GCE

Psychology

H167/02: Psychological themes through core studies

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

Mark Scheme for June 2019

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 2019

Annotations

Annotation	Meaning
?	Unclear
AE	Attempts evaluation
BOD	Benefit of doubt
CONT	Context
✗	Cross
EVAL	Evaluation
—	Extendable horizontal line
~~	Extendable horizontal wavy line
IRRL	Significant amount of material which doesn't answer the question
NAQ	Not answered question
RES	Good use of resources
✓	Tick
✓+	Development of point
^	Omission mark

Question			Answer	Mark	Guidance
1	(a)		**Describe the background to Milgram's study into obedience.** **Possible content:** • From 1933-45 millions of innocent people were slaughtered on command – such inhumane actions could only be carried out on a massive scale because large numbers of people obeyed. • For many people, obedience is such an ingrained behavioural tendency that it will override training in ethics, empathy and moral values. • When given extreme commands by legitimate authority figures, subordinates adopt an agentic state where they become an instrument for carrying out another's wishes. • The adoption of the agentic state can account for horrific acts committed in the name of obedience, e.g. atrocities of WWII, the Balkans conflicts, the atrocities of Rwanda. <u>Examples of a 4-mark answer</u> Throughout history, there have been many atrocities which have resulted in mass genocide and these often rely on people obeying the orders of others (1). For many people, obedience to authority is so ingrained that it happens without question – even if it goes against personal morals and ethics (1). People given extreme commands almost seem to enter an agentic state where they deny responsibility for their actions (1). The aim of Milgram's study was to investigate the process of obedience by testing how far an individual will go in obeying an authority figure, even when the command breaches the moral code that an individual should not hurt another person against his will (1).	4	**3-4 marks** for a detailed and accurate description of the background to the study that demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of the subsequent aim of the investigation N.B. For full marks the response must include reference to the Holocaust/Nazi behaviour during WW2/war (1), to obedience/following commands/through control (1), from an authority figure (1), even though the demands were immoral/unethical/destructive (1). **1-2 marks** for a brief or vague description of the background to the study which may contain some inaccuracies or irrelevancies. **0 marks** – no creditworthy response. NB: If the candidate merely refers to Milgram's aim without any reference to the background, only 1 mark can be awarded.

			During WW2 millions of innocent people were systematically slaughtered (1) on command from the Nazis/Hitler (1). Milgram wanted to investigate the process of obedience by testing how far an individual will go in obeying an authority figure (1) when the command breaches moral and ethical codes (1).		
1	**(b)**	**(i)**	**Describe the sample used in Bocchiaro et al.'s study into whistleblowing.** **Possible features:** • University/undergraduate students ('students' alone is not creditworthy). • University based in Amsterdam/Netherlands/VU University. • Total of 149 used/160 volunteers but 11 dropped out. • Volunteer/self-selecting sample. • (96) women, (53) men (accept males and females). • Mean age = 20.8 years. • 138 comparison students.	2	**2 marks** for a detailed and accurate description of the sample including at least two features. **1 mark** for a brief or vague description of the sample including one feature. There may be some inaccuracy. N.B. References to those used in the pilot studies are not creditworthy. **0 marks** – no creditworthy response.
1	**(b)**	**(ii)**	**Outline one way in which Bocchiaro et al.'s study showed sampling bias.** **Possible examples of bias:** • Selection bias. • Gender bias. • Age bias. • Cultural bias. • Intellectual bias. • Occupation bias. <u>Examples of a 1-mark answer</u> • The study was gender biased (1). • The study was only carried out in the Netherlands	2	**2 marks** for a clearly identifiable and relevant type of bias outlined in the context of this study, e.g. reference to the Netherlands, specific ages or numbers of participants. **1 mark** for a vague response or for a clearly identifiable type of bias which has not been contextualised, e.g. all participants were students in the same university so the sample is unlikely to be representative of the wider population because they are all of a similar age / participants were all students from the same university, therefore their ages were similar and they were from the same area, meaning the results of this study were less generalisable: bias = age/culture but the context is very vague and could apply to other studies, e.g. Loftus & Palmer.

