



GCE

Psychology

Unit **H167/02**: Psychological themes through core studies

Advanced Subsidiary 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.

Question	Answer Guidance	Marks	Awarding Marks Guidance
1 (a)	<p>Using the data from Milgram’s study of obedience presented above: Outline two conclusions.</p> <p>Possible answers (2 needed):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The majority of participants will obey the orders of an authority to administer lethal electric shocks • 300 volts is the point at which some participants were reluctant to continue administering electric shocks • Participants began to be disobedient to the authority figure past the 300 volt level • Over half of the participants administered the highest voltage showing high levels of obedience overall • Other appropriate response 	4	<p>Per conclusion:</p> <p>2 marks – Clear outline of a conclusion which is drawn from the data table</p> <p>1 mark – Attempt to give a conclusion that is not clearly expressed e.g. <i>All participants gave a 300v shock to the learner</i></p> <p>0 marks – no creditworthy response</p> <p><i>Candidates should not be awarded marks for only giving findings – the data in the table needs to be summarised for what shows overall to gain full marks</i></p> <p><i>If a candidate states a conclusion that is not logically drawn from the data table then 0 marks should be awarded e.g. the average person is more obedient than originally thought (as this cannot be concluded from the data presented)</i></p> <p><i>If candidate says “100%” of, this can be taken to mean “All” IF used within a conclusive statement</i></p>
(b)	<p>From Bocchiaro et al.’s study into disobedience and whistleblowing: Describe one way the study is ethical.</p> <p>Possible answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants were told they could withdraw at any time - before or after being asked to write the supporting statement - without penalty 	2	<p>2 marks – An accurate and detailed way the study is ethical as detailed in the answer guidance</p> <p>1 mark – Partial or vague way outlined or answer not fully contextualised e.g. <i>they were debriefed at the end of the study</i></p> <p>0 marks – no credit worthy response</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Signed a consent form giving consent to take part before the study (NOT informed) cover story was read out • After the personality tests were completed the participants were debriefed - each participant was informed of the reasons for the use of deception • During the debrief they made sure that participants did not feel uncomfortable about their obedience and about the fact they had been deceived • Participants were given a written debriefing form that outlined the reason for the fake cover story, as well as an email address to contact in case they wanted to complain or ask further questions about the study. • Other appropriate response 		<p><i>The answer must be clearly linked to the Bocchiaro study to gain full marks</i></p> <p><i>If candidate says the participants gave “Informed consent” this should be awarded 0 marks as the consent given was NOT informed (because of the deception)</i></p> <p><i>The response must clearly link to an actual ethical issue to be given full marks, i.e. ref to distress being caused refers to protection of participants but is not explicitly linked so should only be awarded 1</i></p>
(c)	<p>From Bocchiaro et al.’s study into disobedience and whistleblowing: Describe one way the study is not ethical.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The cover story given was deceptive and not what the study was truly about • Informed consent could not be obtained at the beginning as the participants needed to be unaware • Participants were asked to commit an immoral act and those who did without blowing the whistle may have felt harmed after the study / disappointed in their obedience • Other appropriate response 	2	<p>2 marks – An accurate and detailed way the study is not ethical as detailed in the answer guidance</p> <p>1 mark – Partial or vague way outlined or answer not fully contextualised e.g. <i>they were deceived</i></p> <p>0 marks – no credit worthy information</p>

2	(a)	<p>From Grant et al.'s study on context-dependent memory: Identify the type of data gathered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quantitative (performance on a short-answer recall test / a multiple-choice recall test) <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interval 	1	<p>1 mark – identification of the data type is identified as detailed in the answer guidance</p> <p>0 marks – no creditworthy response</p>
	(b)	<p>Outline one strength of collecting this type of data in this study.</p> <p>Possible Answer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It would be easy to compare and analyse data gathered between the conditions – matching or mis matching – to see if memory was enhanced when the learning and recall environments were the same or not Other appropriate response 	2	<p>2 marks – Response demonstrates good evaluation. Strength is <u>outlined</u> in context of Grant et al's study as detailed in the answer guidance</p> <p>1 mark – Response demonstrates limited/basic evaluation. Strength partially outlined in context of the Grant et al study OR strength is outlined but not in context of Grant et al's study <i>e.g. the data is easy to compare and analyse between the conditions</i></p> <p>0 marks – no creditworthy response</p> <p><i>The question requires candidates explain the strength in context of the study – if merely identified then only 1 mark can be awarded</i></p>
3		<p>From Chaney et al.'s Funhaler study: Outline one reason the Funhaler device made spacers more appealing to children</p> <p>Possible answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Funhaler incorporates a number of features to distract the attention of children from the drug delivery event itself The design anticipates the potential for 	2	<p>2 marks – An accurate and detailed reason of one reason why the Funhaler made spacer more appealing to children</p> <p>1 mark – Partial or vague reason outlined <i>e.g. because it was more interactive</i></p> <p>0 marks – no credit worthy information</p>

