

**GCE**

**Psychology**

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

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

**Mark Scheme for June 2018**

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 2018

## Annotations

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

**Subject-specific Marking Instructions****INTRODUCTION**

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

- the specification, especially the assessment objectives
- the question paper and its rubrics
- the mark scheme.

You should ensure that you have copies of these materials.

You should ensure also that you are familiar with the administrative procedures related to the marking process. These are set out in the OCR booklet Instructions for Examiners. If you are examining for the first time, please read carefully Appendix 5 Introduction to Script Marking: Notes for New Examiners.

Please ask for help or guidance whenever you need it. Your first point of contact is your Team Leader.

Question			Answer Guidance	Mark	Awarding Marks Guidance
1	(a)	(i)	<p><b>From Bandura et al.'s study into the transmission of aggression:</b>  <b>Outline how participants were pre-rated for aggression in the nursery.</b>  <b>Possible answer:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participants were rated on (four) <u>5-point rating scales</u> by the <u>experimenter/researcher and/or (nursery school) teacher</u> (who knew them well).</li> <li>Other appropriate outlines of the procedure should be credited.</li> </ul>	[2]	<p><b>2 marks</b> – A clear outline of how participants were pre-rated for aggression including reference to (4) / <u>5-point rating scales</u> and who did the rating – <u>teacher and/or experimenter</u> i.e. one of the two people.  <b>1 mark</b> – Vague or partial answer e.g. participants were pre-rated for aggression in social interactions by the experimenter and/or a nursery school teacher, participants were pre-rated for aggression using a 5-point rating scale, participants were observed by the experimenter and a nursery school teacher.  <b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy information e.g. using a rating scale.</p>
		(ii)	<p><b>Explain why the researchers pre-rated participants for aggression before placing them into groups for the experiment.</b>  <b>Possible answers:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participants were pre-rated for aggression before being placed into groups for the experiment so they could be <u>matched</u> on aggression, arranged into triplets and <u>assigned</u> randomly to one of the two experimental groups or the control group.</li> <li>Participants were pre-rated for aggression before being placed into groups for the experiment so they could be <u>matched</u> on aggression <u>so that those with similar levels of aggression could be distributed evenly across the two experimental groups and the control group.</u></li> <li>Participants were pre-rated for aggression as a form of control. This allowed the researchers to <u>match</u> the children on aggression so they could <u>be evenly distributed evenly across the two experimental groups and the control group.</u></li> <li>Other appropriate explanations should be credited.</li> </ul>	[2]	<p><b>2 marks</b> – A clear, detailed explanation such as the one given in the Answer Guidance. Reference should be made to: <u>matching</u> participants <b>and</b> so they could be <u>assigned to groups to prevent any one group being unbalanced in respect of aggression levels.</u>  <b>1 mark</b> – Vague or partial answer e.g. so they could be matched on aggression, so one group did not contain more aggressive children than any other group, so that individual characteristics such as how aggressive they are didn't affect the results, it was used as a control for aggression, to reduce the chance of confounding/extraneous variables affecting the results.  <b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy information.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Credit can be given for answers that infer the purpose of pre-rating the children for aggression was a form of control.</i></li> </ul>

Question		Answer Guidance	Mark	Awarding Marks Guidance
1	(b)	<p><b>Describe what the findings from Chaney et al.'s Funhaler study shows us about the development of behaviour.</b></p> <p><b>Possible answers:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If external influences lead to pleasant/satisfying consequences, the behaviour is likely to be repeated. This study shows us that children can develop health-enhancing behaviours over time through the <b>positive reinforcement</b> produced as a result of using a Funhaler. Asthmatic participants found they were able to breathe more easily if they used the Funhaler (as prescribed) and so, over time, were willing to use it and <b>developed</b> behaviours that would, over time, improve their overall health status.</li> <li>(Positive) health behaviours can <b>develop</b> over time. Even after only 2 weeks, the use of a Funhaler as opposed to a basic spacer device led to increased medical compliance in young (Australian) asthmatics.</li> <li>Other appropriate descriptions should be credited.</li> </ul>	[3]	<p><b>3 marks</b> - A clear description of what the study shows us about the <b>development</b> of behaviour <b>linked to</b> Chaney et al.'s study as suggested in the Answer Guidance bullet point 1. i.e. For 3 marks the candidate must include reference to one of: positive reinforcement/external influence(s)/operant conditioning.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – A reasonable description of what the study shows us about the <b>development</b> of behaviour <b>linked to</b> Chaney et al.'s study as suggested in the Answer Guidance bullet point 2.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Vague or partial answer e.g. the use of a Funhaler as opposed to a basic spacer device led to increased medical compliance in young (Australian) asthmatics i.e. <u>the mere identification of a finding/result from the study/no link to development</u>; (good) behaviours can develop over time as a result of external influences on the individual. If the external influence leads to pleasant at satisfying consequences, the behaviour is likely to be repeated and become part of an individual's everyday conduct/the use of positive reinforcement can lead to the development of a behaviour; i.e. <u>no contextualisation</u>.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy information.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>If there is no obvious or implied link to development the response is capped at 1 mark.</i></li> </ul>

Question			Answer Guidance	Mark	Awarding Marks Guidance
2	(a)	(i)	<p><b>From Milgram's study of obedience:</b>  <b>Outline how participants were gathered for the study.</b>  <b>Possible answer:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participants were gathered through a newspaper advertisement/direct mail solicitation which asked for volunteers (to take part in a study of memory and learning).</li> </ul>	[2]	<p><b>2 marks</b> – An accurate outline which includes reference to the use of a <u>newspaper</u> advertisement/<u>direct mail</u> solicitation <b>and</b> volunteers.  <b>1 mark</b> – Vague or partial answer e.g. through a newspaper advertisement, through direct mail solicitation, through advertising, by asking for volunteers.  <b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy information e.g. outlines relating to the sampling method or sample characteristics.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>No credit can be given for the mere identification of posters/adverts.</i></li> <li><i>No credit can be given for the mere identification of posters/adverts placed around the (university) campus. This suggestion can however be ignored if the candidate has also referred to the use of a newspaper advertisement/direct mail solicitation.</i></li> <li><i>No credit can be given if the candidate merely refers to the use of email/leaflets.</i></li> <li><i>The use of 'self-selecting' rather than 'volunteer' should be credited, as also should reference to 'leaflets being sent out'/'newspaper article'.</i></li> </ul>
		(ii)	<p><b>Explain <u>one</u> way the sample used in this study may be considered biased.</b>  <b>Possible answers:</b>  The sample may be considered biased because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All participants were male/androcentric <u>so</u> findings cannot be generalised to females.</li> <li>The sample was not representative as all participants were male <u>so</u> findings cannot be applied to females.</li> <li>All participants were aged between 20 and 50 years <u>so</u> findings cannot be applied to individuals of other ages.</li> </ul>	[2]	<p><b>2 marks</b> – A clear explanation of one way the sample may be considered biased based on the suggestions made in Answer Guidance. There should be <b>both</b>:  (a) an identification of how the sample was biased  (b) implications of the identified bias.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Vague or partial answer e.g. all participants were male/all participants were volunteers/all participants were from the same area i.e. identification of an appropriate bias with <u>no implication</u>;</p>

