

**GCE**

**Psychology**

Unit **H567/02**: Psychological themes through core studies

Advanced GCE

**Mark Scheme for June 2018**

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

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











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

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

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the report on the examination.

© OCR 2018

## Annotations

Annotation	Meaning
	Tick
	Incorrect response
	Benefit of doubt given
	Attempts evaluation
	Context
	Evaluation
	Significant amount of material which doesn't answer the question
	Not answered question
	Unclear
	Good use of research/supporting evidence
	Development of point
	Omission mark
	Use in conjunction with other annotations to highlight text
	Use in conjunction with other annotations to highlight text
	Blank page

## Subject-specific Marking Instructions

**INTRODUCTION**

Your first task as an Examiner is to become thoroughly familiar with the material on which the examination depends. This material includes:

- the specification, especially the assessment objectives
- the question paper and its rubrics
- the mark scheme

You should ensure that you have copies of these materials.

You should ensure also that you are familiar with the administrative procedures related to the marking process. These are set out in the OCR booklet Instructions for Examiners. If you are examining for the first time, please read carefully Appendix 5 Introduction to Script Marking: Notes for New Examiners. Please ask for help or guidance whenever you need it. Your first point of contact is your Team Leader.

**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.

## USING THE MARK SCHEME

Please study this Mark Scheme carefully. The Mark Scheme is an integral part of the process that begins with the setting of the question paper and ends with the awarding of grades. Question papers and Mark Schemes are developed in association with each other so that issues of differentiation and positive achievement can be addressed from the very start.

This Mark Scheme is a working document; it is not exhaustive; it does not provide 'correct' answers. The Mark Scheme can only provide 'best guesses' about how the question will work out, and it is subject to revision after we have looked at a wide range of scripts.

In your marking, you will encounter valid responses which are not covered by the Mark Scheme: these responses must be credited. You will encounter answers which fall outside the 'target range' of Bands for the paper which you are marking. Please mark these answers according to the marking criteria.

Please read carefully all the scripts in your allocation and make every effort to look positively for achievement throughout the ability range. Always be prepared to use the full range of marks.

## INSTRUCTIONS TO EXAMINERS: INDIVIDUAL ANSWERS

1. The indicative content indicates the expected parameters for candidates' answers, but be prepared to recognise and credit unexpected approaches where they show relevance.
2. Using 'best-fit', decide first which set of BAND DESCRIPTORS best describes the overall quality of the answer. Once the band is located, adjust the mark concentrating on features of the answer which make it stronger or weaker following the guidelines for refinement.

**Highest mark:** If clear evidence of all the qualities in the band descriptors is shown, the HIGHEST Mark should be awarded.

**Lowest mark:** If the answer shows the candidate to be borderline (i.e. they have achieved all the qualities of the bands below and show limited evidence of meeting the criteria of the band in question) the LOWEST mark should be awarded.

**Middle mark:** This mark should be used for candidates who are secure in the band. They are not 'borderline' but they have only achieved some of the qualities in the band descriptors.

3. Be prepared to use the full range of marks. Do not reserve (e.g.) high Band 6 marks 'in case' something turns up of a quality you have not yet seen. If an answer gives clear evidence of the qualities described in the band descriptors, reward appropriately.
4. Consideration should be given to the weightings of the assessment objectives within a question, these are clearly stated for each question and care should be taken not to place too much emphasis on a particular skill.

Question			Answer Guidance	Mark	Awarding Marks Guidance
1	(a)	(i)	<p><b><i>From Baron-Cohen et al.'s study on autism in adults:</i></b></p> <p><b><i>Explain why this study is considered a quasi-experiment.</i></b></p> <p><b><u>Example of a 2 mark answer</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This study is considered a quasi-experiment because the independent variable (IV) - the type of person: adults with autism/AS, normal adults and adults with Tourette syndrome(1) – was naturally occurring so could not be manipulated by the researchers (1).</li> </ul>	[2]	<p><b>1 mark</b> for knowing that quasi-experiments have naturally occurring/non-manipulated independent variables</p> <p><b>Plus</b></p> <p><b>1 mark</b> for application to the study where the people with autism/AS are identified alongside at least one of the other groups i.e. people with Tourette's, 'normal' people.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy information.</p>
		(ii)	<p><b><i>Outline the findings in relation to the Strange Stories task.</i></b></p> <p><b><u>Examples of a 2 mark answer</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The autistic/AS group made significantly more errors on the Strange Stories task (1) than the group of adults with Tourette syndrome (1).</li> <li>The findings from the Short Stories task gave the findings concurrent validity (1) as the results from the task matched the outcomes from the Eyes task (1).</li> </ul>	[2]	<p><b><i>For a response focused on the difference between groups;</i></b></p> <p><b>1 mark</b> for knowing the direction of the difference e.g. that people with autism performed less well on the task</p> <p><b>Plus</b></p> <p><b>1 mark</b> for referring to another of the groups in comparison e.g. ...performed less well than the people with Tourette's.</p> <p><b><i>For a response focused on concurrent validity;</i></b></p> <p><b>1 mark</b> for use of the term concurrent validity or for a description of the concept</p> <p><b>Plus</b></p> <p><b>1 mark</b> for showing the agreement was between the Eyes task and the Short Stories task.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy information.</p>

Question	Answer Guidance	Mark	Awarding Marks Guidance
(b)	<p><b>From Freud's study of Little Hans:</b></p> <p><b>Explain why the study can be considered a longitudinal study.</b></p> <p><b>Possible examples to support the idea that Freud's study was longitudinal:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hans was studied for two years</li> <li>• Hans' father frequently conversed with Hans</li> <li>• The study recorded Hans's progress through the phallic stage/Oedipus complex</li> <li>• The study described the development of Hans's phobia</li> <li>• Other appropriate examples should be credited.</li> </ul>	[2]	<p><b>1 mark</b> for knowledge of longitudinal studies i.e. a study takes place over a (long) period of time  <b>Plus</b>  <b>1 mark</b> for applying this knowledge to the study through a relevant example</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy information.</p>
2	<p><b>(a)</b></p> <p><b>Describe how Gould's study 'A nation of morons' links to the key theme 'Measuring differences'.</b></p> <p><b>Possible answers:</b></p> <p><b>Who</b> – either number of people measured (1.75 million) or specific type of people (military personnel or similar). Do not simply credit reference to men or Americans here.</p> <p><b>What</b> – intelligence or mental age</p> <p><b>How</b> - Alpha test or Beta test or the Individual Spoken Examination  Do not simply credit reference to IQ tests or similarly vague answers.</p> <p><b>Findings</b> e.g. black men had a lower mental age than white men, European immigrants could be graded by their country of origin, the lighter the skin colour then the higher the IQ score.  NB Findings must focus on groups rather than measuring differences between individuals.</p>	[4]	<p><b>1 mark</b> for who was measured  <b>Plus</b>  <b>1 mark</b> for what was measured  <b>Plus</b>  <b>1 mark</b> for how it was measured  <b>Plus</b>  <b>1 mark</b> for a finding which focus on the difference between certain groups</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy information.</p>

