

Section A: Core studies

Q1: Identify two features of the sample used in Maguire et al.'s (2000) study of brain plasticity. (2 marks)	
Marking Criteria	Guidance
2 marks: Two accurate details about the sample.	<u>Two from:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ All male ▪ All right-handed ▪ Size of sample was 66 (16 taxi drivers / 50 controls) ▪ All of the taxi drivers had healthy general medical, neurological, psychiatric profiles ▪ Other relevant features as specified in the study.
1 mark: One accurate detail about the sample.	
0 marks: No creditworthy response.	

Q2: Explain how Casey et al.'s (2011) study of delayed gratification relates to the biological area of psychology. (3 marks) [1+1+1]	
Marking Criteria	Guidance
1 mark: Understanding of the biological area shown.	<u>Example 3 mark answer:</u> The biological area investigates the role of biological factors such as genes, hormones and the nervous system in influencing our behaviour. Casey's study relates to the biological area because it showed how brain activity was related to the ability to delay gratification. In particular, high delayers (who were good at delaying gratification) had higher levels of activity in the inferior frontal gyrus than low delayers.
1 mark: Relevant detail from the Casey et al. study given.	
1 mark: Link between the Casey et al. study and the biological area clearly explained.	
0 marks: No creditworthy response.	

Q3a: From Grant et al.'s (1998) study of context-dependent memory: Describe how the sample was obtained in this study. (2 marks)	
Marking Criteria	Guidance
2 marks: Clear and accurate description of how the sample was obtained in this study.	<p><u>Example 2 mark answer:</u></p> <p>The sample was obtained by the eight student-researchers each recruiting five acquaintances to take part.</p>
1 mark: Partial or vague description of how the sample was obtained in this study.	
0 marks: No creditworthy response.	

Q3b: From Grant et al.'s (1998) study of context-dependent memory: Explain one way in which this sample may be biased. (3 marks) [1+1+1]	
Marking Criteria	Guidance
1 mark: Understanding of sampling bias shown.	<p><u>Example 3 mark answer:</u></p> <p>A sample of participants can be biased if it is not fully representative of the target population. This could have been a problem in Grant et al.'s study because of how the eight student-researchers were responsible for each recruiting five acquaintances to take part. The student-researchers were all students at the same University and, if they recruited people they knew, then presumably they all lived in the same area, meaning the participants may not be representative of people living in other parts of the USA or other countries.</p>
1 mark: Relevant detail from the Grant et al. study given.	
1 mark: Link between the Grant et al. study and sampling bias clearly explained.	
0 marks: No creditworthy response.	

Q4: Outline how the procedure used in Experiment 1 of Loftus and Palmer's (1974) study of eyewitness testimony helped ensure the reliability of the findings. (3 marks) [1+1+1]	
Marking Criteria	Guidance
1 mark: Understanding of reliability shown.	<p><u>Example 3 mark answer:</u></p> <p>Reliability relates to consistency, such as ensuring that a procedure is the same for all participants. In the Loftus and Palmer study, all participants saw the same videos of car accidents before all being asked questions about what they had seen. This helped to ensure the reliability of the findings because all participants had had the same experience in a standardised way.</p>
1 mark: Relevant detail from Experiment 1 of the Loftus and Palmer study given.	
1 mark: Link between Experiment 1 of the Loftus and Palmer study and reliability clearly explained.	
0 marks: No creditworthy response.	

Q5: State two different types of story the children heard in Lee et al.'s (1997) study of morality. [2]	
Marking Criteria	Guidance
2 marks: Two correctly stated story types.	<p><u>Any two of the following:</u></p> <p>Social stories Physical stories Pro-social stories Anti-social stories</p>
1 mark: One correctly stated story type.	
0 marks: No creditworthy response.	

Q6: Explain one similarity between the study by Piliavin et al (1969) into emergency helping and the study by Levine (2001) into non-emergency helping. (4 marks) [1+1+1+1]	
Marking Criteria	Guidance
1 mark: Relevant similarity explicitly identified.	<p><u>Example 4 mark answer:</u></p> <p>One similarity between the two studies is that in both of them the person in need of help was always male. For example, in Piliavin’s study, the ‘victim’ collapsing on the New York subway appearing to be either drunk or ill was always male. Similarly, in Levine’s study, it was always a male who dropped a pen, dropped magazines, or tried crossing the road while appearing to be blind. A reason for males always being used as the person in need of help was as a control on extraneous variables because if this person had sometimes been female then this could have affected levels of helping behaviour.</p>
1 mark: Identified similarity is explained.	
1 mark: Relevant supporting detail for the similarity given from the Piliavin study.	
1 mark: Relevant supporting detail for the similarity given from the Levine study.	
0 marks: No creditworthy response.	

