



Oxford Cambridge and RSA

GCE

Psychology

H567/02: Psychological themes through core studies

A Level

Mark Scheme for June 2022

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 2022

MARKING INSTRUCTIONS**PREPARATION FOR MARKING
ASSESSOR3**

1. Make sure that you have accessed and completed the relevant training packages for on-screen marking: *Assessor3* Admin Briefing. *RM Assessor3* Marking User Guide. On OCR Assessment Specialist Communications website, Screen 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> for Question Paper and *RM Assessor3* for final Mark Scheme
3. Log-in to *Assessor3* 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 *Assessor3* 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 *Assessor3* 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.)*

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 Assessor3 **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 Assessor3 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: Not applicable in F501
- 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:

Descriptor	Award mark
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
	Unclear
	Application and evidence
	Benefit of doubt
	Context
	Cross
	Evaluation
	Extendable horizontal line
	Extendable horizontal wavy line
	Significant amount of material that doesn't answer the question
	Not answered question
	Good use of resources
	Tick
	Development of point
	Omission mark

Annotation	Meaning
	Unclear
	Application and evidence
	Benefit of doubt
	Context
	Cross
	Evaluation
	Extendable horizontal line
	Extendable horizontal wavy line
	Significant amount of material that doesn't answer the question
	Not answered question
	Good use of resources
	Tick
	Development of point
	Omission mark

Annotation	Meaning
	Unclear
	Attempts evaluation
	Benefit of doubt
	Context
	Cross
	Evaluation
	Extendable horizontal line
	Extendable horizontal wavy line
	Significant amount of material which doesn't answer the question
	Not answered question
	Good use of resources
	Tick
	Development of point
	Omission mark

Question		Answer	Mark	Guidance
1		<p>Outline the procedure used in Experiment 1 of Moray's study into attention.</p> <p>Features of the procedure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A short list of simple words was repeatedly presented to one of the participant's ears whilst they <u>shadowed</u> a prose <u>message</u> presented to the other ear. (The word list was faded in after shadowing had begun, and was equal in intensity to the shadowed message. At the end of the prose passage it was faded out so as to become inaudible as the prose finished.) • The rejected message (word list) was repeated 35 times. • The participant was then asked to report all he could of the content of the rejected message. • S/he was then given a recognition test using similar material, present in neither the list nor the passage, as a control. • The gap between the end of shadowing and the beginning of the recognition test was about 30 seconds. • Use of repeated measures design. 	4	<p>1 mark for reference to shadowed (prose) message in one ear</p> <p>1 mark for reference to rejected (word list) message in other ear</p> <p>1 mark for recall or recognition task</p> <p>1 mark for any other relevant detail from the procedure</p> <p>0 marks – no creditworthy response</p>
2	(a)	<p>Briefly describe the sample used in Levine's study into helping behaviour.</p> <p>Creditworthy features of sample:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 23 • Cities/countries • Over 16's • Reference to 2 or more cities/countries/continents 	2	<p>1 mark for each creditworthy from the list (up to 2).</p> <p>0 marks – no creditworthy response.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exclusions (or inclusions) - people who were physically disabled, very old, carrying heavy packages and so forth (those not fully capable or expected to help) were excluded. • Both men and women • All cities had pop of 230,000 <p>NB Do not credit sampling techniques.</p>		
2	(b)	<p>Outline one way in which Levine’s study may show sampling bias.</p> <p>Possible answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Age biased – as young and very old people were not selected. • Researcher bias - there may have been an unconscious bias in who researchers approached giving an unrepresentative sample. • Culturally biased – too many individualistic cultures studied. • Culturally biased – cities were used to represent the whole country’s culture/rural areas and towns not used. • Culturally biased – sample too small to represent all 196 countries 	2	<p>2 marks for identifying a bias in the sample and for explaining its impact.</p> <p>1 mark for identifying a bias in the sample or for a muddled explanation.</p> <p>0 marks – no creditworthy response.</p>
3	(a)	<p>Explain how Chaney <i>et al</i>’s study into Funhalers relates to the theme of ‘external influences on behaviour’.</p> <p><u>Example of a 3 mark answer</u></p>	3	<p>3 marks for a clear answer which;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • recognises the influence comes from reinforcement • shows it is external to the children as it relies on incentive toys • shows the behaviour was adherence with an inhaler.

