

# Mark Scheme (FINAL)

## Summer 2008

GCE

GCE Psychology (6761/01)

## General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the team leader must be consulted.
- Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.

## PSYCHOLOGY MARK SCHEMES NOTES FOR ASSISTANT EXAMINERS

GCE Psychology is a very wide and dynamic subject. Hence, the Edexcel Specification is written in such a way where centres can teach their students a main study and any other study to explain psychological concepts. In a few cases, it may be possible for a candidate to answer a particular question using 2 - 4 different studies. Hence, it is **NOT** always feasible to list all the possible answers to a question in the mark scheme.

In the mark scheme, the Principal Examiner may list one to two examples with various points that the candidates may write in response to a question. Please note that in some cases this does not mean that the examples given by the Principal Examiner are the only answers to the question. This is where the professional judgement of you as the Psychology examiner has to be used. There is a note in the boxes in the mark scheme stating that '**the marking points are indicative not comprehensive**'. As Psychology Examiners, you must take **NOTE** of the information put into the boxes on the mark scheme, marking points and follow any other instructions provided at the standardisation meeting very carefully through out your marking.

The Principal Examiners will do their best to give you extra information where possible to help you with your marking. Where you come across answers stating studies or material that you are not familiar with, do **NOT** just mark them wrong! You **MUST** contact your Team Leader to check whether it is valid and could be used to answer the question. This is to ensure that candidates are awarded the marks that they deserve.

Question Number	Answer	Mark
1(a)	<p>One mark for each correctly identified statement. If more than 3 crosses, no marks.</p> <p>The child is capable of abstract thought <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>The child becomes more egocentric <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>The child acquires hypothetical reasoning <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>The child becomes more philosophical <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>The child learns to solve conservation tasks <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>AO1 = 3</p> <p>(3)</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
1(b)	<p>What did Piaget mean by <b>accommodation</b>?</p> <p>Marking points are indicative, not comprehensive and other points should be credited. In each consider Or Words To That Effect (OWTTE). 1 mark per point/elaboration. 1 mark Max can for given for a suitable example if used as an elaboration. One sentence can gain both marks if it is well developed.</p> <p><b>Possible Marking Points</b></p> <p>Accommodation means creating a new schema /eq; Changing an internal schema to take new information into account/eq; For example a child will modify her schema of objects that fly in the sky when they first see an aeroplane to add to their existing bird schema/eq;</p> <p>e.g Where our mind accommodate new information/eq (0 Marks) Where new pieces of information are acquired with old ones/eq (0 Marks) Learning new things,make new schema/eq; (1 Mark) Take in new information and use this to create/amend/change schemas/eq;;(2 Marks)</p> <p>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p>	<p>AO1 = 2</p> <p>(2)</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
1(c)	<p>What did Piaget mean by <b>equilibrium</b>?</p> <p>Marking points are indicative, not comprehensive and other points credited. In each consider Or Words To That Effect (OWTTE).  1 mark per point/elaboration.  1 mark Max can for given for a suitable example if used as an elaboration  One point can gain both marks if it is well developed.</p> <p><b>Possible Marking Points</b>  Equilibrium refers to a balance when the new schema has been formed/eq;  New knowledge gained through process of assimilation and accommodation (adaptation)/eq;  When our existing schemas are capable of explaining what we perceive around us/eq;  For example when the child has formed a new aeroplane schema to add to the existing bird schema and knows the differences between the two/eq;</p> <p>e.g  Equilibrium refers to a balance/eq (0 Marks)  When we understand a situation /eq;(1 Marks)  When you are in equilibrium you understand something/eq; (1 Mark)  When we understand a situation because our schemas can explain everything in that situation/eq;;(2 Marks)  When you are in equilibrium you understand something. You get equilibrium after you have been thrown into disequilibrium(state of confusion)/eq;;(2 Marks)</p> <p>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p>	<p>AO1 = 2  (2)</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
1(d)	<p>Outline <b>one</b> main feature of the sensorimotor stage.</p> <p>Marking points are indicative, not comprehensive and other points credited. In each consider Or Words To That Effect (OWTTE).  1 Mark per point/elaboration  If more than one feature, mark all and credit the best.  Examples can be credited if they provide clarification or elaboration.  MAX. 1.  <b>No identification mark</b></p> <p><b>Suitable examples include</b> object permanence, physical co-ordination circular reactions, symbolism, animism, language develops  <b>REJECT</b> egocentrism, formal reasoning and conservation, it's the first stage (0-2 years)</p> <p><b>Possible Marking Points</b></p> <p><b>E.g. Object permanence develops</b>  Object permanence develops at around eight months (according to Piaget)/eq;  At around this age the baby will start to search for the object in the same place as it was hidden/eq;</p> <p><b>E.g. Physical co-ordination;</b>  Is only able to discover the world through their senses/eq;  Main focus is on physical sensation and learning to co-ordinate movement/eq;  Resulting in reflexive and action schemas such as sucking/eq;</p> <p><b>Look for other reasonable marking points.</b></p>	<p>AO1 = 2</p> <p>(2)</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
1(e)(i)	<p>Identify <b>one</b> research method commonly used in the Cognitive-developmental Approach.</p> <p>Marking points are indicative, not comprehensive and other points should be credited. In each consider Or Words To That Effect (OWTTE). If more than one method given credit the first answer.</p> <p><b>REJECT</b> methods which are not commonly used in the cog-dev approach brain scanning, animal studies.</p> <p><b>Possible Marking Points</b> Clinical interviews; Questionnaires/Surveys/Interviews; Longitudinal studies; Cross sectional studies; Natural Observation; Experiments; Case studies;</p> <p><b>Look for other reasonable marking points.</b></p>	<p>AO1 = 1 <b>(1)</b></p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
	<p>Evaluate the research method you identified in (e)(i) in terms of <b>either</b> a strength <b>or</b> a weakness.</p>	