Q7: Evaluate the use of the case study method in Freud’s (1909) study of phobias. (6 marks)	
Marking Criteria	Guidance
5-6 marks: For demonstrating excellent knowledge of two evaluative points (strengths AND/OR weaknesses) of the case study method, each clearly explained and applied to Freud’s study.	<p><u>Possible strengths/weaknesses could include:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In-depth data/qualitative data ▪ Insightful ▪ Allows the study of rare/unique behaviour
3-4 marks: For demonstrating good knowledge of the case study method (strengths AND/OR weaknesses) and applying this to Freud’s study.	
1-2 marks: For demonstrating limited knowledge of a strength/weakness of the case study method, whether applied to Freud’s study or not.	
0 marks: No creditworthy response.	

Section B: Areas, perspectives, issues and debates

Q8a: Explain each position of the freewill-determinism debate. (4 marks) [2+2]		
Marking Criteria (Freewill)	Marking Criteria (Determinism)	Guidance
2 marks: Clear and accurate explanation of the defining principle of freewill.	2 marks: Clear and accurate explanation of the defining principle of determinism.	<u>Example 4 mark answer:</u> The defining principle of freewill is the idea that we have choice over how we behave and are in control of what we do; our behaviour is down to us, and we can be held responsible for our choices. In contrast, the defining principle of determinism is that how we behave is due to forces beyond our control; some of these may be external such as environmental factors like the climate or weather while others may be internal such as genetic or personality factors, but either way we do not have complete choice over our behaviour.
1 mark: Partial and/or vague explanation of the defining principle of freewill.	1 mark: Partial and/or vague explanation of the defining principle of determinism.	
0 marks: No creditworthy response.	0 marks: No creditworthy response.	

Q8b: Explain how Milgram's (1963) study of obedience can support the reductionism side of the reductionism-holism debate. (3 marks) [1+1+1]	
Marking Criteria	Guidance
1 mark: Understanding of reductionism shown.	<u>Example 3 mark answer:</u> A reductionism stance suggests that there is only one explanation for behaviour. In the Milgram study, only a social/situational explanation (presence of an authority figure) was given to explain the participants' high levels of obedience. This shows reductionism because Milgram failed to investigate other factors that could cause obedience, such as how genes could influence natural levels of obedience.
1 mark: Relevant detail from the Milgram study given.	
1 mark: Link between the Milgram study and reductionism clearly explained.	
0 marks: No creditworthy response.	

Q8c: Identify and explain two applications of the cognitive area. (6 marks) [3+3]	
Marking Criteria	Guidance
For each application:	<u>Example 6 mark answer:</u>
3 marks: Relevant cognitive application is outlined, and it is clearly based on a cognitive area principle/concept that is explained.	One concept from the cognitive area is context-dependent memory, which is the claim that we recall best when we are back in the same context we were in when we had the memory in the first place. This could be applied by students when revising. They take their exams in silence, so if they revise in silence then this may help with recall of material revised in similar conditions.
2 marks: Relevant cognitive application is outlined and it is based on a cognitive area principle/concept but this is identified rather than explained, OR relevant application is identified but not outlined and it is based on a cognitive area principle/concept that is explained.	Another concept from the cognitive area is reconstructive memory, which claims that memories are constructed from a mixture of information during and after events, rather than being an exact recording of the event itself. This could be applied by the police when interviewing witnesses. The police should keep their questions as neutral as possible in order to avoid introducing any images that could further affecting the memory of a witness.
1 mark: Relevant cognitive application is identified.	
0 marks: No creditworthy response.	

