

**GCE**

**Psychology**

Unit **G542**: Core Studies

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

**Mark Scheme for June 2014**

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 2014

Abbreviations, annotations and conventions used in the detailed Mark Scheme

Annotation	Meaning
	Blank Page – this annotation must be used on all blank pages within an answer booklet (structured or unstructured) and on each page of an additional object where there is no candidate response.
	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

Highlighting is also available to highlight any particular points on the script

## SECTION A

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This involved judging photographs of whole faces displaying basic emotions (based on the Ekman categories). Six faces were used testing the following basic emotions: happy, sad, angry, afraid, disgusted, surprised. Participants had to state, from a forced choice of two mental states, which emotion was shown in each photograph.</li> <li>• Other appropriate descriptions should be credited.</li> </ul> <p><b>3-4 marks</b> – An increasingly accurate and detailed description of the Basic Emotion Recognition Task based on the one outlined above.</p> <p><b>1-2 marks</b> – Partial or vague answer e.g. participants were shown 6 photos of faces and had to say what emotion was being shown.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer e.g. descriptions of the Eyes Task / Happé’s Strange Stories / Gender Recognition Task.</p>	4	<p><i>Not all <b>six</b> emotions have to be identified for the candidate to gain full marks.</i></p> <p><i>If the candidate refers to ‘pictures of eyes’ rather than faces, no marks should be awarded as this would refer to the Eyes Task.</i></p>
2	(a) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When indoors all lexigrams used by Kanzi and Mulika were automatically recorded by computer-monitored keyboards</li> <li>• Other appropriate outlines should be credited.</li> </ul> <p><b>2 marks</b> – A clear, accurate outline such as the one given above which must include reference to the lexigram <b>and</b> computer/electronic/automatically recorded.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer e.g. through the use of an lexigram</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer e.g. observed using the lexigram.</p>	2	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(b)	<p>Most likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of an electronic, computerised machine to record symbol usage is an objective measure which removes any researcher bias.</li> <li>• The electronic, computerised machine was a piece of precise technology which provides objective scientific data so researcher errors/omissions in recording symbol usage are removed.</li> <li>• Use of an electronic computerised machine (to record symbol usage) gave quantitative data which allowed comparisons to be made between the pygmy chimpanzees.</li> <li>• Other appropriate suggestions should be credited.</li> </ul> <p><b>2 marks</b> – An appropriate strength such as one of the ones suggested above, is clearly described and contextualised.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer e.g. no observer bias, no human recording errors, produced quantitative data i.e. strength merely identified, <u>answer not contextualised.</u></p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p>	2	
3	<p>Most likely descriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The first is information gleaned during the perception of the original event i.e. whilst watching the film(s) of the car accidents, the second is external information supplied after the fact i.e. through the leading questions in relation the vehicular speed and /or the recollection of seeing broken glass.</li> <li>• Memory is determined by two sources: (i) one's own perception gleaned at the time of the original event i.e.</li> </ul>	4	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>whilst watching the film(s) of the car accidents (ii) external information supplied after the fact i.e. though the leading questions in relation to vehicular speed and/or the recollection of seeing broken glass.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Other appropriate descriptions should be credited.</li> </ul> <p><b>4 marks</b> – A clear, contextualised description of both kinds of memory, such one of the ones outlined above.  <b>3 marks</b> – Description of both kinds of memory with only one contextualised.  <b>2 marks</b> - Only one kind of memory described in context, description of both kinds of memory neither contextualised.  <b>1 mark</b> –Partial or vague answer e.g. information gained at / after an event i.e.one type of memory with no contextualisation /a mere example of either type of information e.g. the use of leading questions which distorts/changes memory  <b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p>		
4	<p>Answers should refer to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participants in the experimental and control groups were matched individually on the basis of ratings of their aggressive behaviour in social interactions in the nursery school. They were rated on four 5-point rating scales by the experimenter and a nursery school teacher, both of whom were well acquainted with the children. (These scales measured the extent to which the children displayed physical aggression, verbal aggression, aggression towards inanimate objects, and aggressive inhibition. The latter scale, which dealt with the child's tendency to inhibit aggressive reactions in the face of high instigation, provided a measure of aggression anxiety). 51 children were</li> </ul>	4	<p><i>Not all fine details have to be included to make the answer worthy of full marks</i></p> <p><i>If the candidate implies/states there were only two conditions, a maximum of 3 marks can be awarded.</i></p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>rated independently by both judges so as to permit an assessment of inter-rater agreement. The composite score was obtained by summing the ratings of the four aggression scales and on the basis of these scores the children were arranged in triplets and then randomly assigned to either one of the two experimental conditions or the control condition.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Other appropriate descriptions should be credited.</li> </ul> <p><b>3-4 marks</b> - An increasingly accurate and detailed description <u>based</u> on the one given above.  <b>1-2 marks</b> –Partial or vague answer e.g. children were rated on a 5-point scale for aggressive tendencies; children were arranged in triplets and assigned one of the three conditions.  <b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p>		
5	<p>Most likely answers will refer to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Piaget’s theory proposed that the ability to conserve increases with age. Findings from this study support this as the older children (8 year-olds) performed better on all conservation tasks (<i>than</i> the younger children (5 year-olds)).</li> <li>Piaget’s theory proposed that the ability to conserve develops in stages/ differs according to the (difficulty) of the task. Findings from this study support this as the mean number of errors in all (three) conditions was lower in the numbers task than in either the mass or volume task.</li> <li>Other appropriate answers should be credited.</li> </ul>	4	<p><b>2+2</b>  <i>Candidates may put the issues of age and stages together. Therefore read the whole answer and, provided each one is explained and supported with appropriate evidence from the study, full marks can be awarded.</i></p>