			(1). <u>Examples of a 2-mark answer</u> • The study was gender biased towards female participants (1) which meant that obedience levels did not fully represent male's behaviour (1). • There may have been a selection bias (1) as the kind of people prepared to take part in a psychology experiment may be more confident than average which may affect their preparedness to 'blow the whistle' (1). • The average age of the sample was low (1) which made it hard to make generalisations about how obedient older adults may be when put in the same situation as these young students (1).		**0 marks** – no creditworthy response.
2			**Explain one similarity between Loftus & Palmer's study into eyewitness testimony and Grant et al.'s study into context-dependent memory.** **Possible similarities:** • Use of experiment. • Use of laboratory. • The experimental design. • Recall tested through self-report/both used questionnaires. • Delay of recall. • Use of quantitative data. • Both have practical applications. <u>Example of a 4-mark answer</u> One similarity is the use of the independent measures design (1) as *both* studies allocated different	4	**4 marks** – for a clear response which: • identifies a similarity, • further outlines that similarity, • illustrates the similarity with reference to Loftus & Palmer's study, • illustrates the similarity with reference to Grant et al.'s study. **3 marks** for a vague response with the *all* of the above points or for a clear response with *three* of the points. **2 marks** for a vague response with *three* of the above points or for a clear response with *two* of the points. **1 mark** for a vague response with *two* of the above points *or* for a clear response with the difference identified/implied. **0 marks** – no creditworthy response. NB: (i) Any references to both studies being concerned with memory <u>distortion</u> are not creditworthy.

			participants to the different conditions being tested (1). For example, in one of Loftus & Palmer's experiments, participants were questioned using one of five words (e.g. hit, smashed, etc.) but no more than one (1). In Grant et al.'s experiment, participants were divided into matching or mismatching conditions when their recall was tested (1).		(ii) Any reference to both studies using an opportunity sample are not creditworthy.
3			**Outline one way in which Chaney et al. followed ethical considerations in their Funhaler study.** **Possible ways:** • Informed consent from parents. • Confidentiality – participant details not shared when study published. • Right to withdraw from study (parents). • The Funhaler made available to control group at the end. • Reduces the likelihood of stress/psychological harm as children participated in their own homes. <u>Examples of a 1-mark answer</u> • They respected confidentiality. • The Funhaler was made available to all children. <u>Examples of a 2-mark answer</u> • Children were only used once informed consent (1) had been received from their parents (1). • Participants' health and well-being was considered (1) by ensuring the Funhaler was made available to all children once its success had been established (1).	2	**1 mark** for demonstrating knowledge of a relevant ethical consideration. **1 mark** for outlining this consideration in the context of Chaney et al.'s study.
4	**(a)**		**Sperry carried out a study into split-brain patients.** **Identify the apparatus used in this study.**	2	**2 marks** for naming both apparatus used. **1 mark** for naming one of the apparatus used**.**

			Apparatus: • Tachistoscope/projector **and** (translucent) screen. • Objects for visual/tactile tests.		**0 marks** – no creditworthy response, e.g. reference to just screen/projector/computer (screen), images flashed on screen. N.B. It is permissible to describe the tachistoscope rather than name it.
4	**(b)**		**Casey et al. carried out a study into neural correlates of delay of gratification.** **Outline one way in which the researchers' procedure increased the reliability of their study.** **Possible answers:** • Use of participants for both conditions ('hot' and 'cool'), i.e. repeated measures. • Use of standardised self-control scales. • Timing of presentation of faces. • Order of presentation of faces. • Use of programmed laptop computers. • Use of same imaging equipment (fMRI)/use of scientific equipment (fMRI). • Electronic response pad for reaction times. • Conducted in a laboratory under controlled conditions. <u>Example of a 1- mark response</u> The self-control scales used to categorise participants had been standardised (1). <u>Example of 2-mark answer</u> All participants were tested using the same fMRI equipment (1) to ensure consistency in measurement (1).	3	**3 marks** for a clear response which identifies a relevant way the study addressed the issue of reliability, outlines how/why it did and demonstrates an understanding of reliability in the process. **2 marks** for a vague response with all three of the above features or for a clear response with two of the features. **1 mark** for identifying a relevant way the study addressed the issue of reliability. **0 marks** – no creditworthy response. N.B. If the answer just demonstrates an understanding of the term reliability but not in the context of Casey et al.'s study, then award 1 mark maximum.