		<p>Chaney et al found that children could be influenced through the process of reinforcement (1). They changed their behaviour by using the inhaler more (1) when it was presented as a Funhaler with bells and whistles. The children using and no using the Funhaler clearly had different external influences (1).</p> <p>NB Reinforcement may be referred through use of the term reward(ing) or positive outcomes/consequences.</p>		<p>2 marks for an answer which addresses at least two of the above points.</p> <p>1 mark for a partial or vague answer which addresses at least one of the above points.</p> <p>0 marks – no creditworthy response.</p>
3	(b)	<p>Outline one strength and one weakness of the method used in Lee et al’s study into lying and truth telling.</p> <p>The candidate is most likely to identify an experiment as the method, and may specifically identify a laboratory or quasi-experiment.</p> <p>Possible strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • high level of internal validity/control • ability to reliably establish cause and effect • objectivity • practical/ethical (quasi) <p>Possible weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • lack of ecological validity/artificial (lab) • lack of construct validity <p>NB Do credit responses where candidates identify self-report or interviews as the method.</p> <p><u>Example of a 4 mark answer</u></p>	4 (2 + 2)	<p>2 marks for a clearly identified and relevant strength which is appropriately applied to the study.</p> <p>1 mark for identifying a relevant strength either explicitly, or implicitly through application to the study.</p> <p>Plus</p> <p>2 marks for a clearly identified and relevant weakness which is appropriately applied to the study.</p> <p>1 mark for identifying a relevant weakness either explicitl, or implicitly through application to the study.</p> <p>0 marks – no creditworthy response.</p>

		<p>A strength Lee et al's lab experiment is that it was highly controlled (1) so that extraneous variables such as the order in which stories were presented did not affect the DV (1). However, a weakness is the lack of construct validity (1) as for the purpose of measurement, children's morality was measured by a simple rating scale (1).</p>		
3	(c)	<p>Explain one issue with validity that arose in Bandura et al's study into aggressive role models.</p> <p>Possible answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internal validity related to high levels of control in the study. • External validity related to generalisability of findings beyond the study. • Ecological validity related to the artificiality of the set up. • Population validity relating to the representativeness of the study. • Construct validity related to how broadly the DV was measured. <p><u>Example of 1 mark answer</u></p> <p>Bandura's study lacked construct validity. (1)</p> <p><u>Example of 2 mark answer</u></p> <p>The study was low in ecological validity (1) because aggression was tested in unnatural conditions in a laboratory (1).</p>	3	<p>3 marks for a clear response which identifies a relevant issue with validity, outlines how/why it arose in the study (context) and demonstrates an understanding of the type of validity in the process.</p> <p>2 marks for a clear response with two of the above features or for a vague response with all three of the above features.</p> <p>1 mark for identifying a relevant issue of validity or for some understanding of the concept of validity.</p> <p>0 marks – no creditworthy response.</p>

		<p><u>Example of 3 mark answer</u></p> <p>The study had an issue with population validity (1) as it only used a narrow age range of children (1) which means it is difficult to generalise the findings and suggest that all children learn aggression in this way (1).</p>		
4	(a)	<p>Outline one finding from Freud’s study of Little Hans.</p> <p>Possible answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little Hans’ fear of horses was considered by Freud as a subconscious fear of his father. This because the dark around the mouth of a horse and the blinkers resembled the moustache and glasses worn by his father. He was fearful of his father because he was experiencing the Oedipus complex. • Hans’ fascination with his ‘widdler’ was because he was experiencing the Oedipus complex. • 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 of becoming a father linked to his experiencing the Oedipus complex. • Hans’ fantasy about the plumber was interpreted as him now identifying with his father and the final family fantasy was interpreted as the resolution of the Oedipus Complex. 	2	<p>2 marks for a clear and accurate outline of a relevant finding</p> <p>1 mark for a briefly stated finding or an outline which is muddled and/or vague</p> <p>0 marks – no creditworthy response.</p>

