

GCE

Psychology

H567/02: Psychological themes through core studies

A Level

Mark Scheme for June 2024

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 2024

MARKING INSTRUCTIONS**PREPARATION FOR MARKING****RM ASSESSOR**

1. Make sure that you have accessed and completed the relevant training packages for on-screen marking: *RM Assessor Assessor Online Training*; *OCR Essential Guide to Marking*.
2. Make sure that you have read and understood the mark scheme and the question paper for this unit. These are posted on the RM Cambridge Assessment Support Portal <http://www.rm.com/support/ca>
3. Log-in to RM Assessor and mark the **required number** of practice responses (“scripts”) and the **number of required** standardisation responses.

YOU MUST MARK 10 PRACTICE AND 10 STANDARDISATION RESPONSES BEFORE YOU CAN BE APPROVED TO MARK LIVE SCRIPTS.

MARKING

1. Mark strictly to the mark scheme.
2. Marks awarded must relate directly to the marking criteria.
3. The schedule of dates is very important. It is essential that you meet the RM Assessor 50% and 100% (traditional 40% Batch 1 and 100% Batch 2) deadlines. If you experience problems, you must contact your Team Leader (Supervisor) without delay.
4. If you are in any doubt about applying the mark scheme, consult your Team Leader by telephone or the RM Assessor messaging system, or by email.
5. **Crossed Out Responses**
Where a candidate has crossed out a response and provided a clear alternative then the crossed out response is not marked. Where no alternative response has been provided, examiners may give candidates the benefit of the doubt and mark the crossed out response where legible.

Rubric Error Responses – Optional Questions

Where candidates have a choice of question across a whole paper or a whole section and have provided more answers than required, then all responses are marked and the highest mark allowable within the rubric is given. Enter a mark for each question answered into RM assessor, which will select the highest mark from those awarded. *(The underlying assumption is that the candidate has penalised themselves by attempting more questions than necessary in the time allowed.)*

Multiple Choice Question Responses

When a multiple choice question has only a single, correct response and a candidate provides two responses (even if one of these responses is correct), then no mark should be awarded (as it is not possible to determine which was the first response selected by the candidate).

When a question requires candidates to select more than one option/multiple options, then local marking arrangements need to ensure consistency of approach.

Contradictory Responses

When a candidate provides contradictory responses, then no mark should be awarded, even if one of the answers is correct.

Short Answer Questions (requiring only a list by way of a response, usually worth only one mark per response)

Where candidates are required to provide a set number of short answer responses then only the set number of responses should be marked. The response space should be marked from left to right on each line and then line by line until the required number of responses have been considered. The remaining responses should not then be marked. Examiners will have to apply judgement as to whether a 'second response' on a line is a development of the 'first response', rather than a separate, discrete response. *(The underlying assumption is that the candidate is attempting to hedge their bets and therefore getting undue benefit rather than engaging with the question and giving the most relevant/correct responses.)*

Short Answer Questions (requiring a more developed response, worth two or more marks)

If the candidates are required to provide a description of, say, three items or factors and four items or factors are provided, then mark on a similar basis – that is downwards (as it is unlikely in this situation that a candidate will provide more than one response in each section of the response space.)

Longer Answer Questions (requiring a developed response)

Where candidates have provided two (or more) responses to a medium or high tariff question which only required a single (developed) response and not crossed out the first response, then only the first response should be marked. Examiners will need to apply professional judgement as to whether the second (or a subsequent) response is a 'new start' or simply a poorly expressed continuation of the first response.

6. Always check the pages (and additional objects if present) at the end of the response in case any answers have been continued there. If the candidate has continued an answer there, then add a tick to confirm that the work has been seen.

7. Award No Response (NR) if:

- there is nothing written in the answer space

Award Zero '0' if:

- anything is written in the answer space and is not worthy of credit (this includes text and symbols).

Team Leaders must confirm the correct use of the NR button with their markers before live marking commences and should check this when reviewing scripts.

8. The RM Assessor **comments box** is used by your team leader to explain the marking of the practice responses. Please refer to these comments when checking your practice responses. **Do not use the comments box for any other reason.**

If you have any questions or comments for your team leader, use the phone, the RM Assessor messaging system, or e-mail.
















9. Assistant Examiners will send a brief report on the performance of candidates to their Team Leader (Supervisor) via email by the end of the marking period. The report should contain notes on particular strengths displayed as well as common errors or weaknesses. Constructive criticism of the question paper/mark scheme is also appreciated.

10. For answers marked by levels of response:

- To determine the level** – start at the highest level and work down until you reach the level that matches the answer
- To determine the mark within the level**, consider the following

<i>Descriptor</i>	<i>Award mark</i>
On the borderline of this level and the one below	At bottom of level
Just enough achievement on balance for this level	Above bottom and either below middle or at middle of level (depending on number of marks available)
Meets the criteria but with some slight inconsistency	Above middle and either below top of level or at middle of level (depending on number of marks available)
Consistently meets the criteria for this level	At top of level

11. Annotations

Annotation	Meaning
	Correct
	Development/explanation/elaboration of point
	Incorrect
	Unclear
	Something contradictory
	Missing information
	Context
	Application to the source/article
	Good use of research
	Evaluation
	Not answering question
	Benefit of doubt given
	Irrelevant
	Seen (to show content on a page has been noted, but not credited)
	Highlighter tool

