OCR
Oxford Cambridge and RSA

GCE

Psychology

Unit **G542**: Core Studies

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

Mark Scheme for June 2017

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.

Annotations in scoris. The following annotations are available:

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

Question			Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
1	(a)		**From the study by Baron-Cohen, Joliffe, Mortimore and Robertson on autism in adults:** **Outline one finding from the performance of the autistic/Asperger syndrome adults on the Eyes Task.** Most likely answers: • The autistic/AS adults had a mean score of 16.3/25 (on the Eyes Task). • The autistic/AS adults had a range of 13 – 23/25 correct answers (on the Eyes Task). • The autistic/AS adults performed worse than either normal adults or the adults with Tourettes (on the Eyes Task). • The autistic/AS adults performed worse than the normal adults (on the Eyes Task) (scoring 16.3/25 compared to 23/25). • The autistic/AS adults performed worse than adults with Tourettes (on the Eyes Task) (scoring 16.3/25 compared to 24/25. • Other appropriate outlines should be credited.	[2]	**2 marks** –A clear, fully contextualised outline, such as one of the ones given. **1 mark** – Partial or vague answer e.g. partial: the autistic/AS adults had a mean score of 16.3 /had a range of 13 – 23 correct answers i.e. the total possible score (25) has not been included; vague: the autistics/AS adults performed the worst. If the answer is not contextualised, only 1 mark can be awarded. **0 marks** – No or irrelevant answer e.g. any references to tasks other than the Eyes Task, no reference to the performance of the autistic/AS adults.
	(b)		**From the study by Baron-Cohen, Joliffe, Mortimore and Robertson on autism in adults:** **Outline one conclusion from the findings of the Eyes Task in relation to autism in adults.** Most likely answers: • Adults with autism/AS possess an impaired theory of	[2]	**2 marks** –An appropriate, fully contextualised conclusion is drawn, such as one of the ones listed. **1 mark** – Partial or vague answer e.g. adults with autism/AS possess an impaired theory of mind / TOM, adults with autism/AS have a cognitive deficit i.e. answer not adequately contextualised to the named study. **0 marks** – No or irrelevant answer e.g. findings from other tests /repeat or further findings from the Eyes

Question			Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
			mind / TOM as they performed worse (on the Eyes Task) than either normal adults or adults with Tourettes. • As some of the autistic/AS participants held university degrees, one may conclude that poor performance on the Eyes Task was not linked to intelligence. • The fact that the adults with Tourettes did not differ from the normal adults on the Eyes Task suggests that the TOM deficits demonstrated by those with autism/AS were not due to having any developmental neuropsychiatric disorder. • Other appropriate conclusions should be credited.		Task without a conclusion.
2			**From Loftus and Palmer's study on eyewitness testimony:** **Outline two ways in which this study lacked ecological validity.** Most likely answers: • The study was conducted in a controlled environment where participants watched film clips of traffic accidents which does not represent real life (in relation to eyewitness testimony). • Participants watched 7 film clips of traffic accidents / a film clip of a multiple car crash / films of traffic accidents and were then asked to complete a questionnaire on the incident(s) they had just watched. This does not represent real life / in real life one is not asked to complete a questionnaire after witnessing a traffic accident. • Four of the seven films (shown in Experiment 1) were staged crashes so not true to real life (in relation to eyewitness testimony). • Other appropriate answers should be credited.	**[2+2=4]**	**2 marks** – A clear, fully contextualised outline, such as one of the ones given. **1 mark** – Partial or vague answer e.g. participants watched film clips of traffic accidents i.e. partial as there is no link to 'not true to real life', the study was conducted in a controlled environment/laboratory setting so not true to real life i.e. vague, no contextualisation. **0 marks** – No or irrelevant answer.

Question			Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
3	(a)		**From Savage-Rumbaugh's study into symbol acquisition by pygmy chimpanzees:** **Outline the 'spoken English to photograph' test used to assess Kanzi's language acquisition.** Most likely answer: • Kanzi listened to the spoken English word and then had to select the appropriate photograph from a set of three alternatives. (The English word was usually presented in a sentence and then repeated). • Other appropriate outlines should be credited.	[2]	**2 marks** - A clear, fully contextualised outline, such the one given above. **1 mark –** Partial or vague answer e.g. Kanzi heard the spoken English word and then had to select the correct photograph,/the experimenter said a word and Kanzi had to point to the same word/object i.e. partial as there is no reference to there being three alternative photographs to choose from. **0 marks** – No or irrelevant answer e.g. outlines of any of the other formal tests, reference to the use of a lexigram or pointing board is not creditworthy.
	(b)		**From Savage-Rumbaugh's study into symbol acquisition by pygmy chimpanzees:** **Outline the blind test used to assess Kanzi's knowledge of the foraging sites in the forest.** Most likely answer: • Kanzi had to select a photograph or point to a lexigram (on the pointing board) indicating where he would like to go and then lead the experimenter, who had never been in the forest with Kanzi, to the correct location. • Other appropriate outlines should be credited.	[2]	**2 marks** - A clear, fully contextualised outline, such as the one given. **1 mark –** Partial or vague answer e.g. Kanzi had to select a photograph / lexigram and take the experimenter to the correct location, Kanzi had to select a photograph/ lexigram indicating where he wanted to go and then take the experimenter to the correct location i.e. partial as there is no indication of how this was a blind test. **0 marks –** No or irrelevant answer.

<table>
<tr><th colspan="3">Question</th><th>Expected Answer</th><th>Mark</th><th>Rationale/Additional Guidance</th></tr>
<tr><td>4</td><td>(a)</td><td></td><td>

The table below represents the mean number of errors made in the three conditions manipulated by Samuel and Bryant in their study on conservation:

Results by mean number of errors

<table>
<tr><th></th><th colspan="3">Condition</th></tr>
<tr><th>Age group</th><th>Standard</th><th>One question</th><th>Fixed array</th></tr>
<tr><td>5-year-olds</td><td>8.5</td><td>7.3</td><td>8.6</td></tr>
<tr><td>6-year-olds</td><td>5.7</td><td>4.3</td><td>6.4</td></tr>
<tr><td>7-year-olds</td><td>3.2</td><td>2.6</td><td>4.9</td></tr>
<tr><td>8-year-olds</td><td>1.7</td><td>1.3</td><td>3.3</td></tr>
</table>

Outline one finding from the above table.

Examples of likely answers:

- The 5-year-olds in the standard condition made an average of 8.5 mistakes / errors.
- The 6-year-olds in the one question condition made an average of 4.3 mistakes / errors.
- The 7-year-olds in the fixed array condition made an average of 4.9 mistakes / errors
- The 8-year-oldsin the one question condition made an average of 1.3 mistakes / errors.
- The mean number of errors in the Standard condition decreased as age increased
- Other appropriate findings from the table should be credited.

</td><td>[1+1=2]</td><td>

1 mark – One correct finding from the given chart.
0 marks – No or incorrect answer e.g. a finding not taken from the given table.

