



# GCE

## Psychology

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

Unit **G542**: Core Studies

# Mark Scheme for January 2011

---

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

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

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

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

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the Report on the Examination.

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

© OCR 2011

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications  
PO Box 5050  
Annesley  
NOTTINGHAM  
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622  
Facsimile: 01223 552610  
E-mail: [publications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:publications@ocr.org.uk)

G542

Mark Scheme

January 2011

## Section A

Question		Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
1		<b>From Savage-Rumbaugh's study into symbol acquisition by pygmy chimpanzees:</b>		
	(a)	<p><b>What were the names of the <u>two</u> pygmy chimpanzees studied?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kanzi</li> <li>• Mulika.</li> </ul> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer eg Austin, Sherman. 1 mark – for each correctly identified pygmy chimpanzee.</p>	[1+1=2]	<i>Names should be accurately spelt and easily recognisable.</i>
	(b)	<p><b>Explain why these pygmy chimpanzees may not have been representative of their own species.</b></p> <p>Likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Because they had been reared in a language environment whereas other members of their species are reared in their natural (wild) environment</li> <li>• Because they had observed their mother Matata being taught symbol usage whereas other members of their species do not get such opportunities</li> <li>• Because they were more intelligent than other pygmy chimpanzees</li> <li>• Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer. 1 mark – Partial or vague answer eg because they had been reared in a language environment,/because they were more intelligent</p>	[2]	

G542

Mark Scheme

January 2011

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
(b)	2 marks – A clear, well explained suggestion, as outlined above – elaboration or comparison.		
2	<p><b>From the study by Baron-Cohen, Jolliffe, Mortimore and Robertson on autism in adults:</b></p> <p><b>Describe how <u>two</u> of the groups of participants were selected.</b></p> <p>Any two from:  <u>Autistic/Asperger Syndrome</u> participants were recruited from a variety of clinical sources, as well as an advert in the National Autistic Society magazine 'Communication'. They were therefore self-selecting/volunteers  <u>'Normal' adults</u> were selected randomly from a participant list drawn from the general population of Cambridge (excluding members of the University) which was held in the University Department of Experimental Psychology and Psychiatry.  <u>Tourette Syndrome adults</u> were recruited from a tertiary referral centre in London which they were attending. They were therefore self-selecting/volunteers</p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer eg <u>Autistic.AS</u> participants were selected through a <u>newspaper</u> advert.  1 mark – Partial or vague answer eg <u>Autistic.AS</u> participants were selected through advertising in a magazine, <u>'Normal' adults</u> were randomly selected from the population of Cambridge, <u>Tourette adults</u> were selected from a clinic in London, they were self-selecting/volunteers.  2 marks – A clear description of how participants were selected, as outlined above, <b>including at least 2 pieces of information.</b></p>	[2+2=4]	<i>N.B. The question requires candidates to describe 'how' groups were selected NOT 'why'?</i>

G542

Mark Scheme

January 2011

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
3	<p><b>Describe the procedure in the <u>second</u> experiment conducted by Loftus and Palmer on eyewitness testimony.</b></p> <p>Likely answer may cover the following content:</p> <p>150 participants were divided into 3 groups of various sizes. Participants were shown a film of a multiple car accident and then given a questionnaire about the accident asking them to firstly describe the accident and then answer a series of questions about the accident which contained a critical question about the speed of the vehicles. 50 participants were asked, "About how fast were the cars going when they smashed into each other?" 50 participants were asked, "About how fast were the cars going when they hit each other?" A control group of 50 participants were not interrogated about vehicular speed.</p> <p>One week later participants returned and without viewing the film again completed another questionnaire containing 10 questions about the accident, one of which was the critical question "Did you see any broken glass?" Participants responded by checking "Yes" or "No".</p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer eg the procedure of the first experiment.</p> <p>1 mark – Some creditworthy information eg Students watched films of car crashes and then said whether or not they had seen any broken glass.</p> <p>2 marks – Partial or vague answer eg Participants were shown a film clip of a road accident and returned a week later to complete a questionnaire which contained the critical question, "Did you see any broken glass?"</p> <p>3 marks – A more accurate and detailed description of the procedure eg participants were shown a film clip of a road accident and then asked to complete a questionnaire which</p>	[4]	<p><i>Before awarding marks please check the 'banding' levels.</i></p>

G542

Mark Scheme

January 2011

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
3	<p>contained a question about how fast the cars were going at the time of the accident. They then returned one week later to complete another questionnaire containing the critical question "Did you see any broken glass?"</p> <p>4 marks – An even more accurate and detailed description of the procedure with few details missing eg 150 participants were divided into 3 groups and shown a film clip of a car accident. They then completed a questionnaire which contained a question on vehicular speed with some participants being asked "About how fast were the cars going when they smashed into each other?", some "About how fast were the cars going when they hit each other?" One week later participants returned and completed another questionnaire which contained the critical question "Did you see any broken glass?"</p>		
4	<p><b>Describe <u>two</u> ethical problems in the study of aggression by Bandura, Ross and Ross.</b></p> <p>Two from the following likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No (informed) consent could be gained from the children because they were <u>too</u> young: under the age of 16/ No (informed) consent was gained from the children's parents (no reference to this in the study)</li> <li>• The children could have been stressed/distressed/suffered short-term psychological harm through witnessing physical and verbal acts of aggression</li> <li>• The children could have suffered long-term psychological harm through witnessing physical and verbal words of aggression</li> <li>• The children could have suffered physical harm when given the opportunity to imitate/create acts of aggression</li> </ul>	[2+2=4]	<p><i>No credit should be given to answers that refer to morals rather than ethics (as with BPS guidelines) e.g. the children were exposed to aggressive behaviour which is wrong.</i></p> <p><i>The problem of consent can only be credited once.</i></p>

G542

Mark Scheme

January 2011

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The children did not realise they should have been given the right to withdraw if they did not wish to participate/continue participating in the study</li> <li>• The children were deceived because they were unaware that they were being covertly observed when they were in room 3</li> <li>• No reference is made in the original study that the children were debriefed at the end of the study</li> <li>• Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer eg confidentiality.            1 mark – Partial or vague answer eg mere identification of appropriate ethical issue – no consent, deception etc.            2 marks – A clear identification and description of an appropriate ethical issue, as outlined above.</p>		
5	<p><b>Freud's study of Little Hans was a 'case study'.</b></p>		
(a)	<p><b>Outline <u>one</u> strength of the 'case study' research method used by Freud.</b></p> <p>Likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A case study allows the researcher to provide detailed descriptions of a behaviour of interest to the person carrying out the study. Here Freud was able to gain detailed information on 'Little Hans' which supported his ideas on psychosexual development, the Oedipus Complex and the effectiveness of psychoanalytic therapy</li> </ul>	[2]	<p><i>1 mark can be given for a general strength of a case study. To gain 2 marks it must be supported by evidence from Freud's study.</i></p>