12 Subject Specific Marking Instructions

Section A – Core Studies

Question		Answer	Mark	Guidance
1	(a)	<p>From Baron-Cohen <i>et al.</i>'s (1997) study into autism in adults:</p> <p>Identify <u>one</u> group of participants in this study and outline <u>two</u> features of that group.</p> <p>Adults with high-functioning autism/Asperger syndrome</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 16 • 4 HF Autism/12 AS • Normal intelligence (>85 on WAIS-R) • Mean age 28.6 range 18-49 • HF had history of 'classical' autism (i.e. Autism accompanied by language delay)/AS had no significant language delay • Recruited from clinical sources/doctors and advert in <i>Communications</i> magazine/ National Autistic society magazine • 13 males and 3 females/ More males than females <p>Normal adults/normal men and women</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 50 • 25 male 25 female/ equal number of males and females • Normal intelligence (assumed) • Mean age 30.0 range 18-48 • General population of Cambridge (not university) • Selected randomly from subject panel held at the university • No history of psychiatric condition/No psychological disorders <p>Adults with Tourette syndrome/adults with TS.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 • 8 male 2 female/ more males than females • Normal IQ (tested on short WAIS-R) • Mean age 27.77 range 18-47 • From tertiary referral centre in London 	<p>3 [1+1+1]</p>	<p>1 marks – For the correct identification of one group of participants</p> <p>PLUS</p> <p>1 mark – For outlining one feature of the named group.</p> <p>PLUS</p> <p>1 mark – For outlining another feature of the named group.</p> <p>0 marks – No creditworthy information.</p> <p>N.B: 1) Cannot get credit for simply stating advert/ magazine, Autism magazine is acceptable. 2) 'Control group' is not creditworthy as a feature as both TS and Normal group were both control groups for different variables 3) Can get credit for identifying sample within the features if not explicitly stated 'One group had been diagnosed as having Tourettes' 4) Saying they had been 'diagnosed as having Tourettes/Autism' cannot be awarded as a feature mark as this is tautological 5) For the Normal group, no credit can be given for saying 'Did not have Tourettes or Autism' 6) Adults is not a defining feature</p>

Question		Answer	Mark	Guidance
1	(b)	<p>From Baron-Cohen <i>et al.</i>'s (1997) study into autism in adults: Outline the effect the participants' gender had on their responses in the Eyes Task. [2]</p> <p><u>Most likely answers:</u></p> <p><i>Normal</i> females performed significantly better than <i>normal</i> males on the Eyes Task</p> <p>Females (mean 21.8) performed significantly better than males (mean 18.8) on the eyes task</p> <p>The <i>normal</i> males were significantly better than the <i>autism</i>/AS group (mean 18.8 versus 16.3).</p> <p><i>Normal</i> females performed the best overall but the <i>normal</i> males performed better than the autistic/AS participants</p> <p><i>Normal</i> females performed better than <i>normal</i> males.</p> <p>Other appropriate descriptions should be credited.</p>	2	<p>2 marks – An accurate response which includes findings in relation to gender for: EITHER - normal females versus normal males. OR - normal males versus the autistic/AS participants. OR- females vs males with supporting results from eye task</p> <p>1 mark – A vague or partial response, e.g. normal females performed the best/ Females performed better than males</p> <p>0 marks – No creditworthy information, e.g. no reference to the participants' condition (normal, autistic/AS), reference to any of the other tasks.</p>

Question			Answer	Mark	Guidance
2	(a)		<p>From Hancock et al's (2011) study into the language of psychopaths:</p> <p>Explain <u>one</u> reason why the interviewer were not told the participants' scores on the psychopathy test. [2]</p> <p><u>Possible answers:</u></p> <p>This helped reduce the risk of (interviewer/researcher) bias (1) as they were unable to manipulate questions relating to the offender's crimes. (1)</p> <p>The interviewer could not influence the participant's performance by treating them in a biased way (1) therefore results in relation to the language used were not in favour or against either the psychopaths or non-psychopaths. (1)</p> <p>Interviewers were unable to manipulate questions due to being blind to their group (1) as they did not know whether the offenders had been classified as psychopaths or non-psychopaths. (1)</p> <p>Other appropriate explanations should be credited.</p>	2	<p>1 mark – For showing an understanding of a (single) blind procedure.</p> <p>PLUS</p> <p>1 mark – For applying this appropriately to Hancock et al.'s (2011) study.</p> <p>0 marks – No creditworthy information.</p> <p>N.B: Interviewers were investigating language use and wrote down verbatim what was said in the interview. Candidates cannot get credit for saying 'statements made in interview were made to be more or less psychopathic'</p>

Question		Answer	Mark	Guidance
2	(b)	<p>Outline <u>one</u> weakness of the sample used in this study. [2]</p> <p><u>Possible answers:</u></p> <p>The findings were based on males (1) so may not be generalisable to female murderers. (1)</p> <p>The findings were drawn from murderers incarcerated in Canadian (1) prisons/correctional facilities so may not be generalisable to other countries. (1)</p> <p>Does not represent females (1) and how they would explain their murders. (1)</p> <p>Sample were all volunteers (1) and may have been more willing to be interviewed about their crimes, this does not represent murderers who do not want to talk about their crimes. (1)</p> <p>It could be seen as ethnocentric (1) due to only including murderers in Canada. (1)</p> <p>Other appropriate explanations should be credited.</p>	2	<p>2 marks – A clear and accurate explanation that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identifies a limitation of the sample Appropriate link made to Hancock et al.'s study <p>1 mark – A vague or partial answer, i.e. the mere identification of a limitation of the sample without any link to generalisability/Hancock et al.'s study.</p> <p>0 marks – No creditworthy information. e.g. 'difficult to generalise to population' is not creditworthy alone as this is a weakness of many samples. Needs to be relevant to Hancock et al and so generalisation/representativeness can only be used within the link. Sample size is not creditworthy, 14 vs 38, so although less psychopaths still a significant size based on proportion in the population</p>

