

1. (a) **Outline** one difference between the samples used in Bandura et al.'s (1961) study into the transmission of aggression and Chaney et al.'s (2004) Funhaler study. (3)

Mark Scheme

<p>Outline one difference between the samples used in Bandura et al.'s (1961) study into the transmission of aggression and Chaney et al.'s (2004) Funhaler study.</p> <p>Differences include: number, ages, age range, ethnicity, gender.</p> <p><u>Likely answers:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> One difference between the two studies is the number of participants used. Bandura = 72 children (accept range 70-74) Chaney = 32 children. (accept range (30-34) One difference between the two studies is the ethnicity of the participants. Bandura = from the USA/ Stanford University nursery Chaney = participants were from Australia. One difference between the two studies is the age range of the participants. Bandura = aged 3 years 1 month to 5 years 9 months/with a mean age 4 years 4 months. Chaney = aged between 1.5 and 6 years/with a mean age of 3.2 years. One difference between the two studies is the number of boys and girls used as participants. Bandura = had an equal number of boys and girls/36 boys and 36 girls Chaney = 22 boys and 10 girls. <p>NB: No credit for sample method</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>3 marks – For including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identification of an appropriate difference between the samples used. Supporting evidence from Bandura et al. Supporting evidence from Chaney et al. <p>2 marks – For identifying an appropriate difference with supporting evidence from <u>either</u> Bandura et al. <u>or</u> Chaney et al. OR No clear identification of a difference but clear evidence given from Bandura et al and Chaney et al with implied comparison.</p> <p>1 mark – For merely identifying an appropriate difference, e.g. the age of the children.</p> <p>0 marks – No or incorrect answer</p>
---	-----------------	---

(b) **Outline** one difference between the experimental designs used in Bandura et al.'s (1961) study into the transmission of aggression and Chaney et al.'s (2004) Funhaler study. (3)

Mark Scheme

<p>Outline one difference between the experimental designs used in Bandura et al.'s (1961) study into the transmission of aggression and Chaney et al.'s (2004) Funhaler study.</p> <p><u>Example answers:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bandura et al. used an independent measures design whereas Chaney et al. used a repeated measures design. (1) The children in Bandura et al.'s study only participated in one condition, i.e. they either saw an aggressive or non-aggressive model/they either saw a male or a female model (1). In Chaney et al.'s study all the children's medical compliance was assessed in both conditions of using a standard inhaler and the Funhaler. (1) Bandura et al. used a matched pairs design whereas Chaney et al. used a repeated measures design. (1) The children in Bandura et al.'s study were matched on their pre-rated levels of aggression (1). In Chaney et al.'s study all the children's medical compliance was assessed in both conditions of using a standard inhaler and the Funhaler. (1) <p>NB: No credit for experiment type (Field/Lab)</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>3 marks – For including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identification of an appropriate difference between the experimental designs used. Supporting evidence from Bandura et al. Supporting evidence from Chaney et al. <p>2 marks – For identifying an appropriate difference with supporting evidence from <u>either</u> Bandura et al. <u>or</u> Chaney et al.</p> <p>1 mark – For merely identifying an appropriate difference, e.g. Bandura et al. used an independent measures design whereas Chaney et al. used a repeated measures design, i.e. no contextualisation.</p> <p>0 marks – No or incorrect answer.</p> <p>NB. Bandura's study can be classed as independent measures or matched pairs (but the supporting evidence must be in relation to the IV in support of the named design.)</p>
---	-----------------	--

2. **With reference** to Kohlberg's (1968) study into the stages of moral development:
 (a) **Give** two reasons why children at the pre-conventional level say that Heinz should not have stolen the drug for his wife. **(2)**

