

GCE

Psychology

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

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

Mark Scheme for June 2016

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 2016

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 |

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. |

| Section A | | | |
|-----------|--|-------|---|
| Question | Answer Guidance | Marks | Awarding Marks Guidance |
| 1 | <p>(a)</p> <p>In Milgram's study of obedience, the majority of participants reached the most severe shock available on the shock generator. Outline one reason to explain the high amounts of obedience observed. [2]</p> <p>Possible reasons;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level of (legitimate) authority • Prestigious setting • Commitment to study • Payment for participation • No obvious point at which to stop • Denial of responsibility • Use of prods <p>2 mark responses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • e.g. The participants thought the study was for a worthy purpose - advancement of knowledge about learning and memory (1) and therefore felt obliged to continue. (1) • e.g. The participant had volunteered to take part (1) – to discontinue administering shocks the experiment is a denial of this initial commitment. (1) • e.g. The participant believed the allocation of roles was due to chance (1) so they obeyed due to feeling the drawing of lots was fair. (1) • e.g. The experimenter was perceived to have legitimate authority (1) so participants were fearful of the consequences of not obeying. (1) <p>1 mark responses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • e.g. the study took place in a prestigious university • e.g. the experimenter kept using prods • e.g. the participant had no past experiences to guide his behaviour • e.g. they assumed the victim was still willing to 'play the game' | 2 | <p>2 marks – An accurate and detailed description of why they obeyed as detailed in the answer guidance</p> <p>1 mark – Partial or vague answer not fully described OR answer not linked to study.</p> <p>0 marks – No creditworthy response</p> <p><i>The candidate must make it clear why the reason they give would have explained obedience, they must go beyond merely identifying a reason for full marks.</i></p> <p><i>Reference the original study to check candidate's answers where needed.</i></p> <p><i>The answer given may not be limited to those given in the guidance but the reason must be a factor that would have increased obedience and not simply a feature of the study.</i></p> |

| Question | Answer Guidance | Marks | Awarding Marks Guidance |
|----------|--|-------|--|
| 1 | <p>(b) From Bocchiaro et al's study into disobedience and whistleblowing: Identify two quantitative findings. [2]</p> <p>Any two of the following:</p> <p>Of all the respondents in the comparison group:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only 3.6% indicated they would obey the experimenter. (Accept 3-4%) • Most believed they would be either disobedient (31.9% - accept 30-33%) or whistleblowers (64.5% - accept 60-70%). • When asked to predict the behaviour of other typical students at their university, only 18.8% (accept 18-20%) thought an average student at VU University would obey, while they believed most other students would either disobey (43.9% - 40-45%) or whistleblow (37.3% accept 35-40%). <p>Of the 149 (accept 140-150) participants in the experimental situation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 76.5% (accept 70-80%) obeyed the experimenter ($n = 114$ – accept 110-120) • 14.1% (14-15%) disobeyed ($n = 21$ – accept 20-22) and 9.4% (accept 9-10%) ($n = 14$ accept 13-15) blew the whistle • Among whistleblowers 6.0% (accept 5-7%) ($n = 9$ – accept 8-10) had written a message (Anonymous whistleblowers) and 3.4% (accept 3-4%) ($n = 5$ – accept 4-6) had refused to do so (Open whistleblowers) • Other appropriate quantitative data (Mean / standard deviation figures / statistical test results). | 2 | <p>2 marks – Two quantitative findings are correctly identified OR two quantitative findings are clearly outlined in context without specifically quoting figures.</p> <p>1 mark – One quantitative finding is correctly identified OR one quantitative finding is clearly outlined in context without specifically quoting figures.</p> <p>0 marks – No creditworthy response i.e. qualitative findings are referred to OR the quantitative findings are not within the accepted range (see opposite).</p> <p><i>Reference the guides/original study to check candidate's answers where needed.</i></p> <p><i>N.B. The emphasis is on identifying patterns in findings not simply quoting figures.</i></p> <p><i>If a candidate has accurately outlined a quantitative finding without identifying specific figures i.e. stating "the majority of" or "very few" and it is appropriately contextualised (compared to another group) with a clear knowledge and understanding shown then this can be awarded 2 marks.</i></p> <p><i>If a candidate quotes findings outside of the accepted range but identifies a correct pattern – e.g. the majority (90%) were obedient this is still creditworthy.</i></p> <p><i>If a candidate uses raw number (e.g. 114 obeyed) to give credit this needs to be compared with another raw number e.g. 114 out of 149 obeyed or 114 obeyed while 14 blew the whistle.</i></p> <p><i>Candidates may have calculated their own means for some data sets; this should be credited if calculated correctly using data contained in the original study. Please refer to original study to check a candidate's response.</i></p> |

