OXFORD CAMBRIDGE AND RSA EXAMINATIONS

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

GCE PSYCHOLOGY

G542 MS

Unit G542: The Core Studies

Specimen Mark Scheme

The maximum mark for this paper is **120**.

Section A		
Question Number	**Answer**	**Max Mark**
1	**The study by Bandura, Ross and Ross on the imitation of aggression used a number of experimental controls. Describe how two variables were controlled.** Most likely answer: children matched for levels of aggression; room same; items on table same; model has 10 mins; model does same behaviours in same order; etc **1 mark** - Identification of control with little detail e.g. Children matched **2 marks** – Full description of control e.g. Children matched for levels of aggression	**[2+2]** **[4]**
2(a)	**Describe the sample used in the study of taxi drivers' brains by Maguire et al.** Any two from the following. • Sample size 16; • all male; • mean age 44; • all licensed taxi drivers for more than 18months; • general health; • neurological and psychiatric profiles all good; • Controls taken from MRI scan data base at same unit that taxi drivers had scans. **1 mark** per example **2 marks max**	**[2]**
2(b)	**Suggest one application of the findings from the study of taxi drivers' brains by Maguire et al** The demonstration that normal activities can induce changes in the relative volume of grey matter in the brain has obvious implications for the rehabilitation of those who have suffered brain injury. **1 mark** – Identification of application with little detail e.g. used to help brain injuries **2 marks** – Full description of application e.g. being able to change the volume of grey matter would help with rehabilitation of accident victims	**[2]**

Section A		
Question Number	**Answer**	**Max Mark**
3	**Describe two features of the experiment by Milgram that may explain the high levels of obedience.** Most likely from a long list including: 1. Done at Yale University; 2. experiment has a worthy purpose – learning & memory; 3. participants has volunteered; 4. participant feels obliged; 5. participant is paid; 6. teacher-learner random so both had equal chance; 7. participants told 'painful but not dangerous'. **1 mark** – Identification of features with little detail e.g. participants are paid **2 marks** – Full description of features e.g. participant is paid so is obliged to continue.	**[2+2]** **[4]**
4 **4(a)**	**From the study by Dement and Kleitman:** **Outline one way sleep has been measured.** Sleep can be measured in a number of ways: Using equipment such as EOG, EMG, EEG. Dement used EEG only, but Question is general. Also self reports of dream content, estimation of dream time. Observation of actual eye movements, such as whether they move vertically or in other directions. **1 mark** – Identification of one way with little detail e.g. EEG **2 marks** – Full description of one way e.g. to measure changes in brain waves during sleep.	**[2]**
4(b)	**Give one strength of this method of data collection.** EOG, EEG, EMG any advantage applicable to use of equipment. Observation – of natural behaviour Self reports – can know exactly what participant dreams about. **1 mark** – Identification of strength with little detail e.g. natural behaviour. **2 marks** – Full description of strength e.g. allows for more accurate data collection due to natural behaviour.	**[2]**

Section A		
Question Number	**Answer**	**Max Mark**
5	**In the study by Reicher and Haslam;** **Describe the ways in which the guards failed to identify with their role.** Description may include; Guards showed awareness from the start of the power they had and felt uncomfortable about it in their conversations. They offered their left over food to the prisoners because they felt bad about the difference in quality. The guards failed to exercise power even though they had many options open to them because of their fear of being seen as authoritarian. They promoted a prisoner who embodied their ambivalence (mixed up feelings). They gave away some of their power to become more democratic 1 mark identification of one way that the guards failed to identify 2 marksdescription of the way that the guards failed to identify Identification of two ways that the guards failed to identify 3 marksdetailed description of the ways that the guards failed to identify 4 marks fully detailed description of the ways that the guards failed to identify	**[4]**

