnosis of schizophrenia 'in remission'</li> <li>• All but one (7) desired to be discharged almost immediately after being admitted</li> <li>• The length of hospitalisation ranged from 7–52 days</li> <li>• The average length of hospitalisation was 19 days</li> <li>• During the first three hospitalisations, when accurate records were kept, 35/118 genuine patients suspected the pseudopatients of not being ill</li> </ul>	8	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The pseudopatients' normal behaviours were frequently misinterpreted by hospital staff eg writing in diaries was seen as an aspect of their pathological behaviour and labelled as 'writing behaviour'.</li> </ul> <p><u>Study 2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Over the 3 months 193 patients were admitted for treatment (none of whom were pseudopatients) of which:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 41 were judged to be pseudopatients by at least one member of staff</li> <li>- 23 were suspected by at least one psychiatrist to be pseudopatients</li> <li>- 19 were suspected by a psychiatrist and one other member of staff to be pseudopatients.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><u>Study 3</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When pseudopatients tried to talk to staff they were ignored as if they did not exist, staff moved on with head averted, staff avoided eye contact, staff avoided speaking with them</li> <li>• Other appropriate results eg results from non-medical campus.</li> </ul> <p><u>Thigpen and Cleckley:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not long into therapy Eve White's husband reported that Eve had gone into town and had bought an array of expensive clothes that were completely out of character. On her next visit to Thigpen and Cleckley she explained for the first time that she heard voices which were becoming more and more frequent and expressed a fear that she was going mad. This prompted the appearance of the 2 personality – Eve Black. After this, the headaches and blackouts improved</li> <li>• After 8 months of therapy the situation changed for the worse. Eve White's headaches and blackouts returned. During one session of hypnosis the 3 personality – Jane appeared</li> <li>• Jane appeared to be the most 'balanced' of the three personalities and the one Thigpen and Cleckley felt should be encouraged to take over. However, they realised it was not their responsibility to make this decision and the study ended with the 3 Faces of Eve still in existence.</li> </ul>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Results from psychological tests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IQ test EW 110 EB 104,</li> <li>• Memory scale EW had a superior memory function than EB,</li> <li>• Rorschach test (ink blot test) EB tendency to regress, EW emotionally repressed</li> <li>• Other appropriate answers.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><b>1–3 marks</b> – Description of results is very basic and lacks detail and accuracy (eg one or two general statements are made, no fine details are included). Limited understanding is shown and expression is generally poor. <u>There are few, if any links to the chosen study.</u></p> <p><b>4–6 marks</b> – Description of the results is accurate and some fine details have been included. Understanding is evident. Expression and use of psychological terminology is reasonable. <u>There are some appropriate links to the chosen study.</u></p> <p><b>7–8 marks</b> – Description of results is accurate, detailed and appropriate to the level and time allowed. Understanding, expression and use of psychological terminology are very good. <u>There are clear and appropriate links to the chosen study.</u></p>		<p><i>Read the whole answer through carefully and check against the marking bands before allocating marks.</i></p> <p><i>Credit can be given for EITHER the breadth AND/OR the depth of the answer.</i></p> <p><i>To reach the top band for Rosenhan, at least 2 of the studies must be mentioned.</i></p> <p><i>Be prepared to go to the original study.</i></p>