</td></tr>
</table>

Question			Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	(b)		**Explain the purpose of the fixed array condition in this study.** Most likely answer: • The purpose of the fixed array condition was to check that children who answered the post-transformation question correctly in the other two conditions (standard and one question) did so by bringing over information from the pre-transformation display (page 316 of original study). • The purpose of the fixed array condition was to show that the children in the other two conditions (standard and one question) were using the information about how the materials looked in the first place to inform their answers to the post-transformation question. • This was a control condition to show that seeing the materials being transformed positively influenced the children's ability to conserve. • Other appropriate explanations should be credited.	**[2]**	**2 marks** – A clear, fully contextualised explanation such as one of the ones given. **1 mark** – Partial or vague answer e.g. as a control / check i.e. vague with no contextualisation **0 marks** – No or irrelevant answer.
5	**(a)**		**From Freud's study of Little Hans:** **According to Freud's theory of psychosexual development why did Little Hans show 'a quite peculiarly lively interest in his widdler'?** Most likely answer: • Hans was going through the phallic stage (of psychosexual development) in which a boy shows particular interest in their penis / genitals (and masturbation). • Hans was going through the phallic stage (of psychosexual development) in which a boy becomes focused of his penis and enjoys playing with his genitals.	**[2]**	*The candidate must refer to the phallic stage though 'of psychosexual development' is not necessary.* **2 marks** – A clear, fully contextualised suggestion is made, such as one of the ones given. **1 mark** – Partial or vague answer e.g. Hans was in the phallic stage (of psychosexual development), Hans was going through stage 3 of psychosexual development e.g. vague as no reference to the relevant characteristic of this stage has been included. **0 marks** – No or irrelevant answer.

Question			Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
			• Other appropriate suggestions linked to psychosexual development should be credited.		
	(b)		**From Freud's study of Little Hans:** **Describe the incident Hans felt was the origin of his fear of being bitten by a horse.** Most likely answers: • Hans traced his fear of being bitten by a horse to an impression he had received at Gmunden. A father had addressed his child on her departure with these words of warning, "Don't put your finger to the white horse or it will bite you." (From the original text.) • Hans felt the origin of his fear was hearing a father tell his child not to put their finger to a horse because it would bite them. • Other appropriate descriptions relating to the incident should be credited.	**[2]**	*To gain full marks the candidate must include reference to 'finger' and 'biting' as these link to Hans' later castration anxiety.* *Any references to Hans' mother seeing him playing with his widdler and saying she would get the doctor to cut it off/references to castration are not creditworthy.* **2 marks** – A clear, fully contextualised description such as one of the ones given. **1 mark** – Partial or vague answer e.g. because he had heard someone tell their child a horse can bite i.e. vague because there is no real contextualisation to the named study. **0 marks** – No or irrelevant answer.
6			**From Bandura et al.'s study of aggression:** **Describe how the model behaved in the aggressive condition.** Answer content from: • The model began by assembling the tinker toys but after approximately a minute had elapsed, the model turned to the Bobo doll and spent the remainder of the period aggressing toward it. In addition to punching the Bobo doll, the model exhibited distinctive aggressive acts (which were scored as imitative responses). The model laid the Bobo doll on its side, sat on it and punched it	**[4]**	**3-4 marks** – An increasingly accurate, detailed and fully contextualised description based on the one given including reference to both verbal and physical aggressive acts. **1-2 marks** – Partial or vague answer e.g. the model began by assembling the tinker toys but then turned to the Bobo doll and started to kick and punch it; the model punched the Bobo doll, sat on it, and hit it on the head with a mallet. **0 marks** – No or irrelevant answer e.g. descriptions of how the model behaved in the non-aggressive condition. *For 4 marks: more than 4 elements of the procedure*

Question			Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
			repeatedly in the nose. The model then raised the Bobo doll, picked up the mallet and struck the doll on the head. Following the mallet aggression, the model tossed the doll up in the air aggressively and kicked it about the room. This sequence of physically aggressive acts was repeated approximately three times, interspersed with verbally aggressive responses such as, "Sock him in the nose....", "Hit him down ....", "Throw him in the air ....", "Kick him ....", "Pow ....", and two non-aggressive comments: "He keeps coming back for more." and "He sure is a tough fella." (Taken from the original text.) • Other appropriate descriptions should be credited.		*including reference to both physical and verbal aggressive acts must be included.* *For 3 marks: 4 elements of the procedure must be included.* *For 2 marks: 3 elements of the procedure must be included.* *For 1 mark: up to two elements of the procedure must be included.*
7	**(a)**		**From Maguire et al.'s study of taxi drivers:** **Identify the two techniques used to examine the effects of taxi driving on brain structure.** 1 Voxel-based morphometry/ VBM. 2 Pixel counting.	**[1+1=2]**	**2 marks** – Both techniques correctly identified **1 mark** – One technique correctly identified **0 marks** – No or irrelevant answer e.g. MRI scans.
	(b)		**From Maguire et al.'s study of taxi drivers:** **Describe one finding from this study in relation to taxi and non-taxi drivers.** Most likely answers: • Taxi drivers had significantly increased/more/larger amount of grey matter volume in the (right and left) posterior hippocampi <u>compared to</u> non-taxi drivers. • In the non-taxi drivers there was a relatively less grey matter volume in the posterior hippocampi <u>compared to</u> taxi drivers.	**[2]**	***Examiners must be prepared to check candidates' responses against the findings given in the original study.*** **2 marks** – A clear, accurate description of a finding that refers to both taxi and non-taxi drivers **1 mark** – Partial or vague answer e.g. in the non-taxi drivers there was a relatively less grey matter volume in the posterior hippocampi, taxi drivers had significantly increased grey matter volume in the posterior hippocampi i.e. a partial answer as the comparison has not been completed / only one group has been referred to.

Question			Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
			• In the non-taxi drivers there was a relatively greater grey matter volume/larger volume of grey matter/more grey matter in the anterior hippocampi compared to taxi drivers. • Taxi drivers had a significantly decreased grey matter volume in the (right and left) anterior hippopcampi compared to non-taxi drivers. • Other appropriate findings should be credited.		**0 marks** – No or irrelevant answer references to the correlational analysis as this did not involve the non-taxi drivers. Any references to the SIZE of the hippocampus are not creditworthy. Responses that give one finding for taxi drivers and a different one for non-taxi drivers because this does not actually answer the question which asks for one finding in relation to taxi AND non-taxi drivers. *To gain full marks the candidate must refer to both taxi and non-taxi drivers as this is in the strap line.*
8	**(a)**		**From Sperry's split-brain study:** **Describe how patients responded to visual material presented to their left visual field.** Most likely answer: • If material was presented to a patient's left visual field the patient either insisted that he had not seen anything or that he had merely seen a flash of light (on the left). • If material was presented to a patient's left visual field the patient was unable to name the object but could point to a matching object or picture (presented among a collection of other pictures or objects) using his left hand. • If material was presented to a patient's left visual field the patient was could retrieve the item pictured from a collection of objects using blind touch with the left hand. • Other appropriate descriptions should be credited.	**[2]**	**2 marks** – A clear and accurate outline such as one of the ones given. **1 mark** – Partial or vague answer e.g. if material was presented to a patient's left visual field the patient insisted that he had not seen anything, if material was presented to a patient's left visual field the patient said that he had merely seen a flash of light, the patient was unable to name the object, the patient but could point to a matching object or picture (presented among a collection of other pictures or objects) using his left hand i.e. only one way the patient responded has been included in the answer because the question asks candidates to describe how patients responded, it does not ask merely for one way patients responded. **0 marks** – No or irrelevant answer e.g. references to how the patient responded to material presented to the RVF, *As this is a 2 mark answer both reference to not 'seeing anything' and 'seeing a flash of light' / 'not being able to name the object' but 'being able to point to it with the left hand' must be included to gain full marks.*