Question		Answer Guidance	Mark	Awarding Marks Guidance
	(b) (i)	<p><b><i>From Hancock et al.'s study into the language of psychopaths:</i></b></p> <p><b><i>Identify the sampling method used.</i></b></p> <p><b>Answer:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Self-selected or self-selecting</li> <li>• Volunteer sampling</li> </ul>	[1]	<p><b>1 mark</b> – identification of the correct sampling method as given in the Answer Guidance.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy information e.g. opportunity sampling, random sampling, snowball sampling.</p>
	(ii)	<p><b><i>Explain why participants were interviewed at the beginning of the study.</i></b></p> <p><b>Possible answers:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To establish whether they were psychopaths or not</li> <li>• To explain purpose of study</li> <li>• To explain procedure of study</li> <li>• To get participants to describe their offences.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Examples of a 2 mark answer</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To establish if participants were psychopaths or not (1) so that reliable comparisons could be made between their responses (1).</li> <li>• To get participants to detail their crimes (1) so that they used language that could be analysed (1).</li> </ul>	[2]	<p><b>1 mark</b> for giving a reason for interviewing the participants</p> <p><b>Plus</b></p> <p><b>1 mark</b> for explaining why this was necessary in this study</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy information.</p> <p><i>NB It is not possible to award the second mark unless the first has been awarded.</i></p>



Question	Answer Guidance	Mark	Awarding Marks Guidance
3	<p><b><i>Explain why Bandura et al.'s study on the transmission of aggression can be placed in the developmental area.</i></b></p> <p><b>Possible links:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the idea that people change and develop, and that this is an on-going process over the life span</li> <li>• the idea that behaviour develops through learning</li> <li>• the idea that early experiences in childhood have an effect on later development</li> <li>• the idea that people develop through pre-determined stages</li> <li>• the investigation of development in children</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Examples of a 3 mark answer</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The developmental area is concerned with the study of psychological and behavioural changes and developments throughout a person's lifespan (1). Bandura et al.'s study focuses on the social process of how children can learn and develop aggressive behaviours (1). The study showed that children who observed a model behaving aggressively were more likely to imitate the aggressive behaviours than those who saw a non-aggressive model or no model at, thus suggesting that certain behaviours can develop as people grow and mature (1).</li> <li>• The developmental area often focuses on children as this is when significant development takes place (1). This links to Bandura's study as it sees children as being particularly susceptible to social learning (1). Bandura showed that many children will develop aggressive behaviour simply by imitating the actions of an adult whom they have recently witnessed being violent (1).</li> <li>• Other appropriate explanations should be credited.</li> </ul>	[3]	<p><b>1 mark</b> for demonstrating knowledge and understanding of the developmental area <b>Plus</b> <b>1 mark</b> for making the link between the area and Bandura's study <b>Plus</b> <b>1 mark</b> for relevant reference to a finding or conclusion from Bandura's study</p> <p><b>0 marks – No creditworthy information.</b></p>

Question	Answer Guidance	Mark	Awarding Marks Guidance
4	<p><b><i>From Blakemore and Cooper's study into the impact of early visual experience:</i></b></p> <p><b><i>Outline how the visual environment in which the kittens were reared was manipulated.</i></b></p> <p><b><u>Example of a 2 mark answer</u></b></p> <p>The environment was manipulated so that one lot of kittens were reared while exposed only to vertical black and white stripes (1) whereas the other lot were exposed to horizontal black and white lines (1).</p>	[2]	<p><b>2 marks</b> referring to both conditions i.e. an environment consisting of vertical lines and an environment consisting of horizontal lines</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> for naming one condition, or for an inaccurate response with both conditions, or for identifying the change in conditions e.g. different types of stripes were used.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy information e.g. other aspects of the visual environment, such as use of cylinder.</p>
5	<p><b><i>From the study by Loftus and Palmer on eyewitness testimony, outline <u>two</u> ways in which the procedure was standardised.</i></b></p> <p><b><u>Examples of a 2 mark answer</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participants watched same (1) film clip/s (1).</li> <li>• Participants were asked set (1) questions (1).</li> <li>• The time-lapse between viewing and questioning (1) was the same (1).</li> <li>• Each (1) participants was asked to give a general account of what they remembered (1).</li> <li>• The environment (1) was consistent (1) across both conditions.</li> <li>• All participants saw the film clip/s at the same (1) time (1).</li> <li>• All participants were given identical (1) instructions (1).</li> <li>• Other appropriate outlines should be credited.</li> </ul>	[4] [2 + 2]	<p><b>For each way;</b></p> <p><b>1 mark</b> for identifying a variable in the study that was standardised</p> <p><b>Plus</b></p> <p><b>1 mark</b> for showing knowledge of the standardisation through use of appropriately terminology e.g. same, all, etc.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy information.</p>

Question	Answer Guidance	Mark	Awarding Marks Guidance
(b)	<p><b><i>To what extent does Grant et al.'s contemporary study into context-dependent memory change our understanding of the key theme of 'Memory'? Support your answer with examples from both Loftus and Palmer's and Grant et al.'s studies.</i></b></p> <p><b>Possible answer:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Grant et al.'s study can be seen as adding to our understanding of how memory works because it investigates a different aspect of memory. Loftus and Palmer's study investigated reconstructive memory whereas Grant et al. investigated context-dependent memory. Both studies show that memory is very fragile and can be easily influenced by external factors. Loftus and Palmer's study showed that memory can be negatively influenced by the information we receive after and event in the form of leading questions e.g. participants who were asked the speed of the vehicles when they smashed into each other, on average, gave higher speed estimates than those who were asked how fast the vehicles were going when they hit each other. Grant et al.'s study showed that memory can be heavily influenced by context. Memory was negatively affected if participants were asked to recall information in a different environment to the one in which it was originally received, thus adding to our understanding of how memory can be influenced. Both Loftus and Palmer's and Grant et al. used students as participants and conducted their studies in American universities. Therefore, Grant et al.'s study does not really change or increase our understanding of memory in relation to people of other ages, occupations or cultures. As both studies were highly controlled laboratory experiments, they lack ecological validity. Therefore,</li> </ul>	[5]	<p><b>GOOD</b>  <b>Up to 3 marks</b> for considering the extent of change. The focus can be one argument in depth, or more than one argument in less depth. Either way the argument should be convincing and effective.</p> <p><b>Plus</b>  <b>1 mark</b> for applying an argument to the study by Grant et al.</p> <p><b>Plus</b>  <b>1 mark</b> for applying an argument to the study by Loftus &amp; Palmer</p> <p><b>REASONABLE</b>  <b>3-4 marks for</b> a response which makes effective and convincing arguments about the extent of change but does not apply to the studies.</p> <p>OR  For a response that makes reference to change but does use the studies effectively to show this.</p> <p><b>LIMITED</b>  <b>1-2 marks</b> for a simple change or no change is stated.  AND/OR  A change that is implied through the description of Grant et al.'s study.</p> <p><b>0 marks –</b> No creditworthy information.</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>