(e)	<p>Answers should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A (generic) explanation of how and why observation was used within the chosen study</li> <li>• Suggestions, with examples, supporting the use of observation in the chosen study</li> <li>• Suggestions, with examples, challenging the use of observation in the chosen study.</li> </ul>	8	<p><i>The question asks candidates to consider the <b>usefulness</b> of observation as a way to gather data, not strengths and weaknesses of observations. Therefore read the question carefully before awarding marks to make certain candidates are actually answering the question.</i></p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Most likely answers:</p> <p><u>Freud</u></p> <p><u>Supporting generic explanation:</u> Little Hans was observed in his own home by his father who was able to notice and record Hans' behaviour in everyday activities. Hans' father was then able to pass this information on to Freud for analysis which allowed Freud to gather evidence to support his theories.</p> <p><u>Supporting evidence:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hans' father observed that when Hans was 4½ years old he developed a phobia of horses which when reported to Freud allowed Freud to suggest that this was actually a subconscious fear of his father because he was experiencing the Oedipus complex</li> <li>• Hans' father observed that after the birth of his sister Hana, Hans became fearful of the bath which Freud suggested was a subconscious fear that his mother might drop him in the bath, thus letting him go away from her, more evidence to suggest Hans was experiencing the Oedipus complex</li> <li>• Just before he was 3 it was observed that Hans started to show a lively interest in his widdler which Freud suggested indicated he was going through the phallic stage of infantile sexual development</li> <li>• Other appropriate evidence.</li> </ul> <p><u>Challenging generic explanation:</u> Observations by both Hans' father and Freud were subject to bias as Hans' father wanted to support Freud in his research by finding evidence to support his theories.</p> <p><u>Challenging evidence</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hans' father observed that when Hans was 4½ years old he developed a fear that a white horse would bite him and thought this should be reported to Freud for analysis. However, Hans had previously heard a father warn his daughter not to put her finger to a white horse as it would bite her. This could therefore be why Hans was frightened, rather than, as suggested by Freud that he had a repressed fear that he would lose his mother</li> </ul>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hans' observed phobia of horses may have been deliberately misinterpreted by Freud to provide evidence for his Oedipus complex theory</li> <li>• Other appropriate evidence.</li> </ul> <p><u>Rosenhan</u></p> <p><u>Supporting generic explanation:</u> Rosenhan and his colleagues were able to go into hospitals and observe the behaviour of the staff towards both themselves and the genuine patients. Their poor treatment lead to tremendous improvements with the way psychiatric patients are treated in hospitals.</p> <p><u>Supporting evidence</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pseudopatients observed that the average amount of time spent by attendants outside the 'cage' was 11.3% and that little of this time was actually spent mingling, talking with or play games with the patients. Psychiatrists were also rarely available to talk to the patients leaving them isolated, anxious and helpless</li> <li>• Pseudopatients observed that patients were beaten by staff, often in front of other patients, for having the courage to try to engage them in conversation</li> <li>• Patients were spoken to in unacceptable ways eg morning attendants would often wake patients with, "Come on, you m----- f-----s, out of bed!"</li> <li>• Other appropriate evidence.</li> </ul> <p><u>Challenging generic explanation:</u> Observations by Rosenhan and his colleagues were subject to bias as they all wanted to find evidence to support the suggestion that doctors could not tell the sane from the insane and that conditions inside psychiatric hospitals were unacceptable.</p> <p><u>Challenging evidence:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The pseudopatients' observations were subjective to the happenings within the psychiatric wards eg one patient who was never questioned about his writing had 'patient engaged in writing behaviour' entered in his notes. This may have been misinterpreted by Rosenhan when he claimed writing behaviour was seen as an aspect of the pseudopatients' pathological behaviour because he wanted to show how the situation one is in determines how behaviour is interpreted</li> </ul>		



Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The observed absence of eye and verbal contact between staff and patients which Rosenhan suggested indicated a lack of concern and individuation may have been for other reasons eg staff were in a hurry, individual characteristics leave some individuals finding eye and verbal contact difficult</li> <li>• Other appropriate evidence.</li> </ul> <p><u>Thigpen and Cleckley</u></p> <p><u>Supporting generic explanation:</u> Eve White was observed on numerous occasions by Thigpen and Cleckley over a 14 month period. They were therefore able to gather a tremendous amount of spontaneous evidence to support their belief that she had MPD.</p> <p><u>Supporting evidence:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thigpen and Cleckley received a letter which showed two distinctly different styles of handwriting which indicated the existence of more than one personality</li> <li>• Not long into therapy, as if seized by a sudden pain, Eve White put both of her hands to her head and after a tense moment, with a quick, reckless smile, she said in a bright, sparkling voice, “Hi there, Doc!” Such actions allowed Thigpen and Cleckley to observe the two distinct personalities of Eve White and Eve Black</li> <li>• Other appropriate evidence.</li> </ul> <p><u>Challenging generic explanation:</u> Observations by Thigpen and Cleckley were subject to bias as they wanted to find evidence to support the possibility that Eve White had MPD and to gain further evidence of the existence of the mental disorder.</p> <p><u>Challenging evidence:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As Thigpen and Cleckley found Eve Black more appealing and attractive than Eve White, they may therefore have warmed to this personality and misinterpreted some of her behaviours making her seem more childish, daredevil and carefree than she really was so they could claim there were two distinct personalities</li> </ul>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Because Thigpen and Cleckley tried, from the beginning, to promote the reintegration of the two personalities, when Jane emerged whom they observed to have the 'promise of something far more of a woman and of life than might be expected from the two Eves', they may have misinterpreted her personality as, after 14 months, they merely wanted to find a way of curing Eve</li> <li>• Other appropriate evidence.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><b>1–3 marks</b> – Reference is merely made to the usefulness of observation as a way of gathering data with <u>no link to the chosen study</u>/only a supporting statement/evidence is provided/only a challenging suggestion/evidence is provided eg <u>Rosenhan</u> and his colleagues were able to go into hospitals and observe the behaviour of the staff towards both themselves and the genuine patients. Their poor treatment lead to tremendous improvements with the way psychiatric patients are treated in hospitals/Just before he was 3 it was observed that Hans started to show a lively interest in his widdler which <u>Freud</u> suggested indicated he was going through the phallic stage of infantile sexual development/As <u>Thigpen and Cleckley</u> found Eve Black more appealing and attractive than Eve White, they may therefore have warmed to this personality and misinterpreted some of her behaviours making her seem more childish, daredevil and carefree than she really was so they could claim there were two distinct personalities.</p> <p><b>4–6 marks</b> – An explanation how observation was used to gather data is provided showing good understanding. EITHER supporting OR challenging <u>linked to the chosen study</u> is provided/ weak explanation using both supporting and challenging evidence <u>linked to the chosen study</u> is provided, elaborating understanding. Expression and use of psychological terminology is reasonable eg Eve White was observed on numerous occasions by <u>Thigpen and Cleckley</u> over a 14 month period. They were therefore able to gather a tremendous amount of spontaneous evidence to support their belief that she had MPD. For example, not long into therapy, as if seized by a sudden pain, Eve White put both of her hands to her head and after a tense moment, with a quick, reckless smile, she said in a bright, sparkling voice, "Hi there, Doc!" Such actions allowed Thigpen and Cleckley to observe the two distinct personalities of Eve White and Eve Black.