CustomerMe

Q8d: Discuss strengths and weaknesses of conducting socially sensitive research. Use examples from appropriate psychological research to support your answer. (12)				
Level	Marking Criteria (AO1)	Level	Marking Criteria (AO3)	Indicative Content
Excellent 4 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The response demonstrates excellent relevant knowledge and understanding of psychological material which is well-developed. The information presented is accurate. There is effective use of supporting examples from psychological research. 	Excellent 7-8 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The response demonstrates an excellent ability to analyse, interpret and evaluate psychological material. A balanced argument should be presented with both strengths and weaknesses discussed, but there does not need to be equal balance between both. Typically, there will be four well-developed, relevant points. 	<p>Relevant strengths of conducting socially sensitive research could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Positive practical applications (e.g., improvements to mental health services) Could help to resolve debates (e.g., the nature-nurture debate, based on Bandura) <p>Relevant weaknesses of conducting socially sensitive research could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Likely to cause upset (e.g., people from ethnic minority groups could worry about discrimination within the legal system, based on Dixon) Could help reinforce prejudices (e.g., against the parents of children who show aggressive behaviour, based on Bandura)
Good 3 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The response demonstrates good relevant knowledge and understanding of psychological material which is reasonably developed. The information presented is accurate. There is reasonable use of supporting examples from psychological research. 	Good 5-6 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The response demonstrates a good ability to analyse, interpret and evaluate psychological material. A balanced argument should be presented with both strengths and weaknesses discussed, e.g., two strengths and one weakness presented. Typically, there will be three reasonably developed, relevant points. 	
Limited 2 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The response demonstrates limited relevant knowledge and understanding of psychological material which show limited development. The information presented may be partially accurate. There is limited use of supporting examples from psychological research. 	Limited 3-4 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The response demonstrates a limited ability to analyse, interpret and evaluate psychological material. The argument may not be balanced, e.g., only strengths or weaknesses may be discussed. Typically, there will be two relevant points that show limited development. 	
Basic 1 mark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The response demonstrates basic relevant knowledge and understanding of psychological material which show limited development. The information presented may contain inaccuracies. There is very limited, if any, use of supporting examples from psychological research. 	Basic 1-2 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The response demonstrates a basic ability to analyse, interpret and evaluate psychological material. Only one side of the argument will be discussed. Typically, there will be one relevant point that shows limited development. 	
0 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No creditworthy response. 	0 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No creditworthy response. 	

Section C: Practical applications

Q9a: Use the individual/situational debate to explain why some children would be more likely to imitate Peppa Pig than others. (4 marks) [2+2]		
Marking Criteria (AO1)	Marking Criteria (AO2)	Guidance
2 marks: Clear and accurate explanation of the individual/situational debate.	2 marks: Individual/situational debate used to clearly and accurately explain why some children would be more likely to imitate Peppa Pig.	<p><u>Example 4 mark answer:</u></p> <p>The individual/situational debate considers whether our behaviour arises from our personalities (individual) or from the circumstances we find ourselves in (situation). In the article, we are told about one father who “spoke of his despair at how his four-year-old son had taken to splashing in what he gleefully called ‘muddy puddles’ on his way to school.” As this involved the child “copying Peppa’s favourite pastime”, this would suggest that the boy’s behaviour is being caused by situational factors – namely, what he happens to watch on TV. If he hadn’t seen Peppa Pig jumping in puddles, then it may be that he wouldn’t be behaving in this way.</p>
1 mark: Partial and/or vague explanation of the individual/situational debate.	1 mark: Individual/situational debate used to attempt to explain why some children would be more likely to imitate Peppa Pig.	
0 marks: No creditworthy response.	0 marks: No creditworthy response.	

Q9b: Describe the procedure used in Bandura et al.'s (1961) study into transmission of aggression and briefly explain how this may relate to the article. (6 marks) [4+2]	
Marking Criteria	Guidance
1 mark for each feature of the procedure of the study described (up to a maximum of 4)	<p><u>Possible features that could be described could include:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Participants in the Bandura study were divided into three conditions in which they either saw an aggressive role model, a non-aggressive role model, or no role model. ▪ If the model was behaving aggressively, he/she would punch and kick a bobo doll in front of the child, and say things like “Sock him in the nose”. ▪ After witnessing the model being aggressive, the child would be subject to mild aggression arousal in which they would start playing with some attractive toys but then be told they couldn't play with them because these toys were being kept for the other children. Finally, the children would be taken into another room and left alone for the researchers to observe how they behaved and, in particular, whether they would show imitation of aggression.
PLUS up to 2 marks for application to the article:	<p><u>Possible link to the article:</u></p>
2 marks: for a relevant link which is clearly, if briefly, explained.	<p>The Bandura study relates to the article because Bandura showed how children will imitate the behaviour of adult role models, and the article is all about how children seem to be copying how they see Peppa Pig behaving on TV, such as gleefully splashing in 'muddy puddles', and “saying 'no' and 'yuk' in a really high and mighty way, just like Peppa does.”</p>
1 mark for a clear link or for one which is not well explained.	