Question		Answer Guidance	Mark	Awarding Marks Guidance
		<p>Grant et al.'s study does not change our understanding of memory in relation to real-life situations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Other appropriate evaluations / explanations should be credited.</li> </ul>		<p><i>Full mark responses would make a judgement about the extent to which a change of understanding has occurred and support their argument with supporting evidence from both the named studies.</i></p> <p><i>NB It is feasible for a candidate to argue for a change in understanding without reference to Loftus &amp; Palmer but this cannot earn full marks. Candidates do need to make reference to Grant et al's research (whether explicit or implicit) to earn any marks. This may include an explanation of how Grant et al have changed our understanding of memory without a reference back to Loftus &amp; Palmer.</i></p> <p><i>2 marks can be given alone for the use of studies as long as it is clear what the comparison (change/no change) is from the descriptions given by candidates.</i></p>
6	(a)	<p><b>From Moray's study into auditory attention:</b></p> <p><b>Describe the research method used in Experiment 2.</b></p> <p><b>Possible features:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The location of the experiment i.e. laboratory or controlled environment</li> <li>The experimental design (do not credit matched pairs)</li> <li>The IVs e.g. use of name (affective) or not (non-affective), knowledge or no knowledge of task, instructions or no instructions, instructions at start or in middle of task.</li> <li>The DV i.e. number of instructions followed</li> <li>The controls e.g. same light fiction, order of presentation of instructions, use of monotone voice, pace of reading.</li> </ul>	[3]	<p><b>1 mark</b> for each feature as indicated in the Answer Guidance. <i>However, only credit one IV and only credit one of the controls.</i></p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy information e.g. description of sample, findings, procedure etc.</p>

Question	Answer Guidance	Mark	Awarding Marks Guidance
(b)	<p><b><i>From Simon and Chabris' study into visual attention:</i></b></p> <p><b><i>Outline the 'gorilla condition'.</i></b></p> <p><b>Possible features:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• use of two teams of players</li> <li>• team passing a basketball between them</li> <li>• between 44-48 seconds/after about a minute/after a short period of time into the video gorilla appears</li> <li>• person in gorilla suit walked from left to right across the scene</li> <li>• this unexpected event lasted for about 5 seconds</li> <li>• the players did not interact with the gorilla</li> <li>• the participant was counting the number of passes throughout</li> </ul>	<b>[3]</b>	<p><b>1 mark</b> for each feature as indicated in the Answer Guidance.</p> <p><i>Examiners should note that for each mark allocation the candidate is required to include AT LEAST a specified number of features. But even if the candidate has included the required number of features, that number of marks does not have to be awarded i.e. even if three features have been included, if the answer does not read well/has inaccuracies, it should be capped at 2 marks.</i></p>
7	<p><b><i>Outline <u>one</u> difference between Milgram's study of obedience and Bocchiaro et al.'s study into disobedience and whistleblowing.</i></b></p> <p><b><u>Examples of a 2 mark answer</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Milgram conducted his study in the New Haven area of the USA/the USA/America (1) whereas Bocchiaro et al. conducted their study in Amsterdam/the Netherlands/Holland (1).</li> <li>• Milgram's study was conducted in 1963/the 1960's (1) whereas Bocchiaro et al.'s study was conducted in 2012/2010's/within the last 10 years (1).</li> <li>• Milgram's study was all male/between the ages of 20 and 50 years/from the New Haven area of the USA/from a wide range of occupations whereas Bocchiaro et al.'s sample contained both males and females/had a mean age of around 20.8/20 years/from the Amsterdam area of the Netherlands/were all</li> </ul>	<b>[2]</b>	<p><b>2 marks</b> – A clear difference is evident that refers to <b>both</b> Milgram's and Bocchiaro et al.'s studies such as the ones suggested under Answer Guidance.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Where the difference is implied by one study but not clear in the other (e.g. Milgram studied destructive obedience whereas Bocchiaro looked at a different type of obedience) or where the difference is stated but not illustrated by the studies (e.g. there was a difference in the nationalities being tested).</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy information.</p>

Question		Answer Guidance	Mark	Awarding Marks Guidance
		undergraduates/ university students/students (1). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Other appropriate differences should be credited.</li> </ul>		
8	(a)	<p><b><i>Describe the concept of freewill.</i></b></p> <p><b>Possible answers:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The freewill debate suggests that individuals can choose how they want to behave (1) and so have responsibility for their own behaviour (1).</li> <li>Freewill is when human beings are considered to be entirely free to act as they choose (1) and so have control over their own actions (1).</li> <li>Freewill is the idea that individuals are able to have some choice in how they act (1) and that this is not determined by other forces or factors (1).</li> <li>Other appropriate outlines should be credited.</li> </ul>	[2]	<p><b>2 marks</b> – The outline demonstrates good knowledge and understanding of concept of freewill such as one of the ones given in the Answer Guidance.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – A vague or partial answer.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy information.</p>
	(b)	<p><b><i>Explain how Lee et al.'s study on evaluations of lying and truth-telling may support the view that behaviour is determined.</i></b></p> <p><b><u>Examples of a 3 mark answer</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lee et al.'s study suggests that moral thinking is determined by the culture individuals grow up in (1). For example, findings showed that Chinese children differed from Canadian children in their evaluations of lying and truth-telling in pro-social situations: Chinese children tended to rate lying significantly more positively than Canadian children (1). Making decisions in relation to moral behaviour seemed to be the consequence of environmental factors over which an individual has little or no control (1).</li> <li>Determinism is the idea that our behaviours are directed by forces which we have no conscious control</li> </ul>	[3]	<p><b>1 mark</b> for demonstrating an understanding of the concept of determinism</p> <p><b>Plus</b></p> <p><b>1 mark</b> for making a link between determinism and Lee et al.'s study</p> <p><b>Plus</b></p> <p><b>1 mark</b> for a specific finding or conclusion that relates to the concept of determinism</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy information.</p>

Question	Answer Guidance	Mark	Awarding Marks Guidance
	<p>of (1). Lee et al.'s study suggests that some aspects of moral reasoning, such as judging anti-social lying as bad, may be universal and therefore determined by biological factors over which an individual has no control (1). For example, their findings showed no significant difference between the children from Canada and China in the anti-social/truth-telling situations with children from both cultures rating truth-telling very positively very positively in all situations (1).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Other appropriate explanations should be credited.</li> </ul>		
(c)	<p><b><i>Suggest why research in the individual differences area is often considered socially sensitive. Support your answer with examples from relevant core studies.</i></b></p> <p><b>Possible answer:</b></p> <p><b>GOOD ANSWER</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Research can be defined as socially sensitive if it has wider (negative) implications, either directly for the participants in the research or for the class of individuals represented by the research (1). Studies in the individual differences area involve participants that, for one reason or another, 'differ' from the majority (1) and therefore findings from such studies, unless treated carefully, may have far-reaching negative consequences in terms of stigmatisation or discrimination (1). For example, in Gould's study it was found the Yerkes' IQ tests were highly flawed being culturally biased, dependent of good literacy and numeracy skills and so had tremendous negative effects on both the participants and others represented by the findings: American army recruits (in WW1) who scored poorly on the tests of native intelligence were marked as 'low average intelligence' and recommended</li> </ul>	[5]	<p><b>GOOD</b>  <b>5 marks</b> – The response demonstrates good knowledge and understanding in relation to the demands of the question. The answer should show the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Knowledge of the individual differences area.</li> <li>Understanding of the concept of socially sensitive research.</li> <li>How the concept links to the individual differences area.</li> <li>Supporting evidence from at least <b>two</b> relevant core studies.</li> </ul> <p><b>REASONABLE</b>  <b>3-4 marks</b> – The response demonstrates reasonable knowledge and understanding in relation to the demands of the question. The answer should show most of the features from the band above.</p> <p><b>LIMITED</b>  <b>1-2 marks</b> – The response demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding in relation to the demands of the question. The answer shows one or two of the features from the top band.</p>