1(e)(ii)	<p>Marking points are indicative, not comprehensive and other points should be credited. In each consider Or Words To That Effect (OWTTE).</p> <p>2 marks for evaluating the same method in (e)(i)  <b>If more than one strength / weakness mark all and credit the best.</b></p> <p>Transferred error - If (e)(i) is non cog-dev method then MAX 1 for appropriate strength / weakness in (e)(ii). If (e)(i) is blank but answer in (e)(ii) focuses on an identifiable cog-dev method then full marks available. If (e)(i) is incorrect but answer in (e)(ii) focuses on an identifiable cog-dev method then MAX 1 mark available.</p> <p><b>Possible Marking Points for Longitudinal Studies</b>  <b>S:</b> You can examine stability / changes of behaviour over time which maybe difficult to do using other methods/eq;  As the same participants are being tested during the study/eq;  <b>W:</b> They may drop out of the study for various reasons (move away etc)/eq;  The procedure takes a long time and its difficult to control what happens to your participants/eq;</p> <p><b>Possible Marking Points for Natural Observation</b>  <b>S:</b> High in ecological validity/eq;  As natural behaviour is observed in natural environment/eq;  <b>W:</b> Lack of control over extraneous variables/eq;  Makes replication and cause and effect conclusions difficult/eq;</p> <p><b>Possible Marking Points for Clinical Interviews</b>  <b>S:</b> Are seen as being flexible because it is possible to change or add new questions based on the answers that are given/eq;  This gives you the opportunity to pursue lines of investigation which may otherwise have been missed/eq;  <b>W:</b> They do not involve standardised questions for each child/eq;  Making it difficult to compare children of different ages based on their answers/eq;</p> <p><b>Possible Marking Points for Cross Sectional Studies</b>  <b>S:</b> Can be conducted fairly quickly as all participants are available at one moment in time/eq;  Meaning a much lower drop out rate compared to longitudinal studies/  <b>W:</b> Difficult to study stability of characteristics or individual development  Due to individual differences in participants/eq;</p> <p>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p>	<p>AO2 = 2</p> <p>(2)</p>
----------	--	---------------------------

(Total 12 marks)

Question Number	Answer	Mark
	Describe <b>one</b> study from the Cognitive-developmental Approach.	



