OCR
Oxford Cambridge and RSA

GCE

Psychology

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

Advanced GCE

Mark Scheme for June 2017

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 will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme.

© OCR 2017

Annotations

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

Subject-specific Marking Instructions

INTRODUCTION

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

- the specification, especially the assessment objectives
- the question paper and its rubrics
- the mark scheme.
- You should ensure that you have copies of these materials.
- You should ensure also that you are familiar with the administrative procedures related to the marking process. These are set out in the OCR booklet Instructions for Examiners. If you are examining for the first time, please read carefully Appendix 5 Introduction to Script Marking: Notes for New Examiners.
- Please ask for help or guidance whenever you need it. Your first point of contact is your Team Leader.

LEVELS OF RESPONSE – LEVEL DESCRIPTORS

	A01	A02	A03
Good	Response demonstrates good relevant knowledge and understanding. Accurate and detailed description.	Response demonstrates good application of psychological knowledge and understanding. Application will be mainly explicit, accurate and relevant.	Response demonstrates good analysis, interpretation and/or evaluation that is mainly relevant to the demand of the question. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and argument is highly skilled and shows good understanding.
Reasonable	Response demonstrates reasonable relevant knowledge and understanding. Generally accurate description lacking some detail.	Response demonstrates reasonable application of psychological knowledge and understanding. Application will be partially explicit, accurate and relevant.	Response demonstrates reasonable analysis, interpretation and/or evaluation that is partially relevant to the demand of the question. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and argument are competent and understanding is reasonable.
Limited	Response demonstrates limited relevant knowledge and understanding. Limited description lacking in detail.	Response demonstrates limited application of psychological knowledge and understanding. Application may be related to the general topic area rather than the specific question.	Response demonstrates limited analysis, interpretation and/or evaluation that may be related to topic area. Some valid conclusions that summarise issues and arguments.
Basic	Response demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding that is only partially relevant. Basic description with no detail.	Response demonstrates basic application of psychological knowledge and understanding. Responses will be generalised lacking focus on the question.	Response demonstrates basic analysis, interpretation and/or evaluation that is not related to the question. Basic or no valid conclusions that attempt to summarise issues. No evidence of arguments.

USING THE MARK SCHEME

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

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

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

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

INSTRUCTIONS TO EXAMINERS: INDIVIDUAL ANSWERS

1. The indicative content indicates the expected parameters for candidates' answers, but be prepared to recognise and credit unexpected approaches where they show relevance.

2. Using 'best-fit', decide first which set of BAND DESCRIPTORS best describes the overall quality of the answer. Once the band is located, adjust the mark concentrating on features of the answer which make it stronger or weaker following the guidelines for refinement.

   Highest mark: If clear evidence of all the qualities in the band descriptors is shown, the HIGHEST Mark should be awarded.
   Lowest mark: If the answer shows the candidate to be borderline (i.e. they have achieved all the qualities of the bands below and show limited evidence of meeting the criteria of the band in question) the LOWEST mark should be awarded.
   Middle mark: This mark should be used for candidates who are secure in the band. They are not 'borderline' but they have only achieved some of the qualities in the band descriptors.

3. Be prepared to use the full range of marks. Do not reserve (e.g.) high Band 6 marks 'in case' something turns up of a quality you have not yet seen. If an answer gives clear evidence of the qualities described in the band descriptors, reward appropriately.

4. Consideration should be given to the weightings of the assessment objectives within a question, these are clearly stated for each question and care should be taken not to place too much emphasis on a particular skill.

Question		Answer Guidance	Marks	Awarding Marks Guidance
1	a	**In Bocchiaro et al.'s study on disobedience and whistleblowing, eight pilot tests were carried out before the main study: Explain why Bocchiaro carried out these pilot tests.** Possible answers: • They were conducted to ensure the procedure was credible as a study on sensory deprivation. • To ensure that the cover story on sensory deprivation given was morally acceptable. • These tests served to standardise the experimenter-authority behaviour throughout the experimental period.	2	**2 marks** – Clear explanation given on why Bocchiaro carried out pilot tests as given in answer guidance **1 mark** – Partial or vague answer that is in context of the study **OR** clear explanation not in context of the original study *e.g To ensure that the procedure was believable/ realistic/ credible/ ethical* **0 marks –** No creditworthy response *Response must be contextualised for full marks*
	b	**In Bocchiaro et al.'s study into disobedience and whistleblowing a sample of 149 students were selected for the main study: Outline one way this study may be considered ethnocentric.** Possible answer: • Bocchiaro's study may be considered ethnocentric because only students from one cultural location were studied (Amsterdam) and so results cannot be applied to other cities/cultures. • Other appropriate response	2	**2 marks** – Clear outline of one way Bocchiaro's study may be considered ethnocentric as given in answer guidance **1 mark** – Partial or vague answer *e.g. because they were all sampled from the same place/ because they are all from the same location/ as they are all from the same culture* **0 marks –** No creditworthy response eg. same university *Candidate must make it clear they understand what is meant by ethnocentrism (different to sampling bias).*
2	a	**In Levine et al.'s study into cross cultural altruism, four community variables were recorded: Describe how two of the community variables were measured.** Any **two** of the following: • Population size. Population size for each of the 23 areas. • Economic indicator. Wealth of the city/ purchasing power parity (PPP) • Cultural values. Rating of the 23 countries in the sample on the dimension of individualism-collectivism/ Countries were rated on a 10-point scale • Pace of Life measured by walking speed (over 60 feet).	4	**For each community variable** **2 marks** – An accurate and detailed description of how one community variable was measured / recorded. For Pace of Life 'walking speed over 60ft' can be accepted. **1 mark** – Partial or vague description that may also not be contextualised e.g. *"how fast people walked" / "how many people lived there"* Can get 1 mark for just identifying the community variable. **0 marks** – no credit worthy information

