



Oxford Cambridge and RSA

**Practice Paper 1 – Set 1**

A Level Psychology

H567/02 Psychological themes through core studies

**MARK SCHEME**

**Duration:** 2 hours

**MAXIMUM MARK      105**

**Final  
Last updated: 27/04/2016**

**This document consists of 24 pages**

## LEVELS OF RESPONSE – LEVEL DESCRIPTORS

	<b>A01</b>	<b>A02</b>	<b>A03</b>
<b>Good</b>	Response demonstrates good relevant knowledge and understanding. Accurate and detailed description.	Response demonstrates good application of psychological knowledge and understanding. Application will be mainly explicit, accurate and relevant.	Response demonstrates good analysis, interpretation and/or evaluation that is mainly relevant to the demand of the question. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and argument is highly skilled and shows good understanding.
<b>Reasonable</b>	Response demonstrates reasonable relevant knowledge and understanding. Generally accurate description lacking some detail.	Response demonstrates reasonable application of psychological knowledge and understanding. Application will be partially explicit, accurate and relevant.	Response demonstrates reasonable analysis, interpretation and/or evaluation that is partially relevant to the demand of the question. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and argument are competent and understanding is reasonable.
<b>Limited</b>	Response demonstrates limited relevant knowledge and understanding. Limited description lacking in detail.	Response demonstrates limited application of psychological knowledge and understanding. Application may be related to the general topic area rather than the specific question.	Response demonstrates limited analysis, interpretation and/or evaluation that may be related to topic area. Some valid conclusions that summarise issues and arguments.
<b>Basic</b>	Response demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding that is only partially relevant. Basic description with no detail.	Response demonstrates basic application of psychological knowledge and understanding. Responses will be generalised lacking focus on the question.	Response demonstrates basic analysis, interpretation and/or evaluation that is not related to the question. Basic or no valid conclusions that attempt to summarise issues. No evidence of arguments.

Section A				
Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	a	<p><b>From Milgram's study of obedience: Describe how obedience was measured</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Observers noted down the maximum shock a participant administered before they refused to go any further or the study ended</li> <li>• The experimenter and observers watched and noted the highest shock level (between 15 – 450 volts) given by each participant</li> </ul>	2	<p><b>2 marks</b> – Clear description of how obedience was measured as detailed</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer e.g. how far participants shocked</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy response</p>
	b	<p><b>Outline one problem with measuring obedience in this way.</b></p> <p><b>Likely problems to be identified:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Observers may 'see' what they expect/want to see/observer bias lowering the validity of the findings</li> <li>• Observers may miss behaviours</li> <li>• If the participant knows they are being observed they behave in a way they think the researchers want them to behave/respond to demand characteristics so they will not show genuine/natural behaviour</li> <li>• If the participant knows they are being observed they respond in a socially desirable way rather than showing their usual/normal behaviour</li> </ul> <p><b>Example Answer</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The participants knew they were being observed so their behaviour may not be as it normally would be. For example, the participants in Milgram's study may have administered more electric shocks because they knew they were being observed in a psychological study</li> </ul>	2	<p><b>2 marks</b> – An accurate outline of a problem in context of the original study as detailed</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague outline of a problem <b>OR</b> answer not linked to study e.g. <i>May have been subject to observer bias</i></p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy response</p> <p><i>The question requires candidates to contextualise their response</i></p> <p><i>Any appropriate problem of the way obedience was measured can be credited but it must be fully contextualised in relation to Milgram's study to gain 2 marks</i></p> <p><i>Answers must clearly be outlining a problem of the way obedience was measured not the study in general</i></p>

<p>2</p>	<p>a</p>	<p><b>From Piliavin et al.’s ‘Subway Samaritan’ study: Explain one reason why “diffusion of responsibility” was not found in this study.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As participants were not able to leave the New York subway train, (it was a continual 7 ½ minute journey from 59<sup>th</sup> street to 125<sup>th</sup> street) they were not able to escape the situation therefore felt more obliged to help the collapsed victim irrelevant of how many other people were present on the carriage (larger the group the more quickly help was received).</li> <li>• When escape is not possible and bystanders are face-to-face with a victim, help is likely to be forthcoming even if the number of bystanders present is high</li> <li>• Participants may have perceived the costs of helping to be low because many others were around to help as well even if something did go wrong</li> <li>• Other appropriate response</li> </ul>	<p>2</p>	<p><b>2 marks</b> – Response demonstrates good relevant knowledge and understanding. Good application of psychological knowledge to Piliavin study</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Response demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding but may lack clarity. Attempt at application of psychological knowledge to Piliavin study <b>OR</b> Response demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding but knowledge is not applied to the Piliavin study</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No credit worthy information</p> <p><i>As diffusion of responsibility refers to responsibility for behaviour being shared between those present - candidates must make reference to the other passengers/other potential helpers/group size to obtain full marks</i></p>
	<p>b</p>	<p><b>In Levine et al.’s study into cultural altruism, there were three different conditions: Describe how helping behaviour was recorded in one of these conditions.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In the dropped pen condition responses to the confederate in need of help were recorded by noting down if participants called back to the experimenter that he had dropped the pen and/or picked up the pen and brought it to the experimenter</li> <li>• In the hurt leg condition helping was recorded by noting down participants that offered to help and/or those who began to help without offering</li> <li>• In the helping a blind person across the street condition helping was recorded by noting down if participants, at a minimum, informed the experimenter that the light was green.</li> </ul>	<p>2</p>	<p><b>2 marks</b> – An accurate and detailed outline of one way helping responses were recorded</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer that may also not be contextualised “If participants stopped to help the person who dropped a pen”</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No credit worthy information</p>