Section A		
Question Number	**Answer**	**Max Mark**
6(a)	**What is meant by the term 'inter-rater reliability'?** Inter-rater reliability is the agreement between two observers watching the same events. After the observation, their records are correlated statistically. If there is good inter-rater reliability, there will be a strong positive correlation **1 mark** – Identification of the term with little detail e.g. consistency **2 marks** – Full description of the term e.g. two observers tested to ensure observations are consistent.	**[2]**
6(b)	**Give one example of inter-rater reliability from a core study.** Inter-rater reliability used to test reliability of observations in Bandura's study. **1 mark** – Identification of example with little detail e.g. observers in Bandura's Study **2 marks** – Full description of example e.g. observers of the children in Banduras study correlated their observations.	**[2]**
7(a)	**Give one assumption of the psychodynamic approach.** Most likely: personality influenced by subconscious mind; children develop through number of stages. **1 mark** – Identification of assumption with little detail e.g. psychosexual stages. **2 marks** – Full description of assumption e.g. children develop through a series of psychosexual stages.	**[2]**
7(b)	**Give one criticism of the psychodynamic approach.** Most likely: unscientific methods of study; difficult to support or refute. Use of case studies. **1 mark** – Identification of criticism with little detail e.g. unscientific **2 marks** – Full description of criticism e.g. case study method lacks scientific rigour.	**[2]**

Section A		
Question Number	**Question Number**	**Question Number**
8	**From the study by Savage-Rumbaugh et al;** **Name two pieces of evidence that pygmy chimpanzees have a greater aptitude for the acquisition of symbols than other apes.** Any one of; Sherman and Austin did not form associations between lexigrams and objects as did Kanzi and Mulika. Sherman and Austin went through a period of new word usage when new words were used incorrectly and then dropped out as correct associations were formed. Kanzi and Mulika used words correctly from the start. Sherman and Austin responded to English only in situations that provided them with contextual information including non-verbal cues. Kanzi and Mulika's understanding is not context dependent. Sherman and Austin aquired broad differentiations for categories e.g. drinking. Kanzi and Mulika were able to differentiate between items in a category e.g. coke, juice Sherman and Austin never formed requests in which someone other than themselves was the beneficiary. Kanzi could request that A act on B when he was neither A or B 1 mark identification of piece of evidence with little detail 2 mark full description of piece of evidence	**[2+2]**
9 **9(a)**	**From the study by Baron-Cohen, Jolliffe, Mortimore and Robertson on autism** **Briefly describe the eyes task** The Eyes task comprises of photographs of the eyes region of faces and the participant is given the question 'which word best describes what this person is feeling or thinking' and given a forced choice between two words such as 'angry' and 'sad'. **1 mark** – Identification of task with little detail e.g. shown photos **2 marks** – Full description of task e.g. shown pictures of task and asked what the person is feeling	**[2]**

Section A		
Question Number	**Answer**	**Max Mark**
9(b)	**Describe how the validity of this task was checked** The test was correlated (concurrent validity) with Happe's strange stories to test an equivalent test of theory of mind **1 mark** – Identification of how validity was checked with little detail e.g. concurrent validity. **2 marks** – Full description of how validity was checked e.g. concurrent validity by comparison of results with other studies.	**[2]**
10	**Briefly explain why Samuel and Bryant conducted their study of cognitive development** Two possible answers, either (or both) acceptable: 1. work of Piaget on cognitive development; 2. work of Rose and Blank on methodological issues arising from Piaget's work. **1 mark** – Identification of context not related to study **2 marks** – Description of context related to the study **3 marks** - Detailed description context related to study but may be superficial description and/or link **4 marks** - Fully detailed description of context with explicit links to the study.	**[4]**
11 **11(a)**	**The study by Griffiths on gambling used the thinking aloud method.** **Outline how the thinking aloud method was used in this study.** Thinking aloud consists of verbalizing every thought that passes through one's mind. Participants had verbalizations recorded via microphone attached to a tape recorder and thought aloud as they gambled. **1 mark** – Identification of how method was used with little detail e.g. talking into a tape recorder. **2 marks** – Full description of how method was used e.g. verbalising thoughts into a tape recorder whilst they gambled.	**[2]**
11(b)	**Give one advantage of the thinking aloud method.** Most likely: qualitative data; possibly fewer demand characteristics; possibly no socially desirable influences; gives insight into thought processes. **1 mark** – Identification of advantage e.g. qualitative data. **2 marks** – Full description of advantage e.g. qualitative data which is rich/detailed.	**[2]**