		<p>boredom of children with particular incentive toys that activate when the device is used to maintain their attention</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The incentive toys activate when the device was used correctly so the children were incentivised to use the device correctly to make the Funhaler interactive / fun Other appropriate response 		
4	(a)	<p>From Casey et al.'s study on the neural correlates of delay gratification: Describe the sample used in experiment 1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 59 (23 males, 36 females) of the 117 agreed to participate in this longitudinal behavioural study (Experiment 1). 32 high delayers (12 male, 20 female) and 27 low delayers (11 male, 16 female). 	2	<p>2 marks – sample is accurately described</p> <p>1 mark – sample is partially described or may lack clarity</p> <p>0 marks – no creditworthy response</p> <p><i>Not all fine details needed to gain full marks</i></p>
	(b)	<p>Casey et al.'s study was also longitudinal. Suggest one strength of conducting this study longitudinally.</p> <p>Possible answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conducting the study longitudinally meant that changes and developments in the delay of gratification abilities could be seen over time (4 years old, 20 years old and 30 years old) Allowed Casey et al to establish internal reliability as the adults were tested at 20 and 30 years old on the self-control scale Other appropriate response 	2	<p>2 marks – Response demonstrates good evaluation. Strength is explained in context of Casey et al's study</p> <p>1 mark – Response demonstrates limited/basic evaluation. Strength partially explained in context of the Casey study OR strength is explained not in context of Casey et al's study e.g. <i>shows changes and developments over time</i></p> <p>0 marks – no creditworthy response</p> <p><i>The question requires candidates to explain the strength in context of the study</i> <i>If candidate refers to reliability then the context must relate to the point being made</i></p>

5	(a)	<p>Describe how Freud’s study of Little Hans links to the individual differences area of psychology.</p> <p>Possible answer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The individual differences area supports the view that individuals differ in their behaviour and personal qualities so not everyone can be considered the average person. In Freud’s study of Little Hans his personal experiences / fantasies / dreams were documented which gave a unique insight into the development of his horse phobia. This shows that Freud et al is linked to the individual diff area as Freud was explaining the reason some individuals may experience behaviours that are not average or “normal”. • Other appropriate response 	3	<p>3 marks – Response demonstrates good analysis and interpretation that is relevant to the demand of the question. Valid links are made between the study and the individual differences area that are highly skilled and shows good understanding. Good supporting evidence.</p> <p>2 marks – Response demonstrates reasonable analysis and interpretation that is partially relevant. Some valid links are made between the study and the individual differences area that are competent and understanding is reasonable. Attempt to provide supporting evidence.</p> <p>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 individual differences area but understanding is limited. Little / no supporting evidence.</p> <p>0 marks – no creditworthy response</p> <p><i>Response needs to go beyond saying “not everyone has experienced this” in reference to ID area</i></p> <p><i>Good understanding of <u>both</u> the study and area must be shown for 3 marks</i></p> <p><i>Candidates are required to draw links between Freud’s study and the individual differences area OR outline the individual differences area and draw links to Freud’s study</i> Candidates response should “best fit” into one of the mark bands</p>
---	-----	--	---	---