4	(b)	<p>Briefly explain how Baron-Cohen et al's study into the theory of mind relates to the area of individual differences.</p> <p>Possible content:</p> <p>The study relates to individual differences because of its focus on <u>trying to understand the way in which people differ</u> – in this case, through being diagnosed as being on the autistic spectrum which can be seen as an <u>abnormal behaviour</u>. It also looked at a variety of individuals with autism to try and understand what causes the <u>unique behaviours</u> presented in each individual. At the same time, it found a way of <u>measuring these differences</u> through the use of the Eyes Task.</p>	4	<p>3-4 marks for a clear and accurate response which demonstrates knowledge and understanding of Baron-Cohen et al's study and of how this links to relevant principles and concepts of the individual differences area.</p> <p>1-2 marks for a brief or vague response which shows some knowledge and understanding of Baron-Cohen et al's study and makes some attempt to link to principles and concepts of the individual differences area.</p> <p>0 marks – no creditworthy response.</p>
4	(c)	<p>Compare Gould's study with Hancock et al.'s study into measuring differences by suggesting either one difference or one similarity between them.</p> <p>Possible differences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • use of primary data (interview) versus use of secondary data (review) • use of transcript analysis versus use of test scores • low control versus high control • type of sampling i.e. opportunistic versus volunteer • sample size <p>Possible similarities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • quasi-experimental 	4	<p>4 marks – for a clear response which;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • identifies a difference/similarity • further outlines that difference/similarity • illustrates the difference/similarity with reference to Gould's study • illustrates the difference/similarity with reference to Hancock et al's study. <p>3 marks for a vague response with the all of the above points or for a clear response with three of the points.</p> <p>2 marks for a vague response with three of the above points or for a clear response with two of the points.</p> <p>1 mark for a vague response with two of the above points or for a clear response with the difference identified/implied.</p> <p>0 marks – no creditworthy response.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • only focused on male participants/subjects • use of both quantitative and qualitative data • use of testing i.e. IQ and personality • comparison of different groups (independent measures design) • ethnocentrism 		<p>NB If the candidate compares the studies on sample size this is permissible but they must get the sample sizes right for both studies to earn the first mark for application. The second application mark should be awarded for some mathematical analysis of the difference (or similarity) in sample size.</p>
5	(a)	<p>Outline one ethical issue raised by Sperry's study into regions of the brain.</p> <p>Possible ethical issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Informed consent – participants knew why they were doing the experiment. • Reducing harm – use of non-invasive techniques for studying the brain. • Protection of participants – made use of pre-existing conditions. • Causing distress – these people had already suffered brain damage and may have found the testing distressing because it made them feel inferior. <p>NB Do not credit references to debriefing as one was not required.</p> <p>=/-</p>	2	<p>2 marks for a response which identifies a relevant ethical issue that is considered in the context of the study.</p> <p>1 mark for identifying a relevant ethical issue either explicitly or implicitly.</p> <p>0 marks – no creditworthy response.</p>
5	(b)	<p>Discuss to what extent Maguire et al.'s contemporary study in biological psychology</p>	5	<p>4-5 marks for a developed response which considers at least one discussion point by explaining the point and</p>

		<p>changes our understanding of brain plasticity when compared to Blakemore and Cooper’s study from 1970.</p> <p>Possible discussion points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of humans over animals • Use of real-life context over experimental set-up • Use of MRI scans <p><u>Example of a top band response</u></p> <p>Both Maguire et al and Blakemore and Cooper allow us to understand the plasticity of the brain in response to environmental experiences. However, in Blakemore and Cooper’s study these experiences were contrived and artificial due to the unusual environments that the cats were raised in whereas Maguire et al’s study of taxi drivers and their experiences of navigating London’s streets allows for findings with more ecological validity. This means we can better understand brain plasticity in a real-life context. In addition, Maguire et al’s use of MRI scans means we now have hard evidence for how the brain has been affected by experience whereas this could only be inferred in the case of the Blakemore and Cooper study. This, in turn, secures our understanding as we can see ourselves the differing structures of the brain. One final and obvious way that our understanding changes is through the fact that Maguire et al studied humans rather than cats. This means we can now apply the theory of brain plasticity to the population that we are really interested in rather than making</p>	<p>then effectively analysing the extent to which it changes our understanding of brain plasticity.</p> <p>2-3 marks for a response which considers at least one discussion point and then analyses the extent to which it changes our understanding of brain plasticity.</p> <p>1 mark for identifying a relevant discussion point.</p> <p>0 marks – no creditworthy response.</p> <p>NB It is permissible to credit a response (using the full range of marks) that argues there have been no changes in understanding.</p>
--	--	--	--