<p>2(a)</p>	<p>Marking points are indicative, not comprehensive and other points credited. In each consider Or Words To That Effect (OWTTE).</p> <p>1 mark per point / elaboration.</p> <p><b>1 mark for identification.</b></p> <p>Must be a study from the cog-dev approach and <u>not</u> a general theory e.g Piaget However do look for and credit a study embedded within the theory/description</p> <p>If more than one relevant study mark all and credit the best.</p> <p><b>Suitable examples include</b> Piaget (1952) Samuel and Bryant (1984), McGarrigle and Donaldson (1974), Piaget and Inhelder (1956), Hughes 'policeman doll' , Baillargeon &amp; Devos (1991)/ Carrot study, Curtiss 'Genie', Case of Victor , there are others.</p> <p><b>Marks can awarded for:</b></p> <p>Name / Identifying study; (1 mark)</p> <p><b>(2 marks max for each of the following)</b> Aim; Method; Results; Conclusion;</p> <p><b>Possible Marking Points for McGarrigle and Donaldson (1974)</b> I: Naughty Teddy / McGarrigle and Donaldson/eq; A: To test Piaget's earlier results with conservation by creating a condition in which the length of the row appeared to change accidentally rather than deliberately/eq; M: Participants presented with two rows of counters, asked them whether there were the same number in each row, then pushed the counters in one row closer and asked them again/eq;; (2 marks) M: In the experimental condition a "naughty teddy" ran across the table and apparently accidentally pushed the counters in one row closer together/eq; The children were then asked whether there were the same number of counters in each row/eq; R: In Piaget's condition only 13 out of the 80 children (16%) correctly said that there was the same number of counters in the two rows/eq; R: However, in this study 50 of the children (62%) answered correctly/eq; C: The results suggest that McGarrigle and Donaldson were correct to think that children acquire their understanding of number conservation at an earlier age than was believed by Piaget/eq; C: They also suggest that Piaget's methods of researching conservation were flawed, because children were responding to what they thought the adult wanted to hear them say rather than what they believed/eq;; (2 marks)</p>	
-------------	---	--

	<p><b>Possible Marking Points for Piaget and Inhelder (1956)</b></p> <p><b>A:</b> To investigate whether children under the age of seven could see the world from another person's point of view/eq;</p> <p><b>M:</b> Ps ages ranged from 4 to 8yrs. All ps were seated at a table upon which was placed a papier-mâché model of three mountains. One mountain had snow on the top, one had a house on the top and one had a red cross on the top/eq;;(2 marks)</p> <p><b>M:</b> The child was allowed to walk around and explore the model. Each child was then seated on one side of the table and a doll was placed at different locations on the model/eq;</p> <p><b>M:</b> The child was shown ten pictures of different views of the mountains and asked to choose the one that represented what the doll could see/eq;</p> <p><b>R:</b> Piaget and Inhelder noted that children aged less than seven had difficulty with this task. For example 4 yr olds were completely unaware of perspectives different from their own and always chose a picture which matched their view of the model/eq;;(2 marks)</p> <p><b>R:</b> 6 yr olds showed some awareness, but often chose the wrong picture. Only 7 and 8 yr olds consistently chose the picture that represented the dolls view showing their ability to de-centre/eq;</p> <p><b>C:</b> After questioning them Piaget found children below the age of 7 suffer from egocentrism - they have great difficulty in seeing the world from the viewpoint of others/eq;</p> <p><b>C:</b> They failed to understand that what they see is relative to their own position and instead take it to represent the world as it really is/eq;</p> <p><b>Look for other reasonable marking points.</b></p>	<p>AO1 = 5</p> <p>(5)</p>
--	--	---------------------------