Question			Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	(b)		**From Sperry's split-brain study:** **Describe how patients responded to objects placed in their right hands.** Most likely answer: • Objects placed in the right hand could be described / named in speech and writing / drawing (with the right hand). • Patients could retrieve the object from a grab bag using the same/right hand. • Patients were ~~un~~able to name the object ~~but~~ and were able to point to it with the ~~left~~ right hand. • Other appropriate descriptions should be credited.	**[2]**	**2 marks** - A clear and accurate description such as the one given. **1 mark** – Partial or vague answer e.g. objects placed in the right hand could be described / named, objects placed in the right hand could be written / drawn i.e. a partial answer as only one ability has been referred to. Objects placed in their right hands could be described verbally i.e. the candidate has not made it clear that verbally refers to speech and writing. **0 marks** - No or irrelevant answer e.g. references to how the patient responded to objects placed in the left hand. *As this is a 2 mark answer both 'describing / naming' and ''writing / drawing' must be included to gain full marks.*
9			**From Dement and Kleitman's study of sleep and dreaming:** **Describe two ways quantitative data was gathered.** Most likely answers: • Quantitative data measuring how often REM periods occurred was gathered through the use of an EEG machine. • Quantitative data measuring how long REM periods lasted was gathered through the use of an EEG machine • Quantitative data was gathered by counting / recording the number of dreams recalled by participants when woken from REM / NREM. • Quantitative data was gathered by counting / recording the number of times participants could not remember dreaming when woken from REM / NREM. • Quantitative data was gathered by counting / recording the number of correct / incorrect estimates when	**[2+2=4]**	**2 marks** - A clear and accurate description such as one of the ones given. **1 mark** – Partial or vague answer e.g. REM periods were measured through the use of an EEG machine i.e. a vague answer as there is no real link to quantitative data; quantitative data was gathered by counting / recording the number of dreams i.e. a partial answer as there is no real contextualisation – link to REM / NREM **0 marks** – No or irrelevant answer e.g. references to awakenings after vertical/horizontal/vertical & horizontal/very little or no eye movements as these gathered qualitative data.

Question			Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
			participants were asked whether they thought they had been dreaming for 5 or 15 minutes. • Other appropriate descriptions should be credited e.g. quantitative data was gathered through the use of an EOG which measured the frequency of patterns of eye movement.		
10	(a)		**Piliavin, Rodin and Piliavin's subway Samaritan study is generally considered a field experiment.** **Outline the 'field' environment in this study.** Most likely answers: • The field situation was the A and D trains of the 8th Avenue IND which had nonstops between 59th Street and 125th Street. • The field situation was a non-stop ride between 59th and 125th Street on the New York subway. • The field situation was a train on the New York subway which travelled through Harlem to the Bronx. • The field situation was a (real) train/carriage on the New York subway. • Other appropriate outlines should be credited.	[2]	**2 marks** - A clear and accurate outline such as one of the ones given. **1 mark** – Partial or vague answer e.g. a real train, the New York subway. **0 marks** – No or irrelevant answer
	(b)		**Piliavin, Rodin and Piliavin's subway Samaritan study is generally considered a field experiment.** **Suggest one weakness of using a field experiment in this study.** Most likely answers will refer to the lack of control over extraneous variables and / or practical difficulties e.g.: • Lack of control over the fact that passengers may witness the victim collapsing more than once. • A genuine lame / drunk person may already be on the train preventing the stooge victim playing their role. • No passengers may board the train on any occasion	[2]	**2 marks** - A clear, accurate and fully contextualised suggestion such as one of the ones given. **1 mark** – Partial or vague answer e.g. the train may be crowded i.e. a partial answer with context but no suggestion as to why this is a weakness/no justification, lack of control over extraneous variables i.e. a vague answer with <u>no contextualisation,</u> **0 marks** – No or irrelevant answer.

Question			Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
			making a planned trial unnecessary • The train being so crowded the research team could not get on the train to conduct the experiment. • The train being so crowded passengers blocked the observers' view so they could not record data accurately / see the passengers' behaviours clearly. • Other appropriate weaknesses should be credited e.g. references to ethical weaknesses such as stress, contextualised to the study.		
11			**From Milgram's study of obedience:** **Outline two ways in which ethical issues were addressed in this study.** Likely answers: • Participants were debriefed. They were interviewed, open-ended questions, projective measures, and attitude scales were employed / After the interview, procedures were undertaken to assure that the participant would leave the laboratory in a state of well being / A friendly reconciliation was arranged between the participant (teacher) and the victim / learner, and an effort was made to reduce any tensions that arose as a result of the experience/participants were debriefed at the end and told the true aim of the study was to investigate levels of obedience. • Participants gave consent. As all participants responded to an advert and so volunteered to take part, they gave consent to take part in their study. • Protection from harm. Procedures were undertaken to assure that the participant would leave the laboratory in a state of well being by arranging a friendly reconciliation between the participants (teacher) and the victim/learner. • Confidentiality was maintained as no names of any of the participants were made public so no-one knows the	**[2+2=4]**	**2 marks** – An accurate, detailed and fully contextualised description based on the ones given above. **1 mark** – Partial or vague answer e.g. participants were debriefed i.e. mere identification of an ethical issue that was addressed, protection from harm: procedures were undertaken to assure that the participant would leave the laboratory in a state of well being i.e. no contextualisation. **0 marks** – No or irrelevant answer.

Question			Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
			names of those who went up to the 450 volts. • Right to withdraw. Participants were allowed to leave the study at any point if they no longer wanted to continue. This was shown through 14 of the participants withdrawing before they reached the full 450 volt level. • Other appropriate outline and issues should be credited.		
12			**From Reicher and Haslam's BBC prison study:** **Outline two of the interventions planned for this study.** Most likely answers: • Permeability: prisoners were told that the guards would be observing them to see if they showed guard-like qualities. They were told that if they did, there was provision for a promotion to be made on Day 3. • Legitimacy: three days after the promotion, participants were to be informed (by the experimenters that observations had revealed) that there were in fact no differences between guards and prisoners on the key group-defining qualities but that as it was impractical to reassign them, the groups would be kept as they were. • Cognitive alternatives: a new prisoner was to be introduced who had a background as an experienced trade union official. • Other appropriate outlines of permeability / legitimacy / cognitive alternatives should be credited.	**[2+2=4]**	**2 marks** - A clear, accurate, fully contextualised and identified outline of one of the planned interventions. **1 mark** – Partial or vague answer e.g. the mere identification of a planned intervention i.e. permeability, legitimacy, cognitive alternatives = no contextualisation/not an outline. **0 marks** – No or irrelevant answer.

Question			Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
13			**From Rosenhan's study 'On being sane in insane places':** **Describe two ways deception was used in this study.** Most likely answers: • When the pseudopatients reported to the hospitals they used fake names (pseudonyms) and so lied to the doctors/nurses. • The pseudopatients falsely complained they had been hearing voices (that said 'empty', 'hollow' and 'thud'. • Staff at a hospital not involved in the original study were told that at some time during the following 3 months, one or more pseudopatients would attempt to be admitted into the psychiatric hospital when in reality no pseudopatients presented themselves. • Other appropriate descriptions and ways participants were deceived should be credited.	[2+2=4]	**2 marks** - A clear, accurate and fully contextualised description such as one of the ones given. **1 mark** – Partial or vague answer e.g. pseudopatients gave false names i.e. an identification of a way participants were deceived, not a description; pseudopatients complained they had been hearing voices i.e. no link to deception. **0 marks** – No or irrelevant answer. *To gain full marks candidates must make a clear / obvious link to deception.* *The question asks for a description so the mere identification of a way pseudopatients were deceived can only gain 1 mark.*
14	(a)		**From Griffiths' study into fruit machine gambling:** **Describe the purpose of the post-experimental semi-structured interviews.** Most likely answers: • The purpose was to gauge RGs' and NRGs' opinions about the level of skill involved • The purpose was to find out how participants judged their level of skill in relation to gambling. • The purpose was to ask RGs and NRGs about their thoughts and opinions about various aspects of skill. • The purpose was to ask participants about their thoughts and opinions about various aspects of skill in relation to	[2]	**2 marks** - A clear, accurate and fully contextualised description such as one of the ones given. **1 mark** – Partial or vague answer e.g. to find out about skill levels, to find out participants' opinions about their skill levels i.e. no real contextualisation as there is no link to fruit machine gambling / playing. **0 marks –** No or irrelevant answer e.g. answers that do not refer to skill.