(b)	<p>In Baron Cohen et al.’s study on autism in adults three groups of participants were selected: Describe how one of these groups was recruited.</p> <p>One of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Group 1: individuals with high-functioning autism or Asperger Syndrome were recruited from a variety of clinical sources, as well as an advert in the National Autistic Society magazine. • Group 2: 50 normal adults were drawn using random sampling from the general population of Cambridge. • Group 3: adults with Tourette Syndrome were recruited from a tertiary referral centre in London. 	2	<p>2 marks – Accurate and detailed description of how one group was recruited</p> <p>1 mark – Generally accurate description of how one group was recruited but lacking detail/clarity e.g. normal adults recruited randomly</p> <p>0 marks – No creditworthy response</p> <p><i>If the sample itself is described then no marks should be awarded</i></p> <p><i>If the candidate just names a technique without linking it to a group e.g. “random sampling” then only 1 mark should be awarded</i></p> <p><i>It must be clear what group they are referring to in order to apply any marks- just saying a control group would not be clear enough</i></p>
(c)	<p>To what extent can this group be considered a biased sample of participants?</p> <p>Possible answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The normal adults only represent normal adults from the Cambridge area, the emotional recognition abilities of people in Cambridge may not represent the abilities of people in other locations and therefore the sample is biased • The normal adults were recruited randomly from the Cambridge area and as this technique is not subject to bias the results about the emotional recognition abilities of this group should 	3	<p>3 marks – Response demonstrates good evaluation that is relevant to the demand of the question. Evaluation of possible sampling bias is skilled and shows good understanding in context of the study.</p> <p>2 marks – Response demonstrates reasonable evaluation that is partially relevant to the demand of the question. Evaluation of possible sampling bias is competent and understanding is reasonable. Attempt to contextualise is made but lacks clarity</p> <p>1 mark – Response demonstrates limited evaluation that is somewhat related to topic area. Evaluation of possible</p>

		<p>represent normal adults in an unbiased way</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There were more male Tourettes sufferers than female, therefore the results about the ability of Tourettes sufferers to recognise emotions in the Eyes Task may be skewed towards male sufferers and the sample can therefore be considered biased • Although there were more male AS / HFA sufferers included than there were female, this is not necessarily biased as more males are diagnosed with AS / HFA so their performance on the eyes task would not produce a biased set of results • Other appropriate response 		<p>sampling bias is not fully explained and understanding is limited. Response is not contextualised</p> <p>0 marks – No creditworthy response</p> <p><i>Candidates need to refer to the same group as they mentioned in 5b</i></p> <p><i>Candidates can argue to an extent it is or to an extent it is not but again it must be clear what group they are referring to and appropriately contextualised</i></p> <p><i>In order to access full marks the implications of the proposed bias must be considered</i></p>
Question		Answer Guidance	Marks	Awarding Marks Guidance
6	(a)	<p>Outline one principle of the individual differences area in psychology.</p> <p>Possible answer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In order to understand human behaviour we need to study how we differ from each other as well as how we are the same. • Individuals differ in their behaviour and personal qualities so not everyone can be considered ‘the average person’. • Believes a person’s behaviours are unique to them due to a combination of biological and experiential factors, such as DNA, cognitions 	2	<p>2 marks – Appropriate principle/concept is accurately outlined and clearly linked to the individual differences area</p> <p>1 mark – Appropriate assumption is briefly or partially described. Understanding is not fully clear e.g. <i>we’re all different</i></p> <p>0 marks – No creditworthy response</p> <p><i>Must clearly be linked to the individual differences area</i></p>

		<p>and development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our individual disposition affects our behaviour and each person has their own unique experiences that influences how they behave • Other appropriate response 		
	(b)	<p>Outline one way the individual differences area has been applied to explaining human behaviour. Justify your response with evidence from a relevant core study.</p> <p>Possible answer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individual differences as an area has historically focused on personality and intelligence, often focusing on studying abnormalities within these behaviours. In looking at how people are different to others this area has been able to establish what constitutes abnormal / dysfunctional behaviour and make assumptions about the abilities / limitations of a certain person or group of people. For example, in Baron Cohen's study they were looking at the differences in emotional recognition between AS, HFA and normal adults, on the assumption that AS / HFA sufferers lack a theory of mind. The results indeed showed that the AS / HFA group were impaired when reading the emotions on the Eyes Task compared to all other conditions, demonstrating that lacking a theory of mind is a core deficit of individuals who have these disorders. • Other appropriate response 	5	<p>5 marks – Response demonstrates good application of psychological knowledge. Good understanding about HOW the individual diff area has been able to explain human behaviour. Application is explicit, accurate and relevant. Clear, detailed and relevant justifying evidence given from an appropriate core study.</p> <p>4 marks – Response demonstrates reasonable application of psychological knowledge. Reasonable understanding about HOW the individual diff area has been able to explain human behaviour. Application will be partially explicit, accurate and relevant. Attempt is made to justify answer with relevant supporting evidence but lacks some clarity.</p> <p>3 marks – Response demonstrates limited application of psychological knowledge. Limited understanding about HOW the individual diff area has been able to explain human behaviour. Application may not directly address the question. Partial attempt made to justify answer with relevant supporting evidence but lacks detail (needed to be developed further).</p> <p>1-2 marks – Response demonstrates basic application of psychological knowledge. Basic understanding about HOW the individual diff area has been able to explain human behaviour. Basic/no attempt to made to justify the answer with relevant supporting evidence from a core study</p>