| Question | Answer Guidance | Marks | Awarding Marks Guidance |
|----------|---|-------|---|
| | (Statistical analysis of) personality characteristics found no patterns in obedience/disobedience/whistle blowing. | | |
| 1 | <p data-bbox="235 312 280 344">(c)</p> <p data-bbox="327 312 1155 376">To what extent does the study by Bocchiaro et al change our understanding of responses to people in authority? [3]</p> <p data-bbox="327 408 837 440">Possible changes to understanding;</p> <ul data-bbox="376 448 1088 655" style="list-style-type: none"> • How the complexity of social situation influences obedience • How perceptions of obedience do not match reality • How dispositional may affect obedience • How people respond to the chance to challenge an unjust system (whistle blowing) <p data-bbox="327 687 568 719">3 mark response</p> <ul data-bbox="376 727 1155 927" style="list-style-type: none"> • e.g. Although the study did develop our understanding of obedience to authority in a more complex social situation, more representative of real life than Milgram’s study, the majority of participants still supported the theory that people will obey authority figures, even if the authority is unjust. <p data-bbox="327 959 568 991">2 mark response</p> <ul data-bbox="376 999 1133 1126" style="list-style-type: none"> • e.g. People believed that they would be highly likely to blow the whistle against authorities who were encouraging immoral behaviour but when put in the situation whistle blowing was not common. <p data-bbox="327 1166 582 1198">1 mark responses</p> <ul data-bbox="376 1206 1122 1342" style="list-style-type: none"> • e.g. I understand that people are more obedient than we would like to think • e.g. understanding hasn’t changed as obedience was high in both the classic and contemporary study | 3 | <p data-bbox="1305 312 2143 472">GOOD 3 – Response demonstrates good analysis that is mainly relevant to the question. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise to what extent our understanding of obedience had changed. Argument is highly skilled and shows good understanding.</p> <p data-bbox="1305 512 2051 671">REASONABLE 2 – Response demonstrates reasonable analysis that is partially relevant to the question. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise to what extent our understanding of obedience had changed. Argument is competent and understanding is reasonable.</p> <p data-bbox="1305 711 2130 871">LIMITED 1 – Response demonstrates limited analysis that may be related to the question. Limited but valid conclusions that partially summarise to what extent our understanding of obedience had changed. Argument is basic and understanding is limited.</p> <p data-bbox="1305 911 1787 943">0 marks – No creditworthy response</p> <p data-bbox="1305 983 2143 1182"><i>Responses are likely to refer to changes in our understanding in the context of comparing this study with Milgram’s findings/conclusions, but responses where candidates consider changes within the Bocchiaro et al’s study or in their own understanding having learnt about the study are also creditworthy.</i></p> <p data-bbox="1305 1222 2143 1350"><i>The question asks to what extent so candidates can argue that it does OR does not change our understanding, OR both. Some contemporary studies change our understanding more than others hence the command “to what extent”.</i></p> |

| Question | Answer Guidance | Marks | Awarding Marks Guidance |
|----------|---|-------|---|
| | | | <p><i>Top band answers would make a judgement about the extent to which a change of understanding has occurred and support their argument with supporting evidence from the named study. Pure description of the study does not necessarily indicate change.</i></p> |
| 2 | <p>(a) From Loftus and Palmer's first experiment: Describe one way the information the participants received after viewing the traffic accidents influenced their memory. [2]</p> <p>Ways memory was influenced;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reconstruction of memory • response-bias <p>2 mark responses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • e.g. A subject is uncertain whether to say 30 mph or 40 mph and the verb <i>smashed</i> (1) biases their response (1) towards a higher estimate. • e.g. The verb <i>smashed</i> may distort a subject's memory (1) such that he 'sees' the accident as being more severe than it actually was and therefore estimates a higher MPH speed. (1) <p>1 mark responses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • e.g. participants gave higher speed estimates when questioned using the word 'smashed' • e.g. it caused memory bias | 2 | <p>2 marks – Increasingly detailed and accurate way described about how information received after the traffic accidents can influence our memory as detailed in the answer guidance.</p> <p>1 mark – Partial or vague answer not fully described OR answer not linked to study.</p> <p>0 marks – No creditworthy response.</p> <p><i>Only one of the ways is needed for full marks but the candidate must make it clear what effect the information has on memory.</i></p> <p><i>Context is needed for full marks; context = speed, mph, smashed verb, accident, etc. Referring to memory alone would not be appropriate contextualisation – Loftus and Palmer is not the only study looking at memory and memory is also in the question.</i></p> <p><i>Do check there is a clear reference to a cognitive process/concept before awarding full marks.</i></p> <p><i>If candidate refers to Experiment 2 (e.g. broken glass) rather than Experiment 1 this can still earn a mark if the general effect on memory is correct. However, the context will be wrong so both marks cannot be awarded.</i></p> |

| Question | Answer Guidance | Marks | Awarding Marks Guidance |
|----------|---|-------|---|
| 2 (b) | <p>In Grant et al's study on context-dependent memory: Describe two ways the assessment of memory was standardised. [4]</p> <p>Possible ways;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • same background noise in study context • same background noise in test context • same material studied • same multiple-choice questions • same short answer questions • order of memory tests was the same each time • standardised instructions • same duration of break between phases • all participants wore headphones <p>2 mark responses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • e.g. All participants in the noisy condition (1) heard the same background noise (1) whilst studying the material to be memorised. • e.g. All participants were given the same to-be-studied material to memorise (1) - an article (1) on psychoimmunology. • e.g. Each participant had to wear headphones (1) in both the study and test phase. (1) • e.g. Every participant was asked the same sixteen multiple-choice (1) questions. (1) • e.g. The short answer test (1) was always administered first. (1) • e.g. Standardised instructions were used (1) making reference to a class project. (1) <p>1 mark responses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • e.g. Every participant was asked the same questions • e.g. All participants wore headphones. • e.g. All participants' recall was tested in the same way. | 4 | <p>2 marks – Accurate way that the assessment of memory was standardised is given as detailed in the answer guidance.</p> <p>1 mark – Partial / vague answer OR answer not linked to study.</p> <p>0 marks – No creditworthy response</p> <p><i>Responses may refer to standardisation across conditions (e.g. same multiple choice questions given to all participants) or within conditions (e.g. every participant in the noisy condition heard same background noise)</i></p> <p><i>N.B. Participants did not wear exactly the same headphones so this is not a creditworthy example of standardisation.</i></p> |