Question			Answer	Mark	Guidance
3	(a)		<p>From Levine et al.'s (2001) study into cross-cultural altruism:</p> <p>Describe the dependent variable in <u>one</u> condition of this study. [3]</p> <p><u>Answers to be drawn from:</u></p> <p><u>The dropped pen condition:</u> Participants were considered to have shown helping behaviour if they called back to the experimenter that he had dropped the pen and/or picked up the pen and took it to the experimenter.</p> <p><u>The hurt leg condition:</u> Helping behaviour was shown if the participant offered to help and/or began to help pick up magazines without offering.</p> <p><u>The blind person (trying to cross the street):</u> Helping behaviour was scored if participants informed the experimenter that the light was green and/or helped them across the street.</p> <p>Other appropriate descriptions should be credited.</p>	3	<p>3 marks – A clear and accurate description that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identifies one of the three measures of helping (1) Both measures are included. e.g. 'participants informed the experimenter that the light was green or helped them cross the street' (2) <p>2 marks – A reasonably accurate description that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identifies one of the three measures of helping. (1) Only one measure included. e.g. 'participants informed the experimenter the light was green' (1) <p>1 mark – A partial or vague answer, e.g. mere identification of one of the measures of helping.</p> <p>0 marks – No creditworthy information.</p>

Question			Answer	Mark	Guidance
3	(b)		<p>From Levine et al.'s (2001) study into cross-cultural altruism:</p> <p>Explain how this study links to the key theme of responses to people in need.</p> <p><u>Possible answers:</u></p> <p>Levine et al.'s study links to the key theme of people in need by showing that the willingness to help people in need differed across cultures/cities.</p> <p>Features of cities or types of helping:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cultural values (Individualism- Collectivism, simpatia) • Economic prosperity/ wealth • Population size • Walking speed/ pace of life • Dropped pen/ hurt leg/ blind victim (types of helping) <p>Findings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individualistic cultures showed lower levels of helping • Countries which were more helpful had lower PPP/ less wealth • No relationship between population size and helping • Faster cities showed less likelihood of help (small correlation) • Simpatia cultures, such as Brazil, were more helpful than non-simpatia cultures, such as Malaysia • A cities helping rate was relatively stable across all three measures. • The most helpful city was Rio de Janeiro (Brazil) <p>Other appropriate explanations should be credited.</p>	3	<p>3 marks for a clear answer which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognises helping is affected by culture/countries • Features of cities or types of helping • An accurate finding of one measure. <p>2 marks for a reasonable answer which refers to two of the above</p> <p>1 mark a vague/partial answer which refers to one of the above</p> <p>0 marks – No creditworthy information.</p>

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
4	<p>Outline the background to Chaney et al.'s (2004) Funhaler study.</p> <p><u>Likely answers will refer to:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor adherence to prescribed frequency/technique remains a major problem for paediatric asthmatics on inhaled medication. • Compliance for offering medication regularly to asthmatic children is low. • Behaviour therapy and behaviour modification - based on operant conditioning have been approaches used by clinical psychologists and health practitioners to improve adherence. • Positive reinforcement techniques – whether incentive toys on the Funhaler would lead to improved adherence in young asthmatics. • Appropriate studies of conditioning – e.g. Skinner. <p>Other appropriate outlines should be credited.</p> <p><u>Links to Chaney</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To investigate how operant conditioning affects adherence of children to asthma medication. • To show that a novel asthma spacer device, the “funhaler” (which incorporates incentive toys) can provide positive reinforcement leading to improved adherence in young asthmatics. 	4	<p>4 marks – A detailed and accurate outline which describes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor compliance to asthma medication • Operant conditioning/Behaviour therapy • Elaboration of conditioning/behaviour modification • Link to study <p>3 marks - A good outline which includes three of the points above</p> <p>2 marks – A reasonable outline which includes two of the points above</p> <p>1 mark – A partial or vague answer which vaguely describes background research/theory</p> <p>0 marks – No creditworthy information. e.g. only stating the aim of Chaney</p>

Question			Answer	Mark	Guidance
5			<p>Explain why Kohlberg's (1968) research into moral development is considered a longitudinal study.</p> <p><u>The answer should refer to:</u></p> <p>Description of a longitudinal study: A longitudinal study is one in which one participant, or a group of participants, is studied over a period of time.</p> <p>Reference to Kohlberg: Studied the <i>same</i> 75 American boys, aged 10 – 16 years old, for 12 years. Followed at three-year intervals until they were 22-28 years old</p>	3	<p>3 marks –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A clear and accurate description of a longitudinal study. • Clear reference to Kohlberg (studied for 12 years) • At least one other feature supporting longitudinal nature of Kohlberg <p>2 marks – Any two of the above</p> <p>1 mark – A vague or partial answer e.g. a mere description of a longitudinal study with no supporting evidence, e.g. Kohlberg studied the same participants for a long period of time.</p> <p>0 marks – No creditworthy information, e.g. mere descriptions of the sample.</p>

Question		Answer	Mark	Guidance
6	(a)	<p>From Moray's (1959) study into auditory attention:</p> <p>Describe how <u>one</u> control was used in this study.</p> <p><u>Possible answers:</u></p> <p>In <i>all</i> tasks (1) the apparatus used was the <i>same</i> type of (Brenell Mark IV stereophonic) <i>tape recorder</i> (1) used for each participant (1)</p> <p>Before <i>each</i> experiment (1) <i>all</i> participants (1) shadowed the <i>same</i> passages. (1)</p> <p><i>All</i> passages throughout the study (1) were recorded by the <i>same</i> <i>male</i> speaker (1) heard by all participants (1)</p> <p>In Experiment 1, the <i>word list</i> (1) was repeated <i>35 times</i> (1) for <i>each</i> participant. (1)</p> <p>The volume was the same (1) in both headphones (1) for the rejected and shadowed message (1)</p> <p>Other appropriate controls should be credited.</p>	3	<p>3 marks – A clear and accurate description that includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of a control. (<i>what</i>) • Identifies that <i>all</i> participants experienced this control. (<i>who</i>) • Identifies how this control was carried out. (<i>how</i>) <p>2 marks - A reasonable description that refers to two of the features listed above, e.g. in <i>all</i> tasks the <i>same</i> apparatus was used.</p> <p>1 mark – A vague answer that only refers to one of the features listed above, e.g. participants shadowed the <i>same</i> passage.</p> <p>0 marks – No creditworthy information. i.e instructions were given</p>

