



Oxford Cambridge and RSA

GCE

Psychology

H567/02: Psychological themes through core studies

A Level

Mark Scheme for June 2023

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 2023

PREPARATION FOR MARKING**RM ASSESSOR**

1. Make sure that you have accessed and completed the relevant training packages for on-screen marking: *RM Assessor3 assessor Online Training; OCR Essential Guide to Marking.*
2. Make sure that you have read and understood the mark scheme and the question paper for this unit. These are posted on the RM Cambridge Assessment Support Portal <http://www.rm.com/support/ca>
3. Log-in to RM Assessor and mark the **required number** of practice responses (“scripts”) and the **number of required** standardisation responses.

Check with instructions: YOU MUST MARK 5 PRACTICE AND 10 STANDARDISATION RESPONSES BEFORE YOU CAN BE APPROVED TO MARK LIVE SCRIPTS.

MARKING

1. Mark strictly to the mark scheme.
2. Marks awarded must relate directly to the marking criteria.
3. The schedule of dates is very important. It is essential that you meet the RM Assessor3 50% and 100% (traditional 40% Batch 1 and 100% Batch 2) deadlines. If you experience problems, you must contact your Team Leader (Supervisor) without delay.
4. If you are in any doubt about applying the mark scheme, consult your Team Leader by telephone or the RM Assessor3 messaging system, or by email.
5. **Crossed Out Responses**
Where a candidate has crossed out a response and provided a clear alternative then the crossed out response is not marked. Where no alternative response has been provided, examiners may give candidates the benefit of the doubt and mark the crossed out response where legible.

Rubric Error Responses – Optional Questions

Where candidates have a choice of question across a whole paper or a whole section and have provided more answers than required, then all responses are marked and the highest mark allowable within the rubric is given. Enter a mark for each question answered into RM assessor, which will select the

highest mark from those awarded. *(The underlying assumption is that the candidate has penalised themselves by attempting more questions than necessary in the time allowed.)*

Multiple Choice Question Responses

When a multiple-choice question has only a single, correct response and a candidate provides two responses (even if one of these responses is correct), then no mark should be awarded (as it is not possible to determine which was the first response selected by the candidate).

When a question requires candidates to select more than one option/multiple options, then local marking arrangements need to ensure consistency of approach.

Contradictory Responses

When a candidate provides contradictory responses, then no mark should be awarded, even if one of the answers is correct.

Short Answer Questions (requiring only a list by way of a response, usually worth only **one mark per response**)

Where candidates are required to provide a set number of short answer responses then only the set number of responses should be marked. The response space should be marked from left to right on each line and then line by line until the required number of responses have been considered. The remaining responses should not then be marked. Examiners will have to apply judgement as to whether a 'second response' on a line is a development of the 'first response', rather than a separate, discrete response. *(The underlying assumption is that the candidate is attempting to hedge their bets and therefore getting undue benefit rather than engaging with the question and giving the most relevant/correct responses.)*

Short Answer Questions (requiring a more developed response, worth **two or more marks**)

If the candidates are required to provide a description of, say, three items or factors and four items or factors are provided, then mark on a similar basis – that is downwards (as it is unlikely in this situation that a candidate will provide more than one response in each section of the response space.)

Longer Answer Questions (requiring a developed response)

Where candidates have provided two (or more) responses to a medium or high tariff question which only required a single (developed) response and not crossed out the first response, then only the first response should be marked. Examiners will need to apply professional judgement as to whether the second (or a subsequent) response is a 'new start' or simply a poorly expressed continuation of the first response.

6. Always check the pages (and additional objects if present) at the end of the response in case any answers have been continued there. If the candidate has continued an answer there, then add a tick to confirm that the work has been seen.
7. Award No Response (NR) if:
 - there is nothing written in the answer space

Award Zero '0' if:

- anything is written in the answer space and is not worthy of credit (this includes text and symbols).

Team Leaders must confirm the correct use of the NR button with their markers before live marking commences and should check this when reviewing scripts.

8. The RM Assessor3 **comments box** is used by your team leader to explain the marking of the practice responses. Please refer to these comments when checking your practice responses. **Do not use the comments box for any other reason.**

If you have any questions or comments for your team leader, use the phone, the RM Assessor messaging system, or e-mail.