Question	Answer Guidance	Mark	Awarding Marks Guidance
	<p>only for the rank of 'ordinary private' whereas those who scored well were offered many promotion opportunities (1). Similarly, Baron-Cohen et al. used vulnerable participants who had autism/AS. This mental condition was already associated with many negative social stigmas so, by highlighting even more of the difficulties experienced by those with autism/AS, both participants and others with cognitive deficits such as lacking a Theory of Mind may experience even more prejudice (1).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other appropriate suggestions should be credited.</li> </ul>		<p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy information.</p>
(d)	<p><b>Describe <u>two</u> weaknesses of the individual differences area. Support your answer with examples from relevant core studies.</b></p> <p><b>Possible weaknesses include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The area lacks a set of defining beliefs about why people behave the way they do + supporting evidence e.g. Hancock et al.</li> <li>• The tools/methods used for measuring differences may not always be valid + supporting evidence e.g. Freud.</li> <li>• The methodology used in this area may not be objective and is therefore open to bias + supporting evidence e.g. Freud.</li> <li>• It may be difficult to find suitable or willing participants so samples are often unrepresentative + supporting evidence e.g. Baron-Cohen et al., Hancock et al.</li> <li>• The area often raises the ethical or moral issue of 'labelling people as different' e.g. Freud, Hancock et al., Baron-Cohen et al., Gould.</li> <li>• Often case studies are used which can lead to biased conclusions / open to researcher bias+ supporting evidence e.g. Freud.</li> <li>• Difficult to make generalisations/predictions because of</li> </ul>	<p>[4] [2+2]</p>	<p><b>Per weakness:</b></p> <p><b>1 mark</b> for stating an valid weakness of the area <b>Plus</b> <b>1 mark</b> for illustrating the weakness through the use of an appropriate study.</p> <p><i>NB The same study cannot be used to illustrate both weaknesses.</i></p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy information.</p>



Question	Answer Guidance	Mark	Awarding Marks Guidance
	<p>the focus on individuals + evidence e.g. Freud</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The reliance on qualitative data makes it difficult to identify patterns/make comparisons e.g. Freud, Hancock et al.</li> <li>• Lacks scientific rigour + supporting evidence e.g. Freud.</li> <li>• Other appropriate weaknesses should be credited.</li> </ul>		
(e)	<p><b><i>Compare the individual differences area with the behaviourist perspective. Support your answer with examples from relevant core studies.</i></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/holism</li> <li>• Determinism/freewill</li> <li>• Scientific procedures</li> <li>• Methodology/designs</li> <li>• Reliability</li> <li>• Validity</li> <li>• Ability to generalise</li> <li>• Individual/situational explanations</li> <li>• Nature/nurture</li> </ul> <p><b>Example answers:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The individual differences area differs from the behaviourist perspective because it focuses on the differences between individuals or groups rather than the similarities as looked for in the behaviourist perspective (1) which sees behaviour as being learned from the environment, suggesting that individuals exposed to the same stimuli will respond in similar ways, especially if the response leads to pleasant consequences (1). For example, Hancock et al.'s study</li> </ul>	[6]	<p><b>GOOD</b>  <b>5-6 marks</b> for one similarity or difference is explored in depth with a detailed consideration of relevant core studies which support both areas.  OR  Two comparison points are identified and clearly linked to a relevant core studies from each area for each point.</p> <p><b>REASONABLE</b>  <b>3-4 marks</b> for one similarity or difference that is brief and supported by evidence or is detailed but only partially supported by evidence.  OR  Two comparison points are identified with limited use of evidence.</p> <p><b>LIMITED</b>  <b>1-2 marks</b> for one similarity or difference which may be supported by evidence.  OR  For outlining two studies where there is an indication of what the difference or similarity might be.</p> <p><i>Responses that discuss comparison points between research rather than the areas should not be credited as these will not answer the question and so will be awarded NAQ.</i></p>

Question	Answer Guidance	Mark	Awarding Marks Guidance
	<p>focused on language differences between psychopathic and non-psychopathic murderers when describing their offences whereas Chaney et al. looked to see whether the overall administration of medication could be improved similarly in both asthmatic boys and asthmatic girls when asked to use a Funhaler compared to a conventional inhaler (1). Because the individual differences area often involves studying atypical individuals, sample sizes are often too small. For example, Freud only studied one individual, Little Hans when he was trying to find evidence to link the development of a phobia to his theory of psychosexual development (1). On the other hand, the behaviourist perspective tries to make general assumptions about how behaviour can be learned from the surrounding environment so, sample sizes can be large (1). For example, Bandura et al.'s sample consisted of 72 children drawn from the Stanford University Nursery School when they showed how children can learn aggressive behaviour from adult models in their immediate environment (1).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Both the individual differences area and the behaviourist perspective recognise the role of environmental experiences in shaping behaviours (1). For behaviourists this is reliably explained in terms of conditioning and learning when individuals experience their environment and for the area of individual differences adopts a more holistic approach recognising the interaction of many external factors and how they impact on an individual (1). The role of experience is demonstrated in Bandura et al.s study where they showed that children exposed to role models in their environment are likely to pay attention to behaviour and imitate it (1). For example, children imitated an adult they had seen on a film by being aggressive to an inflatable doll – something they were unlikely to have</li> </ul>		<p><i>As the question says compare, candidates can give one or two similarities, one or two 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>

Question	Answer Guidance	Mark	Awarding Marks Guidance
	<p>done without this external influence (1). Meanwhile, in Freud's case study of Little Hans there is a suggestion that the boy's experiences through his relationships with his parents had led to him developing a phobia (1). The phobia was not seen as natural phenomenon but as something that was a response to the way Hans's parents had dealt with his Oedipus complex (1).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other appropriate answers should be credited.</li> </ul>		
(f)	<p><b><i>Explain why Chaney et al.'s Funhaler study can be considered useful.</i></b></p> <p><b>Possible arguments for usefulness:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• application to real-life situations</li> <li>• expansion of knowledge</li> <li>• progressing research</li> <li>• leads to therapy/intervention/treatment for problematic behaviour</li> <li>• promotes society</li> <li>• secures economy</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Examples of a 3 mark response</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chaney et al.'s study is useful as it shows how effective simple, low-cost operant conditioning strategies such as positive reinforcement can lead to improved medical compliance and health status (1). The study showed that using the Funhaler rather than a conventional device improved adherence and consequentially reduced the negative effects of asthma in young Australian children (1). Such findings may be extremely useful for the management of not only young asthmatics but also other health-promoting behaviours (1).</li> <li>• Chaney et al.'s study can be considered useful because it shows how children can develop and acquire</li> </ul>	[3]	<p><b>1 mark</b> for a general understanding of usefulness in the context of psychological research</p> <p><b>Plus</b></p> <p><b>1 mark</b> for a link between usefulness and Chaney et al.'s research</p> <p><b>Plus</b></p> <p><b>1 mark</b> for a specific finding or conclusion from the study which illustrates the usefulness of this research</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy information.</p>