	c	<p><b>To what extent does the study by Levine et al. change our understanding of responses to people in need?</b></p> <p><b>Possible answer:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Levine et al. aimed to investigate cross cultural differences in helping behaviour. They claimed explaining why strangers are more likely to receive help in some cities than in others requires investigating the cities' personalities beyond the size of their population. No relationship was found between population size and helping behaviour, which similarly to Piliavin, challenges the diffusion of responsibility theory (the larger the population did not correlate with less help). However Levine et al. did find that countries that had higher per capita purchasing power tended to be less helpful overall (which research had not shown before) so to an extent our understanding of people in need has changed.</li> <li>Other appropriate response</li> </ul>	3	<p><b>3 marks</b> – Response demonstrates good analysis that is mainly relevant to the demand of the question. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and argument is highly skilled and shows good understanding.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – Response demonstrates reasonable analysis that is partially relevant to the demand of the question. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and argument are competent and understanding is reasonable.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Response demonstrates limited analysis that may be related to topic area. Some valid conclusions that summarise issues and arguments.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy response</p> <p><i>The question asks to what extent so candidates can argue that it does OR does not change our understanding. Some contemporary studies change our understanding more than others hence the command “to what extent”</i></p> <p><i>Top band answers would make a judgement about the extent to which a change of understanding has occurred and support their argument with supporting evidence from the named study</i></p>
3		<p><b>Outline how Grant et al.’s study on context-dependent memory links to the cognitive area of psychology.</b></p> <p><b>Possible Answer:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Internal mental processes such as memory are important features influencing human behaviour. Grant et al. aimed to investigate whether memory can be enhanced when information is recalled in the same environment in which the information is originally studied. This shows that Grant et al. is linked to the cognitive area as memory for information is a process of the mind.</li> </ul>	3	<p><b>3 marks</b> – Response demonstrates good analysis and interpretation that is relevant to the demand of the question. Valid links are made between the study and the cognitive area that are highly skilled and show good understanding</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – Response demonstrates reasonable analysis and interpretation that is partially relevant. Some valid links are made between the study and the cognitive area that are competent and understanding is reasonable</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Response demonstrates limited analysis and</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other appropriate answer</li> </ul>		<p>interpretation that is partially related to topic area. Vague or partial links are made / attempted between the study and the cognitive area but understanding is limited</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy response</p> <p><i>Candidates are required to draw links between Grant et al.'s study and the cognitive area OR outline the cognitive area and draw links to Grant et al.'s study</i></p>
4	a	<p>Outline <b>one</b> similarity between Moray's study on auditory attention and Simons and Chabris' study on visual inattention.</p> <p>Candidates may make comparisons between the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data collected</li> <li>• Techniques used to gather data</li> <li>• Reliability</li> <li>• Validity</li> <li>• Environments / controls</li> <li>• Samples (WHO)</li> <li>• Sampling technique (HOW)</li> <li>• Bias</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Moray's study and Simon and Chabris' study both used standardised procedures. For example, in Moray's 1<sup>st</sup> experiment <u>all</u> participants shadowed the same prose message and all heard the same 35 words in the rejected message. In Simon and Chabris' study, the members of each team passed a standard orange basketball to one another in a standardised order: player 1 → player 2 → player 3 → player 1. As both studies use standardised procedures the research, if replicated, should produce consistent findings over time.</li> </ul>	4	<p><b>4 marks</b> – An appropriate similarity is identified and elaborated and appropriate evidence is given from both of the studies as detailed in the answer guidance</p> <p><b>3 marks</b> – An appropriate similarity is identified and elaborated and appropriate evidence is given from one of the studies e.g. Moray's study and Simon and Chabris' study both used standardised procedures. For example, in Simon and Chabris' study, the members of each team passed a standard orange basketball to one another in a standardised order: player 1 → player 2 → player 3 → player 1. As both studies use standardised procedures the research, if replicated, should produce consistent findings over time.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – An appropriate similarity is identified and elaborated but no evidence is provided for either study e.g. Moray's study and Simon and Chabris' study both used standardised procedures. As both studies use standardised procedures the research, if replicated, should produce consistent findings over time.</p> <p><b>OR</b> an appropriate similarity is identified (<u>not</u> elaborated) and appropriate evidence is given from one of the studies e.g. Moray's study and Simon and Chabris' study both used standardised procedures. For example, in Moray's 1<sup>st</sup> experiment all participants shadowed the same prose message and all heard the same 35 words in the rejected</p>