Question Number	Answer	Mark
2(b)	<p>Evaluate the study you described in (a).</p> <p>Marking points are indicative, not comprehensive and other points should be credited. In each consider Or Words To That Effect (OWTTE).</p> <p>1 mark per point / elaboration.  NO credit for stating 'it lacked ecological validity'. In such cases if a technical term is used correctly/explained and linked to the study it can gain 2 marks, 1 for correct use of the technical term and 1 for the correct explanation.</p> <p>No credit for any 'general' evaluation of Piaget UNLESS made explicit to the study</p> <p>Transferred error - If 2(a) is incorrect / non cog-dev study then MAX 2 for evaluation in 2(b). If 2(a) is blank but answer in 2(b) focuses on an identifiable cog-dev conservation study then full marks available.</p> <p><b>Marks can awarded for:</b>  Strengths / Weaknesses of the method;  Whether conclusions are justified by the results;  Replications /Alternative findings;  Social relevance /Application to real life;</p> <p><b>Possible Marking Points for McGarrigle and Donaldson (1974)</b>  Light et al (1979) study provides evidence for McGarrigle and Donaldson and further criticism against Piaget/eq;  They replicated the naughty teddy study with five year olds and found a significantly higher success rate in the naughty teddy condition/eq;  However, while the children were clearly willing to play along with the experimenter in attributing responsibility (blaming) the teddy, they <i>still</i> also knew that it was the experimenter who was responsible for both introducing and manipulating the teddy/eq;; <b>(2 marks)</b>  So at the very least its difficult to know the extent to which the child blames the experimenter and/or the teddy/eq;  Demand characteristics may have played a part as children may have thought they were supposed to have seen the teddy as 'naughty' /eq;; <b>(2 marks)</b>  Piaget has counter-criticised McGarrigle and Donaldson by saying he simply gave children particular objects and asked them to answer specific questions/eq;</p>	

	<p><b>Possible Marking Points for Piaget and Inhelder (1956)</b>  Studies have demonstrated children under the age of seven can decentre and are not as egocentric as Piaget claims/eq;  Hughes (1975) used a design in which a child had to work out where a doll must hide in order not to be seen by a policeman. He demonstrated that 3 1/2 to 5 year olds could de-centre and overcome their egocentrism, if the task made more “human sense” to them/eq;  When these children had to hide a boy doll from two policemen dolls ( a task that required them to take into account the perspectives of others but had a good understandable reason for doing so) they could do this successfully 90% of the time/eq;  Piaget has also been accused of overemphasising intellectual development to the exclusion of social and emotional development/eq;  The three mountains test demonstrates that a child’s perception of adults, the meaning of questions and the importance of a familiar context all effect children’s performance/eq;</p> <p><b>Look for other reasonable marking points.</b></p>	<p>AO2 = 4  (4)</p>
--	---	-----------------------------

Question Number	Answer	Mark
2(c)	<p>One key assumption of the Cognitive-developmental Approach is that a child’s abilities develop over time. What evidence is there from studies to support this assumption?</p> <p>Marking points are indicative, not comprehensive and other points credited. In each consider Or Words To That Effect (OWTTE)</p> <p>1 mark per point / elaboration.</p> <p>Only the findings (results/conclusions) of research are relevant.  No credit for description of research/ theories or for description of research methods</p> <p><b>Possible Marking Points</b>  Younger children cannot conserve whereas older children can/eq;  Its been found that object permanence does not develop until the baby is about 8 months old/eq;  3 mountains experiment demonstrated that pre-operational children did not have the ability to see from others perspective/eq;  In the pendulum study Piaget showed that children cannot think in abstract terms until they are in the formal operational stage /eq;  Bruner’s transposition task shows the move from the iconic to the symbolic mode/eq;</p> <p><b>Look for other reasonable marking points.</b></p>	<p>AO2 = 3  (3)</p>

(Total 12 marks)

Question Number	Answer	Mark
3(a)	<p>The Cognitive Approach uses the computer analogy as one of its key assumptions. Explain what is meant by the computer analogy.</p> <p>Marking points are indicative, not comprehensive and other points credited. In each consider Or Words To That Effect (OWTTE). 1 mark per point / elaboration. Use of relevant examples to illustrate should be credited max 1 mark.</p> <p><b>Possible Marking Points</b> Cognitive psychologists compare the human brain to a computer/eq; Both humans and computers use input, process and output/eq; Information comes into a computer through a keyboard or software disk, humans receive information through their senses/eq; The computer then runs programs to process the information, humans process the information via the central nervous system and the brain/eq; The computer gives out output in terms of a printout and humans give a wide variety of outputs as behaviour/eq;</p> <p>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p>	<p>AO1 = 3</p> <p>(3)</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
3(b)	<p>Case studies of brain damaged patients have been used in the Cognitive Approach. Evaluate the use of case studies of brain damaged patients as a method used in the Cognitive Approach.</p> <p>Marking points are indicative, not comprehensive and other points should be credited. In each consider Or Words To That Effect (OWTTE). 1 mark per point / elaboration.</p> <p>General case study method evaluation which are true of case studies of brain damaged patients can be credited</p> <p><b>Possible Marking Points</b> Case studies are based on one individual making them unique so it's not possible to generalise from the results/eq; Single cases are too small and unrepresentative a sample and the individual being studied may well not be typical of the population/eq; They are useful as it would be unethical to test using other methods i.e. we cannot deliberately damage the brains of people just to see the effect it may have on their memory/eq; Useful for studying function of the brain without having to wait for autopsy/eq; They can therefore be used for studying unusual behaviours or circumstances which may be hard to find outside clinical settings/eq; No two cases are the same because each patient has a different type of damage (location and extent) so reliability is low/eq; For example in the cases of H.M. and Clive Wearing the type of</p>	