Question	Answer Guidance	Mark	Awarding Marks Guidance
	<p>behaviours and how the principles of the behaviourist perspective can be used to facilitate this (1). Results showed that through the principles of operant conditioning – behaviours that lead to pleasant consequences are likely to be repeated – young asthmatics, when asked to use a Funhaler as opposed to a conventional device, were more likely to administer the required daily dosage thus increasing their health status (1). Studies that show how levels of health can be improved can be considered useful as overall costs of medical and social care will be reduced (1).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chaney et al.'s study can be considered useful as the findings have practical implications (1) for how the use of rewards can encouraged desired behaviours which can be used to improve adherence to medical advice and/or reduce unwanted illness behaviours (1). The study showed how the positive rewards of reducing the negative effects of asthma brought about through the use of a Funhaler compared to a conventional device, encouraged children to improve adherence to their prescribed medical regimes which would, over time, result in an increase in health status (1).</li> <li>• Other appropriate explanations should be credited.</li> </ul>		
(g)*	<p><b><i>Discuss ethical considerations in relation to the social area Support your answer with examples from relevant core studies.</i></b></p> <p><b>Supporting evidence should come from:</b> Milgram, Bocchiaro et al., Piliavin et al. and/or Levine et al. However, studies such as Bandura's and Levine's can be made relevant.</p>	[12]	<p><b>GOOD</b></p> <p><b>10-12 marks –</b> The response demonstrates good relevant knowledge and understanding of ethical considerations in relation to the social area. There is evidence of accurate and detailed description of <b>at least two</b> ethical considerations and <b>at least two</b> relevant studies from the social area which are used to good effect. The response demonstrates good analysis, interpretation and/or evaluation of ethical considerations that is mainly relevant to the demand of the question. Valid</p>

Question	Answer Guidance	Mark	Awarding Marks Guidance
	<p><b>Ethical Principles that may be referred to:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Respect – informed consent, right to withdraw, confidentiality.</li> <li>• Competence.</li> <li>• Responsibility – protection of participant(s), debrief.</li> <li>• Integrity – deception.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Example of a GOOD answer</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Studies in the social area are often field experiments with participants being unaware they are being studied. Participants may therefore have no opportunity to give their <i>consent</i>. For example, as the 4,500 participants in Piliavin et al.’s Subway Samaritan study were unaware their helping/non-helping behaviours on the New York subway were being observed and recorded, they had not consented to take part in the study. Whenever possible, participants should be asked if they’re willing to take part in psychological research. However, participants who know they are being studied may respond to demand characteristics so findings will lack validity. If participants are unaware they are taking part in a study they are not offered the <i>right to withdraw</i> either themselves or their data. For example, participants in Piliavin et al.’s study were given no opportunity to withdraw their data as they simply got off the train and left the subway. They could however withdraw themselves from the actual situation by moving out of the critical area or going into another carriage. They therefore, unknowingly withdrew themselves from the situation though their movements were recorded. Similarly, participants in Levine et al.’s study were mere pedestrians in city centres around the world such as Rio de Janeiro, Mexico City and Amsterdam. They were unaware that they were being observed to find out about their helping/non-helping</li> </ul>		<p>conclusions effectively summarise issues around ethical considerations and argument is highly skilled and shows good understanding.</p> <p><b>REASONABLE</b>  <b>7-9 marks</b> – The response demonstrates reasonable knowledge and understanding of ethical considerations. There is evidence of accurate description of <b>at least one</b> ethical consideration and <b>at least one</b> relevant study from the social area which are used to good effect. The response demonstrates reasonable analysis, interpretation and/or evaluation of ethical considerations that has some relevance to the demand of the question. Valid conclusions summarise issues around ethical considerations and argument is skilled and shows reasonable understanding.</p> <p><b>LIMITED</b>  <b>4-6 marks</b> – The response demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of ethical considerations. There is evidence of description of <b>at least one</b> ethical consideration and <b>at least one</b> relevant study from the social area. The response demonstrates limited analysis, interpretation and/or evaluation of ethical considerations that has some relevance to the demand of the question. Argument is evident but with limited understanding.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The response demonstrates reasonable knowledge and understanding of ethical considerations. There is</p>

Question	Answer Guidance	Mark	Awarding Marks Guidance
	<p>behaviours and therefore gave no consent and could not withdraw. However, we could argue that we do not need to gain consent to observe people in a public area as it is accepted that we may be under observation for a number of reasons. Having said this setting up situations could be seen as going beyond mere observation.</p> <p>As many studies in the social area aim to find out how people behave in extreme situations there is often a lot of <i>deception</i>. For example, Milgram aimed to find out the extent to which individuals will obey immoral orders. To do this he deceived his participants in several ways. Firstly, his initial advert asked for volunteers to take part in a study of memory and learning, when in fact he was studying obedience. Secondly, participants thought they had an equal chance of being teacher or learner whereas this was fixed so they were always the teacher, Thirdly, participants were led to believe the shock generator actually gave electric shocks when in reality it did not. If participants are deceived and tricked into believing something that is not true, the integrity of the researcher can be questioned. However, on occasions, if deception is not used, participants may respond in a socially desirable manner so findings will lack validity. It is the responsibility of the researcher to <i>protect participants</i> from any psychological or physical harm yet this ethical consideration can be raised against many studies in the social area. Milgram, in his study of obedience, noted extreme signs of stress in many of his participants – sweating, trembling, laughing nervously. Although participants should not be put under stress it may be necessary to get valid and meaningful results. This when the benefits outweigh the costs.</p>		<p>evidence of accurate description of <b>at least one</b> ethical consideration and <b>at least one</b> relevant study from the social area which are used to good effect.</p> <p><b>BASIC</b>  <b>1-3 marks</b> – The response demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding of ethical considerations. There may be reference to evidence. Any attempt at interpretation, analysis and/or evaluation will be basic.</p> <p>.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy information.</p> <p><i>N.B. If all ethical considerations are made through the context of a study/studies then the answer cannot be placed in the top band.</i>  <i>If there is no specific consideration of the social area in the response then the answer cannot be placed in the top band.</i></p>

Question	Answer Guidance	Mark	Awarding Marks Guidance
	<p><b><u>Example of a REASONABLE answer</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Studies in the social area are often field experiments with participants being unaware they are being studied. Participants may therefore have no opportunity to give their <i>consent</i>. For example, as the 4,500 participants in Piliavin et al.'s Subway Samaritan study were unaware their helping/non-helping behaviours on the New York subway were being observed and recorded, they had not consented to take part in the study. Whenever possible, participants should be asked if they willing to take part in psychological research. However, if participants are observed in a public place this may be more acceptable. Having said this , Piliavin et al.'s participants were not simply observed, they were also set up.</li> </ul> <p>If participants are unaware they are taking part in a study they are not offered the <i>right to withdraw</i> either themselves or their data. For example, participants in Piliavin et al.'s study were given no opportunity to withdraw their data as they simply got off the train and left the subway. This shows lack of respect by the researcher.</p> <p>Although the ethical consideration of <i>debriefing</i> can become a concern in the social area, some studies offer the opportunity for participants to receive feedback so they can leave the research in the same state of mind as they arrived. In the debrief participants should be assured that their behaviour was perfectly acceptable even if it was not predicted. Piliavin et al.'s participants had not opportunity for a debrief as they merely got off the train at 125<sup>th</sup> Street. However, Milgram gave each participant a full debrief at the end of his observation by introducing them to the confederate learner and 'de-hoaxing' them.</p>		