Q9c: Using your knowledge of psychology, suggest and explain two strategies parents could use to encourage their children to behave appropriately. (8 marks) [4+4]		
Level	Marking Criteria	Guidance
For each strategy:		
Excellent 4 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A valid strategy suggested that parents could use to encourage their children to behave appropriately. ▪ There is excellent application of psychological knowledge within the suggested strategy – several details have been included about how they could be implemented and developed. ▪ The strategy is explicitly related to the context of the question 	<p>Suggested strategies could include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of positive reinforcement (e.g. rewards for desired behaviour) • Showing children role models behaving in desired ways in the hope that their child will imitate this behaviour instead (based on Bandura) • Adopting a more formal parenting style and being more authoritative to the children (based on Milgram) • Use of positive punishment (e.g. shouting at a child when they behave in inappropriate ways) • Use of negative punishment (e.g. taking away a child's favourite toy until they behave in an appropriate way) • Etc.
Good 3 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A valid strategy suggested that parents could use to encourage their children to behave appropriately. ▪ There is good application of psychological knowledge within the suggested strategy – some details have been included about how they could be implemented and developed. ▪ The strategy is explicitly related to the context of the question 	
Limited 2 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A valid strategy suggested that parents could use to encourage their children to behave appropriately. ▪ There is limited application of psychological knowledge within the suggested strategy. ▪ The strategy may not be explicitly related to the context of the question. 	
Basic 1 mark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A valid strategy suggested that parents could use to encourage their children to behave appropriately. 	
0 marks	No creditworthy response.	

Q9d: Evaluate the suggestions you have made in 9(c) using your knowledge of psychology. (12 marks)		
Level	Marking Criteria	Indicative Content
Excellent 10-12 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Both suggestions are evaluated. ▪ The response demonstrates excellent evaluation using a range of points/ideas (which are likely to include issues and debates). ▪ The evaluation points are in the context of the suggestion(s) presented in Q9c. ▪ A balanced argument should be presented with both strengths and weaknesses discussed, but there does not need to be equal balance between both. ▪ Typically, there will be four well-developed, relevant points. 	<p>Evaluation points could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Commenting on the suggestions in relation to the different debates (e.g., linking them to the nurture side of the nature-nurture debate) ▪ Commenting on methodological issues (e.g., explaining why a particular role model may be ethnocentric). ▪ Reference to the psychological basis of the suggestion (e.g., pointing out that research based on children aged 3-5 years may not necessarily apply to children who are older) ▪ Practical considerations (e.g., the financial cost of implementing a suggestion). ▪ Other approaches to evaluation could also be creditworthy. <p>NB If only one suggestion is evaluated then a maximum of 6 marks to be award.</p>
Good 7-9 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Both suggestions are evaluated. ▪ The response demonstrates good evaluation using a range of points/ideas (which are likely to include issues and debates). ▪ The evaluation points are in the context of the suggestion(s) presented in Q9c. ▪ A balanced argument should be presented with both strengths and weaknesses discussed, e.g., two strengths and one weakness presented. ▪ Typically, there will be three reasonably developed, relevant points. 	
Limited 4-6 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ One or more suggestion(s) are evaluated. ▪ The response demonstrates limited evaluation using a limited range of points/ideas (which are likely to include issues and debates). ▪ The evaluation points are in the context of the suggestion(s) presented in Q9c. ▪ The argument may not be balanced, e.g., only strengths or weaknesses may be discussed. ▪ Typically, there will be two relevant points that show limited development. 	
Basic 1-3 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ One or more suggestion(s) are evaluated. ▪ The response demonstrates basic evaluation using a very limited range of points/ideas. ▪ The argument may not be balanced, e.g., only strengths or weaknesses may be discussed. ▪ Typically, there will be one relevant point that shows limited development. 	
0 marks	No creditworthy response.	