			<p>0 marks – no creditworthy response</p> <p><i>Candidates must show an understanding of the ID area itself – not just topics studied in specific research e.g. The ID area has been applied to explaining behaviour through Freud’s study... – this would be a bottom band response</i></p> <p><i>As the question asks candidates to use evidence from a relevant core study, only those addressed on the specification should be credited HOWEVER candidates do not have to identify evidence from a core study that is aligned under the area on the spec as they may identify that some core studies apply to more than one area BUT it must be clear that the study referenced does apply to the individual differences area</i></p> <p><i>A <u>description</u> of the area followed by a <u>description</u> of findings from a study should be placed in the bottom band. e.g. ID believes..... Baron Cohen found.. a justification must be attempted to get out of the bottom band - the question demands more than a description and address the question of HOW</i></p> <p><i>Answers that describe <u>research</u> from the ID area without addressing the area itself should be placed in the bottom band as the question asks about the area</i></p> <p><i>Candidate responses should be placed in the band it best fits with overall</i></p>
--	--	--	--

6	(c)	<p>Describe how the social area provides a situational explanation of behaviour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A situational explanation looks past the individual and into their surroundings, focusing on social context, those surrounding them at the time, social processes and social stimuli - such as media/group pressures. The social area provides a situational explanation of behaviour because it investigates how the thoughts, feelings and behaviours of individuals are influenced by the presence of others and the pressures (perceived or otherwise) of a social context upon an individual's behaviour. • Other appropriate response. 	3	<p>3 marks – Good description and a clear understanding of BOTH situational explanations and the social area is shown. Valid description that effectively summarises the interaction between the two is good</p> <p>2 marks – reasonable description and some understanding of BOTH situational explanations and the social area is shown. Competent description that attempts to summarise the interaction between the two</p> <p>1 mark – limited description and limited/basic understanding of situational explanations and the social area is shown. Limited description that does not clearly, if at all, summarise the interaction between the two</p> <p>0 marks – No creditworthy response</p> <p><i>Candidates must show a clear understanding of an situational explanation and the social area (referring to a principle or concept is acceptable) and how they two interact to gain top marks</i></p> <p><i>Evidence from a study is not needed to gain full marks, but candidates may refer to a an appropriate core study to illustrate the link they are making but they must make a link between the area and situational exp in addition to the evidence they give to get more than 1 mark as that is what the question demands</i></p> <p><i>Situational and social area are not just about the “environment”</i></p>
---	-----	---	---	--

	<p>(d) Describe how the biological area provides an individual explanation of behaviour.</p> <p>Possible answer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The individual explanation, centres on a single person, and how their behaviours are unique to them due in part to biological factors, such as DNA and genetics. The biological area provides an individual explanation of behaviour because it believes that physiological differences exist in part due to genetics, physical processes in our bodies and the structure of the brain, which are unique to an individual • Other appropriate response 	<p>3</p>	<p>3 marks – Good description and a clear understanding of BOTH individual explanations and the biological area is shown. Valid description that effectively summarises the interaction between the two is good</p> <p>2 marks – reasonable description and some understanding of BOTH individual explanations and the biological area is shown. Competent description that attempts to summarise the interaction between the two</p> <p>1 mark – limited description and limited/basic understanding of individual explanations and the biological area is shown. Limited description that does not clearly, if at all, summarise the interaction between the two</p> <p>0 marks – No creditworthy response</p> <p><i>Candidates must show a clear understanding of an individual explanation and the biological area (referring to a principle or concept is acceptable) and how they two interact to gain top marks</i></p> <p><i>Evidence from a study is not needed to gain full marks, but candidates may refer to a an appropriate core study to illustrate the link</i></p>
--	--	-----------------	---