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
		<p><b>2 marks</b> – Increasingly accurate descriptions of a way in which the findings from this study support Piaget’s theory, along the lines of those outlined above.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer e.g. older children performed better on all the conservation tasks / older children performed better on all the conservation tasks than younger children i.e. findings not linked to Piaget’s theory, the ability to conserve increases with age i.e. reference to Piaget’s theory not supported by findings from the study, clear description of only one way in which the results of this study support Piaget’s theory.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p>		
6	a	<p>Answers should refer to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ‘In the night there was a big giraffe in the room and a crumpled one, and the big one called out because I took the crumpled one away from it. Then it stopped calling out, (and then I sat down on top of the crumpled one’). (Part 2 of the original study).</li> <li>• Other appropriate descriptions of the giraffe fantasy should be credited.</li> </ul> <p><b>2 marks</b> – An accurate description of the fantasy such as the one given above.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer e.g. There were two giraffes - a big one and a little one.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p>	2	
	b	<p>Most likely answer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Freud (believed it was a replication of what happened in the morning when Hans tried to get into bed with his parents and) suggested this was Hans’ distorted</li> </ul>	2	<p><i>References to ‘genitals’ is not relevant to this question but reference to the big giraffe representing Hans’ father and the crumpled giraffe his mother is creditworthy e.g. the big giraffe represented Hans’ father because of his large genitals and the crumpled giraffe his mother = 1 mark (positive marking:</i></p>

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
		<p>way of communicating his wishes in regard to his mother. The big giraffe represented his father whilst the crumpled giraffe represented his mother. By taking the crumpled giraffe away from the big giraffe Hans was showing his wish to have his mother all to himself.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Other appropriate explanations should be credited e.g. a clearly explained and contextualised answer linked to the Oedipus complex.</li> </ul> <p><b>2 marks</b> – A clear, fully contextualised explanation such as the one given above  <b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer e.g. The big giraffe represented Hans' father, the crumpled one his mother.  <b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p>		<p><i>ignore genitals. However: the tall giraffe was Hans' father's penis and the crumpled giraffe was his mother's vagina = 0 marks.</i></p>
7	a	<p>Most likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If an image/word has been identified and responded to in one visual field it can only be recognised again if it is presented to the same visual field.</li> <li>If an image has been identified and responded to in one visual field is then presented to the other visual field the participant responds as if he had no recollection of the previous exposure.</li> <li>Visual material presented to the LVF cannot be identified in speech and/or pointing/ drawing/ writing with the right hand and/ or but can be identified by pointing/ drawing/ writing with the left hand).</li> <li>Visual material presented to the RVF can be described in speech and/or writing/ drawing/ pointing using the right hand.</li> <li>If two different images are flashed simultaneously to</li> </ul>	2	<p><i>Examiners are advised to check answers against the original study as candidates may cite other findings and/or information that was already known before Sperry conducted this study e.g. the left hemisphere controls speech.</i></p> <p><i>If a conclusion is given rather than a finding 1 marks should be awarded.</i></p> <p><i>NB References to such things as 'the left hemisphere controls speech' are not creditworthy as this was known before this study took place.</i></p> <p><i>NB: Any reference to 'EYE' means the response is not creditworthy, the candidate must refer to VISUAL FIELD.</i></p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>the R and LVFs, the participant can select with their left hand the object from a collection of objects.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If two different words are flashed simultaneously to the R and LVFs the participant can spell with his right hand/say the word presented to his RVF.</li> <li>• Other appropriate answers should be credited.</li> </ul> <p><b>2 marks</b> – A clear, accurate description such as one of the ones given above.  <b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer e.g. images can only be recognised by the same visual field.  <b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer e.g. any reference to EYE as opposed to visual field, reference to any of the tactile tests.</p>		
b	<p>Most likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects put in the right hand for identification by touch alone can be described in speech and writing (using the right hand).</li> <li>• Objects put in the left hand cannot be identified in speech or writing but can be selected by the same hand from a scrambled pile of items / grab bag.</li> <li>• Objects placed in one hand can only be identified through touch alone by the same hand.</li> <li>• If two objects are placed simultaneously, one in each hand, then removed and hidden in a scrambled pile of items / grab bag, each hand will hunt for and select its own object.</li> <li>• Other appropriate answers should be credited.</li> </ul>	2	<p><i>Examiners are advised to check answers against the original study as candidates may cite other findings and/or information that was already known before Sperry conducted this study e.g. the left hemisphere controls speech. If a conclusion is given rather than a finding 0 marks should be awarded.</i></p> <p><i>NB References to such things as ‘the right hemisphere controls the left side of the body’ are not creditworthy as this was already known before this study was conducted.</i></p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><b>2 marks</b> – A clear, accurate description such as one of the ones given above.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer e.g. objects could only be found by the same hand.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer e.g. reference to any of the visual tests.</p>		
8	<p>Answers should refer to:</p> <p>16 right-handed, male, licensed London taxi drivers with a mean age of 44 years and an age range of 32-62 years. All had been licensed London taxi drivers/passed the Knowledge 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 general medical, neurological and psychiatric profiles.</p> <p><b>3-4 marks</b> - An increasingly accurate and detailed description based on the one given above i.e. 4 or more features</p> <p><b>1-2 marks</b> – partial or vague answer e.g. Right-handed, male, taxi drivers i.e. up to 3 features.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer e.g. description of control/non-taxi driver group.</p>	4	<p><i>For full marks, more than four features must be identified correctly.</i></p>
9	<p>Most likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dreams are most likely to be recalled if an individual is awoken whilst in REM sleep than NREM.</li> <li>• Dreaming is accompanied by REM / REM is synonymous with dreaming.</li> <li>• Most dreaming occurs in REM sleep</li> <li>• Regular periods of REM and dreaming are an intrinsic</li> </ul>	4	<p>2+2</p> <p><i>As this question asks for conclusions, the candidate is not required to give findings to support their conclusion. However if findings alone are given the answer can only be credited with partial marks.</i></p>