Question		Answer	Mark	Guidance
6	(b)	<p>From Moray's (1959) study into attention in dichotic listening:</p> <p>Outline <u>one</u> conclusion Moray (1959) made in relation to attention.</p> <p><u>Possible answers:</u></p> <p>Almost none of the verbal content of a rejected message is able to penetrate an attentional block (1) There was no trace of material from the rejected message being recognised (1)</p> <p>This study found that attention is selective (1) because participants were unable to recall information they were not focusing on unless it was subjectively important to them. (1)</p> <p>Moray concluded that information is only processed if it seen as relevant (1) for example, participants were more likely to attend to an instruction if their name preceded it. (1)</p> <p>The study found that most information around us is not processed or paid attention unless it is deemed relevant. (1) Participants were unable to recall information if they did not consider it important to them. (1)</p> <p>Subjectively important messages can penetrate an attentional block (1) as participants heard instructions if their own name was a part of the rejected message (1)</p> <p>Other appropriate outlines should be credited.</p>	2	<p>2 marks – A clear and accurate description that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gives a conclusion (Outlines that attention is selective/information only processed if deemed relevant) • Links to a finding from Moray's study. <p>1 mark – A vague or partial answer, e.g. attention is selective, i.e. no supporting evidence/not contextualised.</p> <p>0 marks – No creditworthy information i.e. findings stated without conclusion</p>

Question			Answer	Mark	Guidance
7			<p>Briefly explain how Simons and Chabris' (1999) study into visual attention changes our understanding of attention, when compared to Moray's (1959) study into auditory attention.</p> <p><u>Possible answer:</u></p> <p>Moray found that individuals are not aware of the content of an unattended auditory message, such as numbers. (1) Simons and Chabris found that individuals tend to fail to notice an unexpected event (e.g. a person wearing a gorilla costume) walking through an event, when their visual attention is focused on something else. (1) Therefore, Simon and Chabris' study expands our understanding of attention by showing that the inability to divide our attention can be related to visual information, and not just auditory information. (1)</p> <p>Other appropriate explanations should be credited.</p>	3	<p>3 marks – A clear and accurate explanation that refers to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How Simons and Chabris' study changes/expands our understanding of attention/inattention. • Moray's findings in relation to attention/inattention. • Simons and Chabris' findings in relation to attention/inattention. <p>2 marks – A reasonable explanation that refers to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How Simons and Chabris' study changes/expands our understanding of attention/inattention. • Simons and Chabris' findings in relation to attention/inattention (without any clear link to Moray's findings to show how our understanding has changed/expanded) <p>1 mark – A partial or vague response, e.g. A change in understanding is shown, but there is no reference to findings of either Moray or Simons and Chabris.</p> <p>0 marks – No creditworthy information. e.g. only findings stated, no change in understanding highlighted</p>

Question			Answer	Mark	Guidance
8			<p>Explain why Grant et al.'s (1998) study into context-dependent memory can be placed in the cognitive area. [3]</p> <p><u>Most likely answers:</u></p> <p><i>Knowledge of Cognitive area:</i> The cognitive area assumes that behaviour can be largely explained in terms of information processing so behaviour such as memory has a cognitive basis. (1)</p> <p><i>Finding from Grant et al:</i> Grant found that memory was influenced by the environmental context of noisy or silent conditions (1)</p> <p><i>Links Grant et al's study to the cognitive area:</i> Therefore, the same environmental context can have a positive effect on performance of memory (1)</p>	3	<p>3 marks – A clear and accurate explanation that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shows an understanding of the cognitive area. Findings from Grant et al.'s study. Links Grant et al's study to the cognitive 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 cognitive area with no supporting evidence from Grant et al.'s study.</p> <p>0 marks – No creditworthy information.</p>

Question			Answer	Mark	Guidance
9			<p>Identify <u>two</u> ways Maguire et al (2000) matched the two groups of participants in their study of taxi drivers.</p> <p><u>Most likely answers:</u></p> <p>Matched for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health/ healthy profile/ no health problems • Handedness (All right-handed). • All male. • Age range (32 or over 62) • Mean age (44 years old) • Generally healthy profile/no health problems. <p>Other appropriate explanations should be credited.</p>	<p>2 [1+1]</p>	<p>2 marks – Identification of <u>two</u> correct matching characteristics.</p> <p>1 mark – Identification of <u>one</u> correct matching characteristic.</p> <p>0 marks – No creditworthy information.</p> <p>NB. Matched on gender is not specific – saying they were all male is.</p>

Section B – Areas, perspectives and debates

Question		Answer	Mark	Guidance
10	(a)	<p>Describe <u>one</u> application of the biological area.</p> <p><u>Possible applications:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rehabilitation for brain-damaged patients • Medication/ Drug treatments for mental illness/psychological disorders • ‘Brain training’ – i.e. encouraging neuroplasticity • Psychosurgery • Prepare for intervention/identify risk factors <p><u>Example answers:</u></p> <p>Rehabilitation programmes are developed to help individuals who have brain damage caused by accidents, trauma, old age, etc (1) The biological area shows how physiological differences exist which affect how we think and behave (1) For example, research has shown that the distribution of grey matter in the hippocampus changes with use – the volume of the posterior hippocampus increases in response to demand for navigational skills. (1)</p> <p>An application of the biological area has been through advances in diagnosis and treatment for individuals with brain damage. (1) As the biological area shows how the brain locates function in certain areas of the brain and has plasticity. (1) Rehabilitation after brain damage aims to stimulate non-damaged brain areas training them to take over some of the responsibilities of damaged areas. (1)</p> <p>Other appropriate applications should be credited.</p>	3	<p>3 marks -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An accurate description of a relevant application. • Clear understanding of a principle or concept of the biological area. • Evidence/ elaboration <p>2 marks -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A reasonably accurate description of a relevant application. <p>With either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A clear understanding of a principle or concept of the biological area <i>or</i> • Evidence/ elaboration. <p>1 mark -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A vague description of a relevant application with no links to research and no principle or concept of the biological area. <p>N.B. 1) Research does not need to be explicit/ named. 2) Cannot credit ‘increases understanding’ as this theoretical not application</p> <p>0 marks – No creditworthy information.</p>