| Question | Answer Guidance | Marks | Awarding Marks Guidance |
|----------|--|-------|--|
| 3 | <p>From Bandura et al's study into the transmission of aggression: Describe how the observation method was used. [4]</p> <p>Possible features of observation;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • use of structured observation through behavioural categories – imitative aggression, partially imitative aggression, non-imitative physical and verbal aggression, non-aggressive behaviour • categories tallied providing quantitative data • use of covert observation through one way mirror • use of time sampling – responses recorded every 5 seconds for 20 minutes • two observers used • non-participant observation as children observed from a different viewpoint • controlled observation as room set up with a number of different toys <p>4 mark response</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • e.g. The observers rated the child's behaviour in terms of pre-determined response categories (event sampling) whilst sitting in an adjoining observation room and watching the child through a one-way mirror (recordings also taken to observe at a later time). Responses were recorded every 5 seconds for 20 minutes (time sampling) in the following categories and provided an aggression score as tallies were added up at the end of the observation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Imitative aggression (physical, verbal and non-aggressive speech). (ii) Partially imitative aggression. (iii) Non-imitative physical and verbal aggression. (iv) Non-aggressive behaviour. | 4 | <p>4 marks – An increasingly accurate and detailed response clearly showing how observation was used to observe transmission of aggression.</p> <p>3 marks – An accurate response detailing how observation was used showing reasonable knowledge and understanding but may be lacking some detail.</p> <p>2 marks – A limited response detailing how observation was used showing some knowledge and understanding.</p> <p>1 mark – Basic response with no detail showing very limited knowledge and understanding of how observation was used.</p> <p>0 marks – No creditworthy response</p> <p><i>N.B. Not all details are required for full marks.</i></p> <p><i>To access full marks at least one behavioural category must be referred to.</i></p> <p><i>Responses which describe features in a generic way without a clear reference to the details of Bandura's study to be capped at two marks.</i></p> <p><i>Do also credit descriptions of how the observation method was used for the first part of the study where children were observed in the playground.</i></p> |

| Question | Answer Guidance | Marks | Awarding Marks Guidance |
|----------|---|-------|--|
| | <p>3 mark response</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> e.g. Two observers observed behaviour every 5 seconds for 20 minutes in the following categories: Imitative aggression (physical, verbal and non-aggressive speech), partially imitative aggression. non-imitative physical and verbal aggression and non-aggressive behaviour. <p>2 mark responses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> e.g. Observers watched the children through a one-way mirror every 5 seconds for 20 minutes. e.g. Bandura used an observation which was covert, structured, non-participant observation and produced quantitative data. <p>1 mark responses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> e.g. observers watched the children through a one-way mirror e.g. a covert, controlled observation was used | | |
| 4 | <p>Describe one similarity between Casey et al's study on delay of gratification and Sperry's study on the effects of hemisphere disconnection. [4]</p> <p>Possible similarities;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Investigating (regions of) the brain Both from biological area (nature over nurture) Quasi experimental Use of controls High reliability High validity Scientific approach Individual over situation | 4 | <p>4 marks – An appropriate similarity is identified and elaborated and appropriate evidence is given from both of the studies as detailed in the answer guidance.</p> <p>3 marks – An appropriate similarity is identified and elaborated and appropriate evidence is given from one of the studies <i>OR</i> an appropriate similarity is identified (not elaborated) and appropriate evidence is given from both of the studies.</p> <p>2 marks – An appropriate similarity is identified and elaborated but no evidence is provided for either study <i>OR</i> an appropriate similarity is identified (not elaborated) and appropriate evidence is given from one of the studies.</p> <p>1 mark – An appropriate similarity is identified but is not elaborated and no evidence is provided for either study.</p> |

| Question | Answer Guidance | Marks | Awarding Marks Guidance |
|----------|---|-------|--|
| | <p>4 mark response</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> e.g. Both Sperry's study and Casey's study were quasi experiments (1) where the IV was naturally occurring (1). For example Sperry's study was a quasi experiment because the independent variable - having a split brain or not - was not directly manipulated by the researchers (1). Also in Casey's study the independent variable - whether the participant was a high delayer or a low delayer - was naturally occurring (1). <p>3 mark responses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> e.g. Both Sperry and Casey were quasi experiments (1) where the IV not manipulated by the researchers (1). In Sperry having a split brain or not, could not be decided by the researchers (1). e.g. Both Sperry and Casey had IV's that were naturally occurring. (1) In Sperry having a split brain or not, was not manipulated by the researchers (1) and in Casey's study whether the participant was a high delayer or a low delayer was naturally occurring (1). <p>2 mark responses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> e.g. Both Sperry and Casey were quasi experiments (1). In Sperry having a split brain or not, was not manipulated by the researchers (1). <p>1 mark response</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> e.g. Both Sperry and Casey were experiments. (1) | | <p>0 marks – No creditworthy response.</p> <p><i>Elaboration means explaining the similarity in some way rather than merely identifying it so the candidate will show an understanding of what the similarity is / means.</i></p> <p><i>N.B. Sampling technique in both Sperry and Casey is unclear so should not be credited.</i></p> <p><i>N.B. If the biological area is identified as the similarity referring to investigation of the brain when outlining studies would be considered relevant and appropriate.</i></p> |

| Question | Answer Guidance | Marks | Awarding Marks Guidance |
|----------|--|-------|---|
| 5 (a) | <p>From Freud's study of Little Hans: Explain one strength of the way data was gathered in this study. [2]</p> <p>Possible strengths;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • detailed/in-depth data • rich data/insight into participant • high levels of validity <p>2 mark responses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • e.g. Self report was often used so it allowed for lots of detail (1) to be gathered about Hans' fears, dreams, fantasies. (1) • Hans was less likely to be stressed by his father asking questions because he was familiar with him (1) so will have answered willingly. (1) • Little Hans was unaware he was being asked questions to investigate his phobia (1) so he would have answered in an unbiased way (1). <p>1 mark responses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • e.g. Lots of detailed information was able to be gathered. • e.g. The findings represented real-life. | 2 | <p>2 marks – An accurate and detailed response in context of the original study as detailed in the answer guidance.</p> <p>1 mark – Partial or vague answer OR answer not linked to study.</p> <p>0 marks – No creditworthy response.</p> <p><i>Any appropriate strength of the way data was gathered can be credited but it must be fully contextualised in relation to the Freud study to gain 2 marks. Answers must make reference to the way the data was gathered (self-report, interviewing, observation, use of letters) and the context must be directly related to this e.g. a simple reference to Hans is not context enough.</i></p> <p><i>Accept reference to qualitative data being gathered as long as the candidate argues why this is a strength in context of the study.</i></p> <p><i>Accept reference to data being gathered longitudinally as long as the candidate argues why this is a strength in context of the study.</i></p> |