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
		<p>part of sleep.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It cannot be stated with complete certainty that dream activity does not occur in sleep stages other than REM / some individuals may dream in non REM.</li> <li>There is a significant association between eye movement and dream content.</li> <li>Other appropriate conclusions should be credited.</li> </ul> <p><b>2 marks</b> – A clear, accurate conclusion is outlined such as one of the ones suggested above.  <b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer e.g. more dreams were recalled by participants awakened from REM sleep than NREM sleep i.e. any reference to findings as opposed to conclusions  <b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p>		
10	a	<p>Answer should refer to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data was gathered by two female confederates who took seats outside the critical area and recorded / noted data, through observations, for the duration of the ride, about (the behaviour of) passengers.</li> <li>Other appropriate outlines should be credited.</li> </ul> <p><b>2 marks</b> – A clear, contextualised outline such as the one given above with at least two pieces of appropriate information e.g. two (female) observers who noted/ recorded down the behaviour of the passengers  <b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer e.g. by two females/two female observers, through observation, answer not contextualised.  <b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer e.g. mere reference to</p>	2	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	what was recorded.		
b	<p>Most likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the carriage where the incident occurred was particularly crowded / a passenger got in the way, the view of the observers may have been blocked so they could not see properly what was happening (so relevant data could have been missed).</li> <li>• Observers could have misinterpreted the passengers behaviour e.g. passengers may have wanted to help but couldn't because there was no space for them to move into, (so data was invalid).</li> <li>• Observers could have shown observer bias e.g. by noting down that a passenger did not help – to support the diffusion of responsibility hypothesis - when in fact they may have tried to but could not get to where the victim lay, (making findings invalid).</li> <li>• Observers may have been inaccurate in their recordings of behaviour e.g. the sex of the passenger may not have been obvious, the latency of the first helper may have been timed wrongly (so data was invalid / unreliable)</li> <li>• Observers had so much data to record e.g. race, sex, and location of every rider seated or standing in the critical area, they may easily have missed something, (so data was unreliable).</li> <li>• Other appropriate suggestions should be credited.</li> </ul> <p><b>2 marks</b> – A clear, contextualised suggestion of a possible weakness such as one of the ones given above.</p>	2	<p><i>The candidate does not have to consider implications to gain the full 2 marks.</i></p> <p><i>References to ethics should not be credited because they would refer to research method rather than the WAY data was recorded. Participants in this study could expect to be observed as they were in a public place.</i></p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer e.g. observer's view may have been blocked, observer bias may have occurred i.e. answer not contextualised.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p>		
11	<p>Most likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both guards and prisoners were aware that they would be constantly observed by television cameras and that anything they did might be shown on national television so they might have responded with demand characteristics and acted how they thought the researchers/television viewers would want them to act.</li> <li>• Both guards and prisoners were aware that they would be constantly observed by television cameras and that anything they did might be shown on national television so they might have responded in a socially desirable way by playing their roles as they thought socially who want them to.</li> <li>• Because the study was constantly recorded by television the study lacked ecological validity because prison life is not normally recorded 24 hours a day for television viewing.</li> <li>• Because participants knew they would be recorded constantly for television, the sample may not have been truly representative of the general population as only a certain kind of person (e.g. extroverts) may have responded to the initial advertisement.</li> <li>• Other appropriate suggestions should be credited e.g. reference to the study having to be controlled because it was going to be televised.</li> </ul>	4	<p><b>2+2</b></p> <p><i>References to ethics such as consent, stress should not be credited because participants had agreed/consented to be televised.</i></p> <p><i>Any references to television/ camera crews alone does not count as contextualisation.</i></p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><b>2 marks</b> - An increasingly detailed and fully contextualised suggestion such as one of the ones given above.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer e.g. because their behaviour was being recorded participants may have responded with demand characteristics; the study lacked ecological validity i.e. <u>answer not contextualised</u>.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer</p>		
12	<p>Most likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participants were deceived over the purpose of the study. They believed it was concerned about memory and learning when it was really about obedience to authority.</li> <li>• Participants believed they had equal chance of being teacher or learner. They were deceived because the lots were rigged to they were always the teacher.</li> <li>• Participants believed the shock machine looked real and actually gave the learner electric shocks when in reality it didn't.</li> <li>• Participants were given a sample shock of 45 volts so believed the shock generator was real when it wasn't.</li> <li>• Other appropriate suggestions should be credited e.g. participants really thought they had killed the learner as he pounded on the wall and stopped responding whereas in reality he was not really being harmed</li> </ul> <p><b>2 marks</b> – A clear, fully contextualised description such as one of the ones given above.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> - Partial or vague answer e.g. participants were deceived over the purpose of the study, participants believed they had equal chance of being teacher or</p>	4	<p><b>2+2</b></p> <p><i>The answer should be fully explained and contextualised because the question asks candidates to 'describe' and 'in this study'</i></p> <p><i>For 2 marks, candidates should not just identify the deception but also explain how it was a deception.</i></p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>learner, participants believed the shock machine was real, participants were given a sample electric shock i.e. deception merely identified so answer not fully described and contextualised.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p>		