Question	Answer Guidance	Mark	Awarding Marks Guidance
	<p><b><u>Example of a LIMITED answer</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rarely is the ethical consideration of <i>confidentiality</i> broken in studies in the social area. All four core studies in this area upheld this consideration as no names of individual participants were recorded. It is the duty of the researcher to show respect to participants so they cannot be identified.</li> </ul> <p>The ethical consideration of <i>debriefing</i> can become a concern in the social area. However, some studies offer the opportunity for participants to receive feedback so they can leave the research in the same state of mind as they arrived. For example, Milgram gave each participant a full debrief at the end of his observation by introducing them to the confederate learner and 'de-hoaxing' them. Unfortunately, Piliavin et al.'s participants were not given the opportunity for a debrief as they merely got off the train at 125<sup>th</sup> Street to go about their planned business.</p> <p><b><u>Example of a BASIC answer</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is the duty of the researcher to keep data entirely <i>confidential</i>. Piliavin et al. did not disclose any of the names of the train passengers. Participants should not be <i>deceived</i> and should know what the research aims to find out. Milgram deceived his participants because they were not told the research was about obedience</li> </ul>		



Question	Answer Guidance	Mark	Awarding Marks Guidance
9 (a)	<p><b>Identify <u>two</u> psychological issues raised by the article above. Support your answer with evidence from the article.</b></p> <p><b>Most likely issues:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Individuals can show altruism/selfless behaviour/unselfish concern for the welfare of others and help others in need.</li> <li>• Individuals will not help others if they see the victim's situation to be due to their own fault/if they see the victim as undeserving of help + evidence from the article.</li> <li>• People from non-simpatuca countries, like America, are less likely to help a person in need than people in simpatuca countries like Brazil + evidence from the article.</li> <li>• Some individuals may consider the costs of helping someone in need outweigh the benefits/rewards, so don't offer help/some individuals may consider the benefits/rewards of helping someone in need outweigh the costs, so offer help + evidence from the article.</li> <li>• Individuals show 'blind-obedience' to their superiors/individuals obey a legitimate authority figure even if what they are asked to do goes against their moral beliefs + evidence from the article.</li> <li>• Those in authority can take their roles to extremes by expecting perceived subordinates to behave in immoral ways + evidence from the article.</li> <li>• Other appropriate issues with appropriate evidence from the article should be credited.</li> </ul>	[6] [3+3]	<p><b>Per issue raised:</b></p> <p><b>1 mark</b> for a clearly identified issue  <b>Plus</b>  <b>1 mark</b> for specific detail from the article which illustrates a link  <b>Plus</b>  <b>1 mark</b> for expanding on the issue which may or may not be through the article</p> <p><b>0 marks – No creditworthy information.</b></p>

Question	Answer Guidance	Mark	Awarding Marks Guidance
	<p><b><u>Example of a 3 mark answer</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Individuals will not help others if they see the victim’s situation to be due to their own fault (1) which is relevant to the article as other runners have a choice of helping the Mexican athlete or not depending on their own beliefs (1). Here the American athlete did not help the Mexican athlete because he felt ‘it was the Mexican’s own fault he was affected so badly by the heat. He should have done more training in hot-climates like this one in Brazil’ (1).</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Example of a 2 mark answer</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Individuals obey a legitimate authority figure even if what they are asked to do goes against their moral beliefs. (1) Here the American athlete said that his coach had told him he should always try to win ‘so he was only obeying orders’ (1).</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Example of a 1 mark answer</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some individuals may consider the costs of helping someone in need outweigh the benefits/rewards, so don’t offer help (1).</li> </ul>		

Question	Answer Guidance	Mark	Awarding Marks Guidance
(b)	<p><b><i>Briefly consider the individual/situational debate in relation to the article above. Support your answer with evidence from the article.</i></b></p> <p><b><u>Example of a GOOD answer</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The debate is relevant to this article as it begs the question whether the Mexican athlete’s situation affected whether he was helped or not, or whether it was more reliant on the individuals who were present at the time (1). An individual explanation for behaviour is one that focuses on a single individual deeming behaviour to be unique to them due to a combination of innate, genetic and experiential factors such as DNA, personality, cognitions and development (1). For example, the Brazilian athlete may have been an innately caring individual who automatically made every effort to catch up and help the struggling Mexican so he could cross the finishing line. Likewise, The American athlete may have been innately self-centred, seeing the Mexican’s plight as being due to his own fault, and therefore focused on his own chance of winning the race (1). <u>On the other hand</u>, a situational explanation for behaviour is one that focuses on environmental factors such as current events which may influence behaviour (1). Here the Brazilian athlete says, “In Brazil we are always encouraged to be friendly, helpful and agreeable” so learning experiences may have made him prepared to stop and help the Mexican athlete. In addition, the social stimulus of seeing the struggling Mexican may have prompted him to offer help to the stricken athlete, suggesting a situational explanation for his behaviour (1).</li> </ul>	[5]	<p><b>GOOD</b>  <b>5 marks</b> – The response demonstrates good knowledge and understanding in relation to the demands of the question. The answer should show the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An understanding of the individual side of the debate.</li> <li>An understanding of the situational side of the debate.</li> <li>An understanding of how the debate in general is relevant to the article.</li> <li>Relevant application of the individual side to the article.</li> <li>Relevant application of the situational side to the article.</li> </ul> <p><b>REASONABLE</b>  <b>3-4 marks</b> – The response demonstrates most of the points identified in the band above to give a reasonable if not full response to the question.</p> <p><b>LIMITED</b>  <b>1-2 marks</b> – The response demonstrates some of the points identified in the top band to give a limited response to the question.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy information.</p>

Question	Answer Guidance	Mark	Awarding Marks Guidance
	<p><b><u>Example of a REASONABLE answer</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An individual explanation for behaviour is one that focuses on a single individual deeming behaviour to be unique to them (1). For example, the Brazilian athlete may have been an innately caring individual who automatically made every effort to help the struggling Mexican (1). <u>On the other hand</u>, a situational explanation for behaviour is one that focuses on environmental factors which may influence behaviour (1). Here the American athlete saw the Mexican struggling and saw his opportunity to win the race so the situation influenced his behaviour (1).</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Example of a LIMITED answer</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An individual explanation for behaviour is one that focuses on a single individual deeming behaviour to be unique to them (1) whereas a situational explanation for behaviour is one that focuses on environmental factors such as current events and social stimuli which may influence behaviour (1).</li> </ul>		
(c)	<p><b><i>Outline Piliavin et al.'s 'Subway Samaritan' study and describe ways in which it could relate to the article. Support your answer with evidence from the article.</i></b></p> <p><b><u>Example of a GOOD answer</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Piliavin et al. conducted a field experiment on the New York subway. The experiment had four independent variables: (i) type of victim (drunk or carrying a cane), (ii) race of victim (black or white), (iii) effect of a model (after 70 or 150 seconds, from the critical or adjacent area), or no model at all, (iv) size of the witnessing group (a naturally occurring independent variable). The dependent variables (recorded by two female observers</li> </ul>	[8]	<p><b>GOOD</b>  <b>7 – 8 marks</b> - Good knowledge and understanding of the named study which is coherently outlined. Good application of knowledge and understanding to explain how the chosen study relates to the article. There must be at least two clear links (pieces of evidence) between the named study and the article. Marks would therefore be allocated in the following way;  <b>2 marks</b> for an outline of Piliavin et al.'s study which details the set up and the findings.  <b>Plus</b>  <b>3 marks</b> for specific detail from the study which can they be related to the article in a developed way.</p>