G542

Mark Scheme

January 2011

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
(a)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A case study allows the researcher to throw light on a particular problem. Here Freud attempted to illustrate that Hans' phobia of horses was actually a form of neurotic disorder</li> <li>• A case study is often longitudinal and allows the researcher to gather qualitative data which provides in-depth information about an individual's behaviour and experiences. Freud gathered lots of in-depth data about Hans' fears eg of horses; that his mother would go away; of carts, buses and furniture vans; of the bath etc</li> <li>• Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.            1 mark – Partial or vague answer eg a case study allows one to gather a lot of in-depth data. Here Freud gathered a lot of in-depth data about Hans; accurate explanation of a strength of a case study not supported by evidence from Freud's study.            2 marks – A clear explanation of a strength of a case study, linked to Freud's study, as outlined above.</p>		
(b)	<p><b>Outline <u>one</u> weakness of the 'case study' research method used by Freud.</b></p> <p>Likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A case study can rarely be generalised to the wider population/is of limited use as it is only concerned with one individual. Here Hans' fears and phobias are specifically related to Hans and his fear of horses which may not be the same as anyone else's</li> <li>• A case study cannot be replicated. Because Freud studies Little Hans during a specific time period in the early 1900's the study can never be repeated (to check for consistency/reliability)</li> </ul>	<b>[2]</b>	<i>1 mark can be given for a general weakness of a case study. To gain 2 marks it must be supported by evidence from Freud's study.</i>



G542

Mark Scheme

January 2011

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
(b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A case study is prone to researcher bias. Here Freud may have purposefully or unintentionally misinterpreted the information on Little Hans to support his ideas on psychosexual development, the Oedipus complex and/or the effectiveness of psychoanalytic theory</li> <li>• A case study is prone to demand characteristics. Here Little Hans may have felt he had to answer his father's questions in a way that would please his father, especially as the study says Hans was particularly close to him. This would mean his answers were not truthful and the results not valid</li> <li>• Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.            1 mark – Partial or vague answer eg a case study can't be generalised, a case study can't be replicated, case study may be prone to researcher bias, a case study may be prone to demand characteristics.; accurate explanation of a weakness of a case study not supported by evidence from Freud's study.            2 marks – A clear explanation of a weakness of a case study, linked to Freud's study, as outlined above.</p>		
6	From the study by Samuel and Bryant on conservation:		
(a)	<p><b>Describe how the participants' age affected their ability to conserve. [2]</b></p> <p>Likely answer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The older the child, the more likely they were to be able to conserve. This was shown by the results which showed that the older children did performed better on all three conservation tasks (number, mass and volume) than the younger children</li> </ul>	<b>[2]</b>	<p><i>To gain the full 2marks, candidates must either support their answer with findings or refer to the conservation tasks the children were asked / tested on.</i></p> <p><i>NB: be prepared to check any results/findings against the original study.</i></p>

G542

Mark Scheme

January 2011

Question		Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	(a)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.            1 mark – Partial or vague answer eg older children did better.            2 marks – A clear, accurate description of the affect of age on conservation ability, linked to either the findings of the study or the conservation tasks tested, as outlined above.</p>		
	(b)	<p><b>Describe how the type of task affected the participants' ability to conserve.</b></p> <p>Likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The number task was significantly easier than the mass or volume tasks because results showed more children in each age group made less mistakes on this task regardless of which experimental condition they were in</li> <li>The volume task was harder than either the number or mass tasks as results showed that overall the mean number of errors on this task was higher regardless of which experimental task the children were in</li> <li>The volume task was the hardest because results showed children of all ages made more errors on this task than either the volume or mass/other two tasks</li> <li>Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p>	[2]	

G542

Mark Scheme

January 2011

Question		Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	(b)	<p>1 mark – Partial or vague answer eg the number task was the easiest/the volume task was the hardest.</p> <p>2 marks – A full description of how the task affected the result, clearly linked to the study, as outlined above.</p>		
7		<b>From Dement and Kleitman's study into sleep and dreaming:</b>		
	(a)	<p><b>Identify <u>two</u> controls used in this study.</b></p> <p>Two from the following most likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All participants reported to the lab just before their usual bedtime</li> <li>• All participants slept in the same sleep laboratory</li> <li>• Participants were asked to abstain from beverages containing alcohol on the day of the experiment</li> <li>• Participants were asked to abstain from caffeine – containing beverages on the day of the experiment</li> <li>• All participants were awakened by the same ordinary doorbell / woken in the same way by a doorbell.</li> <li>• All participants spoke into the same recording device</li> <li>• The researcher did not communicate with any of the participants until s/he had finished speaking</li> <li>• Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer eg all participants had electrodes attached to their scalp and near their eyes.</p> <p>1 mark – Partial or vague answer or each correctly identified control, as outline above.</p>	[1+1=2]	<i>Award 2 marks for 'The participants were not allowed to have any alcohol or caffeine before the study' – 2 controls have been identified.</i>

G542

Mark Scheme

January 2011

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
(b)	<p><b>Explain why <u>one</u> of these controls was used.</b></p> <p>Likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participants reported to the lab just before their usual bedtime so their normal daily routine was not disrupted which may have lead to unnatural sleep patterns</li> <li>• Participants slept in the same sleep lab ( to make it a fair test) as all would be tested in the same environment</li> <li>• Participants were asked not to consume alcoholic beverages as alcohol is known to affect an individual's sleep pattern (so results would be unreliable)</li> <li>• Participants were asked not to consume caffeine-containing beverages as caffeine is a known stimulant which can affect an individual's sleep pattern, (thus making results unreliable)</li> <li>• All participants were woken by the same doorbell so they were all treated in the same way, (making it a fair test)</li> <li>• All participants spoke into the same recording device so they were all treated in the same way, (making it a fair test)</li> <li>• The researcher did not communicate with the participant until they had finished to minimise researcher effects/the chance of demand characteristics influencing results</li> <li>• Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.            1 mark – Partial or vague answer eg to make it fair, to make it more reliable            2 marks – A clear and accurate explanation of why one of the controls was used, as described above.</p>	[2]	<p><i>To get the full 2 marks the answer must be fully explained.</i></p> <p><i>Answers referring to ecological validity are not creditworthy</i></p>

G542

Mark Scheme

January 2011

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
8	<p><b>Sperry in his study on hemisphere disconnection writes, "...one hemisphere does not know what the other hemisphere has been doing."</b></p>		
(a)	<p><b>Give <u>one</u> piece of evidence to support this statement.</b></p> <p>Likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If two different figures were flashed simultaneously to the right and left visual fields and the participant was asked to draw what he saw using his left hand out of sight, he regularly produced the figure seen in the left visual field. However when asked what he had drawn he would say whatever had been presented to the right visual field</li> <li>• If two different words were flashed simultaneously to the right and left visual fields the participant would select with the left hand the object presented to the left visual field but if asked to write the word with the right hand or spell out the word he would write or spell the word presented to the right visual field</li> <li>• An object placed in the participant's right hand could be identified or named in speech or writing whereas if the same object was placed in the left hand the participant could only make wild guesses or seemed unaware that they had been given anything</li> <li>• If an object was placed in the left hand participants could not identify it but could select it from other objects in a grab bag with the same hand</li> <li>• Once a projected picture of an object had been identified and responded to in one visual field, it could not be identified or responded to if then presented to the other visual field</li> <li>• Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul>	[2]	<p><i>References to 'eye' rather than visual field are not creditworthy.</i></p>