	b	**Explain how Levine et al.'s study into cross-cultural altruism informs our understanding of cultural diversity in helping behaviour.** Possible answer: • Levine found cross-cultural differences in helping behaviour (1 mark) For example, the cities in countries with high simpatia (Brazil, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Mexico and Spain) were more likely to help a stranger in need than non-simpatia countries (New York)/ cities that were more helpful tended to have lower Purchasing Power Parity (PPP) than those with higher PPP (2 Marks/ 1 mark for less detail context). *Candidates need to make it clear what the study told us about cultural differences in helping behaviour – various evidence from the study supports that knowledge of cultural diversity has been enhanced, so reference the original study to check the legitimacy of evidence given.*	**3**	**3 marks –** Response demonstrates **good** analysis that is relevant to the demand of the question. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise how Levine informs our understanding. Argument is highly skilled and shows **good** understanding. **2 marks –** Response demonstrates **reasonable** analysis that is partially relevant to the demand of the question. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise how Levine informs our understanding. Argument is competent and understanding is **reasonable**. **1 mark –** Response demonstrates **limited** analysis that may just be related to topic area. Few valid conclusions that summarise how Levine informs our understanding. Argument is basic with **limited** understanding shown. **0 marks –** No creditworthy response
3	**a**	**From Loftus and Palmer's study on eyewitness testimony a laboratory experiment was used. Describe why Loftus and Palmer's study is considered a laboratory experiment** Example Answer: • Loftus and Palmer is considered a laboratory experiment because an **IV was manipulated** – verb used in critical questions (smashed, collided, bumped, hit, contacted), a DV was measured – mph speed estimates and it was carried out in a **highly controlled** environment. • IV's were manipulated – verb used when asked about speed – and mph speed responses were recorded in a controlled environment – all clips shown were the same length and shown in the same way to all p's. • Other appropriate response *Key features of a laboratory experiments are the manipulation of IV', and highly controlled conditions.*	**2**	**2 marks** – An accurate description given as to how Loftus and Palmer is a laboratory experiment as detailed in answer guidance **1 mark** – Partial of vague answer *e.g. it was highly controlled/ there was a manipulation/ it was highly controlled where participants watched the same film clips/ verbs in the critical question were manipulated* **0 marks** – no credit worthy information *Describing purely how it was controlled does a give full understanding of what a laboratory experiment is (an observation may also be controlled) so some indication <u>that variables were manipulated</u> in a <u>highly controlled environment</u> is needed to full marks* *The question requires candidates explain their response in context of the study*

	b	**Explain one weakness of using a laboratory experiment for this study** Possible answer: • One weakness of a laboratory experiment is low ecological validity. Participants watched controlled video clips of staged crashes and this would not represent how an incident is witnessed in real life • Demand characteristics may be high because the environment is artificial and the participants know they're in a study. This means they may not give an honest / true mph estimation as they may just give an answer they think is expected of them • Other appropriate response	**2**	**2 marks** – Weakness is identified and explained in context of Loftus and Palmer's study **1 mark** –Weakness is identified / explanation lacking clarity) but is in context of the study **OR** weakness is explained but not in context of the study *e.g. Low ecological validity so behaviour is not natural* **0 marks** – no creditworthy response *The question requires candidates explain their response in context of the study* *Demand characteristics may be high because the environment is artificial. This means participants may not give an honest / true answer as they may do what they think is expected of them – this is a 1 mark answer as it is not contextualised*
4	**a**	**Bandura et al.'s study on the transmission of aggression is based on the principles of social learning theory. Outline social learning theory.** Possible answer: • The Social Learning Theory says that people learn by observing the behaviours (1) of other people around them who serve as role models (1). Once behaviour has been observed it is likely to then be imitated (1). • Attention, Retention, Reproduction, Motivation • Other appropriate response *Key terminology: Observation of behaviour, imitation, role models.*	**3**	**3 marks** – Response demonstrates good knowledge and understanding of social learning theory. **2 marks** – Response demonstrates reasonable knowledge and understanding of social learning theory but lacks some clarity / specific use of relevant terminology **1 mark** – Response demonstrates limited/basic knowledge and understanding of social learning theory. Response lacks depth and may be very brief **0 marks** – no creditworthy response