	<p>damage was different and consequently they experienced different types of memory loss/eq;  Generally case studies of brain damaged patients are low in ecological validity as they involve testing/scanning in an unnatural setting/eq;  You can draw rich qualitative data from brain damaged patients which provides a large variety of results to draw conclusions from/eq;</p> <p><b>Look for other reasonable marking points.</b></p>	<p>AO2 = 4  (4)</p>
--	---	-----------------------------

Question Number	Answer	Mark
3(c)	<p>Explain how the Cognitive Approach can help us to understand the problem of eyewitness testimony.</p> <p>Marking points are indicative, not comprehensive and other points should be credited. In each consider Or Words To That Effect (OWTTE).</p> <p>Marks are gained by showing how ideas / concepts and theories from the cognitive approach can explain the problems with EWT and / or by assessing the ideas that have been presented.</p> <p><b>Candidate MUST make an explicit link to EWT at least once to access full marks otherwise Max 4</b></p> <p>NO CREDIT for just describing the research or findings only HOW they may influence memory recall</p> <p>1 mark per point / elaboration.  Use of relevant examples to illustrate should be credited max 2.</p> <p><b>Possible Marking Points</b>  EW may not semantically process information at the time so memory may not be as robust/eq;  May be too much information for EW to take into STM / working memory/eq;  STM capacity is 7+ / -2 items which may limit how much an EW can recall/eq;  Event may be so traumatic that the EW represses it to help protect the ego/eq;  What happens in between seeing the event and recall could interfere with accuracy of memory/eq;  Loftus and Palmer found that memories are often a product of reconstruction and can be easily distorted/eq;  The memories an EW relies upon may decay over time and so are not available/eq;  Witnesses may be focusing on a weapon in a crime situation and not thus focus on the face of the criminal/eq;  An EW memory maybe constructed using schemas of events making it unreliable/eq;</p> <p><b>Look for other reasonable marking points.</b></p>	<p>AO2 = 6  (6)</p>

(Total 13 marks)

Question Number	Answer	Mark
4	<p>Describe <b>two</b> theories/models of memory.</p> <p>Marking points are indicative, not comprehensive and other points should be credited. In each consider Or Words To That Effect (OWTTE).</p> <p>1 mark for identification of theory/model. 5 marks for each theory/model. 1 mark per point/elaboration. 1 mark max for a suitable example</p> <p>MAX 2 marks for diagram if accurate and labelled and adds to the description.</p> <p>If candidate attempts more than two theories/models credit the best two.</p> <p><b>Possible theory/model includes</b> Levels of processing/multi store model/ Working memory/ Reconstructive (schema) theory/ Flashbulb and Cue dependent memory. DO NOT treat State and Context as two separate theories</p> <p><b>REJECT</b> theories of forgetting and EWT</p> <p><b>Possible Marking Points for Levels of Processing (1 mark)</b> There are three levels of processing, structural, phonetic and semantic/eq; Phonemic involves processing through sound e.g. does it rhyme with...?/eq; Memory is a consequence of how we process information the deeper we process it the easier it will be remembered/eq; Deep processing which is a form of elaborative rehearsal produces longer lasting memory traces/eq; The deepest level is semantic processing, and the shallowest is structural processing/eq; Information that is attended to on the basis of how it looks (structural processing) is not very durable/eq; Semantic analysis (understanding the meaning) results in deeper processing and deeper processing results in a more durable memory/eq;</p> <p><b>Possible Marking Points for Multi Store Model/Dual model (1 mark)</b> Information moves through three systems (SSM STM LTM)/eq; STM has a capacity of 7+/-2 items and a duration of 15 - 30 seconds/eq; The capacity and duration of LTM is unlimited/infinite/eq; Under the control of various cognitive processes (attention, rehearsal, etc.)/eq;</p>	