Question		Answer	Mark	Guidance
10	(b)	<p>Outline the procedure of Casey et al's (2011) study into neural correlates of delay of gratification and explain why this study has been placed in the biological area. [6]</p> <p><u>Possible answers:</u></p> <p><i>Key features of procedure:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completed self-control scales in their twenties and thirties Participated in two experiments when in their forties. Experiment 1: participants took part in a behavioural version of a 'hot' and 'cool' impulse control test Involved a 'Go/No-go' task 'Cool' version consisted of male and female stimuli presented, one sex as a 'go' (target) stimulus which participants were instructed to press a button, and the other sex as a 'no-go' (non-target) stimulus where participants were instructed to withhold a button press. Experiment 2: 'Hot' version of the 'Go/No-Go' task. Fearful and happy facial expression served as stimuli <p><i>Essential features of Procedure:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use of fMRI imaging technique (operationalised DV) Classifying as high or low delayers as children (IV operationalised) <p><i>Links to the biological area:</i></p> <p>As the biological area assumes that behaviour can be largely explained in terms of physiological processes such as brain function, this study can be placed in the biological area as it shows that 'hot' and 'cool' processing systems in the brain influence self-control.</p> <p>Use of FMRI scan shows activity levels in brain areas responsible for delay of gratification. For example, there was diminished recruitment of the Inferior Frontal Gyrus in low delayers showing how physiological functions can influence our behaviour.</p>	<p>6</p> <p>4 AO1 + 2 AO2</p>	<p><u>For description of the procedure of Casey et al's study:</u></p> <p>4 marks for a detailed and accurate description which identifies at least 5 features of the procedure, including both essential features.</p> <p>3 marks for an accurate description which identifies at least 4 features of the procedure, including at least one of the essential features.</p> <p>2 marks for a brief description of the study which identifies at least 3 of the key/essential features.</p> <p>1 mark for a vague description of the study which identifies one or two key/essential features</p> <p>0 marks – no creditworthy response.</p> <p>PLUS</p> <p><u>For application to the biological area:</u></p> <p>2 marks a clear link which is clearly explained.</p> <p>1 mark for a brief but relevant link</p> <p>0 marks – no creditworthy response information.</p>

Question		Answer	Mark	Guidance
10	(c)	<p>Explain how research from the developmental area can be considered to support the nurture side of the nature/nurture debate. Support your answer with evidence from <u>one</u> appropriate core study. [3]</p> <p><u>Possible answer:</u></p> <p><u>Nurture:</u> sees behaviour as resulting from experience as opposed to being innate</p> <p><u>Developmental area:</u> This area suggests that behaviour can develop and change over time (therefore supporting experience/nurture)</p> <p><u>Research links:</u> <i>Kohlberg:</i> Middle-class children move through the sequence of stages faster and further than working-class children suggesting an environmental influence.</p> <p><i>Lee et al:</i> Found that social and cultural norms influence children's development of moral judgements which impact on lying and truth-telling</p> <p><i>Bandura et al:</i> found that children imitated the aggressive behaviour of an aggressive model reflecting the role of nurture in the development of aggression</p> <p><i>Chaney et al:</i> Found that the use of functional incentive devices, offering rewards to children whilst medicating, improves the health of children. Environmental factors play a role in adherence to medical advice</p> <p><i>Freud:</i> suggests that during psychosexual stages of development, children are likely to be influenced by others in the environment.</p> <p>Other appropriate points should be credited.</p>	3	<p>3 marks - An accurate explanation which shows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An understanding of the nurture side of the debate • An understanding of the developmental area • Supported with evidence from an appropriate core study. <p>2 marks – A reasonably accurate explanation with two of the above.</p> <p>1 mark -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A basic/partial/vague explanation which gives a brief outline e.g 'The developmental area looks at how factors such as role models can affect a child's behaviour' or 'Research by Bandura found that role models can influence behaviour by causing children to imitate aggressive behaviours' <p>0 marks – No creditworthy information, e.g. an explanation of the nature side of the debate, or just describing a developmental study without any link to the debate.</p>

Question		Answer	Mark	Guidance
10	(d)	<p>Discuss ways in which the biological area is similar to the developmental area. Support your answer with evidence from appropriate core studies. [8]</p> <p><u>Likely similarities all of which should be supported by appropriate evidence:</u></p> <p>Both areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Offer the opportunity to conduct research using experiments. • Allow research to be conducted in controlled environments. • Allow researchers to establish cause and effect between variables/ scientific approach • Offer the opportunity to collect objective, quantitative data. • Can support the nature/nurture debate. • Add to the individual/situational debate. • Can raise ethical concerns/ be socially sensitive. • Can give reductionist explanations for behaviour • Can give deterministic explanations for behaviour <p>Research in both areas can have unrepresentative samples.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use observation to gather data. • Can use a longitudinal approach • Can have unrepresentative samples. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other appropriate similarities should be credited. 	8	<p>7-8 marks – A good discussion which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifies at least two appropriate similarities. • Supports these with appropriate evidence from any appropriate core studies from <i>both</i> areas. • Points are considered and well-developed. <p>5-6 marks – A reasonable discussion which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifies at least two appropriate similarities. Supports these with appropriate evidence from any appropriate core studies from <i>both</i> areas. <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifies at least two points but only one similarity is well considered and supported by appropriate core studies. <p>3-4 marks – A limited discussion which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifies at least one appropriate similarity. Supports this with appropriate evidence from any appropriate core studies from <i>both</i> areas. <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two similarities which are considered and developed but lack supporting evidence. <p>1-2 marks – A basic/vague response which</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifies a similarity, e.g. both the biological and developmental areas offer the opportunity to collect objective data. <p>0 marks – No creditworthy information.</p> <p>N.B Do not credit ways they are not similar</p>