			Example of 3-mark answer The faces were presented following standardised times (1) otherwise there timing of presentation would have been an extraneous variable between participants and conditions (1) meaning performance could have been affected by the task itself rather than whether somebody was a high or low delayer (1).		
5	**(a)**		**Freud used the case study method in his research.** **Describe how he used this method in his study of Little Hans.** **Possible definition of case study:** A method which focuses on one individual or one group in order to investigate the subject matter in some depth (qualitative data)/a method which investigates unique behaviours that are not often available to study. Example of a 1-mark answer Freud only studied the one boy. Example of a 2-mark answer Case studies focus on unusual individuals (1) in this example one boy with an extreme fear of horses (1). Case studies often focus on just one individual (1). Here Freud only studies a 5-year-old boy/Little Hans (from Austria) (1). Example of a 3-mark answer The case study method is a method that investigates, in depth (1), an individual or a small group of people (1). Freud studied Little Hans in depth through regular and detailed correspondence	3	**3 marks** for a detailed and accurate description of the case study method (at least two features) and for effectively applying its features to Freud's study of Little Hans. **2 marks** for an accurate description of the case study method (at least two features) not in context **or** a reasonable description of the case study method (one feature) supported by a vague attempt to apply its features to Freud's study of Little Hans. **1 mark** for identifying a feature of the case study method, which is not in the context of Freud's study. **0 marks** – no creditworthy response, e.g. references/descriptions of longitudinal studies, mere descriptions of how data was gathered. NB: Mere reference to 'Little Hans' without additional information is not creditworthy as this is in the strap line.

			with the boy's father. This gave a thorough account of Hans' experience of a phobia of horses (1).		
5	**(b)**		**Baron-Cohen et al. used the experimental method in their study of autism.** **Explain one strength of using this method in this study.** **Possible strength:** • High levels of control. • Objectivity. • Reliability. • Ability to establish cause and effect. • Scientific value. • Easy to replicate. • A quasi experiment was used so the IV did not have to be manipulated, making the study ethical. • Experiments usually gather quantitative data which is easy to analyse so similarities/differences between groups of participants can be identified. <u>Example of a 1-mark response</u> Baron-Cohen had good control of extraneous variables (1). <u>Example of a 2-mark response</u> Baron-Cohen et al. were able to reliably establish the effect (1) of the autism on an individual's theory of mind by comparing this group with others (1). <u>Example of a 3-mark response</u> The experimental method is objective (1) so that there	3	**3 marks** for a clear response that identifies a relevant strength of the experimental method with the implications considered in the context of the study. **2 marks** for a response that identifies a relevant strength of the experimental method linked to the study. **1 mark** for identifying a relevant strength, i.e. not contextualised to Baron-Cohen et al.'s study. **0 marks** – no creditworthy response. NB: References to a laboratory setting are not creditworthy as some participants were tested in their own homes, some tested in the researchers' clinic and some in the researchers' laboratory.

			was little opportunity for the researchers to interpret results (1) as performance was measured strictly through the number of correctly named emotions displayed in the Eye Task (1).		

Question			Answer	Mark	Guidance
6	(a)		**Outline the defining principles and concepts of the area of individual differences.** **Possible content:** • Individuals as unique/everyone behaves differently. • Adopting an idiographic approach. • Understanding differences. • Focus on personality. • Belief in free will. • It supports both sides of the nature/nurture debate.	4	**3-4 marks** for a *detailed*, accurate outline of the individual differences area which includes at *least two* defining principles or concepts. **1-2 marks** for a *brief or vague* outline of the individual differences area which includes at *least two* defining principles or concepts, **or** for a clear and accurate outline of *one* defining principle or concept. There may be some muddling or inaccuracy. 0 marks – no creditworthy response.
6	(b)		**Describe one strength of using the individual differences area to explain behaviour.** **Possible strengths:** • Optimistic – potential for change • Success in treating individuals so has practical applications. • Avoids over-generalisations • Focused on understanding individuals (through the use of case studies). • Recognises the importance of subjective experience in studying behaviours • Combines/uses both quantitative and qualitative data so gives objective differences and some insight/explanation into behaviour as it. • The area is holistic as it can provide a variety of explanations for behaviours. • It allows for the use of scientific methodology.	3	**3 marks** for a clearly described, well developed and relevant strength that is related to the individual differences area (not specific studies). This may be illustrated through appropriate evidence. **2 marks** for a clearly described and relevant strength that is related to the individual differences area (not specific studies). This may be illustrated through appropriate evidence. **1 mark** for a briefly stated strength or one that is muddled. **0 marks** – no creditworthy response.
6	(c)		**Describe one weakness of using the individual differences area to explain behaviour.**	3	**3 marks** for a clearly described, well developed and relevant weakness that is related to the individual differences area (not specific studies). This may be illustrated through appropriate evidence.