	b	**Outline how the results of Bandura et al's study on the transmission of aggression support social learning theory** Possible answer: • SLT is supported by Banduras results because children who observed an aggressive role model did imitate (1) aggressive behaviour, such as hitting the Bobo doll (1). Therefore imitation of aggressive behaviour was shown. • Other appropriate response	**2**	**2 marks** – An accurate outline given as to how Bandura's results support social learning theory. Must have context from the study: aggressive role models/ hitting the Bobo doll/ shouting 'pow'. 1 mark SLT link, 1 mark context with Bandura **1 mark** – Partial of vague answer *e.g. children in the aggressive condition imitated behaviour* **0 marks** – no credit worthy information
5		**Outline how Lee et al.'s study links to the developmental area in psychology** Possible answer: • Lee et al.'s study is considered developmental because children at different ages were studied (1) which shows how attitudes towards truth telling and lying telling develop (1) • Children aged 7, 9 and 11 years (1) were tested on their truth telling and lying behaviour (1) • Other appropriate response	**2**	**2 marks** – Response demonstrates good application of psychological knowledge and understanding in context of the study *Candidates need to link the features of Lee et al's study to how they studied or made conclusions about development across ages in ratings of truth and lie telling* **1 mark** – Response demonstrates partial application of psychological knowledge and understanding **OR** response demonstrates good application of knowledge but is not contextualised *e.g. Lee et al's study showed development in behaviour in different ages* **0 marks** – no credit worthy information
6	**a**	**From Sperry's 'split brain' study into the psychological effects of hemisphere deconnection: Outline one way the results may be considered valid.** Possible answer: • It can be considered valid as participants all had an image flashed to their left or right visual field for $1/10^{th}$ of a second, therefore they were all tested in the same standardised way increasing internal validity. • Sperry's study was high in face validity as it was measuring what it claimed to measure. Sperry was clearly measuring whether each hemisphere possesses an independent stream of conscious awareness. • There is construct validity in the study as he restricted visual information to each visual field and seeing if the participants could	**2**	**2 marks** – Response demonstrates good evaluation of how the results of Sperry's study are valid. **1 mark** – Response demonstrates limited/basic evaluation of validity. Reason is identified *e.g. Participants could not lie about their responses* **0 marks** – no creditworthy response

		name / drawn / select what they had been shown. • Other appropriate response		
6	**b**	**Casey et al.'s study on the neural correlates of delay gratification, examined behavioural and neural correlates of delay of gratification using functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI): Outline how delay of gratification is linked to regions in the brain.** • The (inferior) frontal gyrus was more active in high delayers. The ventral striatum was more active in low delayers than high delayers. (3) • Low delayers had diminished recruitment in the inferior frontal gyrus and higher activity in the ventral striatum (3) • Other appropriate response *Two specific region of the brain must be mentioned (i.e. frontal gyrus, ventral striatum) in relation to a finding to gain top marks*	**3**	**3 marks –** Response demonstrates **good** analysis and interpretation that is relevant to the demand of the question. Two areas need to be mentioned and correctly linked to one group (high/low delayers) or delay of gratification **2 marks –** Response demonstrates **reasonable** analysis and interpretation that is partially relevant. One area of the brain needs to be mentioned linked to one group (High/Low delayer) or delay of gratification **1 mark –** Response demonstrates **limited** analysis and interpretation that is partially related to topic area. Vague or partial links are made / attempted between the study and the key theme but understanding is limited. One or more areas of the brain mentioned with no links to function, or incorrect link to function **0 marks –** no creditworthy response
7		**Outline one difference between Blakemore and Cooper's study on the impact of early visual experience and Maguire's taxi driver study.** Example answer: • One difference is the sample (1). Blakemore and Cooper's sample were non-human whereas Maguire's were human(1). For example Blakemore studied a sample of kittens to show visual development (1). Maguire however studied a sample of 16 taxi drivers to see if the volume of their hippocampus was different to a control group(1). *Elaboration means explaining the difference in some way rather than merely stating it and or providing an implication.*	**4**	**4 marks –** An appropriate difference is identified and elaborated and appropriate evidence is given from both of the studies as detailed in the answer guidance **3 marks –** An appropriate difference is identified and elaborated and appropriate evidence is given from one of the studies ***e.g.*** *One difference is that Blakemore and Cooper studied a sample of non humans but Maguire studied a human sample (1). For example Blakemore studied a sample of kittens to see if the development of the primary visual cortex (in kittens) was innate or learned (1). Therefore the generalisability of results to human brain plasticity is more possible from Maguire's results (1).* **OR** An appropriate difference is identified and appropriate evidence is given from two of the studies ***e.g.*** *One difference*