				<p>message.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – An appropriate similarity is identified but is not elaborated and no evidence is provided for either study e.g. Moray’s study and Simon and Chabris’ study both used standardised procedures.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy response</p> <p><i>Elaboration means explaining the similarity in some way rather than merely stating it, but showing an understanding of what the difference is / means.</i></p> <p><i>Accept reference to; method, bias, controls, the way data was collected, samples</i></p>
	<b>b</b>	<p><b>To what extent can Moray’s study on auditory attention be considered reliable?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reliability is the extent to which a study or method of measurement can be replicated to produce consistent findings over time. In Moray’s 1<sup>st</sup> experiment <u>all</u> participants shadowed the same prose message and <u>all</u> heard the same 35 words in the rejected message. Due to the standardised measurements that have been used, it should be easier to replicate the research to see consistent results over time.</li> <li>In Moray’s study, some aspects of the study / methods of measurement were not fully operationalised. For example, the exact recognition tasks given after shadowing in experiment 1 are not detailed and therefore it is not possible to use the exact recognition tests upon replication of the study. As it may be difficult to replicate the study in exactly the same way it’s harder to establish consistency in the results over time</li> <li>Other appropriate response</li> </ul>	<b>3</b>	<p><b>3 marks</b> – Response demonstrates good evaluation that is mainly relevant to the question. Valid conclusion that effectively assesses the reliability of Moray’s study is skilled and shows good understanding.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – Response demonstrates reasonable evaluation that is partially relevant to the question. Valid conclusion that effectively assesses the reliability of Moray’s study is competent and understanding is reasonable but may lack clarity.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Response demonstrates limited/basic evaluation that may not be relevant to the question. Limited/basic conclusion that attempts to assess the reliability of Moray’s study.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy response</p> <p><i>Candidate must make it clear within their answer what reliability is (many may give a generic definition but this is not needed for full marks provided clear understanding of the</i></p>

				<i>methodological issue is shown)</i>
5	a	<p><b>In Sperry's 'split brain' study into the psychological effects of hemisphere disconnection: Explain why visual information had to be presented for a restricted period of time in the visual tasks.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Because if the information was shown for any longer (than 1/10<sup>th</sup> a second) both visual fields would be able to see the information at the same time which means information would be passed to both the left and right hemispheres at the same time and no difficulties in identifying objects to the left visual field would be apparent</li> <li>• Other appropriate response</li> </ul>	2	<p><b>2 marks</b> – An accurate explanation as given in context of the original study</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer, e.g. so that each hemisphere did not receive the information at the same time</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No credit worthy information</p> <p><i>Any reference to 'EYE' means the response is not contextualised, the candidate must refer to VISUAL FIELD</i></p>
	b	<p><b>From Casey et al's study on delay gratification: Explain one strength of the research method used in this study</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A strength (of using a quasi-experiment in this study) is that it is high in ecological validity. As the independent variable (<i>whether the participant was a high delayer or a low delayer</i>) was naturally occurring the performance on the impulse control task should represent the adults naturally occurring/their normal impulse control behaviour</li> <li>• Other appropriate response</li> </ul>	2	<p><b>2 marks</b> – Response demonstrates good evaluation. Strength is identified and explained in context of Casey et al.'s study</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Response demonstrates limited/basic evaluation. Strength is identified but not explained and not in context of the Casey study e.g. A strength is that it is high in ecological validity</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy response</p> <p><i>The question requires candidates explain their response in context of the study</i></p>
6	a	<p><b>From Blakemore and Cooper's study on the impact of early visual experience: Identify the independent variable</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The independent variable (IV) was: whether the kittens were reared in a horizontal or a vertical environment</li> </ul>	1	<p><b>1 mark</b> – Identification of the IV identified as detailed</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy response</p> <p><i>Both conditions of the IV must be stated for 1 mark</i></p>
	b	<p><b>Describe one dependent variable Blakemore and Cooper's</b></p>	2	<p><b>2 marks</b> – An accurate and detailed description of the DV in</p>



		<p><b>study.</b></p> <p><b>One of the following:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The dependent variable (DV) was their visuomotor behaviour once they were placed in an illuminated environment</li> <li>• Whether the horizontally raised kittens could detect vertically aligned objects</li> <li>• Whether the vertically raised kittens could detect horizontally aligned objects.</li> </ul>		<p>this study</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague description of the DV in this study</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No credit worthy information</p>
	<b>c</b>	<p><b>From Maguire’s taxi driver study:</b></p> <p><b>Describe one finding that demonstrates the brain has plasticity.</b></p> <p><b>One of the following:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Taxi drivers had significantly increased grey matter volume in the right and left posterior hippocampi compared to controls.</li> <li>• In the controls there was a relatively greater grey matter volume in the right and left anterior hippocampi compared to taxi drivers.</li> <li>• Taxi drivers had a significantly greater posterior hippocampal volume than controls.</li> <li>• Controls had a significantly greater anterior right hippocampal volume than the taxi drivers</li> </ul>	<b>2</b>	<p><b>2 marks</b> – An accurate description of a finding which demonstrates plasticity of the brain</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial / vague finding lacking clarity <b>OR</b> finding described without a comparison between conditions made</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No credit worthy information</p> <p><i>For full marks a comparison is needed (as this is what demonstrates the difference which is needed to “prove” plasticity of the brain)</i></p>
<b>7</b>		<p><b>Describe one finding that shows a difference in the performance on the ‘Eyes Task’ between the conditions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participants in the Asperger’s / AS conditions were impaired on the Eyes Task compared to “normal” adults – scoring 16.3/25 and 20.3/25 respectively</li> <li>• Participants in the Asperger’s / AS scored 16.3 on the Eyes task, the lowest compared to all other conditions</li> </ul>	<b>2</b>	<p><b>2 marks</b> – A clear outline of one result supported by evidence given in the data table</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer <b>OR</b> answer not linked to study e.g. Asperger’s participants scored poorly on the eyes task</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy response</p>