Section A		
Question Number	**Answer**	**Max Mark**
12	**Give one similarity and one difference between the study on aggression by Bandura, Ross and Ross and the study by Sperry.** Most likely similarity: lab/controlled setting, use of materials/objects, one to one situation, Most likely differences: children/adults, abnormal and normal participants, sample size etc **1 mark** – Identification of similarity and difference with little detail e.g. need observation **2 marks** – Full description of similarity and difference e.g. observed participants through a one way mirror.	**[2+2]**
13	**Briefly describe the cost benefit theory suggested by Piliavin, Rodin and Piliavin to explain how people behave when deciding whether to help a victim.** Rational decision made on basis of balance of costs and benefits applied to a given situation. **1 mark** – Identification of rational decision not related to study **2 marks** – Description of rational decision related to the study **3 marks** - Detailed description rational decision related to study but may be superficial description and/or link **4 marks-** Fully detailed description of rational decision with explicit links to the study.	**[4]**
14	**The study by Rosenhan raises questions about medical decision making Suggest how type one and type two errors could apply in the study by Thigpen and Cleckley on multiple personality disorder.** Type one error is when a sick person is labelled healthy; type two when a healthy person is labelled as sick. Eve could have been healthy but Thigpen and Cleckley labelled her as having multiple personality disorder. **1 mark** – Identification of type one and two errors not related to the study. **2 marks** – Description of type one and two errors related to the study. **3 marks** – Detailed description of type one and two errors related to the study but may be superficial description and/or link. **4 marks** - Fully detailed description of type one and two errors with explicit links to the study. For full marks description of errors must be included and how they relate to the Thigpen study.	**[4]**

Section A		
Question Number	**Answer**	**Max Mark**
15	**In experiment 2 of the Loftus and Palmer study on eyewitness testimony:**	
15(a)	**What was the result for the 'hit' and control group?**	
	In the hit group 7 participants saw broken glass; in the control group 6 participants saw broken glass.	
	1 mark – Identification of result with little detail e.g. one group.	
	2 marks – Full description of result e.g. two groups.	**[2]**
15(b)	**Give one reason why these participants saw broken glass.**	
	One week later they received a question asking 'did you see broken glass' and this led them to perceive the glass.	
	1 mark – Identification of reason with little detail e.g. altered memory.	
	2 marks – Full description of reason e.g. critical question altered the structure of memory.	**[2]**
	Section A Total	**[60]**

Section B		
Question Number	**Answer**	**Max Mark**
16	**Choose one core study and answer the questions below:**	
16(a)	**What was the aim of your chosen study?**	
	0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.	
	1 mark – Aim is identified. Description is basic and lacks detail. Some understanding may be evident. Expression generally poor.	
	2 marks – Description of aim is accurate. Detail is appropriate and understanding is very good. Fine details may be added. Expression and use of psychological terminology is good.	**[2]**
16(b)	**Describe the sample used in your chosen study and give one limitation of it.**	
	Sample	
	1 mark - Sample is identified, with little or no elaboration.	
	2 marks – Description of sample is basic and lacks in detail. Some understanding may be evident. Expression generally poor.	
	3 marks – Description of sample is accurate and has elaboration. Understanding is good e.g. numbers, ages, genders, target population.	
	Limitation	
	0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.	
	1 mark - Peripherally relevant limitation identified, with little or no elaboration e.g. Generalisability.	
	2 marks – Appropriate limitation chosen. Description of limitation is basic and lacks detail. Limitation is peripherally relevant.	
	3 marks – Appropriate limitation chosen. Description of limitation is accurate and has elaboration. Limitation supports description of sample e.g. children, students.	**[3+3]** **[6]**
16(c)	**Describe how observational data was gathered in your chosen study.**	
	0 marks – No or marks irrelevant answer.	
	1-2 marks – Description of procedure is very basic and lacks in detail (e.g. one or two general statements are identified). Some understanding may be evident. Expression generally poor.	
	3-4 marks – Description of procedure is accurate. Some omissions. Detail is good. Some understanding is evident. Fine details occasionally present, but often absent. Expression and use of psychological terminology is reasonable.	
	5-6 marks – Description of procedure is accurate. Very few or no omissions. Detail is appropriate to level and time allowed. Understanding is very good. Fine details may be added (such as numbers, or specific aspects) Expression and use of psychological terminology is good.	**[3+3]** **[6]**