Mark Scheme

<p>With reference to Kohlberg's (1968) study into the stages of moral development: Give two reasons why children at the pre-conventional level will say Heinz should <u>not</u> have stolen the drug for his wife.</p> <p>Two reasons, one for obedience/punishment and one for self-interest.</p> <p><u>Most likely answers will refer to:</u></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="172 568 868 779"> <thead> <tr> <th>Obedience and Punishment</th> <th>Self Interest</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>To obey the rules.</td> <td>To avoid self-condemnation</td> </tr> <tr> <td>To avoid punishment by authority</td> <td>To obtain rewards</td> </tr> <tr> <td>To not break the law</td> <td>To avoid dislike by others</td> </tr> <tr> <td>To avoid punishment</td> <td>To be respected by others.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Obedience and Punishment	Self Interest	To obey the rules.	To avoid self-condemnation	To avoid punishment by authority	To obtain rewards	To not break the law	To avoid dislike by others	To avoid punishment	To be respected by others.	<p>2 [1+1]</p>	<p>1 mark – For each correctly identified reason.</p> <p>0 marks – No or incorrect answer.</p> <p>NB: Do not credit general reference to morality e.g. 'Because it is immoral' as does not show reasoning for the stage.</p>
Obedience and Punishment	Self Interest											
To obey the rules.	To avoid self-condemnation											
To avoid punishment by authority	To obtain rewards											
To not break the law	To avoid dislike by others											
To avoid punishment	To be respected by others.											

- (b) **Outline** one conclusion that can be drawn from the findings of Kohlberg's study. **(2)**

Mark Scheme

<p>Outline <u>one</u> conclusion that that can be drawn from the findings of Kohlberg's study.</p> <p><u>Most likely answers:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The stages in an individual's moral development are sequential/invariable. • Each stage of moral development comes one at a time and always in the same order. • An individual may stop at any given stage and age in an invariant sequence of moral development. • Pre-conventional thought is based on self-interest • Conventional thought is based on rules and approval from others • Post-conventional thought is based on respect for democratically agreed rules/personal conscience. • Kohlberg's six-stage theory of moral development is not significantly affected by widely ranging social, cultural or religious conditions. • Children can differ in the rate at which they progress through the stages. • Stages of moral development are universal • Other appropriate conclusions should be credited. 	<p>2</p>	<p>2 marks – A clear and accurate conclusion, such as one of the examples given.</p> <p>1 mark – A vague or partial answer, e.g. each stage of moral development comes one at a time, i.e. no reference to 'in the same order'; 'There are stages children go through in moral development' i.e. no reference to 'sequential/invariable'</p> <p>'Moral development is universal' i.e. no reference to 'stages'</p>
---	-----------------	--

3. Grant et al.'s (1998) study into context-dependent memory was a laboratory experiment.

(a) Describe one strength of using a laboratory experiment in this study. (2)

Mark Scheme

<p>Grant et al.'s (1998) study into context-dependent memory was a laboratory experiment. Describe one strength of using a laboratory experiment in this study.</p> <p><u>Example answers:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> One strength of using a laboratory experiment is that they can readily ensure that every participant is treated in the same way by using standardised procedures (1). For example, every participant completed the same short-answer and multiple-choice test (1). One strength of using a laboratory experiment is that the environment can be controlled so no situational variables, such as distractions, noise, the presence of other people can affect results (1). For example, all participants wore headphones. One strength of using a laboratory experiment is that they are easy to replicate (making findings reliable) (1). In Grant all participants followed the same procedure: reading an article, had a break of about 2 minutes, completed a short-answer test and then a multiple-choice test. One strength of using a laboratory experiment is that they enable the use of complex equipment/materials (1). For example, every participant used a cassette player and headphones (1). Other appropriate strengths should be credited. 	<p>2</p>	<p>2 marks – For a clear and accurate description which includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identification of an appropriate strength of a laboratory experiment. Appropriate supporting evidence from Grant et al.'s study. <p>1 mark – For the mere identification of an appropriate strength of a laboratory experiment, i.e. no contextualisation.</p> <p>0 marks – No or incorrect answer.</p>
---	-----------------	---

(b) Outline two features of the procedure in this study. (4)