				<i>A comparison to one or all other conditions must be made to gain 2 marks</i>
8		<p><b>As detailed in Gould’s ‘a nation of morons’, Yerkes argued that intelligence was inherited: Outline one reason why Yerkes argument may be considered invalid.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• His ideas are subject to his own personal bias/agenda - Yerkes believed that intelligence was inherited and unaffected by environmental factors and therefore could not be changed (due to nature) therefore his own personal beliefs may have influenced his “scientific testing” of intelligence and skewed the results to show what he wanted them to show</li> <li>• Nurture is believed to influence “intelligence” - The scientific intelligence tests created by Yerkes were in the main testing literacy, and literacy tests assess education/schooling (nurture) more than they any notion of inherited intelligence</li> <li>• The testing upon which conclusions were drawn was flawed. For example, the Beta examination still required pencil work. Some of the men who scored poorly had never before had held a pencil in their hands but their failure was attributed to innate intelligence which is arguably not a valid conclusion</li> <li>• Other appropriate response</li> </ul>	3	<p><b>3 marks</b> – Detailed and accurate outline of why the conclusions may not be valid supported by clear evidence from Gould’s review. Clear understanding of validity is shown.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – Partial or vague outline but an attempt made to support answer with evidence from Gould’s review. Some understanding of validity is shown.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Basic outline given not supported by appropriate evidence from Gould’s review. Limited/No understanding of validity shown.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy response <i>Answers that refer to reliability instead of validity should not be credited</i></p> <p><i>Candidates may refer to evidence / arguments given by Gould in his book “mis-measure of man” which should also be credited</i></p>
<b>Section B</b>				
<b>Question</b>		<b>Answer</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>Guidance</b>
9	a	<p><b>Describe two principles or concepts of the psychodynamic perspective.</b></p> <p><b>Two of the following:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All human behaviour comes from a part of the mind that individuals have no direct awareness of; the unconscious.</li> <li>• Childhood is a critical period in development of our</li> </ul>	4	<p><b>Per principle / concept</b></p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – Response demonstrates good relevant knowledge and understanding. Accurate and detailed description of a principle/concept</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Response demonstrates reasonable relevant knowledge and understanding. Generally accurate</p>

	<p>behaviour and personality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Our behaviour is a result of an interaction between unconscious innate drives (i.e. desire of pleasure) and early experiences (extent to which our early desires were gratified)</li> <li>• Personality differences can be traced back to the way the early conflicts between desire and experience were handled</li> <li>• Childhood conflicts remain with the adult and exert pressure through unconsciously motivated behaviour</li> <li>• Only a small part of the mind is fully conscious. The unconscious mind, the largest part of the mind, contains our baser drives and impulses.</li> <li>• Structure of our personality is made up of the id, ego and superego.</li> <li>• The id (which exists only in the unconscious), demands instant gratification. The ego seeks to satisfy the demands of the id through socially acceptable channels without offending the superego, the moral guardian of the personality</li> <li>• The ego uses defence mechanisms to conceal or distort unacceptable impulses, thus preventing them from rising into consciousness.</li> <li>• Other appropriate response</li> </ul>		<p>description of a principle/concept but lacks detail/clarity</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy response</p> <p><i>If only one principle or concept is referred to then the answer should be capped at 2</i></p> <p>Evidence from a relevant core study is not necessary to gain full marks</p>
<b>b</b>	<p>Outline how Hancock et al.'s study on language of psychopaths links to the psychodynamic perspective. Support your answer with evidence from this study.</p> <p><b>In referencing Hancock's study candidates may draw upon:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ego development</li> <li>• Use of a Rorschach test</li> <li>• Psychological 'distancing'</li> <li>• Basic and thrill-seeking drives</li> <li>• Language use being in all likelihood beyond conscious control</li> </ul>	<b>4</b>	<p><b>4 marks</b> – Response demonstrates good application of psychological knowledge and understanding. Explicit links are made to how the study supports/fits the features of the perspective. Answer is clearly supported by evidence from the study</p> <p><b>3 marks</b> – Response demonstrates reasonable application of psychological knowledge and understanding. Explicit links are made to how the study supports/fits the features of the perspective but lacks some clarity of expression. Attempt is made to support answer with evidence from the study</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – Response demonstrates limited application of</p>