Question			Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
			gambling. • Other appropriate descriptions should be credited.		
	(b)		**From Griffiths' study into fruit machine gambling:** **Outline one finding from the post-experimental semi-structured interviews.** Most likely answers: • RGs saw fruit machine gambling as relying more on skill than NRGs. • RGs rated their skill levels more highly than NRGs. • Most NRGs said that fruit machine gambling success was due 'mostly to luck'. • Most RGs said that fruit machine gambling success was 'equal chance and skill'. • When asked how skilful they thought they were (compared to the average person), RGs claimed they were at least of average skill. • Many RGs claimed they were either 'above average skill' or 'totally skilled' (when asked how skilful they thought they were). • NRGs on the whole viewed themselves as 'below average skill' or 'totally unskilled'. • When asked, "What skill (if any) is involved in playing fruit machines?" there was a lot of similarity between the skills listed by both RGs and NRGs. • When asked, "What skill (if any) is involved in playing fruit machines?" RGs suggested knowledge of the 'gamble' / knowledge of 'features of skills' / knowledge of when the	[2]	***Examiners must be prepared to check candidates' responses against the findings given in the original study.*** **2 marks** - A clear, accurate and fully contextualised outline of an appropriate finding such as one of the ones given above. **1 mark** – Partial or vague answer e.g. RGs rated their skills more highly i.e. a partial answer as the comparison has not been completed / only one group has been referred to. **0 marks –** No or irrelevant answer.

Question			Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
			machine will pay out / not playing if the machine has just paid out more often than NRGs. • Other appropriate outlines should be credited.		
15	(a)		**Thigpen and Cleckley's study into multiple personality disorder was a longitudinal case study.** **Describe how the longitudinal case study method was used in this study.** Most likely answers: • A longitudinal case study is an in-depth study of one individual, a small group or an institution / organisation which takes place over an extended period of time so changes / developments in behaviour can be observed and recorded. Here, Eve White was studied intensively over a 14-month period during which time Thigpen and Cleckley were able to observe the appearance of two other personalities - Eve Black and Jane. • The longitudinal case study method was used by studying one individual / the same individual – Eve White – intensively over an extended period of time – 14 months. • The longitudinal case study method allowed Thigpen and Cleckley to study in depth the three personalities – Eve White, Eve Black and Jane over a long period of time – 14 months. • Other appropriate descriptions should be credited.	[2]	**2 marks** - A clear, accurate and fully contextualised description such as one of the ones given. **1 mark** – Partial or vague answer e.g. it is an in-depth study of one individual, a small group or an institution / organisation which takes place over an extended period of time, it is an in-depth study of one individual, a small group or an institution / organisation which takes place over an extended period of time so changes / developments in behaviour can be observed and recorded i.e. a description of the longitudinal case study method with no contextualisation; the three personalities – Eve White, Eve Black and Jane were studied for a long time i.e. no clear link to the longitudinal case study method. **0 marks –** No or irrelevant answer.

Question			Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	(b)		**Thigpen and Cleckley's study into multiple personality disorder was a longitudinal case study.** **Describe one strength of using the longitudinal case study method in this study.** Most likely answers: • The use of a longitudinal case study allowed Thigpen and Cleckley to throw light on Eve White's initial problem of suffering from 'severe and blinding headaches'. They were able to study her intensively over a 14-month period to find that these seemed to be caused by the appearance of two other personalities – Eve Black and Jane. • Thigpen and Cleckley were able to study Eve White intensively to gather in-depth information about her behaviour and personality. Over the 14 month period of the study they were able to observe and monitor changes / developments in her behaviour, noting the appearance of Eve Black and Jane. • Other appropriate strengths should be credited.	[2]	**2 marks** - A clear, accurate and fully contextualised strength such as one of the ones given. **1 mark** – Partial or vague answer e.g. lots of in-depth information could be gathered about Eve White, Eve Black and Jane i.e. partial as there is no link to 'longitudinal', it allowed Eve White to be studied for 14 months i.e. partial as there is no link to 'case study'; it allows for lots of in-depth information to be gathered about one individual over an extended period of time i.e. vague as there is no contextualisation. **0 marks** – No or irrelevant answer.

Question			Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
16			**Choose one of the core studies below:** • **Bandura, Ross and Ross: transmission of aggression** • **Piliavin, Rodin and Piliavin: subway Samaritan** • **Griffiths: fruit machine gambling** **And answer parts (a) – (f) on your chosen study.**		
	(a)		**Outline one way qualitative data was gathered in your chosen study.** Most likely answers: <u>Bandura:</u> • Through observing (through a one-way mirror) and recording how the children behaved and comments they made whilst playing with the toys (including the Bobo doll) in the final stage of the experiment. • Other appropriate outlines should be credited. <u>Piliavin:</u> • Through the two female observers who recorded spontaneous comments made by nearby passengers • Through the recordings of the two female observers who attempted to elicit comments from a passenger/talk to a passenger sitting next to them (on the train). • Other appropriate outlines should be credited. <u>Griffiths:</u> • Through the use of the 'thinking aloud' condition in which the thoughts and feelings of the RGs and NRGs were recorded using a lapel microphone and tape recorder whilst they played on the fruit machines.	**[2]**	**2 marks** –A clear, <u>fully contextualised</u> outline of how qualitative data was gathered, such as **one** of the ones outlined. **1 mark** – Partial or vague answer e.g. a way qualitative data was gathered <u>is merely identified and / or is not fully contextualised</u> e.g. Bandura - through observing and recording how the children behaved and comments they made, Piliavin - through the recordings of the two female observers, Griffiths - through the use of the 'thinking aloud' condition / through the post-experimental semi-structured interview **0 marks** – No or irrelevant answer e.g. references to how quantitative data was gathered.

Question			Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
			• Through the post-experimental semi-structured interview during which the thoughts and feelings of the RGs and NRGs relating to skill were recorded. • Other appropriate outlines should be credited.		
	(b)		**Explain why your chosen study can be considered an experiment.** Answers should include: • An introductory explanation of how and why the chosen study can be considered an experiment. • Evidence from the chosen study illustrating why it can be considered an experiment. Most likely answers will refer to: • The IV(s) could be manipulated to see their affect on the DV. • The ability to infer cause and effect due to the ability to manipulate variables. • The ability to manipulate / control conditions. • Other appropriate suggestions should be credited. <u>Example answers:</u> <u>Bandura:</u> • Bandura's study can be considered an experiment because he was able to manipulate independent variables (IVs) to see what effect they had on the dependent variable (DV). He was able to manipulate the IVs of whether the children saw an aggressive or a non-aggressive model and whether the children saw a male	**[4]**	**3-4 marks** –An increasingly detailed and accurate explanation, similar to one of the ones given. Understanding is evident. Expression and use of psychological terminology is reasonable. Appropriate evidence supports the explanation i.e. the answer is <u>appropriately contextualised</u>. **1-2 marks** – The explanation is very basic and lacks detail Some understanding may be evident. Expression is generally poor e.g. Piliavin was able to infer cause and effect due to the ability to manipulate variables so he could infer that the variables manipulated affected people's helping behaviour. <u>If there is no contextualisation, no more than 1 mark can be awarded e.g.</u> Bandura's study can be considered an experiment because he was able to manipulate independent variables (IVs) to see what effect they had on the dependent variable (DV). **0 marks** – No or irrelevant answer.