Mark Scheme

<p>Grant et al.'s (1998) study into context-dependent memory was a laboratory experiment. Outline two features of the procedure used in this study.</p> <p><u>Answers should identify and contextualise two features.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participants were randomly assigned to one of four conditions: silent-silent, silent-noisy, noisy-noisy or noisy-silent Participants read an article under silent or noisy conditions Read aloud standardised instructions that described the tasks as part of a class project/. Participants read an article once and were told they would have to complete tasks based on the article. Participants were given instructions: silent were told nothing would be heard/ noisy were told they would be played loud background music. Participants had a break of 2 mins between the study and test Participants were tested in either matching (silent-silent) or mismatching (silent-noisy) conditions (Independent measures design). Participants completed a short answer/recall test and the multiple-choice/recognition test. Participants were debriefed and were told the research was on the influence of context on memory recall. All participants were given headphones to wear/ All read the same psychoimmunology article (basic standardised features) Other appropriate features of the procedure should be credited. 	<p>4 [2+2]</p>	<p><u>For each feature:</u></p> <p>1 mark – A feature of the procedure identified.</p> <p>Plus</p> <p>1 mark – This feature is further contextualised.</p> <p>0 marks – No or incorrect answer.</p> <p>NB. No marks are credited for details of sample/sample method, operationalisation of variables (planning stage) and aims/hypotheses.</p> <p>Must be features of the procedure/ process.</p> <p>NB <u>One</u> basic standardised feature can be credited</p>
--	---------------------------	--

4. Briefly discuss the extent to which the findings of Maguire et al.'s (2000) study on taxi drivers can be considered valid. (5)

Mark Scheme

<p>Briefly discuss the extent to which the findings of Maguire et al.'s (2000) study on taxi drivers can be considered valid.</p> <p><u>Example discussion points:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High internal validity as participants matched on gender, handedness, good psychological and physical health, and age of the taxi drivers • High validity with the use of blind researcher to carry out pixel counting and VBM scores to remove bias • High validity with comparison of the taxi-drivers to a control group giving construct validity. • Low ecological validity as MRI scanner is not something participants would have to do on a daily basis. • High validity as the variable being measured (hippocampal volume) is not something participants could falsify, • Highly valid because they are supported by evidence from comparative studies with animals and brain damaged patients consistent with the findings from the taxi drivers. • High validity as the volume differences in the hippocampus were established by two independent measures - VBM and pixel counting. • Other appropriate discussions should be credited. 	<p>5</p> <p>5 marks – For a very clear discussion that has considered the extent to which findings can be considered valid. discussion refers to either three reasons why the findings can/cannot be considered valid or two reasons which considers the extent of both how the study can and cannot be considered valid.</p> <p>3-4 marks – For a good discussion that refers to at least two reasons why the findings can/cannot be considered valid.</p> <p>1-2 marks - For a reasonable discussion that refers to at least one reason why the findings can/cannot be considered valid.</p> <p>0 marks – No or incorrect answer.</p>
---	---

5. Explain why Hancock et al.'s (2011) study into the language of psychopaths can be placed in the individual differences area. (3)

Mark Scheme

<p>Explain why Hancock et al.'s (2011) study into the language of psychopaths can be placed in the individual differences area.</p> <p><u>Likely answers:</u></p> <p>Shows understanding of individual differences</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The individual differences area focuses more on those whose behaviour falls outside the 'normal', typical or expected range of behaviour • Emphasizes that people are unique and that behaviour is influenced by individual characteristics • The individual differences area considers that there are many differences between individuals, as well as similarities. • Differences between individuals can be measured/ quantified <p>Outlines a finding from Hancock et al.'s study:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hancock et al. found that psychopaths who had committed murder described powerful emotional events (their crimes) on a more primitive but rational level than non-psychopaths who had committed murder. • The psychopaths used significantly more words connected with food, drink, clothing and money (basic physiological needs) than the non-psychopaths who used significantly more words connected to family and religion (social needs) • Psychopaths also tended to use less positive or emotionally intensive language and showed more instances of callousness and lack of empathy in their narratives than non-psychopaths <p>Links Hancock et al.'s study to the individual differences area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hancock showed that there are differences between psychopaths and non-psychopaths). • The language of psychopaths is not 'normal', typical or expected range of behaviour. • Other appropriate explanations should be credited. 	<p>3</p> <p>3 marks – A clear and accurate explanation that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shows an understanding of the individual differences area. • Outlines a finding from Hancock et al.'s study. • Links Hancock et al.'s study to the individual differences area. <p>2 marks – A reasonably accurate explanation that refers to two of the above.</p> <p>1 mark – A vague or partial answer, e.g. a mere description of the individual differences area with no supporting evidence from Hancock et al.'s study.</p> <p>0 marks – No creditworthy information.</p>
---	--