		<p><b>Possible answer:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The psychodynamic perspective believes that human behaviour often comes from a part of our mind that we have no conscious awareness of – our unconscious mind. In Hancock’s study it was found that psychopaths struggled to describe an emotional event and seemed much more emotionally detached in their language compared to non-psychopaths. Hancock concludes that language differences between psychopathic and non-psychopathic homicide offenders are likely beyond conscious control, which links to a key concept of the psychodynamic perspective.</li> </ul>		<p>psychological knowledge and understanding. A partial link may be made to how the study supports/fits the features of the perspective. Vague attempt to support with appropriate evidence from the study</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Response demonstrates basic application of psychological knowledge and understanding. Very few / no links identified and not supported with appropriate evidence from the study</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy response</p> <p><i>Hancock et al.’s study is not in itself psychodynamic, but it makes repeated references to concepts that draw upon psychodynamic ideas</i></p> <p><i>Question requires candidates to demonstrate how the Hancock’s study links to the psychodynamic perspective. Candidates may outline features of the perspective and then show how Hancock fits these features <b>OR</b> they may outline features of the Hancock study and show how this fits within the principles/concepts of the psychodynamic perspective</i></p> <p><i>Candidates must have knowledge of both the perspective and research to gain full marks</i></p>
	<b>c</b>	<p><b>Outline one reason why individual explanations of behaviour are useful. Support your answer with evidence from an appropriate core study.</b></p> <p><b>Possible answer</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The individual explanation, centres on a single person, and their behaviours are unique to them due to a combination of biological and experiential factors, such as DNA, cognitions and development. Our individual disposition affects our behaviour and each person has their own unique experiences and history. For example, in Freud’s</li> </ul>	<b>4</b>	<p><b>4 marks – Good</b> relevant knowledge and understanding of psychological concepts/theory. Valid conclusions that effectively address why individual explanations are useful are highly skilled and shows good understanding. Clear and detailed justification given in reference to the source supported by relevant evidence from an appropriate core study.</p> <p><b>3 marks – Reasonable</b> relevant knowledge and understanding of psychological concepts/theory. Valid conclusions that effectively address why individual explanations are useful are competent and understanding is</p>

		<p>study of Little Hans his personal experiences and his dysfunctional behaviour (phobia) was documented, along with his interactions with his mother and father which gave a unique insight into his horse phobia and the theorised cause – him being in his Oedipus Complex. This individual explanation was useful as it allowed a unique insight into Han's dysfunctional behaviour and its possible cause to be gathered.</p>	<p>reasonable. Attempt to justify answer in reference to the source but could be expressed more clearly. Supported by evidence from an appropriate core study but could be expressed more clearly.</p> <p><b>2 marks – Limited</b> relevant knowledge and understanding of psychological concepts/theory. Some limited conclusions that attempt to outline why individual explanations are useful but are only partially/vaguely justified. Attempt to support answer with evidence from an appropriate core study.</p> <p><b>1 mark – Basic</b> knowledge and understanding of psychological concepts/theory that is only partially relevant to the question. Basic / No conclusions that outline why individual explanations are useful. Little / No attempt to support answer with evidence from an appropriate core study.</p> <p><b>0 marks – No creditworthy response</b></p> <p><i>As the question asks students to use evidence from a relevant core study, only those addressed on the specification should be credited <b>HOWEVER</b> candidates do not have to identify evidence from a core study that is aligned under the area on the spec as they may identify that some core studies apply to more than one area <b>BUT</b> it must be clear that the study referenced does apply to individual explanations</i></p>
--	--	--	--

d	<p><b>Compare the psychodynamic perspective to the individual differences area. Use examples from appropriate core studies to support your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Candidates may make comparisons between the following:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data collected</li> <li>• Ethical considerations</li> <li>• Reductionism</li> <li>• Determinism</li> <li>• Ethnocentrism</li> <li>• Scientific procedures</li> <li>• Methodology / Designs</li> <li>• Reliability</li> <li>• Validity</li> <li>• Individual/situational explanations</li> <li>• Usefulness of research</li> </ul> <p><b>Possible answer:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One similarity between the individual differences area and the psychodynamic perspective is they both provide individual explanations of behaviour. For example in Freud's study from the psychodynamic perspective, Han's dysfunctional behaviour (phobia) and his fantasies / dreams were documented, and these were unique experiences to him showing his personal development. Also in Baron Cohen's study from the individual differences area shows how behaviour - recognising emotion in the eyes task – differed between individual groups of people – AS/HFA, normal adults and Tourettes sufferers. This shows that the focus of each area/perspective is on the individual's uniqueness and how they are different in their behaviour to others.</li> <li>• A difference between the individual differences area and the psychodynamic perspective is the level of control in</li> </ul>	8	<p><b>Per point of comparison</b></p> <p><b>4 marks</b> – Similarity / difference between perspectives is identified, discussed/elaborated <b>and</b> supported by relevant evidence from two appropriate supporting core studies</p> <p><b>3 marks</b> – Similarity / difference between perspectives is identified but not discussed/elaborated, <b>but</b> supported by relevant evidence from two appropriate supporting core studies – one from each perspective</p> <p><b>OR</b> Similarity / difference between perspectives is identified, discussed/elaborated <b>and</b> supported by relevant evidence from one appropriate core study</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – Similarity / difference between perspectives is identified, not discussed/elaborated <b>but</b> supported by relevant evidence from one appropriate core study</p> <p><b>OR</b> Similarity / difference between perspectives is identified, discussed/elaborated <b>but</b> not supported by any relevant evidence from appropriate core studies</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Similarity / difference is identified</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy response</p> <p><i>As the question asks students to use evidence from appropriate core studies, only those addressed on the specification should be credited</i></p> <p><i>Responses that identify <b>AND/OR</b> discuss comparison points between research rather than the areas should not be credited</i></p> <p><i>As the question says compare, candidates can give 2</i></p>
---	---	---	--