				is that Blakemore and Cooper studied a sample of non humans but Maguire studied a human sample (1). For example Blakemore studied a sample of kittens to see if the development of the primary visual cortex (in kittens) was innate or learned (1). Maguire however studied a sample of 16 taxi drivers to see if the volume of their hippocampus was different to a control group of non taxi drivers (1). **2 marks –** An appropriate difference is identified and elaborated but no evidence is provided for either study **e.g.** *One difference is that Blakemore and Cooper studied a sample of non humans but Maguire studied a human sample (1). Therefore the generalisability of results to human brain plasticity is more possible from Maguire's results (1).* **OR** an appropriate difference is identified (not elaborated) but appropriate evidence is given from one of the studies **e.g.** *One difference is that Blakemore and Cooper studied a sample of non humans but Maguire studied a human sample (1). For example Blakemore studied a sample of kittens to see if the development of the primary visual cortex (in cats) was innate or learned (1).* **1 mark –** An appropriate difference is identified but is not elaborated and no evidence is provided for either study **e.g.** *One difference is that Blakemore and Cooper studied a sample of non humans but Maguire studied a human sample (1).* **0 marks –** no creditworthy response

8	a	**From Freud's study of Little Hans: What is meant by the term Oedipus complex?** Example answer: • A subconscious sexual desire where a boy desires his mother and wants to possess her, this leads the boy to compete with his father in a hostile way but also fear castration because of the sexual desires	2	**2 marks** – An accurate and clear description of the Oedipus complex (detailing more than just one feature) Two key elements of Oedipus needed: **Love of the mother** and **fear/hatred of the father.** **1 mark** – Partial / vague description lacking in depth / clarity *e.g. boys sexual desire his for mother* **0 marks** – no credit worthy information

	b	**Outline one piece of evidence that supports Little Hans was experiencing the Oedipus complex.** • Little Hans' fear of horses was considered by Freud as a subconscious fear of his father (1) linked to his Oedipus complex. This is because the dark around the mouth of a horse + the blinkers resembled the moustache and glasses worn by his father (1). • Hans' daydream about giraffes was a representation of him trying to take his mother away from his father so he could have her to himself – another feature of the Oedipus complex. • Hans' fantasy about the plumber was interpreted as him now identifying / reconciling with his father – the aggressor - and passing through the Oedipus complex. • Little Hans had a fear a horse would bite him which was seen to represent his fear of castration linked to his being in the Oedipus complex • Other appropriate response	2	**2 marks** – A clear outline of one piece of evidence that suggests Hans was experiencing the Oedipus complex. **1 mark** – Partial or vague piece of evidence that is not clearly linked to the Oedipus complex **0 marks** – no creditworthy response *Candidate must link the evidence to a feature of the Oedipus complex for full marks*
9	a	**Outline the different positions of the "psychology as a science" debate.** Possible answer: • One position is that psychology can be considered a science	4	**4 marks –** Response demonstrates **good** knowledge of the two different positions within the debate of Psychology as a science. No context needed. (2+2) Valid conclusions that effectively summarise both positions

		because it does attempt to control variables (1) and research can be replicated in the same way to establish consistent patterns in behaviour(1). The other position is that psychology cannot be considered truly scientific because there are many extraneous variables that cannot be fully controlled (1). Therefore, you cannot measure full cause and effect. (1) • Other appropriate response Potential features: • the study of cause-and-effect • falsification • replicability • objectivity • induction • deduction • hypothesis testing • manipulation of variables • control and standardisation • quantifiable measurements		of the debate are highly skilled and shows good understanding. **3 marks –** Response demonstrates **good** knowledge of one position and **reasonable** knowledge of the opposing position. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise the debate are competent and understanding is **reasonable**. (2+1) or (1+2) **2 marks -** Response demonstrates **good** knowledge of one position within the debate with no mention of the alternative position or limited knowledge of both sides of the debate. Some valid conclusions that summarise the debate but understanding is **limited** / unclear. (1+1) **1 mark -** Response demonstrates **limited** knowledge of one position within the debate. Few / no valid conclusions that summarise the debate and understanding is **basic**. **0 marks** – no creditworthy response
	b	**Outline how one core study challenges the view that psychology can be considered a science. Support your answer with evidence from your chosen study.** **Candidates may claim their chosen study does <u>not</u> achieve some of the following:** • the study of cause-and-effect • falsification • replicability • objectivity	**4**	**4 marks –** Response demonstrates **good** application of psychological knowledge and understanding. Explicit links are made to how the core study challenges the features of scientific research. Answer is clearly supported by evidence from the core study. *Two reasons each with link.* **3 marks –** Response demonstrates **reasonable** application of psychological knowledge and understanding. Explicit links are made to how the core study challenges the features of scientific research but lacks some clarity of expression. Attempt is made to support answer with evidence from the