13	<p>Answer should refer to any <b>one</b> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Eve White: demure, retiring, neat, colourless, conservative, honest, serious, conscientious, anxious, seldom animated, IQ 110, memory far above IQ, repressive, EEG of 10½-11½ cycles per second.</li> <li>• Eve Black: party girl, mischievous, childish, egocentric, vain, amusing and likable, provocative, IQ104, memory on the same level as IQ, regressive, EEG of 12-13 / 12½ cycles per second.</li> <li>• Jane: mature, vivid, sensible, capable, interesting, impressive, EEG of 10½-11½ cycles per second.</li> <li>• Other appropriate descriptions of any one personality should be credited.</li> </ul> <p><b>3-4 marks</b> – A clear, full and increasingly accurate description of a named personality based on the descriptions above to include reference to <b>both</b> psychological/physical tests and personality characteristics.</p> <p><b>1-2 marks</b> – Partial or vague answer e.g. Eve White: demure, retiring, neat and honest i.e. no reference to any of the psychological or physical tests; Eve Black: IQ104, memory on the same level as IQ, regressive, EEG of 12-13 / 12½ cycles per second i.e. no reference to any of the personal characteristics; Eve Black was regressive, loud, outgoing and flirty i.e. a very basic/vague answer.</p>	4	<p><i>To gain marks the candidate must identify which personality they are describing.</i></p> <p><i>For full details of all personalities be prepared to refer to the original study.</i></p> <p><i>References to such things as denying she was married or had a daughter, handwriting etc are not creditworthy as they are not character features.</i></p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer e.g. description of unidentified i.e. not named personality.</p>		
14	<p>Answer should refer to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Qualitative data was gathered through self reports made firstly by RGs and NRGs in the ‘thinking aloud’ condition. Participants in this condition had all their verbalisations recorded using a lapel microphone connected to a portable tape recorder/ recorded by a tape-recorder. All verbalisations made during the gambling session of each participant were transcribed within 24 hours. In addition, qualitative data was gathered in the post-experimental semi-structured interview in which participants were asked a number of skill-related questions.</li> <li>• Other appropriate descriptions should be credited.</li> </ul> <p><b>3-4 marks</b> - . An increasingly accurate and detailed description based on the one given above</p> <p><b>1-2marks</b> – Partial or vague answer e.g. through a lapel microphone attached to a (portable) tape recorder/ through a post-experimental interview in which participants were asked skill-related questions.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer e.g. any reference to the gathering of quantitative data.</p>	4	<p><i>The candidate must refer to both the ‘thinking aloud’ condition and the post-experimental interview to gain full marks</i></p> <p><i>For full marks the candidate must refer to <b>both</b> the tape-recorded verbalisations and the post-experimental interviews.</i></p> <p><i>Only 1 mark can be awarded if the answer is not contextualised: lapel microphone/ skill-related questions count as contextualisation.</i></p>
15	<p>Most likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pseudopatients quarters and possessions were examined by any staff member, for whatever reason</li> <li>• Pseudopatients’ personal history and anguish was available to any member of staff including volunteer staff to read.</li> </ul>	4	<p><b>2+2</b></p> <p><i>Examiners should be prepared to check to make sure suggested evidence is actually cited in the original study</i></p> <p><i>NB the question asks candidates to show how the Pseudopatients were depersonalised not the other patients. Therefore references to such things as ‘physical punishment in front of other patients’ is not creditworthy.</i></p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The personal hygiene and waste evacuation of pseudopatients was often monitored.</li> <li>• The water closets/toilets in the hospitals often had no doors.</li> <li>• On admittance several pseudopatients underwent initial physical examinations in semi-public rooms, (where staff members went about their own business as if the pseudopatients were not there).</li> <li>• One nurse did not seem to acknowledge the patients' presence and unbuttoned her uniform to adjust her bra in the presence of both a pseudopatient and other genuine patients.</li> <li>• When pseudopatients tried to engage in conversations with staff/ask staff questions, they were usually ignored/staff walked away (making them feel as if they didn't exist).</li> <li>• When pseudopatients tried to engage with staff, most staff averted their eyes, trying not to notice the pseudopatient.</li> <li>• Patient quarters and possessions were entered and examined by any member of staff.</li> <li>• Other appropriate descriptions of evidence which must be cited in the original study.</li> </ul> <p><b>2 marks</b> - An increasingly accurate and fully contextualised description such as one of the ones the one given above.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer e.g. toilets had no doors; notes could be examined by anyone i.e. <u>no real contextualisation.</u></p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
16 a	<p>Likely answers:</p> <p><u>Dement and Kleitman:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To see if the physiological aspects of REM relate to an individual's experience of dreaming/to investigate the <i>relationship</i> between REM sleep and dreaming,</li> <li>• To provide a detailed investigation of how objective, physiological aspects of REM relate to the subjective experience of dreaming.</li> <li>• To observe and record the length, frequency and patterns of the participants' REM sleep to discover if there is any relationship between these and dreaming.</li> <li>• To investigate (in an objective way) the relationship between eye movements and dreaming.</li> <li>• Other appropriate reasons should be credited.</li> </ul> <p><u>Thigpen and Cleckley:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• So the psychotherapeutic treatment of a 25 year old woman who presented with a history of severe headaches and blackouts but was later discovered to have multiple personality disorder could be documented.</li> <li>• To review the evidence, (current at the time of the study), relating to MPD and consider the validity of its diagnosis.</li> <li>• To provide an account of an individual thought to have MPD and offer possible treatment.</li> <li>• Other appropriate reasons should be credited.</li> </ul>	2	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<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.</li> <li>• To examine the role of social, organisational and clinical factors in group behaviour.