Question		Answer Guidance	Mark	Awarding Marks Guidance
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participants were all drawn from the same area (New Haven area of America) <u>so</u> findings cannot be generalised to other areas of the USA/other areas of the world.</li> <li>All participants were volunteers who may have different characteristics to other people <u>so</u> findings cannot be generalised to non-volunteers.</li> <li>Participants had to be able to read to be able to understand the newspaper advertisement/the direct mailing message <u>so</u> findings cannot be generalised to non-readers/illiterate people.</li> <li>Other appropriate explanations should be credited.</li> </ul>		<p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy information.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>References to 'it'/'the study' being ungeneralisable are not creditworthy – a sample may be unrepresentative whereas findings may not be generalisable.</i></li> <li><i>The study does not have to be specifically contextualised to gain full marks.</i></li> </ul>
2	(b)	<p><b>Outline <u>one</u> conclusion that can be drawn from Bocchiaro et al.'s study into disobedience and whistleblowing.</b></p> <p><b>Possible answers:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Individuals tend to obey authority figures, (even if the authority is unjust) because the study showed that over 75%/the majority/most of the participants obeyed the experimenter and wrote letters encouraging others to take part in in the proposed sensory deprivation study.</li> <li>What individual's think/say they and others will do in a given situation often differs from actually happens. Initially only 3.6/about 4% of participants indicated that they would obey the researcher when in reality 75%/the majority/most of the participants did so.</li> <li>People underestimate how likely their peers are to obey unjust orders. The comparison group said only 18.8% of other students at their university would obey when in fact 76.5% did so.</li> <li>Other appropriate conclusions should be credited.</li> </ul>	[2]	<p><b>2 marks</b> – A clear and accurate outline of a conclusion which must include <b>both</b>:</p> <p>(a) an appropriate conclusion  (b) evidence from the study to support the conclusion i.e. <u>contextualisation</u>.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Vague or partial answer, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Individuals tend to obey authority figures, what individuals think/say they and others will do in a given situation often differs from actually happens i.e. a conclusion with <u>no contextualisation</u>.</li> <li>75%/the majority/most of the participants obeyed the experimenter and wrote letters encouraging others to take part in in the proposed sensory deprivation study, initially only 3.6/about 4% of participants indicated that they would obey the researcher when in reality 75%/the majority/most of the participants did so i.e. <u>a finding/result with no conclusion</u>.</li> </ul>



Question		Answer Guidance	Mark	Awarding Marks Guidance
				<p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy information.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>If percentages/numbers are given allow a range of +/- 5%.</i></li> </ul>
3	(a)	<p><b>From Freud’s study of Little Hans:</b>  <b>Suggest <u>one</u> strength of studying just one individual.</b>  <b>Possible answers:</b>  Lots of in-depth, qualitative data can be gathered. This allowed Freud to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>observe a child as he progressed through the phallic stage (of psychosexual development)</li> <li>test his ideas about the phallic stage (of psychosexual development)</li> <li>test his theory of psychosexual development</li> <li>find out about Hans’ fears, fantasies and phobia (and link them to his psychosexual theory/the phallic stage of psychosexual development).</li> </ul> <p>Other appropriate suggestions should be credited.</p>	[2]	<p><b>2 marks</b> – A clear strength is identified <b>and</b> contextualised as in the examples in Answer Guidance.  <b>1 mark</b> – Vague or partial answer e.g. lots of in-depth, qualitative data can be gathered i.e. <u>no contextualisation</u>; Freud was able test his ideas about the phallic stage/ test his theory of psychosexual development i.e. no clear strength of studying just one individual identified.  <b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy information</p>
3	(b)	<p><b>How does Baron-Cohen et al.’s study into autism in adults, link to the key theme of understanding disorders?</b></p> <p><b>Possible answers:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The study suggests that, because they got the worst scores on the Eyes Task, adults with autism/AS show a cognitive impairment in relation to Theory of Mind compared to either normal adults or adults with Tourette syndrome.</li> <li>Adults with autism/AS have a cognitive disorder by lacking a Theory of mind. The study showed that compared to normal adults or adults with Tourette</li> </ul>	[2]	<p><b>2 marks</b> – A clear, <u>fully contextualised</u> explanation of how Baron-Cohen et al.’s study links to the key theme of understanding disorders.  <b>1 mark</b> – Vague or partial answer e.g. adults with autism/AS show a cognitive impairment in relation to Theory of Mind/ a finding from the study i.e. <u>no real link to the key theme of understanding disorders</u>, the study links to the theme of understanding disorders as it shows how people on the autism spectrum/people with Tourettes behave differently to ‘normal’ people; the study links to the key theme of understanding disorders as autism is a disorder where autistic people lack</p>

Question		Answer Guidance	Mark	Awarding Marks Guidance
		<p>syndrome, adults with autism/AS were unable to mind-read as they performed poorest on the Eyes task.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comparing the ability to identify emotions between people on the autism spectrum and 'normal' people showed that those on the autism scale found this more difficult.</li> <li>Other appropriate explanations should be credited.</li> </ul>		<p>theory of mind, therefore it helps us understand why they find it hard to relate to others. i.e. <u>no actual evidence from the study to make it properly contextualised</u>.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> - No creditworthy information.</p> <p><i>N.B. To gain full marks the candidate must refer to at least one of the comparison groups ('normal/Tourettes').</i></p>
4	(a)	<p><b>From Loftus and Palmer's first experiment into eyewitness testimony:</b></p> <p><b>Identify the independent variable (IV) <u>and</u> the dependent variable (DV).</b></p> <p><b>Answer should include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IV = the wording of the critical question which asked, "About how fast were the cars going when they smashed/collided/hit/ contacted/bumped each other?"/ the verb used to describe the accident: smashed/collided/hit/ contacted/bumped. [2 marks]</li> <li>DV = the estimated (vehicular) speed (given by participants). [1 mark]</li> </ul>	<p><b>[3]</b> <b>[2+1]</b></p>	<p><b>3 marks</b> – An accurate identification of the IV which must refer to both the critical question, <b>and</b> the content of the critical question (all five verbs) <b>[2 marks]</b> + the correct identification of the DV <b>[1 mark]</b></p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – An accurate identification of the IV which must refer to both the critical question <b>and</b> the content of the critical question with no/an incorrect identification of the DV; the correct identification of the DV with a vague/partial IV.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – The mere identification of the DV; a vague/partial IV = the wording of the critical question.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy information e.g. the IV and/or the DV used in Experiment 2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>To gain the full 2 marks for the IV, candidates must include reference to all five verbs (to prevent confusion with Experiment 2).</i></li> <li><i>Accept 'leading question/verb/word used' instead of 'critical question'.</i></li> </ul>