Question	Answer Guidance	Mark	Awarding Marks Guidance
	<p>seated in the adjacent area) were: (i) frequency of help, (ii) speed of help, (iii) race of helper, (iv) sex of helper, (v) movement out of critical area, (vi) verbal comments by bystanders.</p> <p>Key findings were: The cane victim received spontaneous help 95% of the time (62/65 trials) compared to the drunk victim 50% of the time (19/38 trials). Overall there was 100% help for the cane victim compared to 81% help for the drunk victim. Help was offered more quickly to the cane victim (a median of 5 seconds compared to 109 seconds delay for the drunk victim). 90% of the first helpers were males.</p> <p>Conclusions that can be drawn from this study include: an individual who appears ill/lame is more likely to receive help than one who appears drunk; individuals whom others consider not responsible for their situation are more likely to receive help than individuals whom others feel brought the situation upon themselves; bystanders conduct a cost-reward analysis before deciding whether or not to help a victim.</p> <p>This study links with the article because it shows that individuals whom others consider responsible for their situation stand a strong chance of not receiving help. In the article, the American athlete did not help the Mexican because he said it was 'his own fault he was affected so badly by the heat. He should have done more training in hot climates like this one in Brazil'. Likewise, the drunk victim received less help than the cane victim as bystanders thought he was responsible for his own condition.</p> <p>The study also links to the article because Piliavin et al. suggested that bystanders conduct a cost-reward analysis before deciding whether or not to help a victim</p>		<p><b>Plus</b>  <b>3 marks</b> for specific detail from the study which can be related in a developed way but differently from the point above.</p> <p><b>REASONABLE</b>  <b>5 – 6 marks</b> - Reasonable knowledge and understanding of the named study but lacks some detail. This may be because only one link is made or be because two links are made but not developed.</p> <p><b>LIMITED</b>  <b>3 – 4 marks</b> - Limited knowledge and understanding of the named study that lacks detail/specific knowledge  The study is likely to be outlined but not used very effectively to make links to the article.</p> <p><b>BASIC</b>  <b>1 – 2 marks</b> - Basic knowledge and understanding of the named study that lacks detail/specific knowledge.  The study may be outlined but not linked to the article or attempts to link to the article are not creditworthy.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy response.</p>

Question	Answer Guidance	Mark	Awarding Marks Guidance
	<p>in need. Those who helped either the drunk or the cane victim decided the rewards of helping outweighed the costs. Similarly, the article shows that the Brazilian athlete felt the rewards of helping the Mexican (possible praise, thanks and a feeling of satisfaction) outweighed the costs (losing the race. On the other hand, the American athlete felt the costs (not winning the race) outweighed the benefits (possible praise, thanks and a feeling of satisfaction) and so did not offer the Mexican any help.</p> <p><b><u>Example of a REASONABLE answer</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Piliavin et al. conducted a field experiment on the New York subway. A research assistant on a carriage of a train pretended to fall over and another researcher observed how or if the ‘victim’ was helped. The victim stood near a pole in the critical area. After about 70 seconds he staggered forward and collapsed. If he received no help by the time the train stopped the model helped him to his feet.</li> <li>• Key findings were: The cane victim received spontaneous help 95% of the time (62/65 trials) compared to the drunk victim 50% of the time (19/38 trials); overall there was 100% help for the cane victim compared to 81% help for the drunk victim; no diffusion of responsibility was found.</li> </ul> <p>Conclusions that can be drawn from this study include: individuals whom others consider not responsible for their situation are more likely to receive help than individuals whom others feel brought the situation upon themselves; when escape is not possible and bystanders are face-to-face with a victim, help is likely to be forthcoming.</p>		

Question	Answer Guidance	Mark	Awarding Marks Guidance
	<p>The study shows that in certain situations individuals will help others in need. Bystanders in the subway carriage had little chance to escape the situation and were face-to-face with the victim and so both the cane and the drunk victims received help the majority of the time. Likewise, in the article, the Brazilian was in close proximity to the Mexican – ‘not far behind in second place’ – so that when he saw the struggling Mexican weaving across the course he offered him help by putting his arm around him and ‘all but carried him along the final few hundred metres so he could cross the finishing line’.</p> <p><b><u>Example of a LIMITED answer</u></b></p> <p>Piliavin et al. conducted a field experiment on the New York subway. There: 2 female observers and 2 males – one who acted as victim, one the model. There were 3 white victims and 1 black victim. The victim stood near a pole in the critical area. After about 70 seconds he staggered forward and collapsed. If he received no help by the time the train stopped the model helped him to his feet.</p> <p>Key findings included: The cane victim received spontaneous help 95% of the time compared to the drunk victim 50%; overall there was 100% help for the cane victim but less for the drunk victim; help was offered more quickly to the cane victim than the drunk victim.</p> <p>This study links with the article because it shows that individuals whom others consider responsible for their situation stand a strong chance of not receiving help. In the article, the American athlete did not help the Mexican because he said it was ‘his own fault he was affected so badly by the heat. He should have done more training in hot climates like this one in Brazil’.</p>		

Question	Answer Guidance	Mark	Awarding Marks Guidance
	<p><b><u>Examples of BASIC answer</u></b></p> <p>Piliavin et al. conducted their study on the New York subway.</p> <p>Key findings included: The person who appeared ill received spontaneous help more times than a person who appeared drunk.</p> <p>It links to the article as people seen as responsible for their situation are more likely to receive help than individuals whom others feel brought the situation upon themselves.</p>		
(d)	<p><b><i>Using your psychological knowledge, suggest two ways in which positive helping behaviours may be encouraged in athletes from countries such as America.</i></b></p> <p><b>Answers are likely to refer to:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Such psychological theories as classical conditioning, operant conditioning, social/observational learning theory, and/or cognitive behaviour therapy which are then illustrated through descriptions of how these could be implemented to encourage positive helping behaviours in countries such as America.</li> <li>• Other appropriate psychological strategies should be credited.</li> </ul> <p><b>Some possible applications of theory could be:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rewarding athletes for showing positive helping behaviours. (Operant conditioning).</li> <li>• Encouraging television channels in America to show programmes involving helping behaviours. (Social/observational learning).</li> <li>• Sporting and training venues could be encouraged to set up simulations with video feedback. (Changing cognitions).</li> </ul>	[8]	<p><b>GOOD</b>  <b>7-8 marks</b> – The response shows good knowledge of how positive helping behaviours may be encouraged in athletes.  There is a good application of psychological knowledge to support the suggestions.  There is a good description of how the suggested ways could be implemented and these are feasible.</p> <p><b>REASONABLE</b>  <b>5-6 marks</b> – The response shows reasonable knowledge of how positive helping behaviours may be encouraged in athletes.  There is a reasonable application of psychological knowledge to support the suggestions.  There is a reasonable description of how the suggested way(s) could be implemented and these/this tend to be feasible.</p> <p><b>LIMITED</b>  <b>3-4 marks</b> – The response shows a limited knowledge of how positive helping behaviours may be encouraged in athletes.  There is limited application of psychological knowledge to support the suggestions.</p>