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
10 (e) *	<p>Discuss the usefulness of psychological research placed in the developmental area. Support your answer with evidence from appropriate core studies. [15]</p> <p><u>Reasons why research placed in the developmental area is useful are likely to include:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Findings can inform us about how external factors can influence our behaviour. Findings allow for practical applications to be developed to help manage behaviours. If the study is conducted in a participant's natural environment, the study will be high in ecological validity. If an experiment is used, single variables can be isolated and tested to allow cause and effect conclusions to be drawn. If the study uses a longitudinal design, there is an indication of how behaviour(s) develop over time. If quantitative data is gathered, comparisons can be made, and practical applications developed. If qualitative data are gathered, a detailed insight is gained into the topic being researched. <p><u>Reasons why research in the developmental area may not be useful:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If samples are limited findings will lack generalisability. If the research investigates a socially sensitive issue findings may have wider (negative) implications either for the individuals involved/participants or society in general. If the study uses a snapshot design, there is no indication of how the behaviour(s) develop/continue over time. If only one type of data is gathered usefulness is limited. Any appropriate factors informing about the usefulness/ lack of usefulness of developmental area should be considered. <p><u>Developmental area studies:</u> Kohlberg, Lee et al, Bandura, Chaney, Freud</p>	15	<p>12-15 marks for a thorough and balanced discussion that is relevant to the demands of the question. Arguments are coherently presented with clear understanding of the points raised. A range (at least 3) points are considered and are well developed as part of the discussion. There is evidence of valid conclusions that summarise issues very well. Relevant evidence is used to good effect to support the points being made. There is consistent use of psychological terminology, and well-developed line of reasoning which is logically structured. Information presented is appropriate and substantiated.</p> <p>8-11 marks for a good and reasonably balanced discussion that is mainly relevant to the demands of the question. Arguments are presented with reasonably clear understanding of the points raised. A range of points are considered and some are developed as part of the discussion. There is evidence of valid conclusions that summarise issues well. Relevant evidence is used mostly to good effect to support the points being made. There is good use of psychological terminology in a response with reasonable structure. Information presented is largely appropriate.</p> <p>4-7 marks for a limited discussion that is has some relevancy to the demands of the question. Arguments are presented but with limited understanding of the points raised. There is evidence of attempts to draw conclusions. Relevant evidence is used as part of the discussion. There is some use of psychological terminology in a response with limited structure. Information presented is sometimes appropriate.</p> <p>1-3 marks for a basic discussion that is rarely relevant to the demands of the question. Arguments are presented but with weak understanding of the points raised. Relevant evidence is weak or not apparent at all. There is limited or no use of psychological terminology and structure is poor. Information presented is rarely appropriate.</p> <p>0 Marks – No creditworthy information.</p> <p>NB. Arguments for/against should be identified, explained and supported by appropriate evidence from a developmental area study.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If only one study used in the discussion cap at 7 marks. If all points are made through the context of a study/studies (with no generic points), i.e. study-specific, then the answer should be capped at 7 marks.

Section C – Practical applications

Question		Answer	Mark	Guidance
11	(a)	<p>Explain why this article could be placed in the social area of psychology.</p> <p><u>Possible answers:</u></p> <p><u>The social area:</u></p> <p>The social area holds that the thoughts, feelings and behaviours of individuals are influenced by the actual, imagined or implied presence of others (1) Good understanding</p> <p>The social area looks at how people interact with one another and how their behaviour can be influenced by others. (1) Good understanding</p> <p>The social area looks at how people communicate with each other, how they interact and how they behave in groups.(1) It therefore looks at the behaviour of the individual within a context of interrelationships with others. (1) Developed understanding</p> <p><u>Evidence from article:</u></p> <p>Commit increasingly wicked crimes (what) to keep the fake charity head happy (who)</p> <p>Being verbally prodded by fake charity workers (who) and encouraged to push one of the actors off a roof (what)</p> <p>Other appropriate explanations and supporting evidence should be credited.</p>	<p>4</p> <p>(2 AO1 + 2 AO2)</p>	<p>2 marks for a clear and accurate explanation showing a developed understanding of the social area</p> <p>1 mark for an explanation showing a good understanding of the social area</p> <p><i>Plus</i></p> <p>2 marks clear and relevant link using supporting evidence of why the article could be placed in the social area (what and who).</p> <p>1 mark for a weak but relevant link using supporting evidence of why the article could be placed in the social area (who or what)</p> <p>0 marks – No creditworthy information.</p>