		• induction • deduction • hypothesis testing • manipulation of variables • control and standardisation • quantifiable measurements **Candidates may be refer to:** • Any core study that uses subjective / biased data collection methods (observation – may miss behaviour, self-report – not directly observable) • Any core study that does not manipulate variables or have control over the environment **Example answer:** • Freud's study of Little Hans challenges the view that psychology can be considered a science because subjective data collection techniques are used. Little Han's Father is collecting information, often using leading questions, about his behaviour, fantasies and dreams and sending this information to Freud via letter. This means the data is not empirically gathered which is a key feature of being scientific, but also the Father may have been biased and reported information about his son that fits Freud's theory of psychosexual development which is again not scientific • Other appropriate response		core study. *Two reasons one with link **or** one reason fully elaborated and detailed.* **2 marks –** Response demonstrates **limited** application of psychological knowledge and understanding. A partial link may be made to how the study challenges the features of scientific research. Vague attempt to support with appropriate evidence from the core study. *One reason with link **or** two reasons no links.* **1 mark –** Response demonstrates **basic** application of psychological knowledge and understanding. Very few / no links made to how the study challenges the features of scientific research and basic / no appropriate evidence from the core study. *One reason but no link.* **0 marks –** No creditworthy response *Candidates must have knowledge of both their chosen core study and the principles of scientific research to gain full marks* *No credit to be given to case studies or generalizability.*
9	**c**	**Discuss the extent to which psychology can be considered a science. Use examples from appropriate <u>core studies</u> to support your answer.** **Reasons psychology can be considered a science:** • Standardised procedures • Controlled methodology • Objective data • Objective data collection techniques • Manipulation of IV's and measurements of DV's	**15**	**12-15 marks – Response demonstrates good AO3 evaluation and good description/ understanding**. **A range (*at least 4*) of evaluation points are considered (positive and negative: can be imbalanced e.g.3 positive/1 negative)**. There is a consistent use of psychological terminology. There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and substantiated. The answer is explicitly and consistently related to the

		• Reductionist positions **Reasons psychology may not be considered a science:** • Biased data collection techniques • Self reports • Secondary data • Only partial control can be achieved • Demand characteristics • Unable to falsify some theories (subconscious desires, thought processes) • Lack of direct observation • Lack of empirical data *Discussion means the candidate must draw on ways that psychology can be considered scientific and ways it may not and support points with relevant evidence from appropriate core studies throughout the response* *If no supporting evidence is given then the answer should be capped at 3.* If the answer is completely study led: cap at 3 marks		context of the question. At least **two** core studies should be referenced. **8-11 marks – Response demonstrates reasonable AO3 evaluation and reasonable description/ understanding** **A range of evaluation points (at least 3 points) are considered (positive and negative)**. There is an appropriate use of psychological terminology. There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The answer is often related to the context of the question. At least **two** core studies. **4 – 7 marks –** Response demonstrates **limited A03 evaluation** and **limited description/ understanding** **Limited range of evaluation points (at least two) are considered (positive or negative) also some points that are study led.** There is a limited use of both psychological terminology and appropriate supporting evidence. The information has some relevance and is presented with limited structure. The answer is sometimes related to the context of the question. **1 – 3 marks –** Response demonstrates **basic AO3** evaluation that is **rarely** relevant to the demand of the question. And **basic** understanding of the points raised (identified points are seldom explained). Very limited range of evaluation points considered and/or a discussion is rarely/not apparent. The evaluation points are rarely/not supported by relevant and/or appropriate evidence. The information is basic and communicated in an unstructured way. The answer is rarely/not related to the context of the question.

				0 marks – No creditworthy response
	d	**Compare the biological area to the behaviourist perspective. Use examples from appropriate <u>core studies</u> to support your answer.** **Candidates may make comparisons between the following:** • Data collected • Ethical considerations • Reductionism • Determinism • Ethnocentrism • Scientific procedures • Methodology / Designs • Reliability • Validity • Individual/situational explanations • Nature/nurture • Usefulness of research A comparison point based on the assumption of the areas cannot be credited with elaboration marks unless linked to a debate (maximum 3 marks) **Example comparison point:** • One way the biological area and behaviourist perspective are similar is through the use of controlled methodology such as laboratory experiments (1). For example in Bandura's study from the behaviourist perspective an IV was manipulated – whether or not the children observed an aggressive, non-aggressive or no role model, and the environment was high controlled – all toys in each room were the same for all children (1). Similarly in Blakemore and Coopers study from the biological area, an IV	**8**	**Per point of comparison: Best two should be credited** **4 marks –** Similarity / difference between perspectives is identified (1); discussed/elaborated (1); **And** supported by relevant evidence from two appropriate supporting core studies (1+1) **3 marks –** Similarity / difference between perspectives is identified (1); not discussed/elaborated; **But** supported by relevant evidence from two appropriate supporting core studies – one from each perspective (1+1) **OR** Similarity / difference between perspectives is identified (1) Discussed/elaborated (1);**And** supported by relevant evidence from one appropriate core study (1) **2 marks –** Similarity / difference between perspectives is identified (1); not discussed/elaborated; **But** supported by relevant evidence from one appropriate core study (1) **OR** Similarity / difference between perspectives is identified (1); discussed/elaborated (1); **But** not supported by any relevant evidence from appropriate core studies **1 mark –** Similarity / difference is identified (1) **0 marks –** No creditworthy response *As the question asks students to use evidence from appropriate core studies, only those addressed on the*