	<p>The distinctions among the three structures is made on the basis of three characteristics; capacity, duration and encoding/eq;  We receive information from the environment through our senses, which is automatically stored briefly in a sensory register/eq;  Coding and rehearsal determine the fate of this information.  Rehearsal is seen as a key process as it not only keeps information in STM, but is also responsible for transferring it to LTM/eq;</p> <p><b>Possible Marking Points for Reconstructive /Schema Theory (1 mark)</b>  Memory is more of an imaginative reconstruction of past events influenced by how we encode, store and retrieve information/eq;  Memory is not like a blank video tape but is changed when we recall it/eq;  Our attitudes and responses to events change our memory for those events/eq;  We use schemas that we already have to interpret information and incorporate these into our memory/eq;  Retrieval of stored memories thus involves an active process of reconstruction using a range of information/eq;  Confabulation is when information is added to fill in the gaps to make a story/ make sense/eq;</p> <p><b>Possible Marking Points for Cue Dependent Theory (1 mark)</b></p> <p><b>MAX 2 if memory is ONLY explained through forgetting</b></p> <p>Memory is stored based on state and context cues/eq;  State involves internal mechanisms such as emotions, thoughts and feelings/eq;  Context involves external mechanisms from the environment such as the situation/eq;  Remembering involves the need for the original cue/s to be present/eq;  Students sitting their exam in a classroom will recall more than students sitting their exam in the hall/eq;  This is what Tulving called the encoding specificity principle/eq;</p> <p><b>Look for other reasonable marking points.</b></p>	<p>AO1 = 5 +5  = 10    (10)</p>
--	--	---

(Total 10 marks)



Question Number	Answer Put a cross in the appropriate boxes to indicate which two statements are true of surveys and which two statements are true of field experiments.	Mark																											
5(a)	<p>One mark for each correctly identified statement (2 marks for surveys and 2 marks for field experiments) If more than 2 crosses given for either surveys or field experiments, no marks for that method.</p> <table border="0" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left; width: 45%;">Feature</th> <th style="text-align: center; width: 15%;">Surveys</th> <th style="text-align: center; width: 15%;">Field experiments</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A controlled study in the natural environment</td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Involve the analysis of symbols in dreams</td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Involve open and close questions</td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Involve placing electrodes on the scalp</td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Involve manipulation of independent variable</td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Involve the analysis of one person</td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Involve observing spontaneous behaviour</td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Consist of questionnaires and/or interviews</td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Feature	Surveys	Field experiments	A controlled study in the natural environment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Involve the analysis of symbols in dreams	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Involve open and close questions	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Involve placing electrodes on the scalp	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Involve manipulation of independent variable	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Involve the analysis of one person	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Involve observing spontaneous behaviour	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Consist of questionnaires and/or interviews	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>AO1 =4  (4)</p>
Feature	Surveys	Field experiments																											
A controlled study in the natural environment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>																											
Involve the analysis of symbols in dreams	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																											
Involve open and close questions	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																											
Involve placing electrodes on the scalp	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																											
Involve manipulation of independent variable	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>																											
Involve the analysis of one person	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																											
Involve observing spontaneous behaviour	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																											
Consist of questionnaires and/or interviews	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																											

Question Number	Answer	Mark
5(b)	<p>Marking points are indicative, not comprehensive and other points should be credited. In each consider Or Words To That Effect (OWTTE).</p> <p>1 mark for identifying factor and 1 further mark for elaboration. If more than two given credit the best.</p> <p>Factors must relate to original 1963 study so no credit for variations e.g. could see the learner / forcing hand down onto plate / experimenter left room</p> <p><b>Suitable examples include:</b>  Prestigious University; Slippery Slope; Personal responsibility; Prods/prompts; The perception / presence of legitimate authority; Agentic state</p> <p><b>Possible Marking Points</b></p> <p><b>Prestigious University;</b>  Held at Yale University so participants thought researchers were seen as experts and trustworthy/eq;</p> <p><b>Slippery Slope;</b>  Generator switches only went up in small increments (15 volts) so participants found it easier to obey/eq;</p> <p><b>Personal responsibility;</b>  Many participants asked whose responsibility it was if the learner was harmed and showed visible relief when the experimenter took responsibility/eq;</p> <p><b>Prods/prompts;</b>  “You must continue, the experimenter requires that you continue” etc</p> <p><b>The perception / presence of legitimate authority;</b>  The experimenter was seen as a legitimate authority figure in Milgram’s study and he wore a grey lab coat to indicate his position/eq;</p>	AO2 = 4