G542

Mark Scheme

January 2011

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
(a)	0 marks – No or irrelevant answer. 1 mark – Partial or vague answer eg could only find an object with the same hand; could only identify objects if presented to the same visual field ie answer only refers to how one hemisphere responds. 2 marks – A clear, accurate description of evidence supporting the statement, as outlined above.		<i>To gain the full 2 marks, reference must be made to both hemispheres.</i>
(b)	<p><b>Explain why in everyday life these patients do not experience the problems identified in this study.</b></p> <p>Likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Because normally an individual does not have only 1/10 of a second to identify material flashed top one visual field only, they have time to compensate by moving their eyes so the material is received by both visual fields allowing them to correctly identify the material</li> <li>• Frequently sound/speech is also involved which allows the patient's major hemisphere (left) to talk to the minor hemisphere (right) so material is identified through auditory channels</li> <li>• The inability shown by patients to identify objects presented first to one hand and then the other is usually not a problem because the presentation is normally accompanied by visual cues which allow the patient to recognise the object</li> <li>• Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.            1 mark – Partial or vague answer eg participants have learned to compensate, other senses can be used to help patients identify objects.            2 marks – A clear explanation of why such patients cope with everyday activities, as outlined above.</p>	[2]	

G542

Mark Scheme

January 2011

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
9	<b>From Maguire et al's study of taxi drivers:</b>		
(a)	<p><b>Identify <u>two</u> criteria used to select the taxi drivers in this study.</b></p> <p>Any two from the following likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All right handed</li> <li>• All males</li> <li>• All from London</li> <li>• All aged between 32-62 years of age</li> <li>• All licensed taxi/cab drivers (for more than 1.5 years)</li> <li>• Passed the 'Knowledge'</li> <li>• All had healthy general medical, neurological and psychiatric profiles/all were physically and mentally healthy.</li> </ul> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer eg all were taxi drivers, all licensed drivers. 1 mark – for each appropriate criteria identified, as outlined above.</p>	<b>[1+1=2]</b>	<i>If the term 'the knowledge' is not specifically stated but there is a clear mention of some form of special test having been passed, award 1 mark.</i>
(b)	<p><b>Explain why Maguire et al could not manipulate the independent variable (IV).</b></p> <p>Likely answer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Because the independent variable (IV) occurred naturally: the participants were already either taxi drivers or non-taxi drivers.</li> </ul> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer. 1 mark – Partial or vague answer eg the IV occurred naturally (no link to study). 2 marks – A clear explanation of why the IV could not be manipulated, as outlined above.</p>	<b>[2]</b>	

G542

Mark Scheme

January 2011

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
10	<p><b>Outline <u>two</u> practical problems that may have occurred in the subway Samaritan study by Piliavin, Rodin and Piliavin.</b></p> <p>Likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Because the experiment was repeated many times (between April 15 and June 26, 1968) there is a chance that some passengers may have witnessed the incident more than once and responded with demand characteristics and/or socially desirable behaviour making the results invalid</li> <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>• There were too many passengers in the carriage so the experiment could not take place.</li> <li>• Another emergency incident occurred so the experiment could not take place.</li> <li>• Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.            1 mark – Partial or vague answer eg passengers may have witnessed the event more than once, observers view may have been blocked i.e. mere identification of a possible problem.            2 marks – A clear outline of a possible practical problem, as described above ie practical problem identified, linked to study and justified.</p>	[2+2=4]	<p><i>Practical problems that did occur in the actual study are not creditworthy neither are ethical issues.</i></p>



G542

Mark Scheme

January 2011

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
11	<p><b>Outline <u>two</u> features of the Milgram study of obedience which made it seem real to the participants.</b></p> <p>Two from the following likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The shock generator looked real</li> <li>• Participants believed the 'random' allocation to the roles of teacher/learner was genuine</li> <li>• The participants were given a test shock of 45 volts.</li> <li>• The lab coat worn by the experimenter made him appear a legitimate authority figure</li> <li>• The script followed by the confederate/learner was convincing</li> <li>• The study took place in a prestigious (Yale) university</li> <li>• Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p>0 Marks – No or irrelevant answer.            1 mark – Partial or vague answer eg shock generator, allocation to roles, test shock, script followed by confederate.            2 marks – A clear outline of an appropriate feature, as outlined above.</p>	[2+2=4]	

G542

Mark Scheme

January 2011

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
12	<b>From Reicher and Haslam's BBC prison study:</b>		
(a)	<p><b>Describe how 'permeability' was created.</b></p> <p>Likely answer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At their initial meeting the experimenters told the guards it was possible they had misassigned one or more of the prisoners. Guards were therefore told they should observe the behaviour of the prisoners to see if anyone showed guard-like qualities. If they did, they were told there was provision for a promotion to be made on Day 3. This information was also announced to the prisoners over the loudspeaker</li> <li>• Participants were told the guards had been selected because of certain personality traits eg reliability, trustworthiness, initiative; but that if prisoners demonstrated these traits they might be promoted to being guards</li> <li>• Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.            1 mark – Partial or vague answer eg prisoners were told they could be promoted to guards.            2 marks – A clear, accurate description of how permeability was created, as described above.</p>	<b>[2]</b>	
(b)	<p><b>Outline how the behaviour of the prisoners changed once the groups became impermeable.</b></p> <p>Likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The prisoners started to see themselves as a group and worked collectively to challenge the guards</li> </ul>	<b>[2]</b>	

G542

Mark Scheme

January 2011

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
(b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They developed a much stronger sense of shared identity and developed consensual norms</li> <li>• Prisoners began to discuss how they could improve their position by changing the system</li> <li>• Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.            1 mark – Partial or vague answer eg prisoners became a consolidated group, prisoners were prepared to challenge the guards, the prisoners started to rebel.            2 marks – A clear outline of how the behaviour of the prisoners changed, as outlined above.</p>		
13	<p><b>Outline <u>two</u> ethical issues that could be raised in relation to Rosenhan’s study, ‘On being sane in insane places’.</b></p> <p>Likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distress: In Experiment 1, by the participants (hospital staff) when they found out the results of the study and realised/were confronted with how badly they had treated their patients/In Experiment 2 when staff realised that overall they had diagnosed 41 genuine patients as pseudopatients denying them treatment they needed</li> <li>• Stress: on the pseudopatients (researchers) because they were treated so badly/inconsiderately by hospital staff</li> <li>• Consent/informed consent: in Experiment 1 none of the hospitals involved gave either consent or informed consent for their hospitals and staff to be involved in the study. (Actually one hospital was aware – the one Rosenhan was admitted to)</li> </ul>	[2+2=4]	<p><i>As the researchers acted as ‘participant observers’, allow the use of the term ‘participants’ (BOD) when reference is made to the pseudopatients. However the supporting information must be appropriate for the answer to be creditworthy.</i></p> <p><i>If a candidate writes ‘the hospital staff were deceived because they didn’t know they were in an experiment so hadn’t given their consent’ award 3 marks.</i></p> <p><i>No credit should be given to answers that refer to morals rather than ethics e.g. the pseudopatients were given a label which would be hard to get rid of.</i></p>

G542

## Mark Scheme

January 2011

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consent was not an issue in the second experiment because the hospital involved agreed to take part</li> <li>• Deception: In Experiment 1 doctors at the hospitals were deceived by the pseudopatients when they claimed to be hearing voices (that said 'empty', 'hollow' and 'thud')/in Experiment 2 when the selected hospital was informed that pseudopatients would attempt to be admitted but in fact no pseudopatients presented themselves</li> <li>• Right to withdraw: As the staff did not know they were participating in a study they had no right to withdraw either themselves or data referring to their behaviour</li> <li>• Invasion of privacy: in respect of the genuine patients who may have felt their 'abnormal' behaviour was being recorded unfairly</li> <li>• Confidentiality was not an issue in either experiment as neither the names of the hospitals nor the participants were disclosed</li> <li>• Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer eg debrief/confidentiality.  1 mark – Partial or vague answer eg mere identification/outline of ethical issue not linked to the study.  2 marks – An accurate outline of an appropriate ethical issue, clearly linked to the study, as outlined above.</p>		