</li> <li>• Other appropriate reasons should be credited.</li> </ul> <p><b>2 marks</b> – The reason why the chosen study was conducted is clear and fully contextualised, as outlined above</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer e.g. the reason why the study was conducted has no elaboration and / or is not fully contextualised e.g. Dement and Kleitman – to link sleep with dreaming; Thigpen and Cleckley – to prove MPD exists; Reicher and Haslam – to conduct a study investigating the potential for tyranny.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer e.g. statement of a hypothesis such as ‘REM will be related to dreaming’; to provide the BBC with a good television series.</p>		<p><i>NB: references to the study being conducted to replicate the SPE should not be credited because R&amp;H specifically state that ‘the aim was not to conduct an exact replication of the SPE... (page 7 of original study).</i></p> <p><i>Also references to going to a special room to talk to the researchers is not mentioned in the original study so should not be credited.</i></p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
b	<p>Likely answers:</p> <p><u>Dement and Kleitman:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participants were woken whilst in either REM or NREM sleep. For all awakenings, they spoke into a recording device near their bed. They were instructed to first state whether or not they had been dreaming and then, if they could, to relate the content of their dream. When the participant had finished speaking, the experimenter, who could hear their voices, occasionally entered the room to further question them on some particular point of the dream.</li> <li>Other appropriate descriptions should be credited.</li> </ul> <p><u>Thigpen and Cleckley</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(Over a period of 14 months) during a series of interviews (totalling approximately 100 hours), extensive material was obtained about the behaviour and inner lives of Eve White, Eve Black and Jane. Self report data was also gathered when Eve White was hypnotised. Both of Eve White's parents and her husband were also interviewed. Self-report data was additionally gathered through the psychological tests undertaken by both Eve White and Eve Black. These included an IQ test, a memory test, the Rorschach (inkblot) test and the drawings of human figures test.</li> <li>Other appropriate descriptions should be credited.</li> </ul> <p><u>Reicher and Haslam:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Self report data was gathered firstly in the three-phase screening process which reduced the initial pool of 332 applicants to 27 men. During this process potential participants completed a battery of psychometric tests that measured both social variables (e.g.</li> </ul>	4	<p><i>Full marks can be gained by answering in either breadth or depth</i></p> <p><i>No credit should be given to reference to the EEG as this is not a self-report measure.</i></p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>authoritarianism) and clinical variables (e.g. anxiety). Self report data was also gathered through daily psychometric testing throughout the study. Participants had to apply rating scales in a variety of tests to measure how social (e.g. awareness of cognitive alternatives), organisational (e.g. compliance with rules) and clinical (e.g. depression) variables developed throughout the duration of the study. Participants remained for a further day after the study was brought to a halt, to undertake a series of structured debriefings designed to obtain and provide feedback on their experience.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other appropriate descriptions should be credited.</li> </ul> <p><b>3-4 marks</b> – An increasingly accurate, detailed and contextualised description based on those given above including reference to at least two ways the self-report method was used <u>OR</u> one way described in depth.</p> <p><b>1-2 marks</b> – Partial or vague answer e.g. Dement and Kleitman – by participant reporting their dreams into a tape recorder; Thigpen and Cleckley – through over 100 hours of interviews with Eve and psychometric tests; Reicher and Haslam – through daily psychometric testing that measured social, organisational and clinical variables.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer e.g. descriptions referring to how data was gathered through observations.</p>		
c	<p>Likely answers:</p> <p><u>Strength</u>: most likely answers will give a generic strength of self-reports supported by appropriate evidence from the chosen study.</p> <p>Generic strengths include:</p>	6	<p><b>3+3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>No more than 1 mark can be gained if the strength is not linked to the chosen study.</i></li> <li>• <i>Likewise, no more than 1 mark can be gained if the weakness is not linked to the chosen study.</i></li> <li>• <i>No marks should be awarded for saying a strength of</i></li> </ul>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Self-reports allow the focus to be on the participant's perspective.</li> <li>• Self-reports produce data that reflects the participant's point of view (rather than the researcher's).</li> <li>• Self-reports (especially interviews or open questions) can generate large amounts of detailed, qualitative data, especially about internal mental states / beliefs.</li> <li>• Self-reports (especially questionnaires, rating scales, or closed questions) can generate large amounts of quantitative data that allows the researcher to make comparisons between individuals or groups of people.</li> <li>• Self-reports can generate large amounts of quantitative and qualitative data to give a comprehensive overview of the participant.</li> <li>• Other appropriate strengths should be credited <u>supported by evidence from the chosen study.</u></li> </ul> <p><b>3 marks</b> – An appropriate strength is identified, explained and elaborated through appropriate evidence from the chosen study, showing good understanding e.g. self-reports (especially questionnaires, rating scales, or closed questions) can generate large amounts of quantitative data that allows the researcher to make comparisons between individuals or groups of people. For example Reicher and Haslam were able to use daily psychometric tests involving the application of rating scales to find out how social, organisational and clinical variables developed both in and between participants over the time of the study.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – An appropriate strength is identified but is basic and lacks detail. A vague / weak link is made to the chosen study showing some understanding e.g. self-</p>		<p><i>self-reports is that data can be gathered quickly and easily – this can apply to other research methods such as observation, experiments.</i></p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>reports can generate large amounts of quantitative and qualitative data to give a comprehensive overview of the participant. For example Thigpen and Cleckley were able to get an in-depth understanding of all three of Eve's personalities.