Section B		
Question Number	**Answer**	**Max Mark**
16(d)	**Give one advantage and one disadvantage of observational studies.** Advantage: **0 marks** – No or irrelevant answer. **1 mark** – Advantage is identified, with little or no elaboration. **2 marks** – Description of advantage is basic and lacks in detail. Some understanding may be evident. Expression generally poor. **3 marks** – Description of advantage is accurate and has elaboration. Understanding is good. Disadvantage: **0 marks** – No or irrelevant answer. **1 mark** – Disadvantage is identified, with little or no elaboration. **2 marks** – Description of disadvantage is basic and lacks in detail. Some understanding may be evident. Expression generally poor. **3 marks** – Description of disadvantage is accurate and has elaboration. Understanding is good.	**[6]**
16(e)	**Suggest two changes to your chosen study and outline any methodological implications these changes may have.** Changes to study/procedure: **0 marks** – No or irrelevant answer. **1-2 marks** – One change (or changes) identified but with little or no expansion. Implications may be identified. **3-4 marks** – Changes suggested (2 or more) with expansion and/or explanation. Suggestion is increasingly clear and understanding is good. There may be analysis of suggested changes. Implications of change considered and explained. Implications: **0 marks** – No or irrelevant answer. **1-2 marks** – Discussion of suggested changes is sparse, with very little if any analysis or argument. Implication of changes may be identified. Effect on study/procedure may be identified. Understanding of effects just discernible. **3-4 marks** – Discussion of suggested changes is good, with effective analysis and competent argument at the top end. Effect on study/procedure is explained rather than identified. Understanding of effects is good.	**[8]**

Section B		
Question Number	**Answer**	**Max Mark**
16(f)	**Outline the results of your chosen study.** Changes to study/procedure: **0 marks** – No or irrelevant answer. **1-3 marks** – Description of results is very basic and lacks in detail (e.g. one or two general statements are identified). Some understanding may be evident. Expression generally poor. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. The answer lacks grammatical structure and contains many spelling errors. **4-6 marks** – Description of results is accurate. Some omissions. Detail is good. Some understanding is evident. Fine details occasionally present, but often absent. 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. **7-8 marks** – Description of results is accurate. Very few or no omissions. Detail is appropriate to level and time allowed. Understanding is very good. Fine details may be added (such as numbers, or specific aspects) Expression and use of psychological terminology is good. The answer is competently structured and organised. The answer is grammatically correct with occasional spelling errors.	**[8]**
	Section B Total	**[36]**

Section C		
Question Number	**Answer**	**Max Mark**
17(a)	**Outline one assumption of the social approach in psychology.** **0 marks** – No or irrelevant answer **1 mark** – Assumption is identified. Description is basic and lacks detail. Some understanding may be evident. Expression 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.	**[2]**
17(b)	**Describe how the social approach could explain obedience.** **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 generally poor. **3-4 marks** – Description is accurate. Detail is appropriate and understanding is good. Elaboration (e.g. specific detail or example) is evident. Expression and use of psychological terminology is good.	**[4]**
17(c)	**Describe one similarity and one difference between the Milgram study and any other social approach study.** Similarity: **0 marks** – No or irrelevant answer. **1 mark** – Similarity is identified, with little or no elaboration. **2 marks** – Description of similarity is basic and lacks in detail. Some understanding may be evident. Expression generally poor. **3 marks** – Description of similarity is accurate and has elaboration. Understanding is good. Difference: **0 marks** – No or irrelevant answer. **1 mark** – Difference is identified, with little or no elaboration. **2 marks** – Description of difference is basic and lacks in detail. Some understanding may be evident. Expression generally poor. **3 marks** – Description of difference is accurate and has elaboration. Understanding is good.	**[3+3]** **[6]**