Question		Answer Guidance	Mark	Awarding Marks Guidance
4	(b)	<p><b>Identify the research design used in Grant et al.'s study into context-dependent memory</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Independent measures/independent groups.</li> </ul>	[1]	<p><b>1 mark</b> – Identification of the correct research design as given in the Answer Guidance.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy information e.g. repeated measures design, matched participants design, the research method.</p>
5		<p><b>Describe how visual information was presented to participants in Sperry's study into the effects of hemisphere disconnection.</b></p> <p><b>Possible answer:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The participant, with one eye covered, centred his gaze on a fixed point in the centre of an upright translucent screen. Visual stimuli, on 35-millimetre transparencies, were arranged in a standard projector and were then back-projected at <math>\frac{1}{10}</math> of a second or less to the LVF, RVF (or both visual fields).</li> <li>Other appropriate descriptions should be credited.</li> </ul>	[4]	<p><b>4 marks</b> – A clear and accurate description is provided as detailed in the Answer Guidance. At least <b>4</b> features of the procedure should be included.</p> <p><b>3 marks</b> – A fairly accurate description is provided which includes at least <b>3</b> features of the procedure.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – A basic description is provided which includes reference to at least <b>2</b> features of the procedure.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – An answer that refers merely to <b>one</b> feature of the procedure e.g. visual stimuli were projected onto a screen, there is evidence of some understanding of the procedure.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy information e.g. what was presented to each/both visual fields.</p> <p>Individual features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the participant had one eye covered.</li> <li>the participant centred his gaze on a fixed point on an (upright translucent) screen.</li> <li>visual stimuli were 35-millimetre transparencies.</li> <li>visual stimuli were arranged in a standard projector.</li> <li>visual stimuli were back-projected.</li> </ul>

Question		Answer Guidance	Mark	Awarding Marks Guidance
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>stimuli were shown at <math>\frac{1}{10}</math> of a second or less/very fast.</li> <li>Visual stimuli were flashed onto a screen.</li> <li>Stimuli were presented to the RVF, LVF (or both visual fields).</li> <li>The apparatus used was called a tachistoscope.</li> <li>Visual information was flashed to either the right or the left side of the central fixation point.</li> <li><b>Examiners should note that for each mark allocation the candidate is required to include AT LEAST a specified number of features. But, even if the candidate has included the required number of features, that number of marks does not have to be awarded e.g. even if three features have been included, if the answer does not read well/make much sense, 3 marks do not have to be awarded.</b></li> </ul>
6	(a)	<p><b>Outline <u>one</u> principle or concept of the behaviourist perspective.</b></p> <p><b>Possible answers:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The majority of behaviour is <u>learned</u> from the environment/the people around us (after birth).</li> <li>If behaviour is learned, undesirable and anti-social behaviours can be 'unlearned'.</li> <li>That psychology should be seen as a science and behaviour should be studied in a scientific manner using observation and measurements.</li> <li>The only subject matter for psychology should be behaviours which can be observed and measured.</li> </ul>	[2]	<p><b>2 marks</b> – An appropriate principle/concept is accurately outlined and clearly linked to the behavioural perspective.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – An appropriate principle/concept is briefly or partially described. Understanding is not fully clear e.g. behaviour is learned.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy information e.g. everything is learned.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>If there is no reference to 'behaviour' no marks can be awarded.</i></li> </ul>

Question		Answer Guidance	Mark	Awarding Marks Guidance
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The major influence on human behaviour is <u>learning</u> from the environment.</li> <li>Modelling by significant others can greatly influence the <u>learning</u> of behaviour.</li> <li>Behaviour can be understood by thinking of a person as a machine and looking at what goes into the machine (stimulus or input) and measuring what comes out (responses or outputs).</li> <li>Everyone is born a blank slate and external influences from the environment and others around us shape our behaviours.</li> <li>Behaviour is <u>learned</u> by observing others and imitating them.</li> <li>Other appropriate principle or concept should be credited.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Outlines of classical conditioning/operant conditioning/Social Learning Theory can gain credit here as they are concepts of the behaviourist perspective.</i></li> </ul>
6	(b)	<p><b>Briefly outline why Bandura et al.'s study into the transmission of aggression can be viewed from the behaviourist perspective.</b></p> <p><b>Possible 3-mark answer - GOOD:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The behaviourist perspective holds that the majority of behaviour is <u>learned</u> from the environment after birth. Bandura et al.'s study shows how young children can <u>learn</u> aggressive behaviour through the observation of significant others in their immediate social environment. Children in this study, regardless of their innate levels of aggression, who observed an aggressive model subsequently showed more physical and verbal aggression than children who either saw a non-aggressive model or no model at all, suggesting that behaviour can be <u>learned</u> by observing others.</li> </ul> <p><b>Possible 2-mark answer REASONABLE:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The behaviourist perspective holds that the majority of behaviour is <u>learned</u> from the environment after birth.</li> </ul>	[3]	<p><b>3 marks – GOOD</b> -The response demonstrates good understanding of how Bandura et al.'s study links to the behaviourist perspective with an explicit link being made between the study and the perspective. The response is <u>clearly</u> supported by evidence from the study as illustrated in the Answer Guidance.</p> <p><b>2 marks – REASONABLE</b> – The response demonstrates reasonable understanding of how Bandura et al.'s study links to the behaviourist perspective with a clear link being made between the study and the perspective. The response is not <u>clearly</u> supported by evidence from the study.</p> <p><b>1 mark – LIMITED</b> - The response shows limited understanding of how Bandura et al.'s study links to the behaviourist perspective. There is no actual evidence from the study i.e. <u>no contextualisation</u> but some understanding is evident.</p>