		<p>the research. For example in Baron Cohen’s study, from the individual differences area, controls were put in place to minimise the influence of extraneous variables on the results e.g. the Eyes Task was a controlled test with all participants viewing the same eyes for the same amount of time (3 seconds) with the same emotions to select from. However in Freud’s study of Little Hans from the psychodynamic perspective no controls were in place – the father was biased towards Freud’s theories and at times asked leading questions about his sons fantasies/thoughts to fit Freud’s theories. This implies that the individual differences area is at times more objective in its research than the psychodynamic area.</p>		<p><i>similarities, 2 differences or a similarity and a difference</i></p> <p><i>The evidence given to support must clearly support the point being made to be credited</i></p>
<p><b>e</b></p>		<p><b>Discuss the strengths and weaknesses of conducting socially sensitive research in psychology. Use examples from appropriate core studies to support your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Possible strengths</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Usefulness</li> <li>• Often socially sensitive research is used to shape public policy and effect social change</li> <li>• Often socially sensitive research is used positively to challenge discrimination against groups of people</li> <li>• Practical applications</li> <li>• Gather findings that are not obtainable in a less socially sensitive way</li> <li>• Gain valuable insight into human behaviour as socially sensitive research often investigates highly personal or private experiences</li> <li>• Socially sensitive research sometimes studies deviant behaviour which is beneficial in establishing abnormality from normality</li> <li>• Can establish patterns of behaviour that could prevent future atrocities / immoral acts</li> </ul>	<p><b>15</b></p>	<p><b>Level 4: 12-15 marks</b> – Response demonstrates <b>good</b> evaluation/discussion that is relevant to the demand of the question. Evaluation/argument is <b>coherently</b> presented with <b>clear</b> understanding of the points raised (they are all identified AND explained). A <b>range</b> (<i>at least 3</i>) of evaluation points are considered (positive and negative) and discussed in detail. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and argument is highly skilled and discussion is clearly apparent. The evaluation points are <b>supported</b> by relevant and appropriate evidence.</p> <p>The answer is explicitly and consistently related to the context of the question.</p> <p><b>Level 3: 8-11 marks</b> – Response demonstrates <b>reasonable</b> evaluation/discussion that is mainly relevant to the demand of the question. Evaluation/argument is <b>organised</b> with <b>reasonable</b> understanding of the points raised but lacks development. A <b>range</b> of evaluation points are considered (positive and negative) and discussed but lacks some clarity of expression. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and argument are reasonable and discussion is clearly attempted. The evaluation points are <b>mostly</b></p>

	<p><b>Possible weaknesses</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ethical issues may be raised</li> <li>• (However useful it is) It may be difficult to replicate the research due to its sensitive nature</li> <li>• Often socially sensitive research is used to shape public policy and more informally it feeds the media headlines, both of which can have quite an impact on both individuals and groups in society if the information is used unfairly or inappropriately</li> <li>• Topics may be controversial or produce findings that could lead to discrimination against groups of people / individuals (mental health, crime, racial differences etc)</li> </ul>	<p>supported by relevant and appropriate evidence.</p> <p>The answer is often related to the context of the question.</p> <p><b>Level 2: 4 – 7 marks</b> – Response demonstrates <b>limited</b> evaluation that is <b>sometimes</b> relevant to the demand of the question. Evaluation/argument lacks clear structure/organisation and has <b>limited</b> understanding of the points raised (limited explanation of identified points). Limited range evaluation points considered. Some valid conclusions that summarise issues and arguments but a discussion is only sometimes apparent. The evaluation points are <b>occasionally</b> supported by relevant and appropriate evidence</p> <p>The answer is sometimes related to the context of the question.</p> <p><b>Level 1: 1 – 3 marks</b> – Response demonstrates <b>basic</b> evaluation that is <b>rarely</b> relevant to the demand of the question. Evaluation/argument lacks structure/organisation and has <b>basic</b> understanding of the points raised (identified points are seldom explained). Very limited range of evaluation points considered and a discussion is rarely/not apparent. The evaluation points are <b>not</b> supported by relevant and/or appropriate evidence</p> <p>The answer is rarely/not related to the context of the question.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy response</p> <p><i>Any strength / weakness should be identified, explained and supported by relevant evidence from an appropriate core study</i></p> <p><i>Candidates may make reference to areas/perspectives but</i></p>
--	---	--



			<p><i>supporting examples from relevant core studies within that area / perspective must be given to get top band marks</i></p> <p><i>The explanation part needs to address why that identified strengths or weakness is good / bad – they may counter this argument with a separate yet related point of discussion</i></p> <p><i>If no supporting evidence is given then the answer should be capped at 3</i></p>
--	--	--	---

Practice 1

Section C			
Question	Answer Guidance	Marks	Awarding Marks Guidance
10	a	3	<p><b>3 marks – Good</b> application of knowledge and understanding to identify an appropriate issue and supporting evidence from the source is given</p> <p>An appropriate issue has been identified and is supported by evidence from the article (appropriately contextualised)</p> <p><b>2 marks – Reasonable</b> (partially explicit yet accurate and relevant) application of knowledge and understanding to identify an issue.</p> <p>An appropriate issue may be merely identified but not fully supported with evidence from the article</p> <p><b>1 mark – Limited</b> application of knowledge and understanding to identify an issue. An issue may be briefly identified but not supported with evidence from the article</p> <p><b>0 marks – No creditworthy response</b></p>
	b	4	<p><b>4 marks – Response demonstrates good</b> analysis and interpretation of the cognitive area. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise how the source is relevant to cognitive psychology are highly skilled and show <b>good</b> understanding.</p> <p>Application will be mainly explicit, accurate and relevant.</p> <p><b>3 marks – Response demonstrates reasonable</b> analysis and interpretation of the cognitive area that is partially relevant. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise how the source is relevant to cognitive psychology are competent and show <b>reasonable</b> understanding but may lack clarity.</p> <p>Application will be partially explicit, accurate and relevant.</p>