Question	Answer Guidance	Mark	Awarding Marks Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Other appropriate suggestions should be credited.</li> </ul>		<p>There is a limited description of how the suggested way(s) could be implemented.</p> <p><b>BASIC</b>  <b>1-2 marks</b> – The response shows a basic knowledge of how positive helping behaviours may be encouraged.  There is no real application of psychological knowledge to support the suggestions.  There is unlikely to be description of how the suggested way(s) could be implemented.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy information.</p> <p><i>N.B. If only <b>one</b> way is suggested the answer is capped at 6 marks.</i></p>
(e)	<p><b>Evaluate the suggestions you made in 9(d) using issues and debates you have learned about in psychology.</b></p> <p><b>Evaluation might refer to:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Usefulness</li> <li>Effectiveness</li> <li>Appropriateness</li> <li>Ecological validity</li> <li>Practical implications</li> <li>Ethical considerations</li> <li>Funding issues</li> <li>Nature/nurture</li> <li>Other evaluative suggestions should be considered and credited if appropriate.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Example of a GOOD answer</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A strength of encouraging positive helping behaviours through the use of a rewards system is that it can be</li> </ul>	[8]	<p><b>GOOD</b>  <b>7-8 marks</b> – The response demonstrates good evaluation that is relevant to the demand of the question. Evaluation/argument is coherently presented with clear understanding of the points raised. Evaluation is highly skilled. Understanding, expression and use of psychological terminology are good.</p> <p>A range (two or more) of appropriate evaluation points is considered. The evaluation points are in context and supported by relevant evidence of the suggestions made in in 9(d).</p> <p><b>REASONABLE</b>  <b>5-6 marks</b> – The response demonstrates reasonable evaluation that is mainly relevant to the demand of the question. Evaluation is mainly coherently presented with reasonable understanding of the points raised. Understanding, expression and use of psychological</p>

Question	Answer Guidance	Mark	Awarding Marks Guidance
	<p>useful in helping develop good ethical and moral attitudes which will help reduce psychological stress and physical harm to the person in need. Such initiatives may lead to wider, national benefits as foreigners may be encouraged to visit countries such as America as they feel they will receive help should an emergency arise. On the other hand, a rewards system such as the one suggested in 9(d) has both practical and psychological implications. The recording of helping behaviours may be time-consuming and the accuracy of records will depend on the efficiency and commitment of the managers and authority personnel involved. If records are not kept accurately and diligently, the wrong athlete may be awarded the 'Altruism Cup' which may have negative repercussions among the athletes involved. Also, the athlete who is awarded the most commendations may not wish to be publicly identified by being awarded a trophy. Many altruistic individuals are unassuming people who are embarrassed when their helping behaviours are highlighted in public. The winning athlete may therefore suffer psychological distress which is unethical. Furthermore, the use of operant conditioning to encourage helping behaviours may only be successful as long as the rewards are given. Research has shown that once rewards are removed or become insignificant, behaviour often deteriorates. Strategies would therefore need to be developed to maintain the importance of positive helping behaviours.</p> <p>The use of scenarios/simulations to provide helping opportunities would require careful planning so no ethical or safety issues arise. For example, no participants should be put under undue stress without a debrief. However, all those taking part in the scenario will have given their informed consent and the athlete(s)</p>		<p>terminology are reasonable.</p> <p>Appropriate evaluation point(s) are considered. The evaluation points are mainly in context and supported by some relevant evidence of the suggestion(s) made in 9(d).</p> <p><b>LIMITED</b>  <b>3-4 marks</b> – Response demonstrates limited evaluation that is sometimes relevant to the demand of the question. Evaluation/argument lacks clear structure/organisation and has limited understanding of the points raised. Understanding, expression and use of psychological terminology are limited.</p> <p>The evaluation point(s) are occasionally in context and supported by relevant evidence of the suggestion(s) made in 9(d).</p> <p><b>BASIC</b>  <b>1-2 marks</b> – Response demonstrates <b>basic</b> evaluation that is loosely linked to the demand of the question. Evaluation/argument lacks clear structure / organisation and has basic understanding of the points raised. Understanding, expression and use of psychological terminology are basic and often missing. The evaluation is only loosely linked to the suggestions made in 9(d).</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy information.</p> <p><i>N.B. If only <b>one</b> suggestion is/can be evaluated then cap at 6 marks.</i></p>

Question	Answer Guidance	Mark	Awarding Marks Guidance
	<p>will receive a full debrief when they see the video playback and have the benefits of helping rather the costs explained to them. A difficulty with this initiative is that it may be difficult to find individuals willing to give up their time to take part in the scenarios. Monetary incentives may encourage them to participate but this will have funding issues for the training programme organisers. Scenarios can lack ecological validity as those involved are only acting out an emergency situation. Their behaviour may not be true to real life. If the athlete who is expected to demonstrate helping behaviour is not informed about the scenario, they are being deceived, which can lead to the integrity of those developing the training programme being questioned.</p> <p>If television channels showed more programmes involving helping behaviours by volunteers, athletes, as Bandura suggests, will learn through observation to behave in pro-social, helpful ways when similar situations arise. Such programmes may well also be effective by making athletes change their cognitions as they realise that winning at all costs may not always be the best way to behave. It would however be extremely difficult to persuade television channels in countries such as America to screen programmes at appropriate times to ensure athletes get the opportunity to watch them. Financially TV channels need to show the most popular programmes at peak viewing times and helping behaviour programmes may attract large audiences. Therefore, although such an initiative may be appropriate for encouraging helping behaviours in athletes, it may not be considered appropriate by the profit-driven TV channels.</p> <p>All the ways for encouraging helping behaviours suggested in 9(d) depend on the commitment of the</p>		

Question			Answer Guidance	Mark	Awarding Marks Guidance
			athlete(s) involved to change their behaviour. Many may not be willing to do so because they, by nature, believe the rewards of not helping outweigh the costs of helping, they are by nature egocentric and no amount of nurturing will change their innate characteristics. However, people can see positive behaviours being performed, but may not always copy them when the opportunity arises.		
			<b>Total</b>	<b>[105]</b>	

**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)**  
**The Triangle Building**  
**Shaftesbury Road**  
**Cambridge**  
**CB2 8EA**

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**Education and Learning**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: [general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

[www.ocr.org.uk](http://www.ocr.org.uk)

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

**Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations**  
is a Company Limited by Guarantee  
Registered in England  
Registered Office; The Triangle Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge, CB2 8EA  
Registered Company Number: 3484466  
OCR is an exempt Charity

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

© OCR 2018