			Possible weaknesses: • Too complex to study people reliably. • Cannot establish causal relationships/difficult to test. • Unable to generalise. • Can lack objectivity. • Makes people responsible for actions/ignores determinism. • Research could raise ethical concerns. • Research can be socially sensitive.		**2 marks** for a clearly described and relevant weakness that is related to the individual differences area (not specific studies). This may be illustrated through appropriate evidence. **1 mark** for a briefly stated weakness or one that is muddled. **0 marks** – no creditworthy response.
6	**(d)**		**Outline one application of the individual differences area.** **Possible applications:** • Counselling/client-centred therapy. • Psychoanalysis/psychotherapy. • Intervention strategies, e.g. for children with autism • Education – focusing on the individual. • Personality testing, e.g. as part of selection process in job applications. • Intelligence testing. <u>Example of a 1-mark response</u> Intervention strategies for children with autism (1). Counselling for people with depression (1). <u>Example of a 2-mark response</u> Intervention strategies for children with autism (1), Baron- showed that high-functioning adults with autism have problems when trying to read emotions from eyes so practical ways can be used to help them (1). <u>Example of a 3-mark response</u>	3	**3 marks** for a detailed and accurate outline of a relevant application which is clearly related to at least one of the principles of the individual differences area. **2 marks** for a detailed and accurate outline of a relevant application, not linked to one of the principles of the individual differences area **<u>or</u>** for a brief outline which is clearly related to at least one of the principles of the individual differences area. **1 mark** for identifying an application. **0 marks** – no creditworthy response.

			Intervention strategies for children with autism (1). Baron- showed that high-functioning adults with autism have problems when trying to read emotions from eyes so practical ways can be used to help them (1). Adults on the autistic spectrum can be taught to use different visual and auditory cues, e.g. the mouth and tone of voice, to judge emotions (1).		
6	**(e)**		**Discuss the free will/determinism debate in psychology. Use examples from relevant core studies to support your answer.** **Free will:** The idea that individuals are in control of their destiny and make conscious decisions that affect their behaviour. **Determinism:** The idea that behaviour is determined by forces beyond the individual's control which can be both internal and external. **Possible strengths of free will argument:** • Recognises freedom of choice; gives people responsibility for their actions. • High validity; intuitively right. • Emphasises the value of subjectivity. **Possible weaknesses of free will argument:** • Difficult to test and measure. • Hard to prove – if someone exercises free will then are they just responded to a command to do so (determinism). • Suggests no predictability or patterns to behaviour. **Possible strengths of determinism:** • Able to establish cause and effect. • Allows for prediction and control. • Recognises that people cannot always be held	12	**10-12 marks** for a thorough and balanced discussion that is relevant to the demands of the question. Arguments are coherently presented with clear understanding of the points raised. A range of points **(at least four)** are considered and are well developed as part of the discussion. There is evidence of valid conclusions that summarise issues very well. *Relevant evidence is used to very good effect* to support the points being made. There is consistent use of psychological terminology, and well-developed line of reasoning which is logically structured. Information presented is appropriate and substantiated. **7-9 marks** for a good and reasonably balanced discussion that is mainly relevant to the demands of the question. Arguments are presented with reasonably clear understanding of the points raised. A range of points **(at least three)** are considered and some are developed as part of the discussion. There is evidence of valid conclusions that summarise issues well. *Relevant evidence is used mostly to good effect* to support the points being made. There is good use of psychological terminology in a response with reasonable structure. Information presented is largely appropriate. **4-6 marks** for a limited discussion that is has some relevancy to the demands of the question. Arguments are presented but with limited understanding of the points raised. **Two or more** points are considered and may be developed as part of the discussion. There is