		and biased their response.		<p><b>2 marks</b> – Response demonstrates <b>limited</b> analysis and interpretation of the cognitive area. Some valid conclusions that summarise how the source is relevant to cognitive psychology are made but show <b>limited</b> understanding.</p> <p>Application may not be explicit and/or relevant.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Response demonstrates <b>basic</b> analysis and interpretation of the cognitive area. <b>Basic</b> or no valid conclusions that summarise how the source is relevant to cognitive psychology. No evidence of arguments and <b>basic</b> if any understanding of the cognitive area.</p> <p>Answer will be incomplete and/or lacking in context</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy response</p>
	<b>c</b>	<p>Outline <b>one</b> piece of psychological research that links to the above source and justify how it relates to the above source.</p> <p>Candidates will most likely refer to Loftus and Palmer’s study but are not limited to only referencing core studies addressed on the specification</p>	<b>5</b>	<p><b>Level 4: 7 – 8 marks Good</b> knowledge and understanding of a study which is coherently outlined. <b>Good</b> application of knowledge and understanding to explain how the chosen study relates to the source</p> <p><b>Level 3: 5 – 6 marks Reasonable</b> knowledge and understanding of a study but lacks some detail. <b>Reasonable</b> application of knowledge and understanding to explain how the chosen study relates to the source but lacks clarity</p> <p><b>Level 2: 3 – 4 marks Limited</b> knowledge and understanding of a study that lacks detail/specific knowledge <b>Limited</b> application of knowledge and understanding to explain how the chosen study relates to the source</p> <p><b>Level 1: 1 – 2 marks Basic</b> knowledge and understanding of a study that lacks detail/specific knowledge. A few vague</p>

			<p>sentences may be given.  <b>Basic / No</b> application of knowledge and understanding to explain how the chosen study relates to the source</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy response</p> <p><i>If there is no link to the article made then the response must be capped at 6</i></p> <p><i>Not all fine details need to be included in the study outline to access the top band. Candidates will likely refer to the aim, sample (who), procedure (what) and findings/results</i></p> <p><i>A good summary of the chosen study is needed that clearly demonstrates the key aspects/essential features of the chosen study.</i></p> <p><i>If Loftus and Palmer is used then reference must be made to experiment 1 and 2.</i></p>
d	<p>Using your knowledge of psychology, explain <b>one</b> reason why leading questions <b>should not</b> be asked during an interview with a witness. Justify your answer.</p> <p><b>Possible reasons:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce accuracy of witness statements</li> <li>• Reduce validity of witness statements</li> <li>• Could lead to false perceptions being formed of someone which are untrue</li> <li>• Could lead to false memories being created</li> <li>• Could lead to false confessions</li> <li>• Could seem coercive to the interviewee</li> <li>• Could make interviewee feel uncomfortable</li> <li>• Could make interviewee lie</li> <li>• Could bias the responses given</li> <li>• They deprive respondents of the chance to articulate their experiences in their own terms</li> </ul>	3	<p><b>3 marks</b> – Reason is identified and explained/justified</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – Vague / partial reason identified/explained for why leading questions should not be asked</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Reason merely identified but not explained</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy response</p> <p><i>Reference must be made to an implication/outcome for the reason to gain full marks</i></p>