9. *Assistant Examiners will send a brief report on the performance of candidates to their Team Leader (Supervisor) via email by the end of the marking period. The report should contain notes on particular strengths displayed as well as common errors or weaknesses. Constructive criticism of the question paper/mark scheme is also appreciated.*

10. For answers marked by levels of response:

- To determine the level** – start at the highest level and work down until you reach the level that matches the answer
- To determine the mark within the level**, consider the following

Descriptor	Award mark
On the borderline of this level and the one below	At bottom of level
Just enough achievement on balance for this level	Above bottom and either below middle or at middle of level (depending on number of marks available)
Meets the criteria but with some slight inconsistency	Above middle and either below top of level or at middle of level (depending on number of marks available)
Consistently meets the criteria for this level	At top of level

11. Annotations

Annotation	Meaning
	Blank page
	Meaning unclear
	Incorrect
	
	Something incorrect/contradictory
	Correct
	Development
	Missing information or Band down
APP	Application
CONT	Context
NAQ	Not answering question
RES	Research
SEEN	Seen (to show content on page has been noted but not credited)
BOD	Benefit of doubt given
IRRL	Irrelevant
EVAL	Evaluation
	Highlight

12. Subject Specific Marking Instructions

13.

Question		Answer	Mark	Guidance
1	(a)	<p>Explain how Milgram's (1963) study into obedience may be considered ethnocentric.</p> <p>Knowledge of the concept of ethnocentrism e.g. unrepresentative of other ethnic groups, cannot generalise to other societies, cultural bias, way of thinking focussed on your own cultural group etc</p> <p>Briefly relating to Milgram's study e.g. only Americans were studied, carried out in America.</p> <p>Relating to Milgram's study in a more developed way e.g. Milgram's study only investigated Americans (1) whereas other countries may show higher or lower levels of obedience to authority depending on cultural norms (1).</p>	<p>3</p> <p>AO3</p>	<p>1 mark: knowledge of the concept of ethnocentrism <i>Plus</i></p> <p>1 mark: briefly relating to Milgram's study <i>Plus</i></p> <p>1 mark: further development to Milgram</p>
1	(b)	<p>Describe the procedure used in Piliavin et al's (1969) Subway Samaritan study.</p> <p>Key features include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research team: There were 4 teams of 4 researchers: 2 female observers, 2 males – one acting as victim, one the model. • Victim description: The victims (3 white, 1 black) were all male. They either smelled of liquor and carried a liquor bottle in a brown bag or appeared sober and carried a black cane. • Model conditions: The models (all white) were males. There were 4 model conditions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Critical area – early. (ii) Critical area – late. (iii) Adjacent area – early. (iv) Adjacent area – late. 	<p>6</p> <p>AO1</p>	<p>5-6 marks for a detailed and accurate description of four or more key features (with one or two developed) OR six briefly described key features of the study's procedure.</p> <p>3-4 marks for an accurate description of two key features in detail OR three briefly outlined key features of the study's procedure.</p> <p>1-2 marks for a brief or vague description of the study's procedure which identifies one or two key features.</p> <p>0 marks – no creditworthy response.</p> <p>N.B Recognition of research method or location alone is not procedural element</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Observations: On each trial one observer noted the race, sex and location of every rider seated or standing in the critical area. In addition, she counted the total number of individuals who came to the victim's assistance. She also recorded the race, sex and location of every helper. The second observer coded the race, sex and location of all persons in the adjacent area. She also recorded the latency of the first helper's arrival after the victim had fallen and on appropriate trials, the latency of the first helper's arrival after the model had arrived. Both observers recorded comments spontaneously made by nearby passengers and attempted to elicit comments from a rider sitting next to them. • Location of research team: Observers took seats outside the critical area • The staged emergency The victim stood near a pole in the critical area. After about 70 seconds he staggered forward and collapsed. Until receiving help he remained supine/lying straight upwards on the floor looking at the ceiling. If he received no help by the time the train stopped the model helped him to his feet. • Standardised features: All models wore identical clothing. The victim acted identically in both conditions. • At the stop the team disembarked and waited separately until other passengers had left the station. They then changed platforms to repeat the process in the opposite direction. 		
2		<p>Describe the background to Hancock et al's (2011) study into the language of psychopaths.</p> <p>Possible content:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Psychological characteristics of psychopaths could be understood using statistically based text analysis programmes to analyse linguistic variables 	3 AO1	<p>The Study contains more information that candidates may well draw on. 'background' is a general term, discussion of relevant information in the full article can be credited</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Psychopaths have social, cognitive and emotional characteristics e.g. selfish orientation, diminished moral sensibilities and profound emotional deficits • Psychopaths exhibit no deficit in intellect • Hancock wanted to examine whether the language of psychopaths reflected an instrumental/predatory world view, unique socioemotional needs and a poverty of effect • Psychopaths are manipulative and are skilled conversationalists. <p>Example top band answers :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Psychopaths focus on what Maslow (1943) referred to as basic or material needs, reflecting physiological needs such as food, sex, and shelter, whereas higher level needs such as meaningful relationships and spirituality are likely to be of minimal interest. Hancock was interested in whether these unique drives would result in particular linguistic patterns. • Psychopaths exhibit a deficit in their ability to interpret and experience emotion. This deficit is reflected in their difficulty identifying subtle emotional expressions and problems identifying emotional words and concepts. Hancock et al wanted to examine their emotional deficit whilst they described their crime. • Previous studies have revealed that psychopaths' language appears to be less cohesive than non-psychopaths. Brinkley <i>et al.</i> (1999) found that narratives of psychopaths contained fewer cohesive ties and more integrated details than non-psychopaths. Hancock's research is the first to uniquely examine the specific qualities of 	<p>1 mark – identifying background</p> <p>1 mark – developing the information on the background</p> <p>1 mark – link to Hancock's subsequent aim of the investigation (credit for the aim cannot be given unless it is linked to the background)</p>
--	--	---	---