			responsible for their actions. **Possible weaknesses of determinism:** • If everything has a cause then there is a question about where it begins. • Cannot be disproved as it can always be argued that a cause has not yet been discovered. • Treats people like 'machines' that are programmed and cannot exercise free will. **Examples of research supporting free will:** • Bocchiaro et al. (2012) showed some individuals were able to exercise free will and whistleblow although there is an argument that this was *determined* by faith. • Bandura et al. (1961) demonstrated that not all behaviours are automatically imitated suggesting children make choices about who they model and what they model. • Milgram (1963) showed that not all participants obeyed the authority figure by shocking the learner to 450 volts. 14 participants dropped out at some stage between 300 and 450 volts demonstrating their free will not to harm another person. **Examples of research supporting determinism:** • Bocchiaro et al. (2012) showed that people often obey in ways that they would not predict when faced with certain situations. • Grant et al. (1998) demonstrated that level of recall is determined by context. • Chaney et al. (2004) demonstrated the effect of reinforcement on compliance. • Casey et al. (2011) investigated the idea that the ability to delay gratification is biologically determined. • Freud (1909) showed there was a role for psychic determinism is explaining atypical behaviour.		evidence of attempts to draw conclusions. *Some relevant* evidence is used as part of the discussion. There is some use of psychological terminology in a response with limited structure. Information presented is sometimes appropriate. **1-3 marks** for a basic discussion that is rarely relevant to the demands of the question. Arguments are presented but with weak understanding of the points raised. **One or a limited range** of points are considered with no real development. Relevant evidence is weak or *not apparent at all*. There is limited or no use of psychological terminology and structure is poor. Information presented is rarely appropriate. **0 marks** – no creditworthy response. N.B. Even if the candidate raises the required number of points for a particular mark band, this does not automatically place the response in that band. The overall quality of the response and the other requirements for each band must be considered. N.B. Candidates who only describe freewill and determinism and illustrate each explanation for behaviour with appropriate evidence can gain a maximum of **6 marks**: To access the higher marking bands the strengths and/or weaknesses of determinism and/or freewill need to be considered.

Question			Answer	Mark	Guidance
7	(a)		**Outline the behaviourist perspective in psychology and briefly explain how it applies to this article.** **Possible content for description of perspective:** • Nurture over nature. • Concept of 'blank slate' at birth. • Effect of environment (linked to learning). • Role of learning. • Classical conditioning; learning by association; stimulus-response psychology. • Operant conditioning; learning by consequence; positive reinforcement; negative reinforcement; punishment. • Observational learning/SLT. • Mind as 'black box'. <u>1-mark example:</u> The behaviourist perspective is concerned with how people learn behaviours (1). <u>2-mark example:</u> The behaviourist perspective is concerned with how people learn behaviours (1). People can learn behaviours through the processes of classical conditioning or operant conditioning (1). <u>3-mark example</u> The behaviourist perspective is concerned with how people learn behaviours (1). People can learn behaviours through the processes of classical conditioning or operant conditioning (1). If a behaviour is learned through operant conditioning the individual will learn through the consequences of their actions – pleasant/good consequences will lead to the behaviour	5	For outline of the perspective: **3 marks** for an accurate outline which identifies key features of the perspective. Breadth or depth. **1-2 marks** for a brief or vague outline which identifies at least one key feature. There may be some muddling of ideas or inaccuracies. Breadth or depth. **0 marks** – no creditworthy response. For application to the article: **2 marks** a relevant link which is clearly explained. **1 mark** for a brief link which is not well explained. **0 marks –** no creditworthy response.

			being repeated whereas unpleasant/bad consequences are seen as punishments which usually result in the behaviour not being repeated (1). **How the perspective relates to the article:** • Customers can learn to avoid overspending. • Effects of experiencing shock. • Shock as unconditioned stimulus and pain as unconditioned response. • Going overdrawn as conditioned stimulus. • Shock as punishment reducing overspending. • Managing money reinforced – shock avoided. • Managing money not a conscious cognitive process. <u>1-mark examples:</u> • Customers who overspend could soon get an electric shock to warn them they have gone into debt (1). • Customers can learn to avoid overspending. <u>2-mark example:</u> • Customers who overspend could soon get an electric shock to warn them they have gone into debt (1). The electric shock – "zap" - will be an unpleasant consequence of/punishment for overspending that will make the individual not buy things they cannot afford, preventing them going into debt (1). • Customers can learn to avoid overspending (1). The "zap" from the wristband received by the individual when they go overdrawn and get into financial trouble will be unpleasant/ will serve as a punishment and teach them that they should not buy things they cannot afford (1).		
7	**(b)**		**Briefly describe two psychological issues raised by**	4	For each issue;