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Peripherally relevant strength is either merely identified with little or no elaboration and <u>no link to the chosen study</u> e.g. self-reports reflect the participant's rather than the researcher's point of view.</p> <p><b>0 marks:</b> No or irrelevant answer e.g. any reference to data gathered through observations</p> <p><u>Weakness:</u> most likely answers will give a generic weakness of self-reports supported by appropriate evidence from the chosen study. Generic weaknesses include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Responses may be biased / invalid because of social desirability / researcher or experimenter presence / demand characteristics / the wish to avoid embarrassment.</li> <li>• The data gathered is often unique making comparisons between individuals or groups difficult / making it hard to generalise the findings.</li> <li>• The data gathered is often detailed and complex making interpretation and analysis difficult.</li> <li>• Self-reports, especially any form of interview can be time-consuming so it may take a long time to gather adequate data.</li> <li>• Other appropriate weaknesses should be credited supported by evidence from the chosen study.</li> </ul>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><b>3 marks</b> – An appropriate weakness is identified, explained and elaborated through appropriate evidence from the chosen study, showing good understanding e.g. self reports, especially any form of interview, can be time-consuming so it may take a long time to gather adequate data. For Example Thigpen and Cleckley spent approximately 100 hours interviewing Eve in order to gather adequate data to suggest she had MPD.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – An appropriate weakness is identified but is basic and lacks detail. A vague / weak link is made to the chosen study showing some understanding e.g. the data gathered is often unique making comparisons between individuals or groups difficult. For example although Dement and Kleitman found a relationship between eye movement and dream content, no participants actually reported having the same dream.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Peripherally relevant weakness is either merely identified with little or no elaboration and no link to the chosen study e.g. responses may be biased because the participant responds to demand characteristics.</p> <p><b>0 marks:</b> No or irrelevant answer e.g. any reference to data gathered through observations.</p>		
d	<p>Most likely answers will refer to:</p> <p><u>Dement and Kleitman:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More dreams were recalled from REM than NREM sleep (152:11).</li> <li>• Fewer dreams were recalled in NREM sleep than REM sleep (149:39).</li> <li>• There was 80% dream recall in REM compared to 7% in NREM.</li> <li>• There were significantly more correct estimates of</li> </ul>	8	<i>A maximum of 3 marks can be gained if only ONE result is considered.</i>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>length of REM than incorrect estimates (92:19).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There were more wrong estimates of dream length after 15 minutes of REM than 5 minutes of REM (13:6).</li> <li>• There was a strong association between pattern of REMs and the content of dreams (with examples).</li> <li>• Other appropriate findings should be credited.</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<sup>nd</sup> 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<sup>rd</sup> 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
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Results from psychological tests:               <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> </ul>               Other appropriate findings should be credited.             </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</li> </ul>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>was able to suggest additional 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 results is increasingly accurate and detailed with several fine details included. Detail is appropriate to level and time allowed. Understanding, expression and use of psychological terminology is good. There are clear and appropriate links to the chosen study, as outlined above.</p> <p><b>4-6 marks</b> – Description of results is mainly accurate. There are some omissions but some understanding is evident. Fine details occasionally present. There is some use of psychological terminology and the answer has some structure and organisation. The answer has some clear links to the chosen study.</p> <p><b>1-3 marks</b> – Description of results is very basic and lacks detail e.g. some general statements are identified. Some understanding may be evident. Expression is poor, with few, if any, psychological terms. No fine details have been</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>included. The answer is not linked to the chosen study.  <b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer e.g. Dement and Kleitman – dreams are most likely to be recalled if an individual is awoken during REM sleep i.e. conclusions as opposed to findings.</p>		
e	<p><u>Improvements are likely to refer to:</u></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, if appropriate, credited.</li> </ul> <p><b>7-8 marks</b> - Description of two or more improvements is appropriate to the study. Description is detailed with good understanding and clear expression. Improvements would be effective and should be justified. Implementation has been considered. The answer is competently structured and organised, appropriate to the level and time allowed and has <u>clear links to the chosen study</u>.</p> <p><b>5-6 marks</b> – Description of improvement(s) is appropriate to the study. Description is reasonable with some understanding though expression may be somewhat</p>	8	<p><i>No more than 2 marks can be gained if the answer is not linked to the chosen study.</i></p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>limited. Some justification has been provided and some thought has been given as to how the improvement(s) could be implemented. <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 details with some understanding, though expression may be limited. Some justification has been provided/ thought may have been given as to how the improvements might be implemented. The answer is <u>loosely linked to the chosen study.</u></p> <p><b>1-2 marks</b> – Description of improvement(s) are peripheral to the study. Description is basic and lacks detail. Justification/ ways of how the improvement(s) might be implemented may be just discernible. 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>		
f	<p><u>Evaluation of improvements is likely to refer to:</u></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, if appropriate, credited.</li> </ul> <p><b>7-8 marks</b> – Evaluation of improvements is appropriate to the study. Evaluation is detailed with good</p>	8	<i>No more than 2 marks can be gained if the answer is not linked to the chosen study.</i>