(e)	<p>Compare the social area with the biological area. Use examples from relevant <u>core studies</u> to support your answer.</p> <p>Candidates may make comparisons between the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data collected • Ethical considerations • Reductionism • Determinism • Ethnocentrism • Scientific procedures • Methodology favoured / utilised • Data collection techniques • Individual/situational explanations • Usefulness • Nature • Socially sensitive nature of the research <p>Example comparison point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One difference is that the biological area is often low in ecological validity whereas the social area is often high in ecological validity. For example in Sperry's study from the biological area, the participants would not normally be flashed images for 1/10th of a second and asked to draw and name what they had seen, in everyday life the participants do not struggle as they did in the study to identify objects. On the other hand, in Milgram's study from the social area, the study was believed to be genuine by the participants and although the 	12	<p>10 – 12 marks – Response demonstrates good evaluation that is relevant to the demand of the question. Clear and accurate comparisons are made.</p> <p>Evaluation/argument is coherently presented with clear understanding of the points raised (comparison points are all identified AND explained). A range (<i>at least 3 points of comparison</i>) are considered in detail. Argument is highly skilled (discussing similarities <u>and</u> differences) and shows good understanding.</p> <p>Comparison points are supported by appropriate evidence.</p> <p>7 – 9 marks – Response demonstrates reasonable evaluation that is mainly relevant to the demand of the question. Comparisons are clearly attempted and are accurate.</p> <p>Evaluation/argument is mainly coherently presented with reasonable understanding of the points raised (comparison points are mostly, identified AND explained). At least 2 points of comparison are discussed.</p> <p>The comparison points are mainly supported by appropriate evidence.</p> <p>4 – 6 marks – Response demonstrates limited evaluation that is sometimes relevant to the demand of the question. Attempt to make a direct comparisons between the areas but lacks clarity of expression. Evaluation/argument lacks clear structure/organisation and has limited understanding of the points raised (limited explanation of identified comparison points). At least one comparison point is considered or two are considered but</p>
-----	---	----	---

	<p>environment was unfamiliar the p's believed the research to be genuine hence it had mundane realism. This shows that the social area often collects data that better represents the participant's behaviour as it would be in a real life comparable situation whereas the biological area often collects data under controlled conditions so the conclusions may not represent how participants would behave in a real life setting.</p>	<p>lacks clarity.</p> <p>The comparison points are occasionally supported by appropriate evidence.</p> <p>1 – 3 marks – Response demonstrates basic evaluation that is rarely relevant to the demand of the question. Direct comparison is unclear, inaccurate or nonexistent.</p> <p>Evaluation/argument lacks clear structure/organisation and has basic understanding of the comparison points raised (comparison points are seldom or accurately explained).</p> <p>The comparison points are not supported by appropriate evidence.</p> <p>0 marks – No creditworthy response</p> <p><i>Comparison point should be identified, explained and supported by appropriate evidence from a study</i></p> <p><i>The explanation needs to address implications of the mentioned comparison point – top band answers must go beyond mere identification of a similarity / difference e.g. this shows/means that.</i></p> <p><i>As the question asks students to use evidence from a relevant core study, only those addressed on the specification should be credited HOWEVER candidates do not have to identify evidence from a core study that is aligned under the area on the spec as they may identify that some core studies apply to more than one area BUT it must be clear that the study referenced does apply to either the biological or social area</i></p>
--	--	--

				<p><i>Responses that identify comparison points between research rather than the areas should <u>not</u> be credited</i></p> <p><i>An answer may be contextualised but can still be awarded bottom band if the response is basic and lacks structure</i></p>
Question	Answer Guidance	Marks	Awarding Marks Guidance	
7	(a)		3	<p>3 marks – Good knowledge and understanding of a psychological issue that is clearly expressed supported by appropriate evidence from the source</p> <p>An appropriate issue has been identified (1) and is explained through evidence from the source (appropriately contextualised) (2)</p> <p>2 marks – Reasonable knowledge and understanding of a psychological issue but lacks some clarity with an attempt made to support with appropriate evidence from the source</p> <p>An appropriate issue may be merely identified (1) but not fully explained through evidence from the source (1)</p> <p>1 mark – Limited knowledge and understanding of a psychological issue that is poorly expressed</p>
	<p>Identify one psychological issue raised by the above source. Support your answer with evidence from the source.</p> <p>Likely Issues to be raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introducing a fun element can elicit social change • Introducing a fun element acts as an incentive for behavioural change (positive reinforcement) • Introducing a fun element to a task acts as an incentive to engage with the change <p>Possible evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 66 percent more people took the stairs than usual because they were made into a piano 			