		was manipulated - whether the kittens were reared in a horizontal or a vertical environment (1). This means both approaches carry out research which can establish cause and effect because the influence of extraneous variables is minimised (1) • Other appropriate response		*specification should be credited* *Responses that identify **AND/OR** discuss comparison points between research rather than the areas should not be credited* *As the question says compare, candidates can give 2 similarities, 2 differences or a similarity and a difference* *The evidence given to support must clearly support the point being made to be credited*
	e	**Describe how the biological area is reductionist. Support your answer with evidence from one appropriate <u>core study</u>.** Possible answer: • *(Describe)* Reductionism is where you break down a behaviour into its constituent parts and analyse the relative contribution that factor makes – reducing the explanation down to its simplest form (1). The biological area does not look at all possible causes or explanations for behaviour and reduces the explanation of human behaviour down to a biological cause without considering all contributing factors. (1)*(Evidence)* For example Sperry did not have a control group of participants with epilepsy but had not had their corpus collosum severed. The explanation of the participants' inability to name objects shown to their left visual field was reduced down to a biological cause, but without making a comparison it is know whether something else could be contributing to the observed difficulties. • *Other appropriate response* *Candidates may outline features of the area and then show how it is reductionist **OR** they may describe reductionism and describe how the area fits that definition*	**4**	**4 marks –** Response demonstrates **good** knowledge and understanding of reductionism and the biological area. Explicit description given for how the biological area is reductionist showing good application of knowledge. Answer is clearly supported by relevant evidence from an appropriate core study (2 marks outline of reductionism, 2 marks for core study description) *Candidates must have knowledge of both the area and its relationship with the debate to gain full marks* **3 marks –** Response demonstrates **reasonable** knowledge and understanding of reductionism and the biological area. Explicit description given for how the biological area is reductionist showing some application of knowledge but lacks some clarity. Attempt is made to support answer with relevant evidence from an appropriate core study (2 outline+1 evidence, or 1 outline + 2 evidence) **2 marks –** Response demonstrates **limited** knowledge and understanding of reductionism and the biological area. (1 outline + 1 evidence, or 2 outline +0 evidence)

				Partial description given for how the biological area is reductionist but application of knowledge is **limited**. Vague attempt to support answer with relevant evidence from an appropriate core study **1 mark –** Response demonstrates **basic** knowledge and understanding of reductionism and the biological area. Basic / no clear description given for how the biological area is reductionist showing **basic** / no application of knowledge. **Basic** / no attempt to support answer with relevant evidence from an appropriate core study **0 marks –** No creditworthy response
Question		**Answer Guidance**	**Marks**	**Awarding Marks Guidance**
10	**a**	**Outline one possible reason why it was necessary to divide the students into a superior and inferior group to test for discrimination in this study. Justify your answer in relation to the source.** Possible answer: The teacher had to create two distinct groups where one group was seen/ perceived as superior to the other (1). To see if discrimination would occur between students (1). For example, to see if the blue eyed students would discriminate against the brown eyed group (1) • Other appropriate response	**3**	**3 marks – Good** knowledge and understanding of a reason that is clearly expressed. **Good** application of knowledge and understanding to identify an appropriate reason and supporting evidence from the source is explicit **2 marks – Reasonable** knowledge and understanding of a reason that is clearly expressed. but lacks some clarity **Reasonable** (partially explicit) application of knowledge and understanding to identify a reason and attempt to support with evidence from source **1 mark – Limited** knowledge and understanding of a reason that is poorly expressed. **Limited** application of knowledge and understanding to identify a problem with limited / no attempt to support with evidence from the source *e.g. To create two groups.* **0 marks –** No creditworthy response