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
		<p>understanding and clear expression. Evaluation is effective and informed. The answer is competently structured and organised, appropriate to the level and time allowed and has <u>clear links to the chosen study</u>.</p> <p><b>5-6 marks</b> – Evaluation of improvement(s) is appropriate to the study. Evaluation is 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. Evaluation is basic and lacks details with some understanding, though expression may be limited. The answer is <u>loosely linked to the chosen study</u>.</p> <p><b>1-2 marks</b> – Evaluation of improvement(s) are peripheral to the study. Evaluation is basic and lacks 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>		
17	a	<p>Likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The behaviourist perspective holds that <u>learning</u> by association from the environment is the most important influence on behaviour.</li> <li>• The behaviourist perspective holds that when we are born our mind is a tabula rasa (blank slate) and that all behaviour is <u>learnt</u> from the environment after birth.</li> <li>• The behaviourist perspective sees the majority of all behaviour as being <u>learned</u> from the environment after birth.</li> <li>• Other appropriate outlines should be credited.</li> </ul> <p><b>2 marks</b> – An appropriate outline is accurately described, such as the ones given above.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Vague or partial answer e.g. all behaviour is</p>	2	<p><i>The outline must be;</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Linked to the behaviourist perspective</i></li> <li>• <i>Linked to behaviour</i></li> </ul>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>learned, we are born as blank slates.  <b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p>		
b	<p>Answers are likely to refer to such learning theories as classical conditioning, operant conditioning or social learning theory with links made to the Bandura study:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The behaviourist perspective holds that the majority of behaviour is learned and not innate. This perspective can therefore explain why individuals are aggressive since, according to Bandura, people learn behaviour through specific social learning processes: they observe significant others modelling behaviours which, when the appropriate opportunity arises, they copy or imitate. This was shown in his 'Bashing Bobo' study in which children observed a model acting aggressively towards a bobo doll. Later, when in a similar situation, even though the original model was no longer present, the children imitated many of the model's physical and verbal acts of aggression, showing aggressive behaviour had been learned.</li> <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 is evident and there are clear links to the perspective. Expression and use of psychological terminology is sound.  <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.  <u>NB: A maximum of 1 mark can be gained for a generic explanation not linked to either a specific study or a specific example</u>  <b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p>	4	<p><i>Although candidates are most likely to refer to Bandura, a clear well described generic answer should be credited.</i></p> <p><i>To gain more than 2 marks there must be a link to the behaviourist perspective. A clear link to the behaviourist perspective must be made for full marks.</i></p> <p><i>For a full answer the description should be supported by either a specific detail from a known study and/or an appropriate generic example.</i></p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
c	<p>Answers are likely to refer to sample, methodology (in relation to experiments), ethics</p> <p>Similarity: Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both the experiments conducted by Bandura and Watson and Raynor / both Bandura's and Watson and Raynor's experiments lacked ecological validity so may not represent behaviour in the real world</li> <li>• Both the experiments conducted by Bandura and Watson and Raynor had children as participants</li> <li>• Other appropriate similarities should be credited.</li> </ul> <p><b>3 marks</b> – An appropriate similarity is identified and supported by <u>relevant</u> evidence from <u>two</u> appropriate experiments.  <b>2 marks</b> – An appropriate similarity is identified and supported by <u>relevant</u> evidence from <u>one</u> appropriate experiment  <b>1 mark</b> – An appropriate similarity between two appropriate experiments is merely identified.  <b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p>Difference: Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The samples used in the experiments conducted by Bandura and Pavlov were different .....</li> <li>• The independent variables (IVs) manipulated in the experiments by Bandura and Griffiths were different</li> <li>• Other appropriate differences should be credited.</li> </ul> <p><b>3 marks</b> – An appropriate difference is identified and</p>	6	<p><b>3+3</b>  <i>Likely studies include: Bandura, Pavlov, Skinner, Watson and Raynor, Griffiths. Other appropriate studies should be credited e.g. Reicher &amp; Haslam/ Piliavin.</i></p> <p><i>Do NOT credit evidence from studies such as Savage-Rumbaugh or Freud as these were not experiments.</i></p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>supported by <u>relevant</u> evidence from <u>two</u> appropriate experiments.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – An appropriate difference is identified and supported by <u>relevant</u> evidence from <u>one</u> appropriate experiment</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – An appropriate difference between two appropriate experiments is merely identified.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p>		
d	<p>Strengths may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Independent variables can be manipulated so cause and effect can be inferred</li> <li>• High levels of control mean extraneous variables that could influence findings can be controlled/minimised</li> <li>• High levels of control mean the study can be replicated to check for reliability</li> <li>• Participants are usually aware that they are taking part in an experiment so the ethical guideline of consent is upheld/the right to withdraw can be made clear/ it is easy to debrief participants</li> <li>• Other appropriate strengths should be credited.</li> </ul> <p>Weaknesses may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Controlled environments/unrealistic tasks make the study low in ecological validity so findings may not represent real life situations</li> <li>• There is a strong possibility that participants will respond to demand characteristics so findings lack validity</li> <li>• There is a strong possibility of socially desirable behaviour being demonstrated/answers being given, so findings lack validity.</li> <li>• Participants can be become stressed in a laboratory</li> </ul>	12	<p><i>Evidence is likely to come from Bandura, Pavlov, Skinner, Watson and Raynor, Reicher and Haslam. Other appropriate studies should however be credited.</i></p> <p><i>For a top band answer the candidate must make it clear why their suggestion is a strength/weakness.</i></p> <p><i>The supporting evidence must actually support the identified strength/ i.e. be appropriately contextualised/ linked to a named study that can be viewed from the behaviourist perspective.</i></p> <p><i>Study specific answers are not creditworthy.</i></p> <p><i>Do NOT credit evidence from studies such as Savage-Rumbaugh or Freud as these were not laboratory experiments.</i></p> <p><i>Read through the mark bands carefully before allocating marks.</i></p> <p><i>Responses with only one appropriate strength and one appropriate weakness / only appropriate strengths or only appropriate weaknesses can gain a <u>maximum of 6 marks</u>.</i></p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>environment so ethical guidelines are broken</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 laboratory experiments 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 laboratory experiments 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 laboratory experiments 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 laboratory experiments which are appropriate or peripheral to the question, or there may be an imbalance between the two. Discussion is poor with limited or no understanding. Expression is poor. Analysis is sparse and argument may be just discernible. <u>Sparse or no use of supporting examples.</u></p>		<p><i>Do not credit reference to lab experiments usually having small samples</i></p>