				<p>An issue may be briefly identified but not explained through evidence from the source (1)</p> <p>Evidence may be given in the absence of an issue being identified or a quote will be given from the source without explanation in ref to the question</p> <p>0 marks – No creditworthy response</p>
	(b)	<p>Outline how Chaney et al’s Funhaler study links to the above source. Support your answer with evidence from the source.</p> <p>Possible Answer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chaney et al theorised that the use of a novel asthma spacer device, the “Funhaler”, which incorporates fun incentive toys e.g. a spinner and a whistle which activate when the device is used, would provide positive reinforcement. This did lead to improved adherence in young asthmatics (60% more children took the recommended four or more cycles when using the Funhaler compared with the standard/small volume spacer). This study links to the above source by showing that when a fun element is introduced to a mundane task e.g. making stairs into a musical piano, a positive change in behaviour occurs (acts as a positive reinforcer). Other appropriate response 	4	<p>4 marks - Response demonstrates good analysis, interpretation.. Good, clear links are made between BOTH Chaney and the source material. Good detail.</p> <p>3 marks - Response demonstrates reasonable analysis and interpretation. Reasonable links made between BOTH Chaney and the source material but lacks some clarity. Reasonable detail.</p> <p>2 marks - Response demonstrates limited analysis and interpretation.. Limited links made between BOTH Chaney and the source material which shows limited understanding. Limited detail.</p> <p>1 mark - Basic or no analysis and interpretation. Basic / no links made between BOTH Chaney and source material. Basic detail.</p> <p>0 marks – No creditworthy response</p> <p><i>Detail from the Chaney study and the source material is needed, evidence needs to show what the reinforcers were to demonstrate a full marks link</i></p>

				<i>In order to access full marks the candidate must refer to operant conditioning and / or positive reinforcement</i>
7	(c)	<p>Using your knowledge of psychology, explain why introducing a fun element to tasks can lead to a change in behaviour. Justify your response making reference to the source material.</p> <p>Possible answer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The fun may act as an incentive for participation in a novel task / a change in behaviour. The theory of operant conditioning suggests that behaviour can be changed by the use of reinforcement which is given after the desired response, therefore taking part in a fun activity may act as positive reinforcement for the person which would encourage the behaviour itself. For example, walking up stairs that act as a real piano would be a unique experience for people and the perceived enjoyment of taking the musical stairs would act as an incentive for participation and change their behaviour from elevator to stairs. • When people have fun or laugh their mood is elevated. Serotonin (a hormone) is released when our mood is elevated and therefore people may be in part instinctively driven to seek out and take opportunities to engage in fun activities. As the world becomes increasingly fast paced and at times stressful it seems logical that people would be driven to engage in opportunities to feel good by having 	4	<p>4 marks - Response demonstrates good knowledge and understanding of psychological concepts/theory. Valid explanation that effectively addresses the question are highly skilled and shows good understanding. Clear and detailed justification given in reference to the source.</p> <p>3 marks - Response demonstrates reasonable knowledge and understanding of psychological concepts/theory. Valid explanation that effectively addresses the question are competent and understanding is reasonable. Attempt to justify answer in reference to the source but could be expressed more clearly.</p> <p>2 marks - Response demonstrates limited relevant knowledge and understanding of psychological concepts/theory. Some limited explanation that addresses the question are made but are only partially/vaguely justified in reference to the source.</p> <p>1 mark - Response demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding of psychological concepts/theory that is only partially relevant to the question. Basic or no justification from the source.</p> <p>0 marks – No creditworthy response</p> <p><i>Candidates can talk about any psychological reason that people made the behavioural change detailed in the source. The question requires candidates to apply psychological knowledge that will have accumulated – no specific theory /</i></p>