			generalisations based on the study of non-human animals.		
--	--	--	--	--	--

Question		Answer	Mark	Guidance
6	(a)	<p>Explain how one core study from the social area can be related to the concept of holism.</p> <p>Possible studies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bocchiaro et al – for a looking at a number of situational <i>and</i> personality factors that impact whistleblowing • Piliavin et al – for investigating a number of independent variables that may interact to influence helping behaviour • Levine et al – for investigating four community variables across 23 cultures • Milgram – for concluding that authority, prestige and payment may have worked together to impact on obedience. 	5	<p>4-5 marks for a clear response which outlines relevant features of an appropriate study, states why this makes the study holistic and demonstrates an understanding of the concept in the process.</p> <p>2-3 marks for a clear response with two of the above criteria or for a vague or brief response with all three of the above features.</p> <p>1 mark for illustrating the concept of holism or for demonstrating knowledge of the concept.</p> <p>0 marks – no creditworthy response.</p>
6	(b)	<p>Explain how one core study from the social area can be related to the concept of reductionism.</p> <p>Possible study:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Milgram – for just focusing on authority and its impact on the agentic state as a factor in obedience • Levine et al – reduced down to situational factors rather than dispositional factors. 	5	<p>4-5 marks for a clear response which outlines relevant features of an appropriate study, states why this makes the study reductionist and demonstrates an understanding of the concept in the process.</p> <p>2-3 marks for a clear response with two of the above criteria or for a vague or brief response with all three of the above features.</p> <p>1 mark for illustrating the concept of reductionism or for demonstrating knowledge of the concept.</p> <p>0 marks – no creditworthy response.</p>
6	(c)	<p>Describe one application of the social area.</p> <p>Possible applications:</p>	4	<p>4 marks for a detailed and accurate description of a relevant application which is clearly related to the principles or concepts of the social area.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> reducing blind obedience e.g. in grooming, brainwashing increasing obedience e.g. in schools, prisons, etc encouraging helping behaviour e.g. community programmes, supporting charities changing attitudes e.g. advertising, education promoting conformity and cohesion e.g. political campaigns, in schools crowd control e.g. at large public events, dealing with riots and protests tackling anti-social behaviour 		<p>3 marks for a detailed and accurate description of a relevant application, or for an accurate description which is clearly related to the principles or concepts of the social area.</p> <p>2 marks for an accurate description of a relevant application, or for identifying an application which is related to the principles or concepts of the social area.</p> <p>1 mark for identifying an application.</p> <p>0 marks – no creditworthy response.</p>
6	(d)	<p>Outline the procedure used in one core study and briefly explain how this relates to the social area.</p> <p>Possible studies: Milgram, Bocchiaro et al, Piliavin et al, Levine et al</p> <p>Social area: The social area looks at understanding human behaviour in a social context; that is looking at the factors that lead to us to behave in a given way due to the presence of others. Our behaviour is influenced by the actual, imagined or implied presence of others.</p> <p><u>Example of a 6 mark answer</u></p> <p>Piliavin et al staged a scenario on an underground train where the ‘victims’ either smelled of alcohol and carried a bottle wrapped tightly in a brown bag or appeared sober and carried a black cane.(1) The observers recorded the dependent variables. On each trial one observer noted the race, sex and location of every rider seated or standing in the critical area for helping. In addition she counted the total number of individuals who came to the victim’s assistance. She also recorded</p>	6 (4 + 2)	<p>For description of the procedure of a relevant study;</p> <p>3-4 marks for a detailed and accurate description which identifies most of the key features of the procedure.</p> <p>1-2 marks for a brief or vague description of the study which identifies some key features.</p> <p>0 marks – no creditworthy response.</p> <p>For application to the social area;</p> <p>2 marks a relevant link which is clearly, if briefly, explained.</p> <p>1 mark for a clear link or for one which is not well explained</p> <p>0 marks – no creditworthy response.</p>

		<p>the race, sex and location of every helper.(1) The second observer coded the race, sex and location of all persons in the adjacent area. She also recorded the latency of the first helper's arrival after the victim had fallen and on appropriate trials, the latency of the first helper's arrival after a programmed model had arrived.(1) The victim stood near a pole in the critical area. After about 70 seconds he staggered forward and collapsed. Until receiving help he remained laid on the floor looking at the ceiling. If he received no help by the time the train stopped the model helped him to his feet. At the stop the team disembarked and waited separately until other passengers had left the station. They then changed platforms to repeat the process in the opposite direction.(1) This relates to the social area as the study is clearly set up in a social context – a train carriage full of passengers.(1) The situation also demands that these passengers consider their social behaviour – in this case whether to help another or not.(1)</p>		
6	(e)	<p>Compare the social area with the developmental area in relation to their strengths and weaknesses.</p> <p>Possible strengths/weaknesses of the social area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scientific – use of experiments • High experimental realism • Can explain extreme behaviours • Ethical issues around research • Lack of mundane realism • Ethnocentric • Ignores individual differences in response • Too deterministic • Useful with many applications 	15	<p>12-15 marks for a thorough consideration of strengths and/or weakness from each area. Arguments are clearly developed and coherent. There are explicit and relevant comparisons between the two areas as part of the discussion. A range of points are considered and are well developed as part of the discussion. There is evidence of valid conclusions that summarise issues very well. 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 good consideration of strengths and/or weaknesses from each area. There is some coherency to the arguments made. There are comparisons made between the two areas as part of the discussion.</p>