G542

Mark Scheme

January 2011

Question		Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
14		<b>From Thigpen and Cleckley's study into multiple personality disorder:</b>		
	(a)	<p><b>Outline <u>one</u> projective test used.</b></p> <p>Most likely answer may cover the following content:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inkblot test: the individual is shown 10 standardised abstract designs and asked what they look like. Responses are analysed to give a measure of emotional and intellectual functioning and integration/the test requires participants to look at 10 standardised inkblots that have been squashed between folded paper and look like butterflies, and then say what they look like</li> <li>• Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.            1 mark – Partial or vague answer eg mere identification of a projective test used.            2 marks – Identification and elaboration of an appropriate test</p>	[2]	
	(b)	<p><b>Suggest <u>one</u> problem with projective tests used in this study.</b></p> <p>Likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Projective tests have to be analysed by another individual whose own inner thoughts and feelings may be projected onto their interpretations so the results may not be valid in relation to Eve White's or Eve Black's real thoughts and feelings</li> </ul>	[2]	

G542

Mark Scheme

January 2011

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
(b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Projective tests have been shown to be unreliable and Eve White/Black may have interpreted the pictures differently had the tests been conducted on another day/days</li> <li>• Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.            1 mark – Partial or vague answer eg invalid, unreliable, subjective, ie no real explanation and no link to study.            2 marks – A clear outline of an appropriate problem, linked to the study, as outlined above.</p>		
15	<p><b>The study by Griffiths into fruit machine gambling had four hypotheses.</b></p>		
(a)	<p><b>State one of these hypotheses.</b></p> <p>One from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (Hypothesis 1) – There would be no differences between regular and non-regular fruit machine gamblers on (objective) measures of skill</li> <li>• (Hypothesis 2) – Regular gamblers would produce more irrational verbalisations than non-regular gamblers</li> <li>• (Hypothesis 3) – Regular gamblers would be more skill orientated than non-regular gamblers (on subjective measures of self-report)</li> <li>• (Hypothesis 4) – Thinking aloud participants would take longer to complete the task than non-thinking aloud participants.</li> </ul>	[2]	<p><i>Statement of one of the study's aims is not creditworthy.</i></p>

G542

Mark Scheme

January 2011

Question		Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	(a)	<p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p>1 mark – Partial or vague answer eg no difference in skill levels, more irrational verbalisations by regular gamblers, ie no reference made to the second group of participants.</p> <p>2 marks – A clear, accurate statement of one hypothesis, referring to both experimental groups, as outlined above.</p>		<p><i>For 2 marks both experimental groups must be mentioned</i></p> <p><i>Both IV and DV are identified but not stated as a hypothesis then 1 mark only.</i></p>
	(b)	<p><b>Explain how the results of this study support <u>one</u> of its hypotheses.</b></p> <p>Likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (Hypothesis 1) – Regular gamblers stayed on the fruit machine longer than non-regular gamblers using the same initial stake in terms of number of gambles, but this was not significant, suggesting there was no difference between RGs and NRGs on objective measures of skill/there was no significant difference in total winnings suggesting there was no difference between RGs and NRGs on objective measures of skill</li> <li>• (Hypothesis 2) – RGs produced a total of more irrational verbalisations (14%) than NRGs (2.5%)</li> <li>• (Hypothesis 3) – RGs claimed they were at least of 'average skill' (7/30), but more usually 'above average skill' (18/30) or 'totally skilled' (5/30)</li> <li>• (Hypothesis 4) – Those who thought aloud did take longer to gamble on the fruit machine (in terms of time) – total time for thinking aloud participants = 21.4 mins, non-thinking aloud = 16.9 mins</li> <li>• Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul>	[2]	<p><i>Need not be the same hypothesis as the one mentioned in part (a).</i></p>

G542

Mark Scheme

January 2011

Question		Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	(b)	<p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p>1 mark – Partial or vague answer eg no difference found between RGs and NRGs in terms of skill, RGs produced more irrational vocalisations, RGs were more skill orientated, thinking aloud participants took longer ie affirmative statement of results with no comparison between groups identified.</p> <p>2 marks – A clear explanation, referenced to both groups, showing how results support the selected hypothesis, as outlined above.</p>		<p><i>For 2 marks both experimental groups must be mentioned.</i></p>
<b>Section A Total</b>			<b>[60]</b>	



G542

Mark Scheme

January 2011

## Section B

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
16	<p><b>Choose <u>one</u> of the core studies below</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sperry: 'Split-brain'</li> <li>• Samuel and Bryant: 'Conservation'</li> <li>• Loftus and Palmer: 'Eyewitness testimony'.</li> </ul> <p>and answer parts (a) – (f) on your chosen study.</p>		
(a)	<p><b>Briefly outline the research method used in your chosen study.</b></p> <p>Likely answers may cover the following content:</p> <p><u>Sperry</u>: A natural or quasi experiment with the independent variable (IV) – which could not be manipulated – being the presence or absence of a split brain and the dependent variable (DV) being the participant's performance on various tasks/A case study which involved the intensive study of 11 patients to investigate behavioural symptoms resulting from hemisphere disconnection.</p> <p><u>Samuel and Bryant</u>: A laboratory experiment with the independent variables (IV) being the age of the child (5,6,7,8), the experimental condition (standard, one question, fixed array) and the material used (counters, playdough, liquid) and the dependent variable (DV) being the children's ability to conserve number, mass and volume).</p> <p><u>Loftus and Palmer</u>: 2 x laboratory experiments. In Experiment 1 the independent variable (IV) was the verb used in the critical question (smashed, collided, hit, bumped, contacted) and the dependent variable (DV) was the estimated speed the cars were travelling at the time of the incident and/or in</p>	[2]	

G542

Mark Scheme

January 2011

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
(a)	<p>Experiment 2 the independent variable (IV) was the verb used in the critical question (smashed, hit, no question about speed) and the dependent variable (DV) was whether or not participants recalled seeing any broken glass.</p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.            1 mark – partial or vague answer – method is merely identified with little or no elaboration and no link to chosen study eg Sperry: quasi experiment, Samuel and Bryant/Loftus and Palmer: laboratory experiment, method identified but only 1 variable described, method not identified but both variables described..            2 marks –Correct method is identified and both the IV and DV are identified in relation to the chosen study, as outlined above.</p>		
(b)	<p><b>Explain why your chosen study can be considered a snapshot study.</b></p> <p>Likely answer should have a generic introduction and then include details specific to the chosen study:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Generic introduction: A snapshot study is a research design in which participants of different ages or from different groups are studied simultaneously, often only once, and their behaviour compared using one set of data/a snapshot study is an independent measures research design where participants are studied only once and the data gathered is then compared. Then linked to chosen study:  <u>Sperry</u>: Although the study took several years to complete, each split brain patient and normal participant was tested at one point of time during this period and their behaviour in relation to information presented to different visual fields and through touch alone was compared using one set of data</li> </ul>	[4]	