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><b>7–8 marks</b> – An explanation of how observation was used to gather data is provided showing good understanding. This is supported by appropriate supporting and challenging evidence eg <u>Rosenhan</u> and his colleagues were able to go into hospitals and observe the behaviour of the staff towards both themselves and the genuine patients. Their poor treatment lead to tremendous improvements with the way psychiatric patients are treated in hospitals. For example, pseudopatients observed that patients were beaten by staff, often in front of other patients, for having the courage to try to engage them in conversation. Such behaviour is now not acceptable in hospitals. On the other hand observations by Rosenhan and his colleagues may have been subject to bias as they all wanted to find evidence to support the suggestion that doctors could not tell the sane from the insane and that conditions inside psychiatric hospitals were unacceptable. For example, the observed absence of eye and verbal contact between staff and patients which Rosenhan suggested indicated a lack of concern and individuation may have been for other reasons eg staff were in a hurry, individual characteristics leave some individuals finding eye and verbal contact difficult etc. and therefore the findings are invalid.</p>		<p><i>How to allocate marks:</i></p> <p><i>1–3 marks – mere explanation of the usefulness of observation as a way of gathering data <u>not linked to the chosen study/supporting evidence only/challenging evidence only.</u></i></p> <p><i>4–6 marks – explanation of the usefulness of observation contextualised through EITHER supporting evidence OR challenging evidence/ weak explanation using both supporting and challenging evidence.</i></p> <p><i>7–8 marks – explanation of the usefulness of observation well contextualised through supporting AND challenging evidence ie discussion is made.</i></p>
(f)	<p><u>Changes:</u></p> <p>Answers are likely to refer to ways of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improving ecological validity</li> <li>• Reducing the chance that demand characteristics will influence results</li> <li>• Reducing the chance that socially desirable behaviour will influence results</li> <li>• Improving ethical issues</li> <li>• Improving the sample</li> <li>• Improving how the sample was gathered</li> <li>• Improving aspects of the method</li> <li>• Other appropriate suggestions should be considered` and accepted.</li> </ul>	8	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><u>Evaluation:</u></p> <p>Answers are likely to refer to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More natural/realistic behaviour will be recorded</li> <li>• Improved reliability</li> <li>• Improved generalisability</li> <li>• Improved usefulness</li> <li>• Changes in findings/results</li> <li>• Advantages/disadvantages of improving ethical issues</li> <li>• Sampling problems</li> <li>• Cost and time implications</li> <li>• Other appropriate suggestions should be considered and accepted.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><b>1–2 marks</b> – One or two changes and their-implications are very basic and lack detail eg reduce stress by debriefing the participants, use more participants to improve generalisability. Some understanding may be evident but the answer is unstructured, muddled and <u>not linked to the chosen study</u>.</p> <p><b>3–4 marks</b> – Description of one or two changes, how they can be implemented and their implications is accurate. Detail is reasonable and the answer has some structure and organisation. There may be a few appropriate links to the chosen study.</p> <p><b>5–6 marks</b> – Description of TWO changes showing some understanding of how they might be implemented and possible implications is accurate. There are a/ some link(s) to the chosen study. Expression and use of psychological terminology is reasonable.</p> <p><b>7–8 marks</b> – Description of TWO changes, how they might be implemented and possible implications of the changes is accurate. Detail is appropriate to the level and time allowed. Understanding is good. The answer is structured and there are clear links to the study throughout.</p>		<p><i>No more than <u>3 marks in total</u> can be gained if there is no clear link to the chosen study.</i></p> <p><i>No more than <u>4 marks in total</u> can be gained if only ONE change has been considered.</i></p>
	<b>Section B Total</b>	<b>36</b>	