		<p>fun. Some theorists suggest that laughter and humour are instinctive coping mechanisms that help people deal with the struggles and turbulence of life and therefore when faced with the possibility of climbing stairs that are also a piano people may feel driven to make a change to their normal routine of taking the escalator.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other appropriate response 		<p><i>concept needs to be mentioned but the candidate must talk about psychological theories / concepts and not just draw on common sense arguments. The answer must also be linked to the behavioural change detailed in the source.</i></p> <p><i>The source evidence should be used to support the answer, not be the focus of the response</i></p>
7	(d)	<p>Choose one of the below behaviours:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People not recycling • People regularly eating unhealthy foods • Students not attending lessons • People not keeping to the speed limit • Bullying at school <p>Using your knowledge of psychology, suggest how you could encourage a positive change to your chosen behaviour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates may make references to various ways that a positive behavioural change could be encouraged. • Implementing rewards / punishments are likely to be the most common suggestion / s made e.g. Making recycling into a game, reduced insurance fees for keeping to speed limit • Incentives for positive change / encouraging fun as is done in the source material may also be suggested • There must be a description of how the change will be implemented 	6	<p>5 – 6 marks Good knowledge and understanding of how a positive change could be encouraged. Good application of psychological knowledge and good description of <u>how</u> change could be implemented to encourage a positive change.</p> <p>Application of psychological knowledge is clear</p> <p>3 – 4 marks Reasonable knowledge and understanding of how a positive change could be encouraged. Reasonable application of psychological knowledge and reasonable description of <u>how</u> change could be implemented to encourage a positive change..</p> <p>There is some evidence of psychological knowledge but may not be explicit</p> <p>1 – 2 marks Limited knowledge and understanding of how a positive change could be encouraged. Limited application of psychological knowledge and limited description of <u>how</u> change could be implemented to encourage a positive</p>

	<p>Possible answer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Motorists who are not keeping to the speed limit could be punished and motorists who are keeping to the speed limit rewarded alongside this punishment (operant conditioning). Any motorist who breaks the speed limit who is caught doing so must pay a fine – this would be issued by law enforcement officers and speed cameras. This fine (or a portion of it) is then put into a lottery fund. All motorists who are not breaking the speed limit are then entered in to a lottery and have a chance to win the fees paid by the speeding motorists. They would need to evidence that they have not broken to speed limit to be entered – in car cameras / speed cameras could be used for this also. This should incentivise people not to break the speed limit (change their behaviour) 	<p>change.</p> <p>Limited evidence of psychological knowledge</p> <p>0 marks – No creditworthy response</p> <p><i>Can be a breadth or depth answer</i></p> <p><i>Answers may take the form of a bulleted list or other relevant staged answer but it should be clear how the change could be implemented / encouraged</i></p> <p><i>One or more ways may be suggested</i></p> <p><i>Look for what the candidate is suggesting and how they will make that happen</i></p>
--	--	--

7	(e)	<p>Evaluate the suggestions you made in 7(d).</p> <p>Evaluation may refer to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriateness • Effectiveness • Difficulties in implementing changes • Difficulty monitoring the change • Funding issues • Practical implications / issues • Ethical considerations • Adherence 	8	<p>7– 8 marks – Response demonstrates good evaluation that is relevant to the demand of the question. Evaluation/argument is coherently presented with clear understanding of the points raised. Evaluation is highly skilled. Understanding, expression and use of psychological terminology are good.</p> <p>A range (two or more) of appropriate evaluation points are considered. The evaluation points are in context and supported by relevant evidence of the description given in 7d / the source material.</p> <p>5 – 6 marks – Response demonstrates reasonable evaluation that is mainly relevant to the demand of the question. Evaluation is mainly coherently presented with reasonable understanding of the points raised. Understanding, expression and use of psychological terminology are reasonable.</p> <p>A range (two or more) of appropriate evaluation points are considered. The evaluation points are mainly in context and supported by some relevant evidence of the description given in 7d / the source material</p> <p>3 – 4 marks – Response demonstrates limited evaluation that is sometimes relevant to the demand of the question. Evaluation/argument lacks clear structure/organisation and has limited understanding of the points raised. Understanding, expression and use of psychological terminology are limited.</p> <p>The evaluation points are occasionally in context and supported by relevant evidence of the description given in 7d / the source material</p>
---	-----	--	---	---

				<p>1 – 2 marks – Response demonstrates basic evaluation that is rarely relevant to the demand of the question. Evaluation/argument lacks clear structure / organisation and has basic understanding of the points raised. Understanding, expression and use of psychological terminology are basic.</p> <p>The evaluation points are often not in context / not contextualised throughout. The information is supported by limited relevant evidence of the description given in 7d / the source material</p> <p>0 marks – No creditworthy response</p> <p><i>Answers must be contextualised throughout to access the top band</i></p> <p><i>A clear understanding of evaluation issues must be shown to gain access to the top band (in other words the strength/weakness must be clearly explained as to why it is a good or bad thing)</i></p>
--	--	--	--	---

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