| Question | Answer Guidance | Marks | Awarding Marks Guidance |
|----------|---|-------|---|
| 5 (b) | <p>From the study by Baron Cohen et al on autism in adults:</p> <p>Describe one way the Eyes Task was checked to ensure it was a valid theory of mind test. [2]</p> <p>Ways validity was checked;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • use of Happé’s strange stories task • use of panel of judges <p>2 mark responses;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • e.g. Participants had to complete the Happé’s strange stories task (1) to check there was agreement between both measures (1). • e.g Concurrent validity was established by comparing results from this test (1) and Happé’s strange stories task. (1) • e.g. The target and foil words used to describe the mental state behind each pair of eyes was generated by four judges (1) to ensuring the task was measuring what it claimed to measure. (1) <p>1 mark responses;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • e.g. using Happé’s stories task • e.g. judges checked target words | 2 | <p>2 marks – Accurate description of how the validity of the Eyes Task was checked.</p> <p>1 mark – Some accuracy but lacking detail or is a vague description.</p> <p>0 marks – No creditworthy response.</p> <p><i>Candidates do not need to mention both ways detailed in the answer guidance to gain full marks</i></p> <p><i>Accept reference to concurrent validity but not other types of validity.</i></p> <p><i>Accept references to correlation of scores.</i></p> |

| Section B | | | |
|-----------|---|-------|--|
| Question | Answer Guidance | Marks | Awarding Marks Guidance |
| 6 | <p>(a)</p> <p>Outline one principle or concept of the social area in psychology. [2]</p> <p>Possible principles /concepts;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference to the influence of other people • Reference to the influence of the social situation / social context • Reference to the social environment • Provides deterministic explanation (rather than free will) • Provides reductionist explanation (rather than holistic) • Provides a situational explanation <p>2 mark responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • e.g. Other people and the surrounding environment (1) are major influences on an individual's behaviour, thought processes and emotions (1). • e.g. Attempts to understand how the thoughts and behaviours of individuals are influenced (1) by the actual, imagined or implied presence of others (1). • e.g. Provides a reductionist explanation of behaviour as claims behaviour is mainly influenced (1) by the presence of others (1). <p>1 mark responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • e.g. the social situation influences people • e.g. supports a nurture explanation of behaviour as other people cause people to behave the way they do | 2 | <p>2 marks – Appropriate principle/concept is accurately described and what the influence is upon behaviour / thoughts / emotions. Understanding is clear.</p> <p>1 mark – Appropriate principle or concept is briefly or partially described. Understanding is not fully clear.</p> <p>0 marks – No creditworthy response</p> <p><i>Must clearly be linked to the social area</i> <i>Must clearly make reference to the influence upon thoughts or feelings or behaviours</i></p> <p><i>Do not accept reference to <u>learning</u> from environment/ nurture explanations from the environment as this is the behaviourist perspective.</i></p> |

| Question | Answer Guidance | Marks | Awarding Marks Guidance |
|----------|--|-------|---|
| 6 (b) | <p>Outline how Bocchiaro et al's study links to the social area in psychology. Support your answer with evidence from this study. [3]</p> <p>3 mark responses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> e.g. Bocchiaro et al introduced a new paradigm for investigating the dynamic processes of disobedience between individuals and unjust authority (1). They were interested in investigating how individuals' moral decisions are influenced (1) by others, in this case an authority figure who would put undue pressure on individuals even when not physically present (1). e.g. Bocchiaro looks at the psychosocial processes involved in reporting wrongdoing (1) to higher authorities (1) which is another behavioural option for individuals in the presence of unjust authority figures whose morals may conflict with the majority's (1). e.g. Bocchiaro et al are looking at the social nature of variations in (dis) obedience (1). They used a form of softer aggression than the physical violence paradigm in Milgram's research, and claimed that in modern societies (1) verbal hostility is more typical than is physical aggression in the relationships between individuals and unjust authorities (1). <p>2 mark responses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> e.g. Bocchiaro et al show how whistle blowing may be an option for some people (1) when they perceive the person in authority as making immoral requests (1). e.g. The study showed how other people can make us obey in ways we would not expect to (1) as the reality of social situation is often more demanding than the imagined scenario (1). | 3 | <p>GOOD 3 – Response demonstrates good application of psychological knowledge and understanding. Application will be mainly accurate and relevant. Explicit links are made to how the study supports/fits the features of the area. The response is clearly supported by evidence from the study which relates to both social factors and their influence on behaviour.</p> <p>REASONABLE 2 – Response demonstrates reasonable application of psychological knowledge and understanding. Application will have accuracy and relevance. Partially explicit links are made to how the study supports/fits the features of the social area but lacks some clarity of expression. The response is supported by evidence from the study which relates to both social factors and their influence on behaviour, or focuses on one of these ideas through elaboration.</p> <p>LIMITED 1 – Response demonstrates limited application of psychological knowledge and understanding. A partial link may be made by using evidence from the study that either supports social factors or their influence on behaviour.</p> <p>0 marks – No creditworthy response</p> <p><i>N.B. Marks cannot be awarded for describing the Social area. Candidates must apply the Bocchiaro study to the Social Area to earn credit.</i></p> <p><i>Evidence is needed for full marks but this must go beyond a mere statement of findings. This is likely to be in the form of why the results apply to the Social area.</i></p> |