Question			Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
			or female model. By doing this he was able to study the effect these IVs had on the aggressive and non-aggressive behaviour of the children. <u>Piliavin:</u> • Piliavin was able to infer cause and effect due to the ability to manipulate variables. Piliavin was able to manipulate the type of victim (drunk or carrying a cane, the race of the victim (black or white) and the effect of a model (after 70 or 150 seconds). This allowed them to infer that these variables affect whether or not people will help others in need. (For example, a man carrying a cane is more likely to receive help than a drunk man, so the type of victim affects helping behaviour). <u>Griffiths:</u> • Griffiths was able to infer cause and effect because he was able to control the conditions participants were assigned to. He was able to manipulate whether the regular and non-regular gamblers were placed in the 'thinking aloud' or 'non-thinking loud' condition. This allowed him to infer that regular gamblers have cognitive biases as he found the regular gamblers made more irrational comments whilst playing on the fruit machine than non-regular gamblers.		
	(c)		**Describe one strength and one weakness of the sample used in your chosen study.** Likely answers: <u>Strengths:</u> <u>Bandura:</u>	**[6]**	**Strengths** **3 marks** – A clear, fully contextualised strength is identified and explained/justified with implication considered. **2 marks** – **EITHER** an appropriate strength is identified in context but not explained/ justified e.g. Piliavin – the sample of about 4,500 passengers on the New York subway was large **OR** an appropriate strength is

Question			Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
			• Because the sample consisted of young children, aged 37-69 months / mean age 52 months, Bandura was able to show how easily aggression can be learnt from adult role models. • Because the sample was relatively large (72 children in total), it can be considered representative and so the findings in relation to the transmission of aggression can be generalised. • Other appropriate strengths should be credited. Piliavin: • Because it was a very large sample of about 4,500 men and women, the sample may be considered representative and the findings can be generalised to the target population of passengers on the New York subway. • Because the sample had a fairly equal ratio of white:black passengers (55:45%), Piliavin was able to observe whether whites and blacks were more likely to help a member of their own race rather than a member of the other race. • Other appropriate strengths should be credited. Griffiths: • Because Griffiths used a relatively large sample of 30 regular gamblers (RGs) and 30 non-regular gamblers (NRGs) one may consider the sample representative and so findings in relation to gambling behaviour can be generalised. • Because most of the regular and non-regular gamblers were drawn from the Exeter area of Devon one may consider the sample representative of that area and so findings in relation to gambling behaviour can be		identified and explained / justified but there is no contextualisation e.g. Piliavin - Because it was a very large sample it may be considered representative and the findings can be generalised. **1 mark** – An appropriate strength is merely identified e.g. Bandura - the sample was relatively large. **0 marks** – No or irrelevant answer e.g. references to how the sample was gathered. **Weaknesses** **3 marks** – A clear, fully contextualised weakness is identified and explained/justified with implication considered. **2 marks** – **EITHER** an appropriate weakness is identified in context but not explained/ justified e.g. Griffiths - The age range was limited – mean age = 23.4 years **OR** an appropriate weakness is identified and explained / justified but there is no contextualisation e.g. Griffiths - The age range was too limited for the sample to be representative so findings cannot be generalised to the population as a whole. **1 mark** – An appropriate weakness is merely identified e.g. Bandura - the sample only consisted of young children. **0 marks** – No or irrelevant answer e.g. references to how the sample was gathered.

Question			Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
			generalised to at least the Exeter area. • Other appropriate strengths should be credited. <u>Weaknesses:</u> <u>Bandura:</u> • Because Bandura used young children aged 37-69 months / mean age 52 months, there were ethical problems in relation to consent / withdrawal / debriefing – explained in relation to the issue identified. • Because the children all came from the same nursery school at Stanford University, they may not have been representative of the population as a whole, so results should not be generalised. • Other appropriate weaknesses should be credited. <u>Piliavin:</u> • Because the sample consisted only of passengers on the New York subway (A and D trains of the 8th Avenue subway, between 59th Street and 125th Street) one cannot be sure that passengers on other lines or who use subways in other areas / countries would behave in the same way so generalising the findings in relation to helping behaviour should be done with caution. • Because the sample was only drawn from passengers on the New York subway between the times of 11.00am and 3.00pm between 15 April and 26 June 1968 we cannot be certain that they were representative of passengers who used the train at other times and in other months, so generalising the findings in relation to helping behaviour should be done with caution. • Other appropriate weaknesses should be credited.		

Question			Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
			Griffiths: • The age range was too limited – mean age = 23.4 years – for the sample to be representative of the gambling population as a whole, so findings cannot be generalised. • Although the gender representation of 29 male:1 female RGs was deemed representative of the gambling population at the time, it is impossible to draw any valid conclusions in relation to the gambling behaviour of females from just one participant. • Other appropriate weakness should be credited.		
	(d)		**Discuss the usefulness of the observation method to gather data in your chosen study.** Answers should include: • An introductory explanation of how and why it was useful/ not useful to use observation to gather data within the chosen study • Evidence supporting the usefulness of observation in the chosen study • Evidence challenging the usefulness of observation in the chosen study. Likely answers: Bandura: Supporting explanation: • Researchers were able to observe the children in the final stage, via a one-way mirror, and note any instances	**[8]**	*The question asks candidates to consider the **usefulness** 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.* **Level 3: 7–8 marks** – An explanation of how observation was used to gather data is provided showing good understanding. This is supported by appropriate supporting **and** challenging evidence e.g. Bandura was able to observe the children in the final stage, via a one-way mirror, and note any instances of imitative aggression (physical, verbal and non-aggressive speech), partially imitative aggression, non-imitative physical and verbal aggression and non-aggressive behaviours. For example he observed that boys imitated male models more than girls for physical aggression whereas girls were observed imitating female models more than boys for verbal aggression. This allowed Bandura to conclude that aggression can be transmitted through the imitation of aggressive

Question			Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
			of imitative aggression (physical, verbal and non-aggressive speech), partially imitative aggression, non-imitative physical and verbal aggression and non-aggressive behaviours which allowed Bandura to conclude that aggression can be transmitted through the imitation of aggressive models. • Other appropriate supporting explanations should be credited. <u>Supporting evidence:</u> • Boys were observed imitating male models more than girls for physical aggression whereas girls were observed imitating female models more than boys for verbal aggression. • Children who had observed an aggressive model displayed more acts of imitative aggression than children who either observed a non-aggressive model or who did not observe a model at all. • Other appropriate supporting evidence should be credited. <u>Challenging explanation</u>: • If the observation is covert, ethical issues can be raised. It was unethical in this study for the observers to watch and record the children's behaviour without them knowing. • Other appropriate challenging explanations should be credited. <u>Challenging evidence:</u> • The children were unaware their social interactions in the nursery school were being observed by the experimenter		models. On the other hand, as the observation was covert, ethical issues could be raised against the study. It was unethical for the observers to watch and record the children's behaviour without them knowing. For example, the children were unaware their behaviour in the final stage was being observed and recorded via a one-way mirror, when they were left alone to play with the Bobo doll and other aggressive and non-aggressive toys. Breaking ethical guidelines can damage the reputation of psychology. **Level 2: 4–6 marks** – An explanation how observation was used to gather data is provided showing good understanding. EITHER supporting OR challenging evidence <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 e.g. The two female researchers in Piliavin et al.'s study were able to observe and record the behaviour of the passengers on a New York subway train when a victim who was either black / white or drunk / lame collapsed within their sight. For example ,they observed that the cane victim received spontaneous help 95% of the time (62/65 trials) compared to the drunk victim 50% of the time (19/38 trials). This allowed Piliavin et al. to suggest that certain features of a victim will affect whether or not they receive help i.e. only a supporting explanation and supporting evidence have been provided. **Level 1: 1–3 marks** – 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 e.g. Using observation to gather data was useful as it allowed Griffiths to gather valuable information in relation to the