10	b	**Outline one possible reason the blue eyed students "exceeded their predicted grades". Support your answer with evidence from the source.** Possible answer: • Because the blue-eyed students were receiving praise from their teacher (1). The students were told they were superior and were given support and received praise (1) This praise from a perceived role model may have reinforced their beliefs in their superiority, boosting their self esteem and in turn led to them working harder to achieve (1) • Other appropriate response Possible reasons: Self-fulfilling prophecy, Self-esteem, extra support from teacher	3	**If more than one reason given, credit the best answer** **3 marks – Good** knowledge and understanding of a reason that is clearly expressed. **Good** application of knowledge and understanding to identify an appropriate reason and supporting evidence from the source is explicit **2 marks – Reasonable** knowledge and understanding of a reason that is clearly expressed. but lacks some clarity **Reasonable** (partially explicit) application of knowledge and understanding to identify a reason and attempt to support with evidence from source **1 mark – Limited** knowledge and understanding of a reason that is poorly expressed. **Limited** application of knowledge and understanding to identify a problem with limited / no attempt to support with evidence from the source **0 marks –** No creditworthy response
	c	**Explain two ways the study in the source was not ethically considerate. Justify your answer in relation to the source.** **Possible answer:** • Both groups of participants may not have been protected from harm (1), particularly in the case of the brown-eyed students who reported feeling withdrawn and angry (1). They may have left the study psychologically harmed from taking part as they were made to feeling inferior and stupid by their teacher (1) • None of the students signed a consent form (1) agreeing to take part in the teachers experiment. The teacher carried out the study without explaining the true aims of the exercise in discrimination (1) and this meant p's were not able to willingly and knowingly agree to participate (1) • Other appropriate response	6	**For each ethical issue broken:** **3 marks – Good** knowledge and understanding of an ethical issue that was not upheld in the source. The issue is identified, elaborated and justified in context of evidence from the source **2 marks – Reasonable** knowledge and understanding of an ethical issue that was not upheld in the source. The ethical issue may be elaborated in context of the evidence from the source but not explicitly identified **OR** The ethical issue may be identified and elaborated but not in

		• Parental consent • Deception • Right to Withdraw • Distress (accepted as ethical issue) but as it comes under Protection from harm, cannot then credit 'embarrassment' or other psychological harm. • Debriefing • Privacy		context of evidence from the source **1 mark – Limited** knowledge and understanding of an ethical issue that was not upheld in the source. An issue may be identified but not elaborated and not supported with evidence from the source **0 marks –** No creditworthy response
10	**d**	**Outline one reason the blue-eyed children "went along with the situation even though they knew it was wrong". Support your answer with evidence from the source.** • The teacher has a position of authority and the students are obeying the orders of a teacher who is perceived as a legitimate authority figure. The blue eyed children followed the lead of the teacher who suggested brown eyed children were low in intelligence • The teacher made it socially acceptable to treat the brown-eyed students differently and the blue-eyed students were then following her lead – e.g. they laughed when she said the brown-eyed students had a low IQ. • Other appropriate response	**3**	**If more than one reason given, credit the best answer** **3 marks – Good** knowledge and understanding of a reason that is clearly expressed. **Good** application of knowledge and understanding to identify an appropriate reason and supporting evidence from the source is explicit (1 mark reason, 1 mark for explanation, 1 mark for context) **2 marks – Reasonable** knowledge and understanding of a reason that is clearly expressed. but lacks some clarity **Reasonable** (partially explicit) application of knowledge and understanding to identify a reason and attempt to support with evidence from source **1 mark – Limited** knowledge and understanding of a reason that is poorly expressed. **Limited** application of knowledge and understanding to identify a problem with limited / no attempt to support with evidence from the source **0 marks –** No creditworthy response

10	**e**	**Explain how the above source is relevant to the social area of psychology. Support your answer with evidence from the source** Possible answer: • The social area supports the view that the social setting/social context we are within influences our behaviour as well as the other people around us (family, friends, institutions and wider society). The above source links to the social area because the teacher is clearly influencing the blue-eyed children's behaviour, by telling them they are superior and then openly affording them privileges and special treatment that the others are denied. • The source links to the social area as it looks at the impact of others on behaviour. A social situation was created where the teacher made it socially acceptable to treat the brown-eyed students differently. It also appears the students are complicit to the salient social contract of obeying the orders of a teacher who is perceived as a legitimate authority. • Other appropriate response *Candidate must make it clear how the source is linked to the key principles and concepts of the social area*	**4**	**4 marks -** Response demonstrates **good** analysis and interpretation of the social area. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise how the source is relevant to social psychology are highly skilled and show **good** understanding. Application will be mainly explicit, accurate and relevant. (2 marks : Area, 2 marks: Context) **3 marks -** Response demonstrates **reasonable** analysis and interpretation of the social area that is partially relevant. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise how the source is relevant to social psychology are competent and show **reasonable** understanding but may lack clarity. Application will be partially explicit, accurate and relevant. **2 marks -** Response demonstrates **limited** analysis and interpretation of the social area. Some valid conclusions that summarise how the source is relevant to social psychology are made but show **limited** understanding. Application may not be explicit and/or relevant. **1 mark -** Response demonstrates **basic** analysis and interpretation of the social area. **Basic** or no valid conclusions that summarise how the source is relevant to social psychology. No evidence of arguments and **basic** if any understanding of the social area. Answer will be incomplete and/or lacking in context **0 marks –** No creditworthy response