Question		Answer	Mark	Guidance
11	(b)	<p>Identify <u>two</u> ethical considerations raised by the above article. Support your answer with evidence from the article.</p> <p><u>Possible answers:</u></p> <p><u>Deception</u> (<i>participants should not be deliberately misinformed about the aim or procedure of the study</i>): People are encouraged to attend ‘what they believe to be fundraising galas for a new charity, ‘Push’. / A woman is told that she might get high-paying contracts to work for the charity and the chance to work with one of its millionaire supporters. / She doesn’t know she’s being filmed / that the event isn’t actually real / that all the people involved are professional actors / ... the (fake) charity head .. / (fake) charity workers / then encourages her to peer over the edge to confirm that her ‘victim’ is actually fine</p> <p><u>Protection of participants</u> (<i>participants should not be put at any greater physical or psychological risk than they would expect in their everyday lives</i>): Afterwards the woman shows visible signs of distress. The woman therefore experienced short-term psychological stress which may have long-term consequences.</p> <p><u>Informed consent</u> (<i>participants should have sufficient knowledge about the study to decide whether or not they want to agree to take part</i>): the people were encouraged to attend what they believed to be a fundraising gala for a new charity but the woman in this study does not know that the event isn’t real and that the ultimate aim is to get her to push someone off a roof. The woman was not given adequate information about the study before she took part.</p> <p><u>Right to withdraw</u> (<i>participants should be aware that they can remove themselves from the study at any time</i>): The night builds in intensity as Brown has the woman perform small acts in which she is urged to commit increasingly wicked crimes. The woman being verbally prodded by some (fake) charity workers is encouraged to push one of the actors off a roof. She does so. At no point is the woman given the opportunity to remove herself from the study.</p> <p><u>Debrief</u>: The woman was asked to peer over the edge to confirm that the ‘victim’ was fine</p> <p>Other ethical issues supported by appropriate evidence should be credited.</p>	<p>4 [2+2]</p>	<p><u>For each identified ethical issue:</u></p> <p>2 marks – A clear identification of an ethical concern supported by appropriate evidence from the article.</p> <p>1 mark – The mere identification of an appropriate ethical concern with no/inappropriate supporting evidence.</p> <p>0 marks – No creditworthy information, e.g. merely providing evidence from the article without linking it to an ethical concern.</p> <p><i>N.B: Can accept respect, responsibility, integrity and competence as ethical considerations</i></p>

Question		Answer	Mark	Guidance
11	(c)	<p>Outline one way this article supports the situational side of the individual/situational debate. Support your answer with evidence from the article.</p> <p><u>Likely answer:</u></p> <p><u>Individual/situational debate:</u> An individual explanation for behaviour sees the personal characteristics and traits of an individual to be the main cause of their behaviour whereas a situational explanation for behaviour sees the surrounding environment, including other people in that environment, as being the cause of behaviour.</p> <p><u>Possible links to article:</u> The woman is urged to commit increasingly wicked crimes to keep the (fake) charity head happy.</p> <p>The woman is verbally prodded on by some (fake) charity workers who encourage her to push one of the actors off a roof.'</p> <p>The presence of others in the environment leads the woman to 'commit murder'.</p> <p>Other appropriate answers should be credited.</p>	3	<p>3 marks – A good explanation that shows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An understanding the individual side of the debate • An understanding of the situational side of the debate. • Clear link to how the article supports the situational debate <p>2 marks – A reasonable explanation that includes two of the above points</p> <p>1 mark – A basic explanation that includes either an understanding of the situational side of the debate or a link to how the article supports the situational side of the debate (bullet point 2 or 3)</p> <p>0 marks – No creditworthy information.</p> <p>N.B Tautological elaboration cannot be credited as does not show understanding of the debate. E.g. Individual explanation is about the individual factors. (0 marks). Situational debate is about situational variables affecting people (0 marks) Understanding of the debate can be shown with reference to the article</p>

Question		Answer	Mark	Guidance
11	(d)	<p>Outline Milgram's (1963) study into obedience and explain how it could relate to the article. Support your answer with evidence from the article.</p> <p><u>Answers will likely refer to the following aspects of Milgram's study:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Background, Aims or Hypothesis • Sample: 40 males (aged 20-50) recruited via self-selected sampling • Method/Location: controlled observation in a laboratory setting • Introduction to the research: Participants always given the role of teacher and sat in front of an electric shock generator. Introduced to Mr Wallace and experimenter. • Learning task: Paired-word test conducted with learner. The 'learner' produced a set of predetermined responses, giving approximately 3 wrong answers to every correct one. • Materials: electric shock generator, learner strapped to a chair, audio recording • Prods: Experimenter responded with a series of four standardised prods, e.g. 'Please continue / Please go on.' • Procedure: The Experimenter (a confederate) asked the teacher to give 'electric shock' of increasing intensity for every wrong answer given by the learner (another confederate), up to a maximum of 450v. At 300v the learner pounded on the wall and thereafter made no further replies. The study finished when either the 'teacher' refused to continue (was disobedient) or reached 450 volts (was obedient) • Findings: 100% of participants (40) continued to 300 volts. 65% of participants (26) continued to the full 450 volts (obedient), the other 14 disobedient. Many p showed signs of extreme stress whilst administering the shocks, e.g. sweating, trembling, stuttering, laughing nervously. 3 had full-blown uncontrollable seizures. <p><u>Possible links to the article:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The woman is asked by Brown, whom she trusts, to label beef sausage rolls as vegetarian. It's wrong, but if it means they can raise more money for the charity, surely it's okay? • Brown, whom she holds in high regard, has her perform small acts in which she is urged to commit increasingly wicked crimes (like the increments on the shock generator). • She is encouraged to carry out increasing harmful acts because she is encouraged to do so by the verbal prods of actors. • Other appropriate evidence should be credited. 	<p>6 [4 +2]</p>	<p>Outline of Milgram's study:</p> <p>4 marks – For a detailed outline of Milgram's study which identifies at least 5 of the key features (must refer to the procedure and results)</p> <p>3 – For a good outline of Milgram's study which identifies at least 4 key features (must refer to the procedure or results)</p> <p>2 marks – For a brief outline of Milgram's study which identifies at least 3 key features.</p> <p>1 mark – For a vague outline of Milgram's study which identifies one or two key features</p> <p>0 marks – no creditworthy response.</p> <p>PLUS</p> <p>Application to article:</p> <p>2 marks – For a relevant link which is clearly, if briefly explained.</p> <p>1 mark - For a relevant link which is briefly explained</p> <p>0 marks – no creditworthy response.</p>