| Question | Answer Guidance | Marks | Awarding Marks Guidance |
|----------|---|-------|--|
| | <p>1 mark responses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The study shows how it is not easy to whistle blow when under pressure from others. Bocchiaro et al's study suggests that people with authority have a worrying influence over us. | | <p><i>Rule of Thumb</i></p> <p>1 mark for applying social factors (e.g. there was an authority figure present)</p> <p>1 mark for applying influence on behaviour (e.g. participants felt obliged to write in support of the study)</p> <p>1 additional mark for some expansion e.g. showing how social psychology could explain the response of participants</p> |
| 6 | <p>(c) Describe one way the individual differences area is different from the biological area. Use examples from relevant <u>core studies</u> to support your answer. [5]</p> <p>Possible ways the areas differ:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data collected (e.g. qualitative vs. quantitative) Ethical considerations (ethically inconsiderate vs. ethically considerate) Reductionism (holistic vs. reductionist) Differing principles / concepts (everyone is unique and individually different vs. general focus on biology / genetic basis of behaviour) Scientific procedures (lower control vs. higher control) Methodology (e.g. case studies vs. lab experiments) Reliability (lower in reliability vs. higher in reliability) Validity (lower in validity vs. higher in validity) Practical applications (fewer practical applications vs. more practical applications) Data collection techniques (less objective vs. more objective) | 5 | <p>5 marks – a difference is identified (1) and elaborated for both areas (1+1) and supported by relevant evidence from two appropriate core studies (1+1)</p> <p>4 marks – a difference is identified (1) and elaborated for both areas (1+1) and supported by relevant evidence from one appropriate core study (1) OR a difference is identified (1) and elaborated for at least one area (1) and supported by relevant evidence from two appropriate core studies (1+1)</p> <p>3 marks – a difference is identified (1) and elaborated for at least one area (1) and supported by relevant evidence from one appropriate core study (1) OR a difference is identified (1) and elaborated for both areas (1+1) but inaccurate or no supporting evidence is given</p> <p>2 marks – a difference is identified (1) and elaborated for at least one area (1) but inaccurate or no supporting evidence is given OR a difference is identified (1) not elaborated but supported by relevant evidence from one appropriate core study (1)</p> |

| Question | Answer Guidance | Marks | Awarding Marks Guidance |
|----------|--|-------|---|
| | <p>5 mark responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> One difference is that the biological area often uses laboratory experiments whereas the individual differences area often uses case studies (1). This means that the biological area may have greater control over extraneous variables (1) than the individual differences approach as case studies typically have more extraneous variables (1). For example in Sperry's study all images were presented for the same amount of time for all participants (1) but Freud's study used a case study studying Little Hans' phobia in-depth but much less controls in how data was recorded e.g. questions asked were not standardised (1). One difference is that the biological area tends to collect quantitative data. For example in Casey et al's study they used scanning techniques to measure the activity of the brain (1). Quantitative data gives more objective data which is easier to compare and analyse (1). However the individual differences area often gathers qualitative data (1). For example in Freud's study Little Hans father asked open questions about his sons phobias of horses (1). This means that data is harder to compare but provides a more in depth insight into reasons / feelings than quantitative data (1). <p>4 marks response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> One difference is that the biological area often uses laboratory experiments whereas the individual differences area often uses case studies (1). This means that the biological area may have greater control over extraneous variables (1) For example in Sperry's study all images were presented for the | | <p>1 mark – a difference is identified (1) but not elaborated/incorrectly elaborated and inaccurate/no supporting evidence is given</p> <p>0 marks – No creditworthy response</p> <p>The evidence MUST support the difference the candidate themselves gives e.g. if the candidate argues that one area gathers both qualitative and quantitative data the supporting evidence must prove this point.</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 individual differences area.</i></p> <p><i>Responses that identify comparison points between research rather than the areas should not be credited.</i></p> <p><i>As the question asks the candidates to describe they must go beyond merely identifying a difference - they should elaborate what the difference means or implies for each area e.g. this shows/means that.</i></p> <p><i>Candidates should directly compare between the two areas in describing the difference (as shown in the answer guidance.</i></p> <p><i>The individual differences area does not discredit biological influence as we are in part unique to each other because our genetics so saying individual differences area ignores this influence is not creditworthy.</i></p> |

| Question | Answer Guidance | Marks | Awarding Marks Guidance |
|----------|---|-------|-------------------------|
| | <p>same amount of time for all participants (1) but Freud’s study used a case study studying Little Hans phobia in-depth but much less controls in how data was recorded e.g. questions asked were not standardised (1).</p> <p>3 marks response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> One difference is that the biological area often uses laboratory experiments whereas the individual differences area often uses case studies (1). For example in Sperry’s study all images were presented for the same amount of time for all participants (1) but Freud’s study used a case study studying Little Hans phobia in-depth but much less controls in how data was recorded e.g. questions asked were not standardised (1). <p>2 mark response</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> One difference is that the biological area tends to collect quantitative data but the individual differences area often gathers qualitative data (1). For example in Freud’s study Little Hans father asked open questions about his son’s phobias of horses (1). <p>1 mark response</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> One difference is the biological area is often more reductionist than the individual differences area. | | |

| Question | Answer Guidance | Marks | Awarding Marks Guidance |
|----------|---|-------|---|
| 6 (d) | <p>Discuss the strengths and weaknesses of breaking ethical principles. Use examples from relevant <u>core studies</u> to support your answer. [12]</p> <p>Ethical Principles that may be referred to;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respect – informed consent, right to withdraw, confidentiality • Competence • Responsibility – protection of participant, debrief • Integrity – deception. <p>Possible arguments for breaking ethical principles;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deception may be used to make a situation appear more realistic/feasible in an effort to establish ecological validity (although integrity is compromised). • Participants may not be informed they are being studied (or why they are being studied) to secure more natural behaviour (although this may compromise respect for participants). • Participants may have to suffer distress/discomfort to allow difficult/controversial matters to be investigated but this can be justified for ‘the greater good’ (cost/benefit analysis). • Researchers may wish to break confidentiality when a participant needs to be identified so they can receive support/intervention where they are at risk of harm. | 12 | <p>GOOD 10 – 12 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 (they are all identified AND explained). A range (<i>two appropriate arguments for and two appropriate arguments against</i>) of evaluation points are considered. Argument is highly skilled and shows good understanding. These evaluation points are supported by relevant and appropriate evidence.</p> <p>REASONABLE 7 – 9 marks – Response demonstrates reasonable evaluation that is mainly relevant to the demand of the question. Evaluation/argument is mainly coherently presented with reasonable understanding of the points raised (all points are identified AND mainly explained). At least two appropriate arguments for and one against OR two appropriate arguments against and one for are considered. The evaluation points are mainly supported by relevant and appropriate evidence.</p> <p>LIMITED 4 – 6 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 (limited explanation of identified arguments for/against). At least two appropriate evaluation points are considered. The evaluation points are occasionally supported by relevant and appropriate evidence.</p> |