G542

Mark Scheme

January 2011

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
(b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Samuel and Bryant</u>: Studied different groups of children at different stages of their development (5,6,7 or 8 years old), at one point in time and their ability to conserve number, mass and volume was compared using one set of data</li> <li>• <u>Loftus and Palmer</u>: Studied students who were split into different experimental groups and tested them only once to see the affect of leading questions on the accuracy of eyewitness testimony. The performance of each group was then compared using one set of data.</li> </ul> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.            1-2 marks – Explanation of a snapshot study is generally accurate though basic and lacking in detail. <u>There is no link to the chosen study</u> ie a generic explanation though some understanding is evident. Expression is generally poor with little or no psychological terminology.            3-4 marks – Explanation of a snapshot study is accurate and detailed. <u>There is a clear link to the chosen study.</u> Understanding is evident . Expression and use of psychological terminology is good.</p>		
(c)	<p><b>With reference to your chosen study, suggest <u>one</u> strength and <u>one</u> weakness of conducting snapshot studies.</b></p> <p>Strength:</p> <p>Most likely answers should have a generic introduction and then include details specific to the chosen study:</p>	<b>[6]</b>	<i>An appropriate strength/ weakness that can be applied to a snapshot study eg a snapshot tends to collect quantitative data can gain credit. To gain more than 1 mark it must however be linked to the chosen study.</i>

G542

Mark Scheme

January 2011

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
(c)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Generic strength: Snapshot studies can be conducted over a short period of time/snapshot studies allow the researcher to compare individuals or groups at one period in time to see how they may be similar or different. Then linked to chosen study:</li> <li>• <u>Sperry</u>: Compared test results in relation to the affects of hemisphere deconnection of 9 patients over a relatively short period of time – approximately two years (1966-1967) and found that results were similar for all patients/other appropriate example</li> <li>• <u>Samuel and Bryant</u>: Compared conservation abilities of four groups of children over a short period of time in 1983 and showed that their ability to conserve number, mass and volume increased with age/other appropriate example</li> <li>• <u>Loftus and Palmer</u>: Compared, over a short period of time, the effects of leading questions on the memory of groups of American students and found that the accuracy of their recall was negatively influenced by changing the verb in a critical question/other appropriate example</li> <li>• Other appropriate generic strength supported by relevant example from chosen study.</li> </ul> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.  1 mark – Peripherally relevant strength is identified, <u>not linked to the chosen study</u> and with little or no elaboration eg can be conducted over a short period of time.  2 marks – An appropriate strength is explained but is basic and lacks detail. A vague/weak link is made to the chosen study showing some understanding</p>		

G542

Mark Scheme

January 2011

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
(c)	<p>3 marks – An appropriate strength is explained and is accurate and elaborated. There is a clear, developed link to the chosen study showing good understanding, as outlined above.</p> <p>Weakness:</p> <p>Most likely answers should have a generic introduction and then include details specific to the chosen study:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Generic weakness: snapshot studies do not allow the researcher to discover whether results are due to the development of the behaviour or to individual differences. Then linked to chosen study:</li> <li>• <u>Sperry</u>: Could not control how long before he tested them his patients had had their commissurotomies - one patient over 5 years before the study was conducted, another over 4 years before while the other 9 individuals had had their hemispheres disconnected not long before they were tested/other appropriate example</li> <li>• <u>Samuel and Bryant</u>: Used 63 children whose mean age was 5 years 3 months, 63 mean age 6 years and 3 months, 63 mean age 7 years 3 months, 63 mean age 8 years 3 months. Differences in their ability to conserve may not have been due to their development but due to such factors as their home environment, education etc/other appropriate example</li> </ul>		

G542

Mark Scheme

January 2011

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
(c)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Loftus and Palmer</u>: Used 45/150 US students all of whom will have had different upbringings, educational backgrounds, some may have been drivers, some not etc; so their inability to accurately recall the speed of the vehicles/whether or not they had seen broken glass may have been due to individual differences rather than because they had been asked a leading question/other appropriate example</li> <li>• Other appropriate generic weakness supported by relevant example from chosen study.</li> </ul> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.            1 mark – Peripherally relevant weakness is identified, <u>not linked to chosen study</u> and with little or no elaboration eg participant variables may influence results rather the independent variable.            2 marks – An appropriate weakness is explained but is basic and lacks detail. A vague/weak link is made to the chosen study showing some understanding.            3 marks – An appropriate weakness is explained and is accurate and elaborated. There is a clear, developed link to the chosen study showing good understanding, as outlined above.</p>		

G542

Mark Scheme

January 2011

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
(d)	<p><b>Describe the procedure followed in your chosen study.</b></p> <p>Likely answers may cover the following content:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Sperry</u>: The participant had one eye covered and was asked to gaze at a fixed point in the centre of a projector screen. Visual stimuli were back-projected onto the screen, either to the right or left of the screen, at a very high speed – one picture every 1/10<sup>th</sup> of a second or less. This meant that the eye only had time to process the image in the visual field where it was placed (ie if the image was shown to the left visual field there was not time for the participant to move their eye or head so the right visual field might also receive the image). Below the screen was a gap so the participant could reach objects but not see his or her hands. Visual investigations were then conducted which involved flashing one stimuli at a time to one visual field or two stimuli simultaneously to different fields and participants were asked to identify what they saw through speech, writing or drawing. Tactile investigations involved placing an object in one hand or the other, or both hand simultaneously without the participant being able to see what they were holding and then asking them to identify what they had been holding through speech, writing, drawing or manual selection from various objects</li> <li>• Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul>	<b>[8]</b>	

G542

Mark Scheme

January 2011

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
(d)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Samuel and Bryant</u>: each age group was subdivided into three groups, closely matched for age: Condition 1 – Standard/two question/Piagetian condition: these children were given the traditional conservation task where they were asked the same conservation question twice; Condition 2 – One judgement condition: these children were asked the conservation question only once, after the display was changed (ie post-transformation); Condition 3 – Fixed array condition: this group only saw one display, the post-transformation one and were then asked the conservation question. Each child had four attempts at the tests for the conservation of number, mass and volume. However the group they had been allocated to (standard, one question or fixed array) did not vary. The order in which the children undertook the tasks was systematically varied to prevent order effects eg first child – number, mass, volume; second child – mass, volume, number; third child – volume, number, mass etc</li> <li>• Other appropriate answer</li> <li>• <u>Loftus and Palmer</u>: Experiment 1: Participants were divided into 5 groups. All participants were shown the same seven film clips of different traffic accidents which were originally made as part of a driver safety film. After each clip participants were given a questionnaire which asked them firstly describe the accident and then answer a series of specific questions about the accident. There was one critical question - 'About how fast were the cars going when they hit each other?' One group of participants was given this question whilst the other four were given the verbs 'smashed', 'collided', 'bumped' or 'contacted' instead of the verb</li> </ul>		



G542

Mark Scheme

January 2011

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
(d)	<p>'hit'. Experiment 2: Participants were divided into 3 groups. All participants were shown a one-minute film which contained a four-second multiple car accident. They were then given a questionnaire which firstly asked them to describe the accident and then answer a set of questions about the incident, including a critical question about speed where one group was asked 'About how fast were the cars going when they 'smashed' into each other?' another group were asked 'About how fast were the cars going when they 'hit' each other?' and the third group did not have a question relating to vehicular speed. One week later participants returned and without seeing the film clip again completed another questionnaire about the accident which contained the further critical question 'Did you see any broken glass?' There had been no broken glass in the original film.</p> <p><u>NB because this is an 8 mark question BOTH experiments should be referred to. If only one is mentioned, maximum of 4 marks</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.            1-3 marks – Description of procedure is very basic and lacks detail and accuracy (eg two or three general statements are identified). Some understanding may be evident. Expression is generally poor with few, if any, psychological terms and few, if any, links to the chosen study.</p>		