	Look for other reasonable marking points.	(4)
--	---	-----

Question Number	Answer	Mark
5(c)	<p>Evaluate Milgram's original study of obedience.</p> <p>Marking points are indicative, not comprehensive and other points should be credited. In each consider Or Words To That Effect (OWTTE). NO credit for simply saying study is unethical or just listing guidelines without reference to HOW they were broken.</p> <p>Max 1 mark for a real life example. 1 mark per point / elaboration.</p> <p>NO credit for stating 'it lacked ecological validity'. In such cases if a technical term is used correctly/explained and linked to the study it can gain 2 marks, 1 for correct use of the technical term and 1 for the correct explanation.</p> <p><b>Possible Ethical Marking Points</b> Participants were deceived over the nature of the study they thought experiment to be on learning and memory not obedience/eq; Also deceived by thinking other participant (Mr. Wallace) was also naïve and really getting electric shocks/eq; The study caused considerable distress to the participants through feelings of guilt and loss of self esteem/eq; However all participants were fully debriefed and in a follow up survey a year later 84% were glad to have been involved/eq; The study abused the rights of participants to withdraw many wishing to leave were told to continue/eq; However Milgram would argue they were not physically restrained and designed many variations to increase refusal / disobedience/eq; Milgram defends his actions as without deception the study would not have worked / revealed why people obey/eq;</p> <p><b>Possible Methodological Marking Points</b> Study lacked ecological validity as conducted in the unrealistic setting of a laboratory (1 mark) as people are not expected to give electric shocks as a result of an order eq/; (2 marks) Sample was mostly American males making it unrepresentative and ethnocentric/eq; They were also volunteers that may already have been more obedient and helpful due to enthusiasm in taking part/eq; The cues in the experimental setting (such as legitimate authority) may have influenced the participant's perceptions of what was required of them/eq; These demand characteristics may therefore have been the cause of obedience levels rather than other factors/eq;</p> <p><b>Possible Real Life Application Marking Points</b></p>	



	<p>Marks for assessing these findings. One mark for each point / elaboration.</p> <p>S.I.T. underestimates the importance of individual differences. Some people have a much greater tendency than others to favour in-group over out-group, depending on their personality/eq; Not everybody with a strict upbringing develops an authoritarian personality/eq; Super-ordinate goals cannot always be set up between all groups and failure to achieve them may result in worse prejudice/eq; Sherif used a field experiment which took place in real life setting of a summer camp which gives it high ecological validity/eq; However the study is ethnocentric as it only uses white middle class American boys making it difficult to generalise elsewhere/eq; Being forced to live around someone you dislike may increase prejudice (Deutsch &amp; Collins)/eq; Jane Elliott's study has been criticised for breaking ethical guidelines and all the participants were clearly caused distress and discomfort/eq;</p> <p>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p> <p><b>Clarity /Communication:</b> Mark independently of AO1 and AO2 and show total for C</p> <p>0 Note form / unintelligible / irrelevant 1 Essay format / some use of appropriate specialist terms / some spelling mistakes 2 Essay format / good use of appropriate specialist terms / good spelling and grammar</p> <p><b>Balance / Breadth:</b> Mark independently of AO1 and AO2 and show total for B</p> <p>0 Totally irrelevant response 1 Adequate coverage of subject content (one study only)/ some irrelevances 2 Good coverage of subject content / minor irrelevances</p>	<p>AO2 - 4</p> <p>AO1 - 2</p> <p>AO2 - 2</p> <p>(12)</p>
--	--	--

(Total 12 marks)

TOTAL FOR PAPER: 72 MARKS