	<p><b>Explanation on why:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could lead to a wrongful conviction if the evidence is taken to court</li> <li>• Could lead to an innocent person being arrested for a crime they did not commit</li> <li>• Could lead to a person facing negative reactions in society / amongst friends / family if they are innocent yet implicated because of false evidence</li> <li>• Could lead to unfair immoral / unethical reactions from others to the accused if the leading question implicates false guilt</li> <li>• If the questions contain false statements about what happened, the witness incorrectly remembers the event to match the questions</li> <li>• Leading questions mean the account given by the witness is being directed to what the interviewer thinks is the truth, which may not be correct</li> <li>• They tend to prevent the conversation from going in an unwanted direction so other lines of questioning which could be useful are not explored</li> </ul>	
e	<p><b>Using your knowledge of psychology, explain one reason why leading questions should be asked during an interview with a witness.</b></p> <p><b>Possible reasons:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questions are clear/unambiguous</li> <li>• Questions can easily be repeated in the future</li> <li>• Specific bits of information can be asked for</li> <li>• If the question is clear the answer should be clear</li> <li>• Some witnesses may struggle to remember any information so a direct question may help them remember the event</li> </ul> <p><b>Explanation on why:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could lead to specific information being gathered that</li> </ul>	<p><b>3 marks</b> – Reason is identified and explained/justified</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – Vague / partial reason identified/explained for why leading questions should be asked</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – reason merely identified but not explained</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy response</p> <p><i>Reference must be made to an implication/outcome for the reason to gain full marks</i></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>secures a conviction of an offender</li> <li>It is difficult to interpret the question differently over time so the response given by the witness should be more reliable</li> <li>The witness may be able to remember more detailed information if the questioning is targeted which could lead to the arrest of an offender</li> <li>They tend to prevent the conversation from going in an unwanted direction which would be irrelevant to the witness statement</li> </ul>		
<b>f</b>	<p><b>Design an ethical questionnaire you could give to the witness that does not include leading questions. You must have at least 3 questions in your questionnaire.</b></p> <p><b>Example answer:</b></p> <p>If you find any of the following questions upsetting then please do not feel obliged to answer.</p> <p>Please answer the following questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Describe the accident in your own words.</li> <li>Draw a diagram of the accident</li> <li>Describe how you felt after the accident.</li> <li>Estimate the speed at which the other car was travelling</li> </ol> <p>Signature of consent:</p>	<b>4</b>	<p><b>4 marks</b> Response demonstrates <b>good</b> knowledge and understanding of how to design an ethical questionnaire that avoids the use of leading questions. The questions are clearly applied to the source.</p> <p><b>3 marks</b> – Response demonstrates <b>reasonable</b> knowledge and understanding of how to design an ethical questionnaire that avoids the use of leading questions. The questions could be clearer but an attempt made to apply them to the source.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> Response demonstrates <b>limited</b> relevant knowledge and understanding. Limited description lacking in detail.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Response demonstrates <b>basic</b> knowledge and understanding of how to design an ethical questionnaire that avoids the use of leading questions. <b>Basic</b> description lacking in detail/structure and <b>basic/no</b> attempt made to apply questions to the source</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> - No creditworthy response</p>
<b>g</b>	<p>Evaluate the questionnaire you designed in question <b>10(f)</b></p> <p>Evaluation might refer to:</p>	<b>10</b>	<p><b>Level 4: 9– 10 marks</b> – Response demonstrates <b>good</b> evaluation that is relevant to the demand of the question. Evaluation/argument is <b>coherently</b> presented with <b>clear</b></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Usefulness</li> <li>• Appropriateness</li> <li>• Time constraints</li> <li>• Reliability</li> <li>• Validity</li> <li>• Social desirability</li> <li>• Lack of specific information</li> <li>• Hard to compare / analyse results gathered</li> <li>• Doesn't gather specific details which are needed to provide a full account</li> <li>• Limited information will be gathered</li> <li>• If they are able to not answer (for ethical reasons) then no information may be gathered</li> <li>• Participants may not write enough information to gather an accurate account</li> </ul> <p><b>Possible answer:</b> One strength of my questionnaire is that is likely to produce a less biased and distorted account of the traffic incident. As the victim is asked open ended questions such as "Describe how you felt after the accident?" they will be less likely to change their true feelings because the question itself just not predispose them to a desired answer, this should also reduce social desirability bias as they will feel less pressure to provide an answer that they believe is the desired one. This should improve the validity of the data gathered from the victim.</p> <p>However a weakness of my questionnaire is that the questions are quite broad in nature and may not gather enough specific information about the incident from the victim. By asking "Describe the accident in your own words" the victim may only write a couple of sentences which would not be enough information to gather an accurate view of the incident. Although the question is not leading, more specific follow up conversations may be needed to glean a useful and relevant account of the</p>	<p>understanding of the points raised. Understanding, expression and use of psychological terminology are <b>good</b>. There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. A <b>range</b> (two or more) of appropriate evaluation points are considered. The evaluation points are in <b>context</b> and <b>supported</b> by relevant evidence of the description given in 10f / the source material.</p> <p><b>Level 3: 7 – 8 marks</b> – Response demonstrates <b>reasonable</b> evaluation that is <b>mainly</b> relevant to the demand of the question. Evaluation/argument is <b>mainly</b> coherently presented with <b>reasonable</b> understanding of the points raised. Understanding, expression and use of psychological terminology are <b>reasonable</b>. There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. A <b>range</b> (two or more) of appropriate evaluation points are considered. The evaluation points are <b>mainly</b> in context and supported by some relevant evidence of the description given in 10f / the source material</p> <p><b>Level 2: 4 – 6 marks</b> – Response demonstrates <b>limited</b> evaluation that is <b>sometimes</b> relevant to the demand of the question. Evaluation/argument lacks clear structure/organisation and has <b>limited</b> understanding of the points raised. The evaluation points are <b>occasionally</b> in context and supported by relevant evidence of the description given in 10f / the source material</p> <p><b>Level 1: 1 – 3 marks</b> – Response demonstrates <b>basic</b> evaluation that is <b>rarely</b> relevant to the demand of the question. Evaluation/argument lacks clear structure / organisation and has <b>basic</b> understanding of the points raised. Expression and use of psychological terminology is <b>basic</b> /</p>
--	---	---

	<p>incident, which may negate the benefit of asking such an open question to begin with.</p> <p>In addition, by making the questionnaire ethical and allowing participants to not answer the question about the incident if they do not want to may also limit the amount of information that could be gathered from the questionnaire.</p>	<p><b>poor.</b> The evaluation points are often <b>not</b> in context / not contextualised throughout. The information is supported by limited relevant evidence of the description given in 10f / the source material</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy response</p> <p><i>Answers must be contextualised throughout to access the top band</i></p> <p><i>A clear understanding of evaluation issues must be shown to gain access to the top band (in other words the strength/weakness must be clearly explained as to why it is a good or bad thing)</i></p>
--	---	---