Question			Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
			and a nursery school teacher so they could be pre-rated for aggressiveness, (put into matched triplets and then assigned to one of the two experimental groups or to the control group). • The children were unaware their behaviour in the final stage was being observed and recorded via a one-way mirror, when they were left alone to play with the Bobo doll and other aggressive and non-aggressive toys. • Other appropriate challenging evidence should be credited. <u>Piliavin:</u> <u>Supporting explanation</u>: • The two female researchers were able to observe and record the behaviour of the passengers on a New York subway train when a victim who was either black / white or drunk / lame collapsed within their sight. This allowed Piliavin et al. to suggest that certain features of a victim will affect whether or not they receive help. • Other appropriate supporting explanations should be credited. <u>Supporting evidence:</u> • The two females researchers were able to observe that the cane victim received spontaneous help 95% of the time (62/65 trials) compared to the drunk victim 50% of the time (19/38 trials). • The two female researchers were able to observe that 90% of the first helpers were male. • Other appropriate supporting evidence should be credited.		gambling behaviours of both regular gamblers (RGs) and non-regular gamblers (NRGs). This allowed Griffiths to note a variety of behavioural differences between regular and non-regular gamblers i.e. no actual evidence has been provided. / Griffiths was able to observe that RGs had a significantly higher playing rate than NRGs (with eight gambles per minute compared to six). This is useful. **0 marks** – No or irrelevant answer.

Question			Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
			<u>Challenging explanation</u>: • Using observation to gather data did not allow the two female observers to find out why the passengers on the train behaved the way they did. All they could do was note down what they saw. • Other appropriate challenging explanations should be credited. <u>Challenging evidence:</u> • Although no diffusion of responsibility was found was found in this study, the mere use of observation to gather data did not allow the researchers to ask passengers why this was so e.g. why response times were faster with larger groups than with smaller ones. • Although the cane condition / lame victim received spontaneous help 95% of the time compared to 50% of the time for the drunk victim, the mere use of observation to gather data did not allow the researchers to ask passengers why this was so, they had to make assumptions. • Other appropriate challenging evidence should be credited. <u>Griffiths:</u> <u>Supporting explanation</u>: • Using observation to gather data was useful as it allowed Griffiths to gather valuable information in relation to the gambling behaviours of both regular gamblers (RGs) and non-regular gamblers (NRGs). This allowed Griffiths to note a variety of behavioural differences between regular and non-regular gamblers.		*Any references to data being gathered through either the use of the thinking aloud and non-thinking aloud conditions or the post experimental interviews are not creditworthy as these involved gathering data through self-reporting.*

Question			Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
			<u>Supporting evidence:</u> • Griffiths was able to observe that RGs had a significantly higher playing rate than NRGs (with eight gambles per minute compared to six). • Griffiths was able to observe that there was no significant difference between the playing times of RGs and NRGs. • Other appropriate supporting evidence should be credited <u>Challenging explanation</u>: • Using observation to gather data did not allow Griffiths to find out why the RGs and NRGs behaved the way they did whilst playing on the fruit machines. <u>Challenging evidence:</u> • Griffiths was unable to ask the RGs why they had a significantly higher playing rate than NRGs / why NRGs had a significantly lower playing rate than RGs. • Griffiths was unable to ask the RGs why they were able to stay on the fruit machine longer than the NRGs using the initial stake i.e. make more gambles / Griffiths was unable to ask the NRGs why they were not able to stay on the fruit machine as long as the RGs. • Other appropriate challenging evidence should be credited.		
	(e)		**Suggest improvements to your chosen study.** Answers are likely to refer to: • Ways of improving the research method and design.	**[8]**	*As the question asks candidates to suggest improvements to their chosen study, if there is no reference at all as to how the suggested improvement (s) could be implemented no more than 4 marks can be awarded.*

Question			Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
			• Ways of improving the sample. • Ways of improving the sampling technique (Griffiths only). • Ways of improving the procedure. • Ways and reasons for altering the time frame of the study. • Ways of improving data collection / recording. • Ways of improving the type of data gathered. • Ways of improving ethics. • Ways of improving reliability. • Ways of improving validity. • Ways of improving ecological validity. • Ways of reducing the chance that demand characteristics will influence results. • Other appropriate suggestions should be credited.		*No more than 2 marks can be gained if the answer is not linked to the chosen study* **Level 4: 7-8 marks** – Description of two or more appropriate improvements is accurate. Description is detailed with good understanding and clear expression. Improvements would be effective and should be justified/ explained. Implementation has been considered. The answer is competently structured and organised, appropriate to the level and time allowed and has clear links to the chosen study. **Level 3: 5-6 marks –** Description of improvement(s) is appropriate to the study. Description is reasonable with some understanding though expression may be somewhat limited. Some justification/explanation *has* been provided and some thought has been given as to how the improvement(s) could be implemented. The answer has some links to the chosen study. **Level 2: 3-4 marks –** Description of improvement(s) is appropriate to the study. Description is basic and lacks details with some understanding, though expression may be limited. Some justification/explanation may have been provided/ thought *may* have been given as to how the improvements might be implemented. The answer is loosely linked to the chosen study. **Level 1: 1-2 marks –** 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 not linked to the chosen study. **0 marks –** No or irrelevant answer.
	(f)		**Evaluate the improvements you have suggested for your chosen study.**	**[8]**	*No more than 2 marks can be gained if the answer is not linked to the chosen study.*

Question			Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
			Answers are likely to refer to: • More natural/realistic behaviour will be recorded. • Improved validity / ecological validity. • Improved reliability. • Improved generalisability. • Improved usefulness. • Changes in findings/results. • Advantages/disadvantages of improving ethical issues. • Sampling problems. • Cost and time implications. • Other suggestions should be considered and, if appropriate, credited.		*Examiners are advised to read the answer carefully to make sure that explicit links are made to the chosen study and that they are not merely implicit because the candidate is 'carrying over' presumed contextualisation from the previous question part.* *N.B. Any justifications/explanations credited in part (e) cannot be credited again in this question part.* **Level 4: 7-8 marks –** Evaluation of improvements is appropriate to the study. Evaluation is detailed with good 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 clear links to the chosen study. **Level 3: 5-6 marks –** 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 some links to the chosen study. **Level 2: 3-4 marks –** 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 loosely linked to the chosen study. **Level 1: 1-2 marks –**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 not linked to the chosen study. **0 marks –** No or irrelevant answer