		<p>Possible strengths/weaknesses of the development area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Considers both nature/nurture • Shows development over a time span • Shows how to support children's development and therefore well-being • Participants are often children leading to ethical concerns • Ethnocentric • Too deterministic <p>NB If research evidence is used as part of the discussion, this is only creditworthy if it is used to illustrate or explain an identified and valid strength or weakness of one or both areas.</p>		<p>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. There is good use of psychological terminology in a response with reasonable structure. Information presented is largely appropriate.</p> <p>4-7 marks for accurately outlining at least one strength and/or weaknesses from both areas. There is some attempt to make a comparison between the two areas as part of the discussion. Arguments are presented but with limited understanding of the points raised. There is evidence of attempts to draw conclusions. There is some use of psychological terminology in a response with limited structure. Information presented is sometimes appropriate. Comparison in here too.</p> <p>1-3 marks for accurately identifying a strength and/or weakness of one or both areas. There may be an attempt to make a comparison between the two areas. Arguments are presented but with weak understanding of the points raised. There is limited or no use of psychological terminology and structure is poor. Information presented is rarely appropriate.</p> <p>0 marks – no creditworthy response.</p>
--	--	---	--	---

Question		Answer	Mark	Guidance
7	(a)	<p>Outline one principle or concept of the cognitive area and briefly explain how it relates to this article.</p> <p>Possible principles/concepts:</p>	4	<p>2 marks for a clear and accurate outline of one principle or concept of the cognitive area.</p> <p>1 mark for a brief or vague outline of one principle or concept of the cognitive area.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Investigation of our internal mental processes – memory is one of these processes as it happens in the mind. Behaviour is highly predictable based on identifiable patterns in thinking – reconstruction of memories is a common process across people. Schemas are an important part of cognitive development – it is schemas which are used to help to reconstruct a memory. 		<p>Plus</p> <p>2 marks for a clear and relevant link between the principle/concept and the content of the article</p> <p>1 mark for a weak but relevant link between the principle/concept and the content of the article.</p> <p>0 marks – no creditworthy response.</p>
7	(b)	<p>Describe the Loftus et al study into memory and briefly explain how it relates to this article.</p> <p>Possible key features for description of study:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Background to study Aims and hypotheses Design Sample Procedure Materials Key findings Conclusions drawn <p>NB Candidates can refer to both experiments or one of the experiments when describing this study.</p> <p>How the study relate to the article:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Human memory is not reliable/accurate/detailed Memory is constructive 	7 (5 + 2)	<p>For description of the study using one experiment:</p> <p>5 marks for a detailed and accurate description which identifies most of the key features of the study.</p> <p>3-4 marks for an accurate description which identifies most of the key features of the study.</p> <p>1-2 marks for a brief or vague description of the study which identifies some key features.</p> <p>0 marks – no creditworthy response.</p> <p>For description of the study using both experiments:</p> <p>5 marks for an accurate description which identifies most of the key features of each experiment.</p> <p>3-4 marks for an accurate description which identifies some of the key features of each experiment but where there may be an imbalance (more detail on one experiment or the other)</p> <p>1-2 marks for a brief or vague description of the two experiments.</p>

					<p>0 marks – no creditworthy response.</p> <p>For application to the article;</p> <p>2 marks a relevant link which is clearly, if briefly, explained.</p> <p>1 mark for a clear link or for one which is not well explained</p> <p>0 marks – no creditworthy response.</p>
7	(c)	(i)	<p>With reference to the article, explain one strength of using the self-report method in research.</p> <p>Possible strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ability to access thoughts and opinions – so respondents can share their views on memory as these cannot be observed. • Self report allows for more reliable comparisons than observations as questions are more easily standardised than multiple observers or multiple observations – so comparing experts and non-experts views on memory is easily done with common questions • Values personal experience – participants own views on memory are shared rather than relying on assumptions and inferences from common sense observations • More ethical – as answering a question is something someone does with complete free will 	3	<p>1 mark for identifying a relevant strength <i>Plus</i></p> <p>1 mark for an explanation/implication of this strength <i>Plus</i></p> <p>1 mark for considering this in the context of the article</p> <p>1 mark for identifying a relevant weakness <i>Plus</i></p> <p>1 mark for an explanation/implication of this weakness <i>Plus</i></p> <p>1 mark for considering this in the context of the article</p> <p>NB Do not credit strengths/weaknesses which are either specific to questionnaires or interviews.</p> <p>NB Do not credit strengths/weaknesses which are either specific to types of questions or types of data that may be generated.</p> <p>NB It is possible to credit strengths and weaknesses which do not apply to the article (e.g. inability to articulate) but this will not earn more than 2 marks.</p>