G542

Mark Scheme

January 2011

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
(d)	<p>4-6 marks – Description of the procedure is accurate though there will be some omissions. Fine details are occasionally present and understanding is evident. Expression and use of psychological terminology is reasonable and there are some clear, appropriate links to the chosen study.</p> <p>7-8 marks – Description of procedure is accurate and detailed with few or no omissions. The detail is appropriate to the level and time allowed. Understanding, expression and use of psychological terminology are very good. There are many, clear and appropriate links to the chosen study.</p>		
(e)	<p><b>Suggest how the procedure followed in your chosen study could be improved.</b></p> <p>Answers are likely to refer to ways of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improving ecological validity</li> <li>• Reducing the chance that demand characteristics will influence results</li> <li>• Reducing the chance that socially desirable behaviour will influence results</li> <li>• Making the study longitudinal rather than snapshot</li> <li>• Improving any ethical issues</li> <li>• Improvements to the sample</li> <li>• Other appropriate suggestions should be considered and accepted.</li> </ul> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.            1-3 marks – One or two improvements are suggested which are very basic and lack detail (one or two general statements are identified eg do the study in a natural environment). There are few, if any, suggestions as to how the improvements could be implemented. Some understanding may be evident. The answer is unstructured, muddled, and</p>	[8]	<p><i>This question part requires candidates to describe <u>what</u> they would improve and <u>how</u> they would do it. Suggestions here may not be practical or ethical but they should still receive credit eg real car crash Implications mentioned in this question part do not gain credit.</i></p> <p><i>EACH ISSUE RAISED, REGARDLESS OF THE NUMBER OF IMPROVEMENTS SUGGESTED SHOULD ONLY BE CONSIDERED AS ONE CHANGE EG REGARDLESS OF HOW MANY ETHICAL IMPROVEMENTS ARE SUGGESTED THIS COULD ONLY COUNT AS 1 CHANGE SO CANNOT GAIN MORE THAN 6 MARKS WITHOUT ANOTHER ISSUE BEING CONSIDERED EG IMPROVEMENT TO METHODOLOGY</i></p>

G542

Mark Scheme

January 2011

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
(e)	<p>grammatical structure is poor. There are few, if any, links to the chosen study.</p> <p><u>NB: A maximum of 3 marks can be gained if the answer is not clearly linked to the chosen study</u></p> <p>4-6 marks – Description of one or more appropriate changes is accurate. Detail is good and basic suggestions are made as to how the improvements could be implemented. Understanding is evident. Expression and use of psychological terminology is reasonable. The answer has some structure and organisation, is mostly grammatically correct and has few spelling errors. There are some clear, appropriate links to the chosen study.</p> <p>7-8 marks – Description of <u>at least two</u> appropriate changes is accurate and clear links to the chosen study are evident throughout. Sound suggestions are made as to how the improvements could be implemented. Detail is appropriate to level and time allowed. Understanding, expression, literacy and use of psychological terminology are good. The answer is competently structured and organised and is grammatically correct with only occasional spelling errors.</p>		
(f)	<p><b>Outline the implications of the procedural changes you have suggested for your chosen study.</b></p> <p>Answers are likely to refer to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More natural/realistic behaviour will be recorded</li> <li>• Improved reliability</li> <li>• Improved generalisability</li> <li>• Improved usefulness</li> <li>• Changes in findings/results</li> </ul>	[8]	

G542

Mark Scheme

January 2011

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
(f)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advantages/disadvantages of improving possible ethical issues</li> <li>• Sampling problems</li> <li>• Cost and time implications</li> <li>• Other appropriate suggestions should be considered and accepted.</li> </ul> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer eg repetition of suggestions made in part (e).</p> <p>1-3 marks – Implications are very basic and lack detail (eg one or two general statements are identified such as increased EV, no demand characteristics). Some understanding may be evident. Expression is generally poor. The answer is unstructured, lacks organisation, grammatical structure is poor and there are many spelling errors. There are few, if any, links to the chosen study.</p> <p><u>NB: A maximum of 3 marks can be gained if the answer is not linked to the chosen study</u></p> <p>4-6 marks – Description of implications is accurate. Detail is good and some understanding is evident. Expression and use of psychological terminology is reasonable. The answer has some structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with some spelling errors. There are some clear, appropriate links to the chosen study.</p> <p>7-8 marks – Description of implications is accurate and clear links to the chosen study <b>are evident throughout</b>. Detail is appropriate to level and time allowed. Understanding is very good. Expression and use of psychological terminology is good. The answer is competently structured and organised. The answer is grammatically correct with occasional spelling errors.</p>		
<b>Section B Total</b>		<b>[36]</b>	

G542

Mark Scheme

January 2011

Section C

EITHER

Question		Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
17	(a)	<p><b>Outline <u>one</u> assumption of the social approach.</b></p> <p>Likely answer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One assumption of the social approach is that other people and the surrounding environment are major influences on an individual's behaviour, thought processes and emotions</li> <li>Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.            1 mark – Assumption is identified. Description is basic and lacks detail. Some understanding may be evident. Expression is generally poor.            2 marks – Description of assumption is accurate. Detail is appropriate and understanding is very good. Fine details may be added. Expression and use of psychological terminology is good.</p>	[2]	<p><i>The assumption must be:            Linked to the social approach            Linked to behaviour</i></p>
	(b)	<p><b>With reference to Milgram's study, describe how the social approach could explain obedience.</b></p> <p>Likely answer may cover the following content:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The social approach, as demonstrated through Milgram's study could explain obedience. Firstly, as Milgram himself suggested the environment – Yale University – may have influenced participants as to the worthiness of the study and the competence of the experimenter, resulting in high levels of obedience which may not be found in a less prestigious setting. Secondly, the presence of what</li> </ul>	[4]	

G542

Mark Scheme

January 2011

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
(b)	<p>appeared to be a legitimate authority figure, dressed in a white lab coat, carrying a clip board, influenced the participants' behaviour as they believed him to be a trustworthy and knowledgeable individual who should be obeyed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.            1-2 marks – Description is generally accurate, but is basic and lacks detail. Some understanding and or elaboration may be evident. Expression is generally poor.  <u>NB: A maximum of 1 mark can be gained for a generic explanation not linked to the named study into obedience.</u>            3-4 marks – Description is accurate. Detail is appropriate and understanding is good. Elaboration (eg specific detail or example) is evident. Expression and use of psychological terminology is good.</p>		
(c)	<p><b>Describe <u>one</u> similarity and <u>one</u> difference between any core studies that take the social approach</b></p> <p>Answers are likely to refer to: sample, methodology, ethics.</p> <p>Possible answers:</p> <p>Similarity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A similarity can be found between the Milgram study into obedience and the Reicher and Haslam BBC prison study which also takes the social approach in that both studies used samples comprised of adult males. Milgram's study involved 40 adult males; aged 20-50,</li> </ul>	<p><b>[3+3]</b> <b>[6]</b></p>	<p><i>This question requires candidates to refer to the 3 social approach core studies</i></p>