Question			Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
17	(a)		**Briefly outline one strength of the social approach.** Likely answers: • One strength of the social approach is that it allows one to study how other people influence an individual's behaviour. • One strength of the social approach is that it allows a researcher to study the effects of an individual's surrounding environment on their behaviour. • One strength of the social approach is that it allows one to study/understand how other people and their surrounding environment can influence people's behaviour. • Other strengths of the social approach, linked to behaviour should be credited.	[2]	*The strength must be clearly linked to:* • *the social approach* • *behaviour* **2 marks** – A strength of the social approach, linked to behaviour, is clearly identifiable. Understanding is obvious. Expression and use of psychological terminology is good. **1 mark** – Partial or vague answer e.g. a strength of the social approach is vague and lacks detail, there is no link to behaviour e.g. one strength of the social approach is that it allows one to study the effects of other people and the surrounding environment i.e. no link to behaviour. Some understanding is evident. Expression is generally poor. **0 marks** – No or irrelevant answer.
	(b)		**Describe how the social approach could explain why people offer assistance to others in need.** **Support your answer with evidence from Piliavin, Rodin and Piliavin's subway Samaritan study.** Likely answer: • Other people and the surrounding environment influence the way people behave. The environment, the situation we are in and the people around us therefore have a major influence on whether or not individuals offer assistance to others in need. Piliavin's study showed that when in a closed environment, such as a subway train, individuals tend not to diffuse responsibility by sharing it among those present, rather they feel personally responsible and so offer help to a victim in need. Findings showed that the more people present in the train when either the drunk or	[4]	*A maximum of 1 mark can be gained if there is no link to the named study.* *To gain more than 2 marks there must be a clear link to the social approach.* *For full marks the description should be supported by at least one example from the named study.* *Any reference to making a 'cost-benefit' decision/analysis are not creditworthy as this would be a cognitive explanation, not a social one.* **Level 2: 3-4 marks –** Description is accurate. Detail is appropriate and understanding is good. Elaboration (specific detail or example from the named study) is evident. Expression and use of psychological

Question			Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
			cane victim fell, the more people went to help him. • Other appropriate descriptions and evidence from the named study should be credited e.g. evidence relating to the drunk / cane condition, evidence from the black / white condition.		terminology is sound. **Level 1: 1-2 marks –** Description is generally accurate, but is basic and lacks detail. Some understanding and/or elaboration may be evident. Expression is generally poor. NB: A maximum of 1 mark can be gained for a generic explanation not linked to the named study. **0 marks –** No or irrelevant answer.
	(c)		**Describe one similarity and one difference between any of the social approach core studies that gathered quantitative data.** Answers are likely to refer to sample, methodology, ethics. Possible similarities: • Both Milgram and Reicher and Haslam had samples comprised of only men • Both Milgram's and Piliavin's studies were conducted in the same country / the USA • Both Milgram and Reicher and Haslam conducted their studies in controlled environments • Both Reicher and Haslam's and Piliavin's studies were experiments with IVs and DVs • Both Milgram and Reicher and Haslam debriefed their participants • Other appropriate similarities should be credited. Possible differences: • Milgram and Piliavin had different sized samples ... • The studies by Reicher and Haslam and Milgram / Piliavin were conducted in different countries ... • The study by Milgram / Reicher and Haslam was conducted in a controlled environment whereas the study by Piliavin was conducted in a natural environment	**[6]**	*Answers must refer to the following studies: Milgram, Piliavin et al., Reicher and Haslam.* ***N.B. Milgram should not be considered an experiment but a controlled observation.*** *Answers referring to similarities / differences in the focus of the studies can only be awarded 1 mark.* **Similarities** **3 marks** – An appropriate similarity is identified and supported by relevant evidence from two appropriate social approach core studies. **2 marks** – An appropriate similarity is identified and supported by relevant evidence from one appropriate social approach core study. **1 mark** – An appropriate similarity between two appropriate social approach core studies is merely identified. **0 marks** – No or irrelevant answer e.g. stating the purpose/theme of the selected studies. **Differences** **3 marks** – An appropriate difference is identified and supported by relevant evidence from two appropriate social approach core studies. **2 marks** – An appropriate difference is identified and

Question			Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
			• The study by Milgram was a snapshot study whereas the study by Reicher and Haslam was a longitudinal study. • Reicher and Haslam / Milgram used a different sampling method to Piliavin. • Other appropriate differences should be credited.		supported by relevant evidence from one appropriate social approach core study **1 mark** – An appropriate difference between two appropriate social approach core studies is merely identified. **0 marks** – No or irrelevant answer.
	(d)		**Discuss strengths and weaknesses of quantitative data. Support your discussion with evidence from any of the core studies that take the social approach.** Strengths may include: • Because it uses numbers: identification of patterns or trends in behaviour is possible/one can calculate the mean or average occurrence of behaviour/patterns of dispersion can be shown/it is easy to calculate and analyse results so conclusions can be drawn/it is easy to make comparisons between group/individuals. • Because it is objective results are reliable and not open to subjective interpretation. • Other appropriate strengths should be credited Weaknesses may include: • Because it only uses numbers: one gains no explanation about why the behaviour occurred/findings are fairly superficial/the study lacks rich, in-depth detail. • Because it uses only numbers, conclusions may lack validity as no reasons have been provided for why the behaviour occurred/conclusions may lack validity as no reasons are provided for the numerical findings. • Other appropriate weaknesses should be credited.	**[12]**	*Evidence must come from the following studies: Milgram, Piliavin et al., Reicher and Haslam.* *The candidate must make it clear why their suggestion is a strength / weakness e.g. a strength of quantitative data is that because it uses numbers, identification of patterns or trends in behaviour can be identified / a weakness of quantitative data is that because it only uses numbers, one gains no explanation about why the behaviour occurred.* *The supporting evidence must actually support the identified strength / weakness i.e. be appropriately contextualised / linked to a named core study that takes the cognitive approach.* *Read through the mark bands carefully before allocating marks.* ***Study specific** answers are not creditworthy.* *Responses with only one appropriate strength and one appropriate weakness / only strengths or weaknesses can gain a maximum of 6 marks*. **Level 4: 10-12 marks** – There is a good range of 2 or more strengths ***and*** 2 or more weaknesses relating to quantitative data which are appropriate to the question. There is a good balance between the two. Discussion is

Question			Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
					detailed with good understanding and clear expression. Analysis is effective and argument well informed. Appropriate use of supporting examples. The answer is competently structured and organised. Answer is mostly grammatically correct with few spelling errors. **Level 3: 7-9 marks** – There may be a range of strengths ***and*** weaknesses relating to quantitative data which are appropriate to the question, or there may be an imbalance between the two. Discussion is good with some understanding and good expression. Analysis is reasonably effective and argument is informed. Some use of appropriate supporting examples. **Level 2: 4-6 marks** – There may be some strengths ***and/or*** weaknesses relating to quantitative data which are appropriate to the question, or there may be an imbalance between the two. Discussion is reasonable with some understanding though expression may be limited. Analysis is effective sometimes and argument limited. Sparse use of /weak supporting examples. **Level 1: 1-3 marks** – There may be some strengths ***and/or*** weaknesses relating to quantitative data which are appropriate or peripheral to the question, or there may be an imbalance between the two. Discussion is poor with limited or no understanding. Expression is poor. Analysis is sparse and argument may be just discernible. Sparse or no use of supporting examples. **0 marks** – No or irrelevant answer.
18	**(a)**		**Briefly outline one strength of the cognitive approach.** Likely answers: • One strength of the cognitive approach is that it allows one to study how an individual's behaviour is affected by the way they attain, retain and process information. • One strength of the cognitive approach is that it allows	**[2]**	*The strength must be clearly linked to:* • *the cognitive approach* • *behaviour* **2 marks** – A strength of the cognitive approach, linked to behaviour, is clearly identifiable. Understanding is obvious. Expression and use of psychological terminology is good.