Question		Answer Guidance	Mark	Awarding Marks Guidance
		<p>Bandura et al.'s study shows how young children can learn aggressive behaviour through the observation of significant others in their immediate social environment.</p> <p><b>Possible 1-mark answer LIMITED:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bandura et al.'s study shows how young children can learn behaviour through the observation of significant others in their immediate social environment.</li> </ul>		<p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy information, e.g. mere findings from the study with no link to learning.</p> <p><i>N.B. If the answer merely refers to behaviour being influenced by other people/the environment/external influences, <u>no marks</u> can be awarded as this is to be considered a social explanation.</i></p> <p><i>If the candidate refers to the Social Learning Theory, the response must make it clear that <u>learning</u> is involved to gain more than 1 mark.</i></p>
6	(c)	<p><b>Describe <u>two</u> strengths of the developmental area. Support your answer with examples from relevant core studies.</b></p> <p><b>Possible strengths include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Research within the developmental area can help improve our understanding of human behaviour, particularly the extent to which it is affected by ageing/maturity</li> <li>Research within the developmental area can be extremely useful, having practical applications in the real world e.g. child care, education</li> <li>Developmental research can help us positively influence children's behaviour.</li> <li>A major strength of the developmental area is that participants can be studied over time to show how behaviours develop/change.</li> <li>A major strength of the developmental area is that it has improved our knowledge and understanding of people at different ages and stages of development.</li> <li>A strength of the developmental area is that the same participants can be studied over time to reduce participants variables.</li> </ul>	<p><b>[4]</b> <b>[2+2]</b></p>	<p><b>Per strength:</b></p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – A clear description of an appropriate strength which is supported by appropriate evidence from a relevant core study.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – The mere identification of an appropriate strength with no supporting evidence i.e. <u>no contextualisation</u>/ the mere identification of a strength with no justification/some understanding of a strength of the developmental area supported by vague evidence.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy information.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The strength can be described <b>either</b> after the evidence has been provided <b>or</b> before.</i></li> <li><i>Study-specific answers <b>are capped at 1 mark per strength.</b></i></li> </ul>

Question	Answer Guidance	Mark	Awarding Marks Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The developmental area sheds light on the nature/nurture debate.</li> <li>• The developmental area uses a variety of quantitative and qualitative methods so gains useful data.</li> <li>• The area sheds light on when we can anticipate certain behaviours to develop/change.</li> <li>• The area can be considered scientific as laboratory experiments can be used which allow for high controls and the manipulation of variables so cause and effect can be inferred.</li> <li>• The area can be reductionist, allowing researchers to concentrate on one variable to study its effect on behaviour.</li> <li>• The area can be holistic, allowing researchers to examine how behaviour can be influenced by a variety of factors.</li> <li>• Other appropriate strengths should be credited.</li> </ul> <p><b>Sources of supporting evidence:</b> Supporting evidence is likely to come from Bandura et al., and/or Chaney et al. though examples from other studies may be appropriate e.g. Freud.</p> <p><b>Examples of a 2-mark answer:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A major strength of the developmental area is that participants can be studied over time to show how behaviours develop/change. Chaney et al.'s Funhaler study showed how, even after only a two-week period, the use of positive reinforcement techniques improved levels of medical compliance in young asthmatics.</li> <li>• The study by Bandura et al. helps to show us that if young children witness aggressive acts being displayed by their role models, there is a strong possibility that they will imitate the aggressive behaviours when appropriate opportunities arise. Research within the developmental area can therefore be very useful, having practical</li> </ul>		

Question		Answer Guidance	Mark	Awarding Marks Guidance
		<p>applications in the real world. For example, the study by Bandura can encourage role models to display pro-social behaviours rather than anti-social behaviours.</p> <p><b>Examples of a 1-mark answer:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A major strength of the developmental area is that it has improved our knowledge and understanding of people at different ages and stages of development.</li> <li>• The developmental area uses a variety of quantitative and qualitative methods so gains useful data.</li> </ul>		
6	(d)	<p><b>Describe <u>two</u> ways in which the developmental area is similar to the area of individual differences. Support your answer with examples from relevant core studies.</b></p> <p><b>Possible similarities:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both areas offer the opportunity to conduct research using experiments.</li> <li>• Both areas allow research to be conducted in controlled environments.</li> <li>• Both areas allow researchers to establish cause and effect between variables.</li> <li>• Both areas offer the opportunity to collect objective, quantitative data.</li> <li>• Both areas support the nature debate.</li> <li>• Both areas can support the nurture debate.</li> <li>• Both area add to the individual/situational debate.</li> <li>• Both areas can be reductionist.</li> <li>• Both areas can be holistic.</li> <li>• Both areas can raise ethical concerns.</li> <li>• Research in both areas can lack ecological validity.</li> <li>• Research in both areas can have unrepresentative samples.</li> <li>• Both areas use observation to gather data.</li> <li>• Both areas can break ethical guidelines.</li> </ul>	[6] [3+3]	<p><b>For each way in which the developmental area is similar to the area of individual differences:</b></p> <p><b>3 marks:</b> An appropriate similarity is identified [<b>1 mark</b>] and supported by relevant evidence from a core study that can be placed in the developmental area [<b>1 mark</b>] and a study that can be placed in the area of individual differences [<b>1 mark</b>].</p> <p><b>2 marks:</b> An appropriate similarity is identified [<b>1 mark</b>] and supported by relevant evidence from <b>either</b> a core study that can be placed in the developmental area <b>or</b> a study that can be placed in the area of individual differences [<b>1 mark</b>].</p> <p><b>1 mark:</b> An appropriate similarity is merely identified with <u>no supporting evidence</u>.</p> <p><b>0 marks –</b> No creditworthy information.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Study-specific answers are capped at 1 mark per similarity i.e. showing how a study from the</i></li> </ul>



Question	Answer Guidance	Mark	Awarding Marks Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both areas offer the opportunity to study the development of behaviour over time.</li> <li>• Other appropriate similarities should be credited.</li> </ul> <p><b>Sources of supporting evidence:</b> Supporting evidence is likely to come from Bandura et al., Chaney et al., Freud, Baron-Cohen et al.</p> <p><b>Examples of a 3-mark answer:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both areas offer the opportunity to collect, objective quantitative data. Chaney et al. found that asthmatic children achieved significantly more of the required four or more cycles per aerosol delivery when using the Funhaler compared to when they used the standard device. Likewise, Baron-Cohen et al. found that fewer adults with autism/AS were able to identify emotions in the Eyes Task than either normal adults or adults with Tourette syndrome.</li> <li>• Research in both areas can have unrepresentative samples. For example, Bandura et al. in their study into the transmission of aggression used participants drawn from the nursery school of Stanford University. The children may not be representative of children from other geographical areas of the world. On the other hand, Freud used only one participant, Little Hans who had a phobia of horses. Not many young boys suffer such an extreme fear of horses. It is therefore difficult to generalise the findings of either study.</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples of a 2-mark answer:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research in both areas can have unrepresentative samples. For example, Bandura et al. in their study into the transmission of aggression used participants drawn from the nursery school of Stanford University so findings cannot be generalised to children from other geographical</li> </ul>		<p><i>developmental area is similar to a study from the individual differences area.</i></p>