| Question | Answer Guidance | Marks | Awarding Marks Guidance |
|----------|---|-------|--|
| | <p>Possible arguments against breaking ethical principles that may be identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants may experience immediate physical or psychological harm. • Participants may leave a study in a different state to which they entered. • It may be more difficult to replicate the study if ethical principles are not upheld. • Can damage the reputation of psychology research if a study is published and seen as harmful to a person's well-being. | | <p>BASIC</p> <p>1 – 3 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 (identified points are seldom explained). The evaluation points are not supported by relevant and/or appropriate evidence.</p> <p>0 marks – No creditworthy response</p> <p><i>Arguments for/against should be identified, explained and supported by appropriate evidence from a study that clearly broke ethical principles in some way. If the candidates speculate about what ethical principles were broken then this should NOT be credited as supporting evidence – candidates should pick supporting evidence where it is clear that ethical principles were broken.</i></p> <p><i>The explanation part needs to address why the identified arguments for/against breaking ethical principles are good / bad – this asks candidates to explore the implications of not upholding ethical principles and although this does not have to be extremely detailed, it must be apparent in at least two strengths and two weaknesses to access the top band.</i></p> <p><i>If only for and against points have been outlined and none are supported by appropriate evidence then the answer should not be placed in the top band.</i></p> <p><i>If only for or against points have been outlined but all are support by appropriate evidence then the answer should be capped at 6.</i></p> <p><i>If all points are made through the context of a study/studies (with no generic points) then the answer should be placed in the bottom band.</i></p> |

| Question | Answer Guidance | Marks | Awarding Marks Guidance |
|----------|---|-------|--|
| 6 (e) | <p>Describe one reason why conducting reductionist research is useful. [3]</p> <p>Possible reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standardised procedures often used • Cause and effect can be better established • High level of control over extraneous variables • Use of quantitative data • More reliability • Easier to apply in terms of treatment/techniques <p>3 mark response</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • e.g. Reductionist research aims to simplify a behaviour by explaining it in terms of a single cause (1). This means it is easier to reliably establish cause and effect (1) which makes it more likely that a treatment or application can be used to prevent or control a behaviour (1). <p>2 marks responses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • e.g. Reductionism involves investigating complex behaviours by isolating them to a single cause (1) which makes research easier to replicate increasing reliability (1). • e.g. Reductionist research is useful because it adopts scientific principles (1) which means that behaviours have the potential to be predicted and controlled (1). <p>1 mark responses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reductionist research is viewed as being more objective • reductionist research looks to reduce human behaviour down to a single root cause | 3 | <p>GOOD 3 marks – Understanding of reductionism is evident with a reason is identified and described in detail to show how the identified reasons increases usefulness. The response is clear and accurate.</p> <p>REASONABLE 2 marks – Understanding of reductionism is evident with a reason identified, OR a reason is identified and described in detail to show how the identified reasons increases usefulness. The response is reasonably clear and accurate.</p> <p>LIMITED 1 mark – Understanding of reductionism is evident OR a reason is identified. The response is may be limited in clarity and accuracy.</p> <p>0 marks – No creditworthy response</p> <p><i>Supporting evidence is not needed to access full marks but a clearly described reason that is explicitly linked to usefulness is needed.</i></p> <p>N.B. Understanding of reductionism may be explicit (a definition) or implicit in explaining its usefulness.</p> |

| Section C | | | |
|-----------|--|----------|--|
| Question | Answer Guidance | Marks | Awarding Marks Guidance |
| 7 | <p>(a)</p> <p>Identify one psychological issue raised by the above article. Support your answer with evidence from the article. [3]</p> <p>Possible psychological issues to be raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Children are learning empathy / kindness from television (positive reinforcement) • Children show less aggression if they watch educational TV programmes • Children are copying good behaviour from television shows (imitation) • Children are motivated to learn if they are not aggressive • Teenagers will be better prepared for school if they watch educational programmes • Negative impact on a child's academic achievement if they have learnt aggression • Children will feel good about their achievements if they are rewarded • Use of children in research • Nature versus nurture • Determinism versus free will • Impact of media on development <p>3 mark responses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • e.g. One psychological issue is that children's aggression can be modified through what they view on TV (1). As the article says, children who watched Sesame Street end up "gaining a greater sense of competence, being less aggressive" (1). This shows that indirect forms of learning have an impact of the development of children and that learning does not always have to be instructional (1). | 3 | <p>GOOD</p> <p>3 marks – Good knowledge and understanding of a psychological issue that is clearly expressed. Good application of knowledge and understanding to identify an appropriate issue and supporting evidence. An appropriate issue has been identified and is supported by evidence from the article (appropriately contextualised).</p> <p>REASONABLE</p> <p>2 marks – Reasonable knowledge and understanding of a psychological issue but lacks some clarity of expression. Reasonable (partially explicit yet accurate and relevant) application of knowledge and understanding to identify an issue. An appropriate issue may be merely identified but not fully contextualised or supported with evidence from the article.</p> <p>LIMITED</p> <p>1 mark – Limited knowledge and understanding of a psychological issue that is poorly expressed. Limited application of knowledge and understanding to identify an issue. An issue may be briefly identified but not contextualised or supported with evidence from the article.</p> <p>0 marks – No creditworthy response.</p> <p><i>Rule of Thumb:</i> <i>Identify relevant issue – 1 mark</i> <i>Give an example from article (quote or otherwise) – 1 mark</i> <i>Apply the example back to identified issue – 1 mark.</i></p> |