## SECTION C

Generic guidance

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

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
17 (a)	<p>Likely answer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Internal mental processes such as memory, thinking, reasoning, problem-solving and language are important features influencing human behaviour.</li> <li>• The human mind works like a computer – it inputs, processes and responds to information and <b>behaviour</b> is influenced by the way information is received and processed.</li> <li>• Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Assumption is identified. Description is basic and lacks detail though some understanding may be evident.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – Description of assumption is accurate. Detail is appropriate and understanding is very good.</p>	2	<p><i>The assumption must be:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Linked to the cognitive approach</i></li> <li>• <i>Linked to behaviour.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>It is not necessary for the assumption to be unique to the cognitive approach.</i></p>
(b)	<p>Likely answer may cover the following content:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As cognitive psychology involves the study of all mental processes, one of its key areas of focus is memory and factors that can either impair or improve an individual's ability to accurately recall information. Loftus and Palmer suggested that there are two types of information that make up memory of a complex event: information gathered from perceiving the event and information gathered after the event. These two pieces of information become integrated and if the information after the event is influenced by leading questions the individual is left with an inaccurate memory of that event. In their study students watched film clips of car crashes and were then asked leading</li> </ul>	4	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>questions about the crashes. For example some students were asked, "About how fast were the cars travelling when they crashed into each other?" whilst others were asked, "About how fast were the cars travelling when they hit each other?" Those with the verb crashed in the question responded with faster speeds than those with the verb hit. This shows that any testimony relating to an event may therefore be inaccurate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other appropriate explanation.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><b>1–2 marks</b> – Description is generally accurate, but is basic and lacks detail. Some understanding and elaboration may be evident. Expression is generally poor. <u>NB: A maximum of 1 mark can be gained for a generic explanation not linked to the named study.</u></p> <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 are good.</p>		
(c)	<p>Answers are likely to refer to: sample, methodology, ethics.</p> <p>Possible answers:</p> <p><b>Similarity:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Eg Both Loftus and Palmer and Baron-Cohen used laboratory experiments to investigate how cognitive processes influence behaviour.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Similarity is identified, with little or no elaboration.</p>	3+3 6	<p><i>This question requires candidates to refer to the 3 cognitive approach core studies</i></p> <p><i>Guidance for allocating marks: 1 mark – An appropriate similarity/difference between two appropriate studies is merely identified.</i></p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><b>2 marks</b> – Description of similarity is basic and lacks detail. Some understanding may be evident. Expression is generally poor.</p> <p><b>3 marks</b> – Description of similarity is accurate and has elaboration. Understanding is good.</p> <p><b>Difference:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Eg Loftus and Palmer and Savage-Rumbaugh used different samples. Loftus and Palmer used American human beings who were university students whereas Savage-Rumbaugh studied pygmy and common chimpanzees.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Difference is identified, with little or no elaboration.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – Description of difference is basic and lacks detail. Some understanding may be evident. Expression is generally poor.</p> <p><b>3 marks</b> – Description of difference is accurate and has elaboration. Understanding is good.</p>		<p><i>2 marks – An appropriate similarity/difference is identified and supported by <u>relevant</u> evidence from <u>one</u> appropriate study.</i></p> <p><i>3 marks – An appropriate similarity/difference is identified and supported by <u>relevant</u> evidence from <u>two</u> appropriate studies</i></p> <p><i>Reference to the aim/ focus of the studies gains only 1 mark.</i></p>
<b>(d)</b>	<p>Strengths may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It provides explanations of many aspects of human behaviour ....</li> <li>• It has useful applications eg when interviewing witnesses the police should avoid using leading questions...</li> <li>• It uses scientific/objective methods which provide accurate unbiased data....</li> </ul>	12	<p><i>This question requires candidates to refer to the 3 cognitive approach core studies.</i></p> <p><i>The candidate must make it clear why their suggestion is a strength/weakness.</i></p> <p><i>The supporting evidence must actually support the identified strength/weakness ie be appropriately contextualised.</i></p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Weaknesses may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is often over simplistic and ignores the complexity of human functioning...</li> <li>• It is unrealistic and ignores biological influences and the grounding of mental processes...</li> <li>• Usually studied through either laboratory experiments or case studies....</li> <li>• It raises particular ethical issues such as.....</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><b>1–3 marks</b> – There may be a few strengths and/or weaknesses which are peripheral to the question. Discussion and expression are poor with limited or no understanding. There is no supporting evidence.</p> <p><b>4–6 marks</b> – There may be some strengths and/or weaknesses which are appropriate to the question. Discussion is reasonable with some understanding though expression may be limited. Sparse use of supporting examples.</p> <p><b>7–9 marks</b> – There may be a range of strengths and weaknesses which are appropriate to the question. There may be an imbalance between the two. Discussion is reasonable and understanding is evident. Some use of supporting examples.</p> <p><b>10–12 marks</b> – There is a good range of strengths (2 or more) and weaknesses (2 or more) which are appropriate to the question. Both strengths and weaknesses have been considered there is a balance between the two. Discussion is detailed showing sound understanding, clear expression and good literacy. Appropriate supporting evidence has been given throughout.</p>		<p><i>Study specific answers are not creditworthy.</i></p> <p><i>Responses that refer to methodology MUST be directly related to the strengths and weaknesses of the approach. Methodology specific responses are therefore NOT creditworthy.</i></p> <p><u><i>Read through the mark bands carefully before allocating marks.</i></u></p>



Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
18 (a)	<p>Likely answer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One assumption of the social approach is that other people <b>and</b> the surrounding environment are major influences on an individual's behaviour, thought processes and emotions</li> <li>• Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Assumption is identified. Description is basic and lacks detail though some understanding may be evident.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – Description of assumption is accurate. Detail is appropriate and understanding is very good.</p>	2	<p><i>The assumption 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><i>It is not necessary for the assumption to be unique to the social approach</i></p>
(b)	<p>Likely answer may cover the following content:</p> <p>The environment and situation we are in are major influences on whether or not individuals will help another person. Piliavin's study showed that when in a closed area individuals tend not to diffuse responsibility and that the more people there were present when the incident occurred, the more people went to help the victim. They also found that if a victim is lame people are more likely to help than if the victim is drunk. Also, if a victim is the same race as a potential helper they are more likely to help them.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><b>1–2 marks</b> – Description is generally accurate, but is basic and lacks detail. Some understanding and elaboration may be evident. Expression is generally poor.  <u>NB: A maximum of 1 mark can be gained for a generic explanation not linked to the named study.</u></p> <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 are good.</p>	4	<p><i>References to the cost-reward model are not creditworthy as this would be a cognitive approach explanation for helping behaviour.</i></p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(c)	<p>Answers are likely to refer to: sample, methodology, ethics.</p> <p>Possible answers:</p> <p><b>Similarity:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Eg A similarity can be found between the Milgram study into obedience and the Reicher and Haslam BBC prison study which also takes the social approach in that both studies used samples comprised of adult males. Milgram's study involved 40 adult males; aged 20–50, from various occupational and educational backgrounds, and Reicher and Haslam used 15 males who showed a diversity of age, social class and ethnic background</li> <li>• Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Similarity is identified, with little or no elaboration.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – Description of similarity is basic and lacks detail. Some understanding may be evident. Expression is generally poor.</p> <p><b>3 marks</b> – Description of similarity is accurate and has elaboration. Understanding is good.</p>	3+3 6	<p><i>This question requires candidates to refer to the 3 social approach core studies.</i></p> <p><i>Guidance for allocating marks:</i></p> <p><i>1 mark – An appropriate similarity/difference between two appropriate studies is merely identified.</i></p> <p><i>2 marks – An appropriate similarity/difference is identified and supported by <u>relevant</u> evidence from <u>one</u> appropriate study.</i></p> <p><i>3 marks – An appropriate similarity/difference is identified and supported by <u>relevant</u> evidence from <u>two</u> appropriate studies</i></p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><b>Difference:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Eg A difference between the two studies is the country/environment in which the studies were conducted in that Milgram's was conducted in America whereas Reicher and Haslam's took place in England./Milgram carried out his experiment in Yale University which is in the New Haven area of Connecticut, USA, whereas Reicher and Haslam created their mock prison at Elstree Studios in London, England</li> <li>• Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Difference is identified, with little or no elaboration.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – Description of difference is basic and lacks detail. Some understanding may be evident. Expression is generally poor.</p> <p><b>3 marks</b> – Description of difference is accurate and has elaboration. Understanding is good.</p>		<p><i>Reference to the aim/ focus of the studies gains only 1 mark.</i></p>
(d)	<p>Strengths may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It helps us understand how behaviour can be influenced by other people and the situation in which people find themselves...</li> <li>• It can provide explanations for a great many phenomena...</li> <li>• It provides a strong support for the nature side of the nature/nurture debate.....</li> <li>• It often lends itself to research being conducted in natural environments.....</li> </ul> <p>Weaknesses may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It underestimates the influence of individual differences on behaviour...</li> </ul>	12	<p><i>This question requires candidates to refer to the 3 social approach core studies..</i></p> <p><i>The candidate must make it clear why their suggestion is a strength/weakness eg it provides a strong argument for the nature side of the nature-nurture debate <u>indicating that other people and the surrounding environment are major influences on a person's behaviour.</u></i></p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It often fails to emphasise that human behaviour has not just a cultural but also an historical context...</li> <li>• It is often claimed to be reductionist.....</li> <li>• Studies that take this approach often raise ethical issues.....</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><b>1–3 marks</b> – There may be a few strengths and/or weaknesses which are peripheral to the question. Discussion and expression are poor with limited or no understanding. There is no supporting evidence.</p> <p><b>4–6 marks</b> – There may be some strengths and/or weaknesses which are appropriate to the question. Discussion is reasonable with some understanding though expression may be limited. Sparse use of supporting examples.</p> <p><b>7–9 marks</b> – There may be a range of strengths and weaknesses which are appropriate to the question. There may be an imbalance between the two. Discussion is reasonable and understanding is evident. Some use of supporting examples.</p> <p><b>10–12 marks</b> – There is a good range of strengths (2 or more) and weaknesses (2 or more) which are appropriate to the question. Both strengths and weaknesses have been considered, there is a balance between the two. Discussion is detailed showing sound understanding, clear expression and good literacy. Appropriate supporting evidence has been given throughout.</p>		<p><i>The supporting evidence must actually support the identified strength/weakness ie be appropriately contextualised. Study specific answers are not creditworthy.</i></p> <p><i>Responses that refer to methodology MUST be directly related to the strengths and weaknesses of the approach. Methodology specific responses are therefore NOT creditworthy.</i></p> <p><u><i>Read through the mark bands carefully before allocating marks.</i></u></p>
	<b>Section C Total</b>	<b>24</b>	

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

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**Education and Learning**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

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

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

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

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

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

© OCR 2013