Question		Answer Guidance	Mark	Awarding Marks Guidance
		<p>areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Research in both areas can lack ecological validity. For example, in Baron-Cohen et al.'s study, participants had to interpret emotions from black and white pictures of eyes. This does not represent a real-life situation.</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples of a 1-mark answer:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Both areas allow researchers to conduct experiments to establish cause and effect.</li> <li>Both areas can raise ethical concerns.</li> </ul>		
6	(e)*	<p><b>Discuss the usefulness of psychological research. Support your answer with examples from relevant core studies from the area of individual differences.</b></p> <p><b>Points of usefulness may include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(Academic) understanding is increased in relation to the way people behave.</li> <li>Practical applications can be developed to help manage behaviours.</li> <li>Findings may be high in validity.</li> <li>If the study is conducted in the participant's natural environment, the study will be high in ecological validity.</li> <li>If an experiment is used single variables can be isolated and tested to allow cause and effect conclusions to be drawn.</li> <li>If quantitative data is gathered comparisons can be made and practical applications developed.</li> <li>If qualitative data is gathered procedures may be put in place to help the participants involved.</li> </ul>	[10]	<p><b>GOOD</b>  <b>9 – 10 marks</b> – The response demonstrates good understanding of the usefulness debate. Application of the debate is coherently presented showing a clear understanding of the points raised (at least 3).  <b>Both</b> sides of the debate (i.e. supporting and challenging usefulness, e.g. two supporting and one challenging suggestions/two challenging and one supporting suggestions) are considered and supported with appropriate, detailed evidence from <b>more than one</b> relevant core study. Discussion is detailed with good understanding and clear expression. Analysis is effective and argument well informed.</p> <p><b>REASONABLE</b>  <b>7 – 8 marks</b> – The response demonstrates reasonable understanding of the usefulness debate. Application of the debate is mainly coherently presented showing a reasonable understanding of the points raised (at least 2).  <b>Both</b> sides of the debate are considered (i.e. supporting and challenging usefulness, e.g. one supporting suggestion and one challenging suggestion)</p>

Question	Answer Guidance	Mark	Awarding Marks Guidance
	<p><b>Points against usefulness may include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The study may lack internal/external validity (lack of controls, use of self-reports, researcher bias, demand characteristics etc.).</li> <li>Small/biased samples limit the generalisability and therefore the usefulness of the findings.</li> <li>If an experimental method is used, the study may be low in ecological validity.</li> <li>If the study uses a snapshot design there is no indication of how the behaviour(s) develop/continue over time.</li> <li>If only one type of data is gathered usefulness is limited (practical applications are difficult to develop from just quantitative data; comparison cannot really be made from qualitative data).</li> </ul> <p><b>Good response:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Psychological research can be considered intrinsically useful if it furthers our knowledge and understanding of why people behave the way they do. For example, Freud found that Little Hans' fear of horses was really a subconscious fear of his father because he was experiencing the Oedipus complex. Such findings have considerable implications for psychologists/psychiatrists who are trying to find unconscious reasons for people's behaviours. Freud's work led to the birth of psychoanalysis which still plays a significant role in the treatment of psychological issues today. However, one must be careful not to exaggerate the usefulness of such research. Freud's study only involved one young boy who may not have been typical or representative of the general population: not many young boys show such an extreme fear of horses; and as no girls were studied one cannot say how they might behave in similar situations.</li> </ul>		<p>and <b>either</b> supported with appropriate evidence from one relevant core study in detail <b>or</b> superficial evidence from more than one study.</p> <p><b>LIMITED</b>  <b>4 – 6 marks</b> – The response demonstrates limited understanding of the usefulness debate. Application of the debate lacks clear structure/organisation and shows limited understanding of the point(s) raised (at least 1).  <b>Most likely only one</b> side of the debate is considered e.g. one supporting suggestion and supporting evidence from one or more relevant core studies is superficial.</p> <p><b>BASIC</b>  <b>1 – 3 marks</b> – The response demonstrates very basic understanding of the usefulness debate. Application of the debate lacks clear structure/organisation. If both sides of the debate are referred to the points made are very weak and supporting evidence is likely to be <b>either</b> inappropriate/very vague <b>or</b> non-existent i.e. <u>no creditworthy evidence/very weak supporting evidence.</u></p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy information.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Evidence must be clearly linked to the supporting/challenging point raised to gain any credit.</i></li> <li><i>To reach the top band response must refer to both sides of the usefulness debate <b>and</b> more than one study as the question asks for examples from</i></li> </ul>

Question	Answer Guidance	Mark	Awarding Marks Guidance
	<p>Psychological research can be seen as useful when it has practical applications that improve people's lives and/or the societies they live in. The research by Baron-Cohen et al. on advanced theory of mind showed that even high-functioning adults with autism/AS have problems when it comes to reading emotions in faces. When asked to complete the Eyes Task, participants with autism/AS performed significantly worse than either normal adult or adults with Tourette syndrome. Such research can open up practical ways forward in helping high-functioning people with autism/AS and/or those who interact with such individuals. For example, it might be possible to teach people on the autistic spectrum to use alternative visual clues to interpret emotion or teach those who interact with those on the spectrum to give clear visual and verbal cues to signal how they are feeling. Even so, such research may have limited usefulness in real life situations. The use of black and white photographs of peoples' eyes to test whether or not an individual can read another person's emotion lacks ecological validity. It is extremely rare in real life that anyone will only be presented with a pair of eyes and expected to judge the emotion being portrayed. Studies in the area of individual differences are often conducted under controlled, laboratory conditions and therefore lack ecological validity meaning they may not be related to real life situations where other factors in the surrounding environment may influence behaviour. The usefulness of research will also be affected by the tasks participants are asked to undertake. Much research in the area of individual differences deals with abstract tasks in unreal situations so research often therefore lacks mundane realism because the tasks used are contrived or artificial. The research by Baron-Cohen et al. involved reading emotions from black and white photographs of eyes which were presented to participants for three seconds.</p>		<p><i>relevant core studies.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Study-specific answers are <b>capped at 3 marks.</b></i></li> <li>• <i>Answers merely discussing the usefulness of the individual differences area/debate are not creditworthy.</i></li> </ul>

Question	Answer Guidance	Mark	Awarding Marks Guidance
	<p>No other indications of emotional state or environmental influences that may help an individual interpret a person's emotional state/feelings were presented. This infers that the usefulness of such research may be of limited value.</p> <p><b>Reasonable response:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Psychological research can be considered useful as many interesting topics concerned with the understanding of human behaviour lend themselves to experimental research in which single variables can be isolated and tested to allow cause and effect conclusions to be drawn. In the research by Baron-Cohen et al. the ability to read emotions was tested using the Eyes Task in which participants were shown 25 black and white photographs of the eye region and asked make a forced choice between two mental states. Results showed that those with autism/AS scored worse than participants who were either normal or who suffered with Tourette syndrome. This allowed Baron-Cohen et al. to suggest that people with autism/AS have a core cognitive deficit of lacking a theory of mind. However, the findings such research may be difficult to apply outside the research setting may therefore have limited usefulness. Experimental research can be well-controlled, creating high internal validity. For example, in Baron-Cohen et al.'s study in theory of mind, procedures were standardised so all participants saw the same 25 black and white photos for 3 seconds each and had to choose between the same two emotional states for each photo This enables easy replication to confirm the results. Consistent results infer reliability. If findings can be considered reliable, the research may be very useful. It is useful to know that individuals on the autistic spectrum have difficulty reading the emotional states of other people.</li> </ul>		