Question			Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
			researchers to study how internal processes such as memory, thinking, reasoning, problem solving and language influence an individual's behaviour. • One strength of the cognitive approach is that it shows how the human mind can be likened to the workings of a computer – it inputs, stores, processes and responds to information. This allows us to understand how the way the information is received and processed can influence the way a person behaves. • Other strengths of the cognitive approach, linked to behaviour should be credited.		**1 mark** – Partial or vague answer e.g. a strength of the cognitive approach is vague and lacks detail, there is no link to behaviour e.g. one strength of the cognitive approach is that it allows one to study how the human mind can be likened to the workings of a computer – it inputs, stores, processes and responds to information i.e. no link to behaviour. Some understanding is evident. Expression is generally poor. **0 marks** – No or irrelevant answer.
	(b)		**Describe how the cognitive approach could explain inaccurate witness testimonies in court.** **Support your answer with evidence from Loftus and Palmer's study on eyewitness testimony.** Likely answer: • Two types of information make up memory – a cognitive process - 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. This was shown in Loftus and Palmer's study. In the first experiment the verb in the critical question relating to speed was different for each of the five groups of participants. The group who were asked the question 'About how fast were the cars going when they smashed into each other?' gave higher speed estimates than the group who were asked the question 'About how fast were the cars going when they hit each other?' Any witness testimonies given in court may therefore be inaccurate if leading questions are asked. • Other appropriate descriptions and evidence from the named study should be credited e.g. evidence from	**[4]**	*A maximum of 1 mark can be gained if there is no link to the named study.* *To gain more than 2 marks there must be a clear link to the cognitive approach.* *For full marks the description should be supported by at least one example from the named study.* **3-4 marks –** Description is accurate. Detail is appropriate and understanding is good. Elaboration (specific detail or example from the named study) is evident. Expression and use of psychological terminology is sound. **1-2 marks –** Description is generally accurate, but is basic and lacks detail. Some understanding and/or elaboration may be evident. Expression is generally poor. NB: A maximum of 1 mark can be gained for a generic explanation not linked to the named study. **0 marks –** No or irrelevant answer.

Question			Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
			experiment 2.		
	(c)		**Describe one similarity and one difference between any of the cognitive approach core studies that gathered quantitative data.** Answers are likely to refer to sample, methodology, ethics. Possible similarities: • Both Loftus and Palmer's and Savage-Rumbaugh's studies were conducted in the same country / the USA • Both Loftus and Palmer and Savage Rumbaugh conducted their studies in controlled environments • Both Loftus and Palmer's and Baron-Cohen's studies were experiments with IVs and DVs • The ethical issue of stress could be raised against both Baron-Cohen and Lotus and Palmer / Savage-Rumbaugh • Other appropriate similarities should be credited. Possible differences: • Loftus and Palmer / Baron- Cohen / Savage-Rumbaugh had different samples • Loftus and Palmer / Baron- Cohen / Savage-Rumbaugh had different sample sizes • Loftus and Palmer / Savage-Rumbaugh and Baron-Cohen conducted their studies in different countries • Loftus and Palmer's / Baron-Cohen's study was a snapshot study whereas Savage-Rumbaugh's was a longitudinal study. • Confidentiality was upheld by Loftus and Palmer / Baron-Cohen but not by Savage-Rumbaugh • Other appropriate differences should be credited.	**[6]**	*Answers must refer to the following studies: Loftus and Palmer, Baron-Cohen et al., Savage-Rumbaugh.* ***N.B. Savage-Rumbaugh should not be considered an experiment but a (longitudinal) case study.*** *Answers referring to similarities / differences in the focus of the studies can only be awarded 1 mark.* **3 marks** – An appropriate similarity is identified and supported by relevant evidence from two appropriate cognitive approach core studies. **2 marks** – An appropriate similarity is identified and supported by relevant evidence from one appropriate cognitive approach core study. **1 mark** – An appropriate similarity between two appropriate cognitive approach core studies is merely identified. **0 marks** – No or irrelevant answer e.g. stating the purpose/theme of the selected studies. **3 marks** – An appropriate difference is identified and supported by relevant evidence from two appropriate cognitive approach core studies. **2 marks** – An appropriate difference is identified and supported by relevant evidence from one appropriate cognitive approach core study **1 mark** – An appropriate difference between two appropriate cognitive approach core studies is merely identified. **0 marks** – No or irrelevant answer.

Question			Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	(d)		**Discuss strengths and weaknesses of gathering quantitative data. Support your discussion with evidence from any of the core studies that take the cognitive approach.** Strengths may include: • Because it uses numbers: identification of patterns or trends in behaviour is possible/one can calculate the mean or average occurrence of behaviour/patterns of dispersion can be shown/it is easy to calculate and analyse results so conclusions can be drawn/it is easy to make comparisons between group/individuals. • Because it is objective results are reliable and not open to subjective interpretation. • Other appropriate strengths should be credited Weaknesses may include: • Because it only uses numbers: one gains no explanation about why the behaviour occurred/findings are fairly superficial/the study lacks rich, in-depth detail. • Because it uses only numbers, conclusions may lack validity as no reasons have been provided for why the behaviour occurred / conclusions may lack validity as no reasons are provided for the numerical findings. • Other appropriate weaknesses should be credited.	**[12]**	*Evidence must come from the following studies: Loftus and Palmer, Baron-Cohen et al., Savage-Rumbaugh.* *The candidate must make it clear why their suggestion is a strength / weakness e.g. a strength of quantitative data is that because it uses numbers, identification of patterns or trends in behaviour can be identified / a weakness of quantitative data is that because it only uses numbers, one gains no explanation about why the behaviour occurred.* *The supporting evidence must actually support the identified strength / weakness i.e. be appropriately contextualised / linked to a named core study that takes the cognitive approach.* *Read through the mark bands carefully before allocating marks.* ***Study specific** answers are not creditworthy.* *Responses with only one appropriate strength and one appropriate weakness / only strengths or weaknesses can gain a maximum of 6 marks.* **Level 4: 10-12 marks** – There is a good range of 2 or more strengths ***and*** 2 or more weaknesses relating to quantitative data which are appropriate to the question. There is a good balance between the two. Discussion is detailed with good understanding and clear expression. Analysis is effective and argument well informed. Appropriate use of supporting examples. The answer is competently structured and organised. Answer is mostly grammatically correct with few spelling errors. **Level 3: 7-9 marks** – There may be a range of

Question			Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
					strengths ***and*** weaknesses relating to quantitative data which are appropriate to the question, or there may be an imbalance between the two. Discussion is good with some understanding and good expression. Analysis is reasonably effective and argument is informed. Some use of appropriate supporting examples. **Level 2: 4-6 marks** – There may be some strengths ***and/or*** weaknesses relating to quantitative data which are appropriate to the question, or there may be an imbalance between the two. Discussion is reasonable with some understanding though expression may be limited. Analysis is effective sometimes and argument limited. Sparse use of /weak supporting examples. **Level 1: 1-3 marks** – There may be some strengths ***and/or*** weaknesses relating to quantitative data which are appropriate or peripheral to the question, or there may be an imbalance between the two. Discussion is poor with limited or no understanding. Expression is poor. Analysis is sparse and argument may be just discernible. Sparse or no use of supporting examples. **0 marks** – No or irrelevant answer.
			Total	**[120]**	

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Education and Learning
Telephone: 01223 553998
Facsimile: 01223 552627
Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

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

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

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