			this article. **Possible issues:** • The ethic of protection of participant (physical/psychological harm) – *through use of an electric shock.* • The ethic of consent – *customers would not be made to sign up.* • The long term effects of punishment – *negative experiences with money rather than positive.* • The concept of denial – *people don't want to check their accounts.* • Dealing with anxiety/fear – *is this the best way to deal with fear of looking at account?* • The impact of technology on people's lives – *taking away responsibility for managing money.* • Alienation of people from society – *managing money without having to lift a finger.* • Issues of generalisability – *research only carried out on young people.*		**1 mark** for knowledge of a relevant psychological issue. **1 mark** for applying this knowledge to the article. N.B. It is not possible to credit the application mark without the knowledge mark otherwise the candidate is simply quoting from the article with no evidence of understanding. N.B. Ethical concerns can be credited more than once if the candidate refers to different issues, e.g. harm and consent. N.B. The issue raised must have an identifiable link to psychology.
7	**(c)**		**Using your knowledge of psychology, suggest <u>two</u> ways in which young people could be encouraged to save money.** **Possible suggestions:** • Use of positive reinforcement (rewards), e.g. higher interest rates, gifts for saving so much, etc. • Use punishments, e.g. lower/no interest rates. • Vicarious reinforcement, e.g. articles/blogs of people who have benefitted from their savings (buying a house). • Modelling, e.g. money saving programmes, lessons/courses aimed at young people. • Establishing social norms, e.g. make saving socially desirable through Government sponsored campaigns.	8	**7-8 marks** for a high standard of knowledge and understanding of how the two ways could be used to encourage saving in young people. 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. **5-6 marks** for a good standard of knowledge and understanding of how the two ways could be used to encourage saving in young people. 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. **3-4 marks** for reasonable knowledge and understanding of how the two ways could be used to

			• Learning how to defer gratification, e.g. through lessons at school. NB: The two suggestions may use the same principles (e.g. rewarding with higher interest, rewarding with gifts) but this is likely to limit the marks available on both parts (c) and (d) as details and evaluation will overlap.		encourage saving in young people. There is *some* application of psychological knowledge within these suggestions. The suggestions are partially accurate. **1-2 marks** for basic knowledge and understanding of how the two ways could be used to encourage saving in young people. There is *very weak/no* application of psychological knowledge within these suggestions. The suggestions may have limited accuracy. **0 marks** – No creditworthy response. 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. N.B. The suggestions must be feasible.
7	**(d)**		**Evaluate the suggestions you have made in part(c) with reference to issues and debates you have studied in psychology.** **Potential issues for evaluation:** • Assumptions relating to nature/nurture. • Assumptions relating to freewill/determinism. • Assumptions relating to reductionism/holism. • Assumptions relating individual/situational explanations. • Usefulness. • Ethical considerations. • Social sensitivity. • Psychology as a science. • Ethnocentrism. • Validity. • Reliability.	8	**7-8 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 **(at least two)** of appropriate evaluation points relating to issues and debates are considered. The evaluation points are in context and supported by relevant evidence of the description given in 7(c). *Both* suggestions are evaluated. **5-6 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 **(at least two)** of appropriate evaluation points relating to issues and debates are considered. *Both* suggestions are evaluated. The evaluation points are mainly in context and supported by relevant evidence of the description given in 7(c). **3-4 marks** for demonstrating limited evaluation **(at one**

					point) that is sometimes relevant to the demand of the question. The arguments may lack clear structure/organisation and show limited understanding of the points raised in relation to issues and debates. The candidate may evaluate only *one* suggestion. The evaluation points are occasionally in context and supported by relevant evidence of the description given in 7(c). **1-2 marks** for demonstrating basic evaluation **(one weak point)** that is rarely/barely relevant to the demand of the question. Any arguments lacks clear structure/organisation and show a very basic/no understanding of the points raised in relation to issues and debates. Only *one* suggestion is likely to be evaluated. The evaluation points are not necessarily in context and are not supported by relevant evidence of the description given in 7(c). **0 marks** – No creditworthy response. N.B. If only one suggestion is evaluated in relation to issues and debates then a maximum of 4 marks to be awarded. Award marks in line with the descriptors above. If the candidate merely evaluates their 7(c) suggestions without making any reference to issues and debates no marks can be awarded. Any issues and debates must be clearly identified to gain credit. N.B. Even if the candidate raises the required number of points for a particular mark band, this does not automatically place the response in that band. The overall quality of the response and the other requirements for each band must be considered.

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
The Triangle Building
Shaftesbury Road
Cambridge
CB2 8EA

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; The Triangle Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge, CB2 8EA
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity

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

© OCR 2019