| Question | Answer Guidance | Marks | Awarding Marks Guidance |
|----------|--|-------|-------------------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • e.g. One issue is raised is that children can be advantaged educationally if their parents let them watch television (1). The article explains how children made gains in their reading and arithmetic just from watching a particular show (1) therefore suggests that parents should be less anxious about the negative impacts of television provided it is the right kind of programme that is being watched (1). <p>2 mark responses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • e.g. One psychological issue is that children’s aggression can be modified through what they view on TV (1). As the article says, children who watched Sesame Street end up “gaining a greater sense of competence, being less aggressive” (1). • e.g. One issue is raised is that children can be advantaged educationally if their parents let them watch television (1). The article suggests that parents should be less anxious about the negative impacts of television provided it is the right kind of programme that is being watched (1). <p>1 mark response</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • e.g. one psychological issue is that positive reinforcement affects development • e.g. is behaviour more a result of nurture than nature? | | |

| Question | Answer Guidance | Marks | Awarding Marks Guidance |
|----------|--|-------|--|
| 7 (b) | <p>Briefly outline one piece of psychological research and justify how it relates to the above article. [6]</p> <p>Likely studies to be outlined:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bandura (link to social learning theory / imitation / learnt behaviour) • Chaney (operant conditioning) • Casey (link to development in behaviour) • Any piece of research that links to conditioning • Any piece of research that shows development in behaviour <p>Good response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bandura studied 72 children from Stanford university nursery school. Children observed an aggressive model, non aggressive aggressive model or no model. The aggressive model was physically and verbally aggressive towards to Bobo doll. The non-aggressive model ignored the Bobo doll. In room 2 all children were allowed to play very attractive toys but the experimenter then took the toys away. Children were then observed through a one-way mirror for 20 minutes whilst observers recorded behaviour every 5 seconds into predetermined categories e.g. Non-imitative physical and verbal aggression. Children in the aggressive condition showed significantly more imitation of physical and verbal aggressive behaviour than children in the non-aggressive or control conditions. (4) Similarly to the article, this study relates to explaining a learnt behaviour because it shows the children who observed an aggressive role model were more likely to imitate/copy the modelled aggressive behaviour | 6 | <p>GOOD 5 – 6 marks – Good knowledge and understanding of a study which is coherently outlined. The outline is increasingly accurate and specific details have been included. Good application of knowledge and understanding. There is good understanding shown about how their chosen study can be linked to the issues identified in the article.</p> <p>REASONABLE 3 – 4 marks – Reasonable knowledge and understanding of a study. The outline is reasonable but may lack detail. Few specific details are included. Reasonable application of knowledge and understanding. There is reasonable understanding shown about how their chosen study can be linked to an issue identified in the article but the link lacks clarity</p> <p>LIMITED 1 – 2 marks – Limited knowledge and understanding of a study. The outline is limited and lacks detail. Sparse / no specific details are included. Limited application of knowledge and understanding. There is very little indication that the candidate appreciates why the study can be linked to an issue identified in the article</p> <p>0 marks – No creditworthy response</p> <p><i>Candidates can gain 4 marks for their outline and 2 marks for their link to the article.</i></p> <p><i>If there is no link to the article made then the response must be capped at 4.</i></p> |

| Question | Answer Guidance | Marks | Awarding Marks Guidance |
|----------|---|-------|---|
| | <p>because they had observed it, like when the children observed sesame street. (2)</p> <p>Reasonable response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Children observed an aggressive model, non aggressive model or no model. The aggressive model was physically and verbally aggressive towards to Bobo doll. Children were then observed through a one-way mirror in room 3 whilst observers recorded behaviour into categories. Children in the aggressive condition showed significantly more imitation of physical and verbal aggressive behaviour than children in all other conditions. (3) This study relates to the article because it shows the children who observed an aggressive role model were more likely to imitate/copy the modelled behaviour (1). <p>Limited response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Children observed an aggressive model or non aggressive model. Observers recorded aggressive behaviour towards the Bobo Doll. Children in the aggressive condition showed more physical and verbal aggressive behaviour (1). This study relates to the article because it looks at aggression like the article says. (1) | | <p><i>Not all fine details need to be included in the study outline to access the top band. Candidates will be likely refer to the aim, procedure and findings. A good summary of the chosen study is needed that clearly demonstrates the key aspects/essential features of the chosen study including what was done and what was found out.</i></p> |

| Question | Answer Guidance | Marks | Awarding Marks Guidance |
|----------|---|-------|---|
| 7 (c) | <p>Using your knowledge of psychology, suggest techniques that teachers could use to encourage positive behaviours in children. [6]</p> <p>Answers may refer to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aspects of social learning theory as shown in Bandura's study which are then illustrated through descriptions of techniques which could be devised to condition children into showing positive behaviour such as empathy, kindness, sharing, turn taking, patience. References may also be made to imitation of role models / imitation of peers / rewards / reinforcement / punishment / observation of others / modelling. Reference to positive reinforcement such as reward charts, treats, golden time or more specific techniques as used in Chaney et al's study may also be referred to. References to cognitive techniques where positive thinking may lead to positive behaviours. <p>Good response Teachers could promote the positive behaviour through use of operant conditioning. This would involve reinforcing good behaviour through use of rewards – in the case of children this could be a sticker chart. Each time a child displays positive behaviour they would receive a sticker which would be displayed for others to see. The positive consequence of behaving well should encourage a child to repeat this kind of behaviour in order to get the reward again. Teachers may also use punishment when poor behaviour is displayed – like making a child sit on the 'thinking' chair given the child time to reflect on how they could improve their behaviour to make it more appropriate. Other children may also see the consequence of poor behaviour and want to avoid this by being well behaved instead.</p> | 6 | <p>GOOD 5 – 6 marks – Good knowledge and understanding of how techniques identified could be used to encourage positive behaviour. Good application of psychological knowledge within these techniques. The suggested techniques are mainly accurate and several details have been included about how the techniques could be implemented and developed to encourage positive behaviour. Understanding and application of psychological knowledge is good. At least two techniques are considered.</p> <p>REASONABLE 3 – 4 marks – Reasonable knowledge and understanding of how the technique(s) identified could be used to encourage positive behaviour. Reasonable application of psychological knowledge within these techniques. The suggested programme is reasonably accurate and a few fine details have been included about how it could be implemented and developed. There is some evidence of psychological knowledge and its possible application. Two techniques may be considered but could be developed further OR one technique is considered in detail.</p> <p>LIMITED 1 – 2 marks – Limited knowledge and understanding of how the technique(s) identified could be used to encourage positive behaviour. Limited application of psychological knowledge within these techniques. The suggested technique/s contain limited detail or evidence of psychological knowledge, e.g. one or two brief sentences. Little if any reference made to positive behaviours.</p> <p>0 marks – No creditworthy response</p> |