	f	**Describe two changes you could make to the experiment detailed in the source material.** **Possible changes to be made:** • Make it more ethical • Make is less ethical – by emphasising differences more • Change of setting • Change of segregation technique • Change who was studied • Allow the study to run for a long period of time **Example of one change:** • One possible change would be to emphasise the group differences more (What). The teacher could do this by telling the blue-eyed students that they need to place a collar on the brown-eyed students so it's clear who they are. The teacher could instruct the blue-eyed students to do this in a lesson. (How). This would help see if the results were affected by establishing an obvious marker for their inferior group status – would this make the brown-eyed students feel more powerless and angry? (Why)	**6**	**For each change** **3 marks:** Response demonstrates **good** knowledge and understanding of how to make appropriate changes to the source. Change is detailed (What (1) and How (2)) and accurately described in reference to the source material - application to the source is explicit, accurate and relevant. **2 marks:** Response demonstrates **reasonable** knowledge and understanding of how to make appropriate changes to the source. **Reasonably** accurate description of a change but lacking some detail. The change in reference to the source material - application is **reasonably** explicit, reasonably accurate and mostly relevant. There may be inconsistency in the quality for each change described. **1 marks:** Response demonstrates **limited** knowledge and understanding of how to make appropriate changes to the source. **Limited** description of a change lacking in detail. **Limited**- application is limited, unclear and at times irrelevant. **0 marks –** No creditworthy response *Description means they identify WHAT they are changing and HOW they will implement the change.*

	g	**Discuss the implications of the suggestions you made question 10(f).** **Possible implications:** • More / less ethical issues raised • Increase / decrease in representativeness • Increase / decrease in generalisability of results • Increase / decrease in standardisation • Increase / decrease in bias • Increase / decrease in reliability • Discussions about the effects on the results • How changes would enhance understanding / usefulness Example paragraph: • An implication of emphasising the group differences between blue-eyed and brown-eyed students is that protection from harm may not be upheld. The blue-eyed and brown-eyed students may both feel demoralised even further. For example, the blue-eyed students upon reflection, may feel like bad people knowing they placed a visible marker upon fellow students and used that marker to treat them differently. An implication of this is that they could leave the study with long term psychological harm. However, this change may lead to more telling findings about how we often follow immoral orders but also whether or not emphasising differences between groups in a more obvious way lead to more discrimination / prejudice. *Answers must be contextualised throughout to access the top band* *Implications refers to the resulting factor from what they choose to do in question 10f – the so what? Implications can be both*	**10**	**9– 10 marks –** Response demonstrates **good** discussion that is relevant to the demand of the question. Evaluation/argument is **coherently** presented with **clear** understanding of the points raised. Understanding, expression and use of psychological terminology are **good**. There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. A **range** of positive and negative implications are considered. The implications are discussed in **context** and **supported** by evidence of the description given in 10f / the source material. **3 or more** points which should discuss implications of **both changes** made in 10f. **7 – 8 marks –** Response demonstrates **reasonable** discussion that is **mainly** relevant to the demand of the question. Evaluation/argument is **mainly** coherently presented with **reasonable** understanding of the points raised. Understanding, expression and use of psychological terminology are **reasonable**. There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. A **range** of positive and negative implications are considered but may not form a fully developed discussion. The implications are **mainly** in context and supported by some evidence of the description given in 10f / the source material. **two or more** points are made across **both changes** **4 – 6 marks –** Response demonstrates **limited** discussion that is **sometimes** relevant to the demand of the question. Understanding, expression and use of psychological terminology are **limited.** Evaluation/argument lacks clear structure/organisation (but an attempt is made) and has **limited** understanding of the points raised. The implications are **occasionally** in context, supported by **limited** evidence of the description given in 10f . One point is made from one of the **changes.** The response may be all positive or all negative and the implications therefore are not being discussed as detailed in the question.

		positive and negative – if the implications are not discussed the answer must be capped at 6 as per guidance above *Answers must be contextualised throughout to access the top band*		**1 – 3 marks –** Response demonstrates **basic** discussion that is **rarely** relevant to the demand of the question. Understanding, expression and use of psychological terminology are **basic/poor.** Evaluation/argument lacks structure / organisation and has **basic** understanding of the points raised. No evidence of a discussion. The implications are often **not** in context / not contextualised throughout, supported by basic / no evidence of the description given in 10f / the source material **0 marks** – No creditworthy response Discuss means that both positive and negative implications need to be considered

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
1 Hills Road
Cambridge
CB1 2EU

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Education and Learning
Telephone: 01223 553998
Facsimile: 01223 552627
Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

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

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations
is a Company Limited by Guarantee
Registered in England
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity

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

© OCR 2017

PART OF THE CAMBRIDGE ASSESSMENT GROUP

LLOYD'S REGISTER QUALITY ASSURANCE ISO9001
UKAS MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS 001