G542

Mark Scheme

January 2011

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
(c)	<p>from various occupational and educational backgrounds, and Reicher and Haslam used 15 males who showed a diversity of age, social class and ethnic background</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.            1 mark – Similarity is identified, with little or no elaboration, topic of study is merely reiterated.            2 marks – Description of similarity is basic and lacks detail. Some understanding may be evident. Expression is generally poor.            3 marks – Description of similarity is accurate and has elaboration. Understanding is good.</p> <p>Difference:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A difference between the two studies is the country/environment in which the studies were conducted in that Milgram's was conducted in America whereas Reicher and Haslam's took place in England./ Milgram carried out his experiment in Yale University which is in the New Haven area of Connecticut, USA, whereas Reicher and Haslam created their mock prison at Elstree Studios in London, England</li> <li>• Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.            1 mark –Difference is identified, with little or no elaboration, topic of study is merely reiterated.            2 marks – Description of difference is basic and lacks detail. Some understanding may be evident. Expression is generally poor.            3 marks – Description of difference is accurate and has elaboration. Understanding is good.</p>		

G542

Mark Scheme

January 2011

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
(d)	<p><b>Discuss strengths <u>and</u> weaknesses of the social approach using examples from any core studies that take this approach.</b></p> <p>Strengths may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It helps us understand how behaviour can be influenced by other people and the situation in which people find themselves...</li> <li>• It can provide explanations for a great many phenomena...</li> </ul> <p>Weaknesses may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It underestimates the influence of individual differences on behaviour...</li> <li>• It often fails to emphasise that human behaviour has not just a cultural but also an historical context...</li> </ul> <p>Possible answer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One strength of the social approach is that it helps understand how behaviour can be influenced by other people and the situation in which people find themselves.[S] For example, Milgram suggested the high levels of obedience found in his experiment were due not only to the presence of a legitimate authority figure but also because the study was conducted in a renowned educational establishment.[E] This indicates that to get desirable behaviour one must ensure the people involved and the situation are appropriate.[C]</li> </ul>	[12]	<p><i>This question again requires candidates to refer to the 3 social approach core studies.</i></p> <p><i>The candidate must make it clear why their suggestion is a strength/weakness.</i></p> <p><i>The supporting evidence must actually support the identified strength/weakness i.e. be appropriately contextualised.</i></p> <p><i>Study-specific answers are NOT creditworthy</i></p>



G542

Mark Scheme

January 2011

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
(d)	<p>Another strength of the social approach is that it can provide explanations for a great many phenomena. The big moral question in the middle of the twentieth century was how the horrors of WW2 could have happened. Was the killing of so many Jews because Germans were particularly obedient to authority figures?[S] Studies like Milgram's have shown that, under the right conditions, Americans (and subsequently other cultures) will obey authority figures even when the command requires destructive behaviour. [E] His findings therefore not only help explain the obedience of the Germans to Hitler's inhumane commands but open up research opportunities to investigate how such atrocities may be prevented in the future.[C]</p> <p>A weakness of the social approach is that it underestimates the influence of individual differences on behaviour. [W] Although Milgram's study showed that 65% (26/40) of the participants were prepared to obey the authority figure and give electric shocks up to 450 volts, 35% (14/40) were not prepared to go to such extremes.[E] Likewise, although Milgram obtained extremely high levels of obedience from his male participants it is generally accepted that although females are more obedient, they are more caring and empathetic, so would they behave in the same way?[E] Individual differences in personality as well as upbringing influence behaviour; so suggesting that behaviour is totally influenced by one's social environment is reductionist.[C]</p>		

G542

Mark Scheme

January 2011

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
(d)	<p>A further weakness of the social approach is that it often fails to emphasise that human behaviour has not just a cultural but also an historical context.[W] Milgram was able to demonstrate that most cultures throughout the world in the 1960's were obedient to authority figures. However these results may only apply to that historical period. Many events in the early 21<sup>st</sup> Century eg disobedience to police instructions are regularly cited in the national press; suggest that if Milgram were to conduct his research in today's social environment, results may be very different.[E] The social approach therefore often only provides 'superficial snapshots of social processes' (Hayes, 1995), ignoring their development over time and the broader social, political and historical context that the research takes place in. [C]</p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.  1-3 marks – There may be some strengths or weaknesses which are appropriate or peripheral to the question, or there may be an imbalance between the two. Discussion is poor with limited or no understanding. Expression is poor. Analysis is sparse and argument may be just discernible. Sparse or no use of supporting examples.  4-6 marks – There may be some strengths and weaknesses which are appropriate to the question, or there may be an imbalance between the two. Discussion is reasonable with some understanding though expression may be limited. Analysis is effective sometimes and argument limited. Sparse use of supporting examples.</p>		<p><i>NB: NO MORE THAN 6 MARKS CAN BE AWARDED IF THE CANDIDATE HAS NOT PROVIDED 2 APPROPRIATE STRENGTHS AND 2 APPROPRIATE WEAKNESSES</i></p>

G542

Mark Scheme

January 2011

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
(d)	<p>7-9 marks – There may be a range of strengths (2 or more) and weaknesses (2 or more) 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 supporting examples</p> <p>10-12 marks – There is a good range of strengths (2 or more) and weaknesses (2 or more) 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 occasional spelling errors.</p>		

G542

Mark Scheme

January 2011

OR

Question		Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
18	(a)	<p><b>Outline <u>one</u> assumption of the individual differences approach.</b></p> <p>Likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Individuals differ in their behaviour and personal qualities so not everyone can be considered 'the average person'</li> <li>• Every individual is genetically unique and this uniqueness is displayed through their behaviour. So everyone behaves differently</li> <li>• All human characteristics can be measured and quantified .The measures gained from one person are different to those gathered from another</li> <li>• All psychological characteristics are inherited and as everyone inherits different characteristics, everyone is different and unique</li> <li>• Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.            1 mark – Assumption is identified. Description is basic and lacks detail. Some understanding may be evident. Expression is generally poor.            2 marks – Description of assumption is accurate. Detail is appropriate and understanding is very good. Fine details may be added. Expression and use of psychological terminology is good.</p>	[2]	<p><i>The assumption must be:</i>  <i>Linked to the individual differences approach</i>  <i>Linked to behaviour</i></p>

G542

Mark Scheme

January 2011

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
(b)	<p><b>With reference to Griffiths' study, describe how the individual differences approach could explain gambling addiction.</b></p> <p>Likely answer may cover the following content:</p> <p>This approach can explain gambling because it focuses on differences between people rather than commonalities between people. Griffiths in his study into fruit machine gambling looked at the behaviours of regular and non-regular gamblers. He found regular gamblers were more likely than non-regular gamblers to personalise the machine by saying such things as 'The machine likes me', and to make more irrational vocalisations than non-regular gamblers such as 'I lost because I wasn't concentrating.' Such behaviours show that regular gamblers behave differently to non-regular gamblers showing that individual differences are strong factors affecting gambling behaviour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other appropriate answer</li> </ul> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.            1-2 marks – Description is generally accurate, but is basic and lacks detail. Some understanding and or elaboration may be evident. Expression is generally poor.  <u>NB: A maximum of 1 mark can be gained for a generic explanation not linked to the named study into gambling.</u>            3-4 marks – Description is accurate. Detail is appropriate and understanding is good. Elaboration (eg specific detail or example) is evident. Expression and use of psychological terminology is good.</p>	[4]	