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
18	a	<p>Likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The cognitive approach sees behaviour as being heavily influenced by cognitive process such as perception, language, attention, thinking, problem solving and memory.</li> <li>The cognitive approach sees the human mind as working like a computer – it inputs, processes and responds to and <b>behaviour</b> is influenced by the way information is received and processed.</li> <li>Other appropriate outlines should be credited.</li> </ul> <p><b>2 marks</b> – An appropriate outline is accurately described, such as the ones given above.  <b>1 mark</b> – Vague or partial answer e.g. the cognitive approach studies such things as memory, perception, problem solving and language, the cognitive approach sees the human mind working like a computer – it inputs, processes and responds to information i.e. <u>no link to behaviour</u>.  <b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p>	2	<p><i>The outline 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>
	b	<p>Answers are likely to refer to either the Baron-Cohen study using the Sally Ann Test or the Baron-Cohen study using the Eyes Task.</p> <p>Likely answer could include the following content:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An assumption of the cognitive approach is that internal mental processes influence the way people behave. It has been found that many autistic people have impairments in the development of a theory of mind – a cognitive process that enables people to attribute mental states (knowledge, beliefs, desires and feelings) to others. Lacking a theory of mind may be the core deficit that underlies the social, communicative and imaginative dysfunctions of autistic</li> </ul>	4	<p><i>Although candidates are most likely to refer to either of the Baron-Cohen studies (Sally Ann Test or Eyes Task), a clear well described generic answer should be credited.</i></p> <p><i>To gain more than 2 marks the candidate must make a link to the cognitive approach. A clear link to the cognitive approach must be made for full marks.</i></p> <p><i>For a full answer the description should be supported by either a specific detail from a known study and/or an appropriate generic example.</i></p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>people. Theory of mind is one aspect of autistic mind-blindness and deficits in the normal process of empathising, which also involves appropriate emotional reactions (e.g. sympathy) to other people. Baron-Cohen found that autistic adults had tremendous difficulty in recognising other people's emotional states. Using the Eyes Task, designed to be a 'pure' theory of mind test, he found that autistic participants had more difficulties than either normal adults or adults with Tourette's syndrome in recognising mental states from photographs of eyes – their mean score was 16.3/25 compared to 20.3/25 for normal adults and 20.4/25 for those with Tourette's. This indicated that the autistic participants lacked a theory of mind. This deficit in mental processing may therefore explain why such people have difficulty empathising with others / understanding other people's mental states.</p> <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 is evident and there are clear links to the approach. 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 either a specific study or a specific example.</u></p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p>		
c	Answers are likely to refer to sample, methodology (in relation to experiments), ethics	6	<p><b>3+3</b> Likely studies include Loftus &amp; Palmer, Baron-Cohen (Sally-Anne Test and/or Eyes Task), Samuel and Bryant, Griffiths.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><u>Similarity</u> Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both Loftus and Palmer and Baron-Cohen conducted experiments with high levels of control so cause and effect could be inferred .....</li> <li>• The experiments conducted by Loftus and Palmer and Samuel and Bryant both raise the ethical issue of stress (as there is no evidence in the original study that this issue was managed through a debriefing at the end of the study) .....</li> <li>• Other appropriate similarities should be credited.</li> </ul> <p><b>3 marks</b> – An appropriate similarity is identified and supported by <u>relevant</u> evidence from <u>two</u> appropriate experiments.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – An appropriate similarity is identified and supported by <u>relevant</u> evidence from <u>one</u> appropriate experiment</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – An appropriate similarity between two appropriate experiments is merely identified.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><u>Difference:</u> <u>Examples:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The samples used in the experiments conducted by Baron-Cohen and Griffiths were different .....</li> <li>• The type of experiment conducted by Loftus and Palmer was different to the type of experiment conducted by Griffiths .....</li> <li>• Other appropriate differences should be credited.</li> </ul> <p><b>3 marks</b> – An appropriate difference is identified and</p>		<p><i>Other appropriate studies should be credited.</i></p> <p><i>Do NOT credit evidence from studies such as Savage-Rumbaugh as this was not an experiment.</i></p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>supported by <u>relevant</u> evidence from <u>two</u> appropriate experiments.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – An appropriate difference is identified and supported by <u>relevant</u> evidence from <u>one</u> appropriate experiment</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – An appropriate difference between two appropriate experiments is merely identified.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p>		
d	<p>Strengths may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Independent variables can be manipulated so cause and effect can be inferred</li> <li>• High levels of control mean extraneous variables that could influence findings can be controlled/minimised</li> <li>• High levels of control mean the study can be replicated to check for reliability</li> <li>• Participants are usually aware that they are taking part in an experiment so the ethical guideline of consent is upheld/the right to withdraw can be made clear/ it is easy to debrief participants</li> <li>• Other appropriate strengths should be credited.</li> </ul> <p>Weaknesses may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Controlled environments/unrealistic tasks make the study low in ecological validity so findings may not represent real life situations.....</li> <li>• There is a strong possibility that participants will respond to demand characteristics so findings lack validity.....</li> <li>• There is a strong possibility of socially desirable behaviour being demonstrated/answers being given, so findings lack validity.....</li> </ul>	12	<p><i>Evidence is likely to come from Loftus &amp; Palmer, Baron-Cohen (Sally-Anne Test and/or Eyes Task), Samuel and Bryant. Other appropriate studies should however be credited.</i></p> <p><i>For a top band answer the candidate must make it clear why their suggestion is a strength/weakness.</i></p> <p><i>The supporting evidence must actually support the identified strength/ i.e. be appropriately contextualised/ linked to a named study that can be viewed from the cognitive approach.</i></p> <p><i>Do NOT credit evidence from studies such as Savage-Rumbaugh as this was not a laboratory experiments.</i></p> <p><i>Study specific answers are not creditworthy.</i></p> <p><i>Read through the mark bands carefully before allocating marks.</i></p> <p><i>Responses with only one appropriate strength and one appropriate weakness / only appropriate strengths or only appropriate weaknesses can gain a <u>maximum of 6 marks</u>.</i></p> <p><i>Do not credit reference to lab experiments usually having</i></p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participants can be become stressed in a laboratory environment so ethical guidelines are broken.....</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 laboratory experiments 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 laboratory experiments 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 laboratory experiments 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 laboratory experiments 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>		<i>small samples</i>

**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 2014