Question	Answer Guidance	Mark	Awarding Marks Guidance
	<p><b>Limited response:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Psychological research can be considered useful as many interesting topics concerned with the understanding of human behaviour lend themselves to experimental research in which single variables can be isolated and tested to allow cause and effect conclusions to be drawn. In the research by Baron-Cohen et al. the ability to read emotions was tested using the Eyes Task in which participants were shown 25 black and white photographs of the eye region and asked make a forced choice between two mental states. Results showed that those with autism/AS scored worse than participants who were either normal or who suffered with Tourette syndrome. This allowed Baron-Cohen et al. to suggest that people with autism/AS have a core cognitive deficit of lacking a theory of mind. This is useful for people who interact with people on the autistic spectrum. Research that furthers knowledge and understanding of human behaviour contributes to the belief that psychology is an academic discipline. This is useful as it improves the credibility of psychology and strengthens the claim that it should be considered as a science.</li> </ul> <p><b>Basic response:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Psychological research can be seen as useful when it has practical applications that improve people's lives and/or the societies they live in. Psychological research can be considered intrinsically useful if it furthers our knowledge and understanding of why people behave the way they do. Research is therefore useful if it makes us more aware of our behaviour and the reasons for it. Research can also be considered useful as many interesting topics concerned with the understanding of human behaviour lend themselves to experimental research in which single variables can be isolated and tested to allow cause and effect conclusions to be drawn.</li> </ul>		

Question		Answer Guidance	Mark	Awarding Marks Guidance
7	(a)	<p><b>Suggest why this article can be placed in the cognitive area.</b></p> <p><b>Possible answer:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The article is mainly concerned with memory, a cognitive process. Here eyewitnesses were asked to remember what they saw in relation to ‘a violent attack on an individual in a crowded train station’.</li> <li>Other suggestions linking the article to the cognitive area should be credited.</li> </ul>	[2]	<p><b>2 marks</b> – An appropriate suggestion has been provided which clearly links the article with the cognitive area such as the one given in Answer Guidance.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Vague or partial answer e.g. in the article eyewitnesses were asked to remember what they saw in relation to ‘a violent attack on an individual in a crowded train station’ i.e. evidence from the article with <u>no clear link to the cognitive area</u>; the article is concerned with memory, a cognitive process i.e. <u>no supporting evidence from the article/no contextualisation</u>.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy information.</p>
7	(b)	<p><b>Identify <u>one</u> psychological issue raised by the article. Support your answer with evidence from the article.</b></p> <p><b>Possible issues:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Eyewitness testimony is unreliable/inaccurate/false so it should not be relied upon (in court). Here eyewitnesses reported the suspect to have: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Vaulted over a ticket barrier when in fact he had walked through the barriers.</li> <li>- Run away from security officers when none had actually been on the platform at the time.</li> <li>- Worn a bulky jacket that they suggested concealed a weapon when in fact he had been wearing a light denim jacket with a bag of sweets tucked into one pocket.</li> </ul> </li> <li>The interviews lacked an environmental context which has been shown to enhance the accuracy of recall. Eyewitnesses were interviewed ‘at a local police station’ while the incident had occurred ‘in a crowded train station’.</li> </ul>	[3]	<p><b>3 marks</b> – <b>Good</b> knowledge and understanding of a psychological issue that is clearly expressed <b>and</b> supported by appropriate evidence from the article.</p> <p>An appropriate issue has been identified [1] and is explained through evidence from the article (appropriately contextualised). [2]</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – <b>Reasonable</b> knowledge and understanding of a psychological issue but lacks some clarity with an attempt made to support this with appropriate evidence from the article.</p> <p>An appropriate issue may be merely identified. [1] but not fully explained through evidence from the article. [1]</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – <b>Limited</b> knowledge and understanding of a psychological issue that is poorly expressed. An issue may be briefly identified but not explained</p>

Question		Answer Guidance	Mark	Awarding Marks Guidance
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The stress of witnessing the event may have led to inaccurate testimonies as research has shown that stress can negatively affect recall. Here, 'during the interview many of the witnesses showed extreme stress when asked to recall details of the event'.</li> <li>Other people can influence the accuracy of recall. Here eyewitnesses 'were interviewed as a group'. Other people may have provided information which influenced memories of the event.</li> <li>The use of leading questions can distort a person's memory so that they give false/inaccurate testimonies which cannot be used as evidence in court. Here, the case was dismissed as it was found that the police used leading questions when interviewing eyewitnesses.</li> <li>People's memories can be influenced by a variety of factors. For example, witnesses were interviewed a day after the event, by which time their memory may not be as accurate. Also, witnesses were interviewed as a group so other people around them may have influenced their recall so they remembered things inaccurately.</li> <li>Other suggestions linking the article to the cognitive area should be credited e.g. the fact that the interviews were conducted 'the day after the incident' linked to the effects of time on memory.</li> </ul>		<p>through evidence from the article. [1]</p> <p>Evidence given in the absence of an issue being identified. [1]</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy information.</p>
7	(c)	<p><b>Briefly outline one of the experiments from the core study into eyewitness testimony conducted by Loftus and explain how it could relate to the article.</b></p> <p><b>Possible answers:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In Experiment 1, participants were shown seven film clips of traffic accidents and after each clip were asked to complete a questionnaire which contained a critical question: "About how fast were the cars going when they smashed/collided/hit/contacted/bumped into each other?"</li> </ul>	[4]	<p><b>4 marks</b> – The response demonstrates <b>good</b> knowledge and understanding of either of Loftus and Palmer's experiments. Literacy is good with clear expression good spelling and good grammar. Knowledge and understanding of how the experiment can be related to the article is good <b>and</b> these are supported by appropriate evidence from the source.</p> <p><b>3 marks</b> – The response demonstrates <b>reasonable</b> knowledge and understanding of either of Loftus and</p>