G542

Mark Scheme

January 2011

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
(c)	<p><b>Describe <u>one</u> similarity and <u>one</u> difference between any core studies that take the individual differences approach.</b></p> <p>Answers are likely to refer to: sample, methodology, ethics.</p> <p>Possible answers:</p> <p>Similarity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A similarity between two studies that take the individual differences approach is that both the Rosenhan study 'sane in insane places' and Griffiths' study into fruit machine gambling were conducted in natural environments. The Rosenhan study looked at the behaviour of staff in 12 psychiatric wards in 12 real hospitals across various states in America and Griffiths' study was conducted in a real gambling arcade in Exeter, Devon, England. Both studies are therefore high in ecological validity and results can be considered representative of what one would find in the real world.</li> <li>• Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.  1 mark – Similarity is identified, with little or no elaboration, topic of study is merely reiterated.  2 marks – Description of similarity is basic and lacks detail. Some understanding may be evident. Expression is generally poor.  3 marks – Description of similarity is accurate and has elaboration. Understanding is good.</p>	<p><b>[3+3]</b> <b>[6]</b></p>	<p><i>This question requires candidates to refer to the 3 individual differences approach core studies</i></p>

G542

Mark Scheme

January 2011

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
(c)	<p>Difference:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A difference between two studies that take the individual differences approach is that Thigpen and Cleckley in their study into multiple personality disorder only studied one individual – Eve White, whereas Rosenhan’s sample consisted of any of the staff on duty during the time of the study in the 12 hospitals selected for the investigation. This means that Thigpen and Cleckley findings cannot be generalised to any other individuals whose experience of multiple personality disorder is likely to be very different to that of Eve whereas Rosenhan’s findings are very likely to be representative of most staff in psychiatric wards across the USA.</li> <li>• Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.            1 mark – Difference is identified, with little or no elaboration, topic of study is merely reiterated.            2 marks – Description of difference is basic and lacks detail. Some understanding may be evident. Expression is generally poor.            3 marks – Description of difference is accurate and has elaboration. Understanding is good.</p>		

G542

Mark Scheme

January 2011

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
(d)	<p><b>Discuss strengths <u>and</u> weaknesses of the individual differences approach using examples from any core studies that take this approach.</b></p> <p>Strengths may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allows psychologists to learn more about human behaviours because all behaviours, not just average ones are studied</li> <li>• Allows psychologists to measure differences between individuals in qualities such as personality, intelligence, memory etc</li> <li>• Allows one to identify differences between individuals, so comparisons can be made.</li> </ul> <p>Weaknesses may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Techniques used are not fully objective and therefore open to bias</li> <li>• It creates divisions between people because individuals are identified as being 'different'</li> <li>• It is difficult to define and measure individual qualities such as personality, intelligence etc</li> <li>• Ethical concerns may be raised.</li> </ul>	[12]	<p><i>This question requires candidates to refer to the 3 individual differences approach core studies.</i></p> <p><i>The candidate must make it clear why their suggestion is a strength/weakness.</i></p> <p><i>The supporting evidence must actually support the identified strength/weakness i.e. be appropriately contextualised.</i></p> <p><i>Study-specific answers are NOT creditworthy</i></p>



G542

Mark Scheme

January 2011

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
(d)	<p>Possible answer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A strength of this approach is that it allows one to identify differences between individuals, so comparisons can be made. In the Griffiths study into fruit machine gambling it was shown that regular gamblers made many more irrational verbalisations than non-regular gamblers suggesting individual differences influence gambling behaviour. Likewise the Thigpen and Cleckley study identified significant differences between the three personalities of Eve eg Eve White was found to be quiet and reserved, Eve Black flirtatious and unreliable and Jane the most balanced of the three. These differences allowed comparisons to be made between them so that multiple personality disorder could be identified</li> <li>• Another strength of this approach is that it allows psychologists to learn more about human behaviours because all behaviours, not just average one are studied. In the Rosenhan study, the researchers (the pseudopatients) were able to study how people who have been labelled insane (not average) are often treated unfairly by those caring for them eg hospital staff spent as little time as possible with their patients, tried to avoid conversing with them and avoided eye-contact whenever possible. Likewise Griffiths was able to study gambling behaviour and find that regular gamblers (not average) made more plays per minute (8) than non-regular</li> </ul>		

G542

Mark Scheme

January 2011

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
(d)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="392 228 1205 938">• A weakness of this approach is that the techniques used are not fully objective and therefore open to bias. In the Rosenhan study pseudopatients gathered their data through participant observation and then recorded their findings in daily diaries. These are not objective measures and the use of observation as a research method offers opportunities for behaviour to be misinterpreted. Although pseudopatients recorded that staff avoided eye-contact as much as possible and linked that to being because they did not want to converse with insane people, this could actually be because people in general try to avoid eye-contact when asked personal or awkward questions eg 'Do you know when I will be discharged?' Likewise Thigpen and Cleckley claimed that the 3 Faces of Eve were significantly different. However to an impartial witness, video evidence taken during the 100 hours of interviews, often makes the differences in the personalities impossible to identify, suggesting that the techniques used to gather data in this study were open to at least researcher bias</li> <li data-bbox="392 946 1205 1410">• A further weakness of this approach is that it often raises such ethical concerns as consent, deception, invasion of privacy and psychological stress. Participants (hospital staff) in Rosenhan's first study were deceived firstly by the fact that they were unaware that they were involved in a psychological study and secondly by the pseudopatients faking illness. They may then have become very distressed when they were told they had wrongly identified sane people as insane and concerned that both their jobs and their reputations were in jeopardy. This is extremely unethical, after all one would expect people attending a hospital claiming to hear voices to be genuine. Likewise, although Christine Sizemore (Eve</li> </ul>		

G542

Mark Scheme

January 2011

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
(d)	<p>White) was a willing participant in Thigpen and Cleckley's study she may well have suffered additional stress through the intensive 100 hours+ of interviewing, the use of hypnosis, all the physiological and psychological testing etc. She is likely also at times to have felt an invasion of privacy, particularly once a video of her interviews had been formulated and sold on the commercial market. However, she gave her consent for this to happen and has, as a result of the publicising of her case made herself famous – and rich!!</p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.  1-3 marks – There may be some strengths or weaknesses which are appropriate or peripheral to the question, or there may be an imbalance between the two. Discussion is poor with limited or no understanding. Expression is poor. Analysis is sparse and argument may be just discernible. Sparse or no use of supporting examples.  4-6 marks – There may be some strengths and weaknesses which are appropriate to the question, or there may be an imbalance between the two. Discussion is reasonable with some understanding though expression may be limited. Analysis is effective sometimes and argument limited. Sparse use of supporting examples.  7-9 marks – There may be a range of strengths (2 or more) and weaknesses (2 or more) 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 supporting examples.</p>		<p><i>NB: NO MORE THAN 6 MARKS CAN BE AWARDED IF THE CANDIDATE HAS NOT PROVIDED 2 APPROPRIATE STRENGTHS AND 2 APPROPRIATE WEAKNESSES</i></p>

G542

## Mark Scheme

January 2011

Question		Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	(d)	10-12 marks – There is a good range of strengths (2 or more) and weaknesses (2 or more) 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 occasional spelling errors.		
		<b>Section C Total</b>	<b>[24]</b>	
		<b>Paper Total</b>	<b>[120]</b>	

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

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**14 – 19 Qualifications (General)**

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