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
11 (e)	<p>Using your knowledge of psychology, suggest and explain at least two ways young people could be encouraged to resist being negatively obedient.</p> <p><u>Answers are likely to refer to:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Such psychological theories as classical conditioning, operant conditioning, social/observational learning theory (<i>what</i>) to resist being negatively obedient. (<i>why</i>). • Cognitive behaviour therapy (<i>what</i>) to resist being negatively obedient. (<i>why</i>). • Education in schools/on television/in social clubs, etc. (<i>what</i>) to improve understanding the effects of negative obedience and thus encourage youngsters to avoid it. (<i>why</i>). • Campaigns (<i>what</i>) to raise awareness of issues relating to the effects of negative obedience and thus encourage youngsters to avoid its negative aspects (<i>why</i>). • Suggestions relating to how these ideas could be implemented to avoid negative obedience (<i>how</i>). • Role play situations (<i>what</i>) to increase awareness of what it is like to experience negative aspects of obedience so that it can be avoided (<i>why</i>). • Other appropriate suggestions should be credited. 	8	<p>7-8 marks - A good standard of knowledge and understanding of what could be done/methods that could be used to reduce negative obedience (<i>what</i>). There is very effective application of psychological knowledge within these suggestions to explain the purpose of the suggestions (<i>why</i>). The suggestions are largely accurate and several details have been included about how they could be implemented and developed (<i>how</i>). <u>At least two suggestions</u> are covered.</p> <p>5-6 marks - A reasonable standard of knowledge and understanding of what could be done/methods that could be used to reduce negative obedience (<i>what</i>). There is effective application of psychological knowledge within these suggestions to explain the purpose of the suggestions (<i>why</i>). The suggestions are mostly accurate and some vague details have been included about how they could be implemented and developed (<i>how</i>). <u>Two suggestions</u> are covered.</p> <p>3-4 marks – A limited knowledge and understanding of what could be done/methods that could be used to reduce negative obedience (<i>what</i>). There is some application of psychological knowledge within these suggestions to explain the purpose of the suggestions (<i>why</i>). This may be implicit rather than explicit. The suggestions are somewhat vague and lack in detail relation to how they might be implemented (<i>how</i>).</p> <p>1-2 marks – A basic knowledge and understanding of what could be done/methods that could be used to reduce negative obedience (<i>what</i>). There is weak application of psychological knowledge within these suggestions, possibly with little or no information relating to either the (<i>why</i>) or the (<i>how</i>). The suggestions will have limited accuracy.</p> <p>0 marks – No creditworthy response.</p> <p>N.B.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If only <u>one</u> suggestion is made then a maximum of 4 marks to be awarded. Award marks in line with the descriptors above.

Question			Answer	Mark	Guidance
11	(f)	*	<p>Evaluate the suggestions you have made in part (e) using your knowledge of psychology.</p> <p>Evaluation might refer to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Usefulness (including practicality, funding issues, effectiveness, appropriateness). • Ecological validity/validity. • Reliability. • Ethics. • Social sensitivity. • Scientific methodology. • Nature/nurture. • Freewill/determinism. • Individual/situational. • Other appropriate issues should be considered and credited accordingly. 	10	<p>GOOD 9-10 marks for demonstrating good evaluation that is relevant to the demand of the question. The arguments are coherently presented with clear understanding of the points raised. A range of appropriate evaluation points are considered. The evaluation points are in context and supported by relevant evidence of the description given in 11e. More than one suggestion is evaluated.</p> <p>REASONABLE 6-8 marks for demonstrating reasonable evaluation that is mainly relevant to the demand of the question. The arguments coherently presented in the main with reasonable understanding of the points raised. A range of appropriate evaluation points are considered. The evaluation points are mainly in context and supported by relevant evidence of the description given in 11e.</p> <p>LIMITED 3-5 marks for demonstrating limited evaluation that is sometimes relevant to the demand of the question. The arguments may lack clear structure/organisation and show limited understanding of the points raised. The evaluation points are occasionally in context and supported by relevant evidence of the description given in 11e.</p> <p>BASIC 1-2 marks for demonstrating basic evaluation that is rarely relevant to the demand of the question. Any arguments lack clear structure/organisation and show a very basic understanding of the points raised. The evaluation points are not necessarily in context and are not supported by relevant evidence of the description given in 11e.</p> <p>0 marks – No creditworthy information.</p> <p>N.B.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If only one suggestion is evaluated then a maximum of 6 marks to be awarded. If only one evaluation point is made but is done well it can achieve a maximum of 4 marks. Award marks in line with the descriptors. • Make sure points credited in 11(e) are not double-credited in this question part, e.g. double-crediting the purpose of the suggested improvement. • Make sure evaluation points actually refer to improvements that have been suggested in 11(e), i.e. are not new suggestions which the candidate then evaluates.

Need to get in touch?

If you ever have any questions about OCR qualifications or services (including administration, logistics and teaching) please feel free to get in touch with our customer support centre.

Call us on

01223 553998

Alternatively, you can email us on

support@ocr.org.uk

For more information visit



ocr.org.uk/qualifications/resource-finder



ocr.org.uk



Twitter/ocrextams



/ocrextams



/company/ocr



/ocrextams



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS & ASSESSMENT

OCR is part of Cambridge University Press & Assessment, a department of the University of Cambridge.

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored. © OCR 2024 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 operates academic and vocational qualifications regulated by Ofqual, Qualifications Wales and CCEA as listed in their qualifications registers including A Levels, GCSEs, Cambridge Technicals and Cambridge Nationals.

OCR provides resources to help you deliver our qualifications. These resources do not represent any particular teaching method we expect you to use. We update our resources regularly and aim to make sure content is accurate but please check the OCR website so that you have the most up-to-date version. OCR cannot be held responsible for any errors or omissions in these resources.

Though we make every effort to check our resources, there may be contradictions between published support and the specification, so it is important that you always use information in the latest specification. We indicate any specification changes within the document itself, change the version number and provide a summary of the changes. If you do notice a discrepancy between the specification and a resource, please [contact us](#).

Whether you already offer OCR qualifications, are new to OCR or are thinking about switching, you can request more information using our [Expression of Interest form](#).

Please [get in touch](#) if you want to discuss the accessibility of resources we offer to support you in delivering our qualifications.