Section C		
Question Number	**Answer**	**Max Mark**
17(d)	**Discuss the strengths and limitations of the social approach using examples from the Milgram study.** **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 a balance between the two. Discussion is good with some understanding and good expression. Analysis is reasonably effective and argument informed. Some use of supporting examples. Maximum mark of 7 for strengths or weaknesses only. **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.	**[12]**
18(a)	**Outline one assumption of the behaviourist approach in psychology.** **0 marks** – No or irrelevant answer. **1 mark** – Assumption is identified. Description is basic and lacks detail. Some understanding may be evident. Expression 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.	**[2]**
18(b)	**Describe how the behaviourist approach could explain aggression.** **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 generally poor. **3-4 marks** – Description is accurate. Detail is appropriate and understanding is good. Elaboration (e.g. specific detail or example) is evident. Expression and use of psychological terminology is good.	**[4]**

Section C		
Question Number	**Answer**	**Max Mark**
18(c)	**Describe one similarity and one difference between the Bandura, Ross and Ross study and any other developmental study.** Similarity: **0 marks** – No or irrelevant answer. **1 mark** – Similarity is identified, with little or no elaboration. **2 marks** – Description of similarity is basic and lacks in detail. Some understanding may be evident. Expression generally poor. **3 marks** – Description of similarity is accurate and has elaboration. Understanding is good. Difference: **0 marks** – No or irrelevant answer. **1 mark** – Difference is identified, with little or no elaboration. **2 marks** – Description of difference is basic and lacks in detail. Some understanding may be evident. Expression generally poor. **3 marks** – Description of difference is accurate and has elaboration. Understanding is good.	**[6]**
18(d)	**Discuss the strengths and limitations of the behaviourist approach using examples from any study involving behaviourism.** **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 a balance between the two. Discussion is good with some understanding and good expression. Analysis is reasonably effective and argument informed. Some use of supporting examples. Maximum mark of 7 for strengths or weaknesses only. **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.	**[12]**
	Section C Total	**[24]**
	Paper Total	**[120]**

Assessment Objectives Grid (includes QWC)

Section A Question	AO1	AO2	AO3	Total
1	2	2		4
2(a)	2			2
2(b)		2		2
3	2	2		4
4(a)	2			2
4(b)			2	2
5(a)	2			2
5(b)		2		2
6(a)	2			2
6(b)		2		2
7(a)	2			2
7(b)		2		2
8	2		2	4
9(a)	2			2
9(b)		2		2
10	4			4
11(a)	2			2
11(b)		2		2
12		4		4
13	4			4
14		4		4
15(a)	2			2
15(b)		2		2
Total	**30**	**26**	**4**	**60**
Section B Question	**AO1**	**AO2**	**AO3**	**Total**
16(a)			2	2
16(b)	2		4	6
16(c)	2		4	6
16(d)		6		6
16(e)		4	4	8
16(f)	6	2		8
Total	**10**	**12**	**14**	**36**
Section C Question Candidate answers either Q1 or Q2	**AO1**	**AO2**	**AO3**	**Total**
1(a)	2			2
1(b)	2	2		4
1(c)	3	2	1	6
1(d)	5	5	2	12
2(a)	2			2
2(b)	2	2		4
2(c)	3	2	1	6
2(d)	5	5	2	12
Total	**12**	**9**	**3**	**24**
Paper Total	**52**	**47**	**21**	**120**