Question	Answer Guidance	Mark	Awarding Marks Guidance
	<p>Results showed that the verb in the critical question greatly influenced speed estimates. Participants with the verb ‘smashed’ in the critical question reported significantly higher speed estimates than those who had the verb ‘contacted’. This experiment showed that eyewitness testimony can be inaccurate and that leading questions can influence memory. The experiment relates to the article because eyewitnesses were found to have inaccurately recalled details of both the event and the suspect. For example, it was reported that the suspect was wearing a bulky jacket that eyewitnesses suggested concealed a weapon when in fact he had been wearing a light denim jacket with a bag of sweets tucked into one pocket. The inaccuracies in recall could have been because ‘it was found that the police had used leading questions when interviewing eyewitnesses.’</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In Experiment 2, participants were shown a film clip of a multiple car accident and were then asked to complete a questionnaire in which some were asked, “About how fast were the cars going when they smashed into each other?”, some were asked, “About how fast were the cars going when they hit each other?” with others not being asked about the speed of the vehicles (the control condition). A week later all participants completed a second questionnaire in which they were asked, “Did you see any broken glass? Yes/No?” More participants in the smashed condition reported seeing broken glass than in either the hit or control condition. This experiment showed that eyewitness testimony can be inaccurate and that leading questions can influence memory. The experiment relates to the article because eyewitnesses were found to have inaccurately recalled details of both the event and the suspect. For example, it was reported that the suspect vaulted over a ticket barrier when in fact he had walked through the barriers. The inaccuracies in recall could have been because ‘it was found that the</li> </ul>		<p>Palmer’s experiments. Expression, spelling and grammar are reasonable. Knowledge and understanding of how the selected experiment can be related to the article is reasonable though the link and supporting evidence to the article may be weak.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – The response demonstrates <b>limited</b> knowledge and understanding of either of Loftus and Palmer’s experiments. Expression, spelling and grammar are weak. Knowledge and understanding of how the selected experiment can be related to the article is barely discernible and supporting evidence from the article is very weak.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – The response is very <b>basic</b>. Knowledge and understanding of either of Loftus and Palmer’s studies is hardly discernible, there is no real understanding of how the selected experiment relates to the article and there is <u>no supporting evidence</u>; some understanding may be evident in relation to how Loftus and Palmer’s research links to the article. Expression, spelling and grammar are poor.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy information.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>In order to access full marks, the candidate must refer to ‘leading questions’.</i></li> <li>• <i>If the candidate merely describes one/both of Loftus and Palmer’s experiments the answer is capped at <b>2 marks</b>.</i></li> <li>• <i>If the outline of either of Loftus and Palmer’s experiments shows good knowledge and understanding but the link to the article is weak, the answer is capped at <b>3 marks</b>.</i></li> </ul>

Question		Answer Guidance	Mark	Awarding Marks Guidance
		<p>police had used leading questions when interviewing eyewitnesses.'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Other appropriate outlines should be credited.</li> </ul>		
7	(d)	<p><b>Using your psychological knowledge, suggest how eyewitness testimony could have been improved in relation to the incident reported in the article.</b></p> <p><b>Possible strategies:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Police should be trained not to use leading questions as these have been shown to negatively affect the accuracy of eyewitness testimony.</li> <li>Eyewitnesses should be interviewed individually to prevent others in their immediate environment influencing their recall. Observational learning shows that what we see and hear from others around us influence the way we subsequently behave.</li> <li>Eyewitnesses should be interviewed at the scene of the event, not in a different environment, as research has shown that environmental cues can enhance recall.</li> <li>Efforts should be made to reduce stress levels in eyewitnesses so that they feel relaxed when being interviewed. Research has shown that individuals who have witnessed a stressful event do not recall details of the event as well as individuals who witness non-stressful events.</li> <li>Other appropriate suggestions should be credited.</li> </ul> <p><b>Good response:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Leading questions led eyewitnesses to inaccurately recall details of both the event and the suspect in the article. Police should be trained not to use leading questions as these have been shown to negatively affect the accuracy of eyewitness testimony. (Part of the training process of police officers should be to take part in interviewing</li> </ul>	[8]	<p><b>GOOD</b>  <b>7-8 marks</b> – The response shows <b>good</b> knowledge of how eyewitness testimony could have been improved <u>in relation</u> to the article (at least three, well-developed suggestions).  There is a <b>good</b> application of psychological knowledge to support the suggestions i.e. the candidate has explained the purpose of the suggested improvement.  There may be a description of how the suggested improvements could be have been implemented.</p> <p><b>REASONABLE</b>  <b>5-6 marks</b> – The response shows <b>reasonable</b> knowledge of how eyewitness testimony could have been improved <u>in relation</u> to the article (at least two well-developed suggestions).  There is a <b>reasonable</b> application of psychological knowledge to support the suggestions.  There may be some description of how the suggested improvements could be have been implemented.</p> <p><b>LIMITED</b>  <b>3-4 marks</b> – The response shows a <b>limited</b> knowledge of how eyewitness testimony could have been improved <u>in relation</u> to the article (at least one well-developed/two basic suggestions).  There is <b>limited</b> application of psychological knowledge to support the suggestions.  There is unlikely to be a description of how the suggested improvements could be have been implemented.</p>

Question	Answer Guidance	Mark	Awarding Marks Guidance
	<p>scenarios in which they should be encouraged not to use leading questions. These practice interviews should be video-recorded so that trainee officers can receive feedback and learn how to improve their interviewing skills. In this incident eyewitnesses were interviewed as a group but observational learning shows that what we see and hear from others around us influences the way we subsequently behave and recall information. Eyewitnesses should therefore be interviewed individually to prevent others in their immediate environment influencing their recall. (This could be done by taking all eyewitnesses to an empty waiting area where one police officer will sit with them to ensure they do not talk or interact with each other whilst an interviewing officer takes witnesses individually to a quiet staff room in the train station so they can be questioned without the influence of other people.) In the article the actual event occurred in a busy train station but eyewitness statements were taken at a local police station. Eyewitnesses should be interviewed at the scene of the event, not in a different environment, as research has shown that environmental cues can enhance recall. (This could be achieved by taking each eyewitness from a waiting area in the train station back to the actual place where they were standing when the incident occurred.)</p> <p><b>Reasonable response:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In the article, leading questions led eyewitnesses to inaccurately recall details of both the event and the suspect. Police should be trained not to use leading questions as these have been shown to negatively affect the accuracy of eyewitness testimony. (Part of the training process of police officers should be to take part in interviewing scenarios in which they should be encouraged not to use leading questions.) Eyewitnesses should be interviewed individually, not as a group, to</li> </ul>		<p><b>BASIC</b></p> <p><b>1-2 marks</b> – The response shows a <b>basic</b> knowledge of how eyewitness testimony could have been improved <u>which may be vaguely related to the article</u> (one/two very basic suggestions). There is <b>no real</b> application of psychological knowledge to support the suggestions. There is <b>no</b> description of how the suggested improvements could have been implemented.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy information.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Suggestions in relation to how the suggested improvement(s) may be implemented can be credited.</i></li> </ul>