7	(c)	(ii)	<p>With reference to the article, explain one weakness of using the self-report method in research.</p> <p>Possible weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demand characteristics – experts may understand not to express common sense opinions but ones that are expected • Social desirability – non-experts may be anxious to express views on memory which go against common sense norms • Relies on insight – why should non-experts have the same ability to understand how memory works 	3	
7	(d)		<p>Using your knowledge of psychology, suggest ways that teachers could be taught to improve their understanding of how their students' memory works.</p> <p>Possible suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct instruction (from psychologists) using theories and research, and how this can be applied to the classroom e.g. Grant, Loftus & Palmer • Modelling of how to review or revise work with students • Get teachers to be participants in experiments on memory • Get teachers to trial/experiment with different memory strategies in the classroom • Get teachers to keep a diary of how they use their own memory • Teachers could interview/survey their own students about how they best learn/recall/revise 	8	<p>7-8 marks for a high standard of knowledge and understanding of how the suggested ways could be used to improve teachers understanding of how memory works. There is very effective application of psychological knowledge within these suggestions. The suggestions are largely accurate and several details have been included about how they could be implemented and developed. At least two suggestions are covered.</p> <p>5-6 marks for a good standard of knowledge and understanding of how the suggested ways could be used to improve teachers understanding of how memory works. There is effective application of psychological knowledge within these suggestions. The suggestions are mostly accurate and some details have been included about how they could be implemented and developed. At least two suggestions are covered.</p>

		NB If a response explains an approach teachers could use with students without having explained how the teacher has been taught (e.g. how, by whom, where) then this can earn up to 2 marks still.		<p>3-4 marks for reasonable knowledge and understanding of how the suggested ways could be used to improve teachers understanding of how memory works. There is some application of psychological knowledge within these suggestions. The suggestions are partially accurate.</p> <p>1-2 marks for basic knowledge and understanding of how the suggested ways could be used to improve teachers understanding of how memory works. There is weak application of psychological knowledge within these suggestions. The suggestions may have limited accuracy.</p> <p>0 marks – No creditworthy response.</p> <p>N.B. If only one suggestion is made then a maximum of 4 marks to be awarded. Award marks in line with the descriptors above.</p>
7	(e)	<p>Evaluate the suggestions you have made in part (d) with reference to issues and debates you have studied in psychology.</p> <p>Potential issues for evaluation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assumptions relating to nature/nurture e.g. potential to learn/change understanding • Assumptions relating to freewill/determinism e.g. are teachers or students resistant to instruction? • Assumptions relating to reductionism/holism e.g. do individual teaching sessions or single experiments recognise the holistic nature of memory? • Assumptions relating individual/situational explanations e.g. is memory too unique to be that well understood? • Usefulness e.g. practicalities of suggested ways, will they make a difference? 	10	<p>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 7d. More than one suggestion is evaluated.</p> <p>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 7d.</p> <p>3-5 marks for demonstrating limited evaluation that is</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ethical considerations e.g. may teachers feel patronised by a certain approach? • Social sensitivity e.g. may teachers feel they are being labelled as non-experts in this important field? • Psychology as a science e.g. are theories well tested? • Ethnocentrism – is the importance of memory being over-emphasised at the expense of other important skills? • Validity – experimental realism of research, social desirability in student responses, ecological validity of training sessions • Reliability – do findings generalise to students or all students? <p>NB More practical issues are also creditworthy if made relevant.</p>	<p>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 7d.</p> <p>1-2 marks for demonstrating basic evaluation that is rarely relevant to the demand of the question. Any arguments lacks 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 7d.</p> <p>0 marks – No creditworthy response.</p> <p>N.B. If only one suggestion is evaluated then a maximum of 6 marks to be awarded. Award marks in line with the descriptors above.</p>
--	--	---	--

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/ocrexams



/ocrexams



/company/ocr



/ocrexams



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 2022 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.