| Question | Answer Guidance | Marks | Awarding Marks Guidance |
|----------|---|-------|--|
| | <p>Reasonable response Teachers could promote the positive behaviour through rewards. Each time a child displays positive behaviour they would receive a sticker which would be displayed for others to see. They will like getting stickers and behave to get more. Teachers may also use punishment when poor behaviour is displayed – like making a child sit on the ‘thinking’ chair given the child time to reflect on how they could improve their behaviour to make it more appropriate.</p> <p>Limited response Teachers could promote the positive behaviour through operant conditioning and giving out rewards to children. Teachers may also use punishment when poor behaviour is displayed – like making a child sit on the ‘thinking’ chair.</p> | | <p><i>Answers may take the form of a bulleted list or other relevant staged area but it should be clear how the technique/s would lead to positive behaviours in children.</i></p> <p><i>Answers that refer to punishments to discourage behaviour should be credited but it must be clear what the positive behavioural outcome will be as requested in the question.</i></p> |

| Question | Answer Guidance | Marks | Awarding Marks Guidance |
|----------|--|-------|--|
| 7 (d) | <p>Evaluate the techniques you suggested in 7(c). [10]</p> <p>Evaluation might refer to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Usefulness • Appropriateness • Effectiveness • Implications for the child (upset caused) • Reductionism • Ecological Validity • Determinism • Nature vs Nurture • Individual / Situational explanations • Scientific explanation • Practical Applications • Ethical considerations <p>Good response One strength of suggesting children could receive rewards for good behaviour in the classroom, by using a star chart, would be that it is effective. The children would be easily able to see their rewards and would be receiving acknowledgement of their efforts in front of their peers, reinforcing their good behaviour to ensure it is repeated. When other children are able to view the positive reinforcement would also likely encourage them to adopt similar behaviour as they will learn from their peers. This would likely increase the effectiveness of the technique in helping the children learn positive behaviour. The star chart may also lead to a self-fulfilling prophecy where those who have visibly less rewards than others may feel labelled as bad children and feel frustrated by the public acknowledgement that they aren't being as 'good' as other children. Developmentally this could upset the children and discourage them from trying in the future. It is also an age appropriate technique as children tend to respond positively to the praise of adults and are often</p> | 10 | <p>GOOD 9 – 10 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. 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 7c. More than one technique is evaluated.</p> <p>REASONABLE 7 – 8 marks – Response demonstrates reasonable evaluation that is mainly relevant to the demand of the question. Evaluation/argument is mainly coherently presented with reasonable understanding of the points raised. A range (two or more) of appropriate evaluation points are considered. The evaluation points are mainly in context and supported by relevant evidence of the description given in 7c.</p> <p>LIMITED 4 – 6 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. The evaluation points are occasionally in context and supported by relevant evidence of the description given in 7c.</p> <p>BASIC 1 – 3 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. The evaluation points are not in context and are not supported by relevant evidence of the description given in 7c.</p> |

| Question | Answer Guidance | Marks | Awarding Marks Guidance |
|----------|---|-------|--|
| | <p>motivated by this in their behaviours. However in suggesting that time on the thinking chair if a child shows negative behaviour may be perceived as discouraging to some children, especially if they feel they are trying. Children at a young age may become confused by boundaries or 'slip up' at times as they are learning ways to navigate the world so being punished for this would overly focus on the negative and may lead to a backfire effect being observed in their behaviour.</p> <p>Reasonable response One strength of suggesting children could receive rewards for good behaviour in the classroom, by using a star chart, would be that it is effective. The children would be easily able to see their rewards and would be receiving acknowledgement of their efforts in front of their peers, reinforcing their good behaviour to ensure it is repeated. The star chart may also lead to a problems where those who have less rewards than others may feel labelled as bad children and feel frustrated by the fact that they aren't being as 'good' as other children. It is also an age appropriate technique as children tend to respond positively to the praise of adults and are often motivated by this in their behaviours. However in suggesting that time on the thinking chair if a child shows negative behaviour may be perceived as discouraging to some children, especially if they feel they are trying which may lead to a backfire effect in their behaviour.</p> <p>Limited response One strength of suggesting children could receive rewards for good behaviour in the classroom would be that it is effective but the star chart may also lead some children getting frustrated if they don't get many stickers as other children. It is an age appropriate technique as children tend to respond positively to the praise of adults and are often motivated by this</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> <p><i>More than one technique must be evaluated to access the top band.</i></p> |

| Question | Answer Guidance | Marks | Awarding Marks Guidance |
|----------|---|-------|-------------------------|
| | <p>in their behaviours. Stickers are also quite a cheap type of reward compared to things like sweets and toys.</p> <p>Basic response Stickers might be seen as a reward by some children but not by others. If children don't feel rewarded then they have no incentive to behave themselves.</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 2016