Question		Answer Guidance	Mark	Awarding Marks Guidance
		<p>prevent others in their immediate environment influencing their recall. (This could be done by the interviewing officer taking witnesses individually to a quiet staff room in the train station so they can be questioned without the influence of other people.) Eyewitnesses should be interviewed at the scene of the event, not in a different environment, as research has shown that environmental cues can enhance recall.</p> <p><b>Limited response:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Police officers are reported in the article to have used leading questions. (They should be trained not to use such questions,) These should not be used as they have been shown to negatively affect the accuracy of eyewitness testimony. Eyewitnesses should be interviewed at the scene of the event, not in a different place. Efforts should be made to reduce stress levels in eyewitnesses so that they feel relaxed when being interviewed.</li> </ul> <p><b>Basic response:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interviewers should be trained not to use leading questions. Eyewitnesses should be interviewed at the scene of the event.</li> </ul>		
7	(e)*	<p><b>Evaluate the suggestions you made in 7(d) in relation to the incident reported in the article.</b></p> <p><b>Evaluation may refer to:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Usefulness</li> <li>Effectiveness</li> <li>Appropriateness</li> <li>Ecological validity</li> <li>Practical implications</li> <li>Ethical considerations</li> </ul>	[8]	<p><b>GOOD</b>  <b>7-8 marks</b> – The response demonstrates <b>good</b> evaluation that is relevant to the demand of the question. Evaluation/argument is <b>coherently</b> presented with <b>clear</b> understanding of the points raised. Evaluation is highly skilled. Understanding, expression and use of psychological terminology are <b>good</b>.</p> <p>A <b>range</b> (two or more) of appropriate evaluation points</p>

Question	Answer Guidance	Mark	Awarding Marks Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Funding issues</li> <li>• Nature/nurture</li> <li>• Validity/reliability</li> <li>• Other evaluative suggestions should be considered and credited if appropriate.</li> </ul> <p><b>Good response:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training police officers not to use leading questions will prevent information received after an event affecting a person's memory of that event which may lead eyewitnesses to recall more accurately the event they saw. However, this is easier said than done. Police officers develop schemas based on previous information and life experiences and knowledge. Their schema for an incident like the one reported in the article may lead them to automatically ask leading questions as they expect the information given to fit with their schema for such events. Asking leading questions may therefore be part of a police officer's nature so that nurturing changes in the way they ask questions may be difficult to achieve. It may therefore be necessary to select interviewing officers based on their ability to avoid the use of leading questions. This may be difficult as, with the continual reduction in police numbers, officers need to be extremely versatile so it may not be possible to select officers based on such specific abilities. Training police officers not to use leading questions through the use of scenarios will lack ecological validity though such exercises can be made extremely realistic through the use of real interview rooms, the use of CCTV rather than video recorders etc. Adequate training will be time-consuming and it may be difficult to include enough training scenarios to ensure interviewing officers learn to consistently avoid the use of leading questions. Interviewing eyewitnesses individually rather than in a group may be stressful and so this</li> </ul>		<p>is considered from <b>both</b> a positive and a negative perspective/strength and weakness aspect. The answer is therefore <u>well balanced</u>. The evaluation points are in <b>context</b> and <b>supported</b> by relevant evidence of the suggestions made in in 7(d) /the article</p> <p><b>REASONABLE</b>  <b>5-6 marks</b> – The response demonstrates <b>reasonable</b> evaluation that is <b>mainly</b> relevant to the demand of the question. Evaluation is <b>mainly</b> coherently presented with <b>reasonable</b> understanding of the points raised. Understanding, expression and use of psychological terminology are <b>reasonable</b>.</p> <p>A <b>range</b> (two or more) of appropriate evaluation points is considered though <b>both</b> positive and negative perspectives/strength and weakness aspects are <u>not always</u> provided. The response may therefore <u>not be well balanced</u>. The evaluation points are <b>mainly</b> in context and supported by some relevant evidence of the suggestions made in 7(d) / the article.</p> <p><b>LIMITED</b>  <b>3-4 marks</b> – Response demonstrates <b>limited</b> evaluation that is <b>sometimes</b> relevant to the demand of the question. Only positive perspectives/strengths or negative perspectives/weaknesses are considered. .Evaluation/argument lacks clear structure/organisation and has <b>limited</b> understanding of the points raised. Understanding, expression and use of psychological terminology are <b>limited</b>.</p> <p>The evaluation points are <b>occasionally</b> in context and supported by relevant evidence of the suggestions made in 7(d) / the article.</p>

Question	Answer Guidance	Mark	Awarding Marks Guidance
	<p>suggestion raises ethical concerns. Therefore, the effectiveness of this strategy may be questionable. Witnesses have already seen a distressing incident on a train station and by trying to gather statements about the event from people isolated from others may increase stress levels even more. Interviewing witnesses individually is also very time-consuming and it may be difficult to find either enough interviewing officers and/or suitable interviewing areas. However interviewing witness individually reduces the chance of others in the immediate environment influencing their recall and would therefore be a useful and appropriate strategy to employ.</p> <p><b>Reasonable response:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A strength of training police officers not to use leading questions will reduce the chances of the witness receiving information after the event which may negatively affect their recall. Such a strategy would be useful. A problem with this is that, regardless of training, it may be in some police officers' nature to ask leading questions so that any nurturing through specific training programmes, may have limited effectiveness. A strength of interviewing witnesses individually is that other people cannot influence their recall which is useful. However, there may be ethical concerns as individuals are already stressed by witnessing an event such as an assault in a railway station. Interviewing them individually may increase stress levels even further. It may not be practical to interview witnesses straight after an event as there may not be an appropriate area in which to conduct the interview.</li> </ul>		<p><b>BASIC</b>  <b>1-2 marks</b> – Response demonstrates <b>basic</b> evaluation that is loosely linked to the demand of the question. Evaluation/argument lacks clear structure / organisation and has <b>basic</b> understanding of the points raised. Understanding, expression and use of psychological terminology are <b>basic</b> and often missing. The evaluation points are <b>not</b> contextualised to the article.</p> <p>The evaluation is only loosely linked to the suggestions made in 7(d).</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy information.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Make sure points credited in 7d are not double-credited in this question part e.g. double-crediting the purpose of the suggested improvement.</i></li> <li>• <i>Make sure evaluation points actually refer to improvements that have been suggest in 7d i.e. are not new suggestions which the candidate then evaluates.</i></li> <li>• <i>Evaluations in relation to implementation can gain credit.</i></li> </ul>

Question	Answer Guidance	Mark	Awarding Marks Guidance
	<p><b>Limited response:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training police officers not to use leading questions will prevent them from influencing a witness’s memory of the event so that their recall is more reliable. This is therefore a useful strategy to improve eyewitness testimony. It will however be very difficult and time consuming to train police officers not to use leading questions. Interviewing witnesses individually may be an effective strategy to ensure reliable eyewitness testimony. However, there are practical implications as the process will be very time consuming, especially in such situations as the one in the article as there were likely to have been lots of people in the train station who witnessed the assault.</li> </ul> <p><b>Basic response:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training police officers not to use leading questions will be time consuming and expensive but should lead to increased accuracy of recall. Interviewing witnesses at the scene of the event is useful as it gives them the opportunity to relive the event.</li> </ul>		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>[75]</b>	

**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](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

[www.ocr.org.uk](http://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 2018