			psychopathic language using sophisticated statistical text analysis tools.		
3			<p>Outline three different results from Blakemore & Cooper's study into the impact of early visual experience.</p> <p>Possible findings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regardless of whether the kittens had been exposed to vertical or horizontal stripes, they were initially extremely visually impaired. • Kittens showed 'behavioural blindness' in that the kittens raised in the horizontal environment could not detect vertically aligned objects and vice versa. • Only the eyes of the kitten brought up in vertical stripes followed a rod held vertically and only the eyes of the kitten reared in horizontal stripes followed the rod if it was held horizontally i.e. both kittens remained blind to contours perpendicular to the stripes they had lived with. • The kittens quickly recovered from many of the deficiencies and within a total of about 10 hours of normal vision they showed startled responses and visual placing and would jump with ease from a chair to the floor. • Some of the kittens' defects were permanent: they always followed moving objects with jerky head movements and often tried to touch things well beyond their reach. • The neurophysiological examination showed no evidence of severe astigmatism, which might have explained the behavioural responses. • Horizontal plane recognition cells did not 'fire-off' in the kitten from the vertical environment and vertical plane cells did not 'fire-off' in the kitten from the horizontal environment so there was distinct 	6 AO1 2+2+2	<p>For each result:</p> <p>1 mark for brief, vague or muddled statement of findings</p> <p>2 marks for developed, detailed and accurate statement of findings</p>

			<p>orientation selectivity, showing the kittens suffered from 'physical blindness'.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • About 75% of cells in both kittens were clearly binocular and in almost every way the responses were like that of a normal kitten. • The distributions of preferred orientation were totally abnormal: not one neurone had its optimal orientation. • This anisotropy (the property of being directionally dependent) was significant at $p \leq 0.00001$: chi squared test. • No obvious large regions of 'silent' cortex corresponding to the 'missing' cortical columns were observed/found. 		
4	(a)		<p>In Grant et al's (1998) study on memory why was the short-answer test taken before the multiple-choice test?</p> <p>To ensure that the information being recalled was from the reading of the text not recalled from the multiple-choice test</p>	2 AO1	<p>1 mark: MCQ being used in recall/ impact MCQ could have on answer</p> <p>1 mark: recall of reading the text/ memory of the article/ elaboration of why this is an issue</p>
4	(b)	i	<p>Explain one difference between Experiment 1 of Moray's (1959) study into attention and Simons and Chabris's study into inattention</p> <p>Possible differences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • use of auditory data versus use of visual data • repeated measures vs independent measures design • different type of equipment used • number of conditions set up/independent variables • Sampling technique – Opportunity vs self-selected sampling 	4 AO1	<p>4 marks – for a clear response which;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • identifies a difference • further outlines that difference • illustrates the difference with reference to Moray's study (Experiment 1) • illustrates the difference with reference to Simon and Chabris' study. <p>3 marks for a vague response with the all of the above points or for a clear response with three of the points.</p>

					<p>2 marks for a vague response with three of the above points or for a clear response with two of the points.</p> <p>1 mark for a vague response with two of the above points or for a clear response with the difference identified/implied.</p> <p>0 marks – no creditworthy response.</p> <p>Max 3 marks if it is not clearly linked to experiment 1 of Moray.</p> <p>Do not credit differences that pertain to the aim, key theme or area of psychology.</p>
4	(b)	ii	<p>Explain one similarity between Experiment 1 of Moray’s (1959) study into attention and Simons and Chabris’s study into inattention</p> <p>Possible similarities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • use of experiment/manipulation of IV • use of laboratory/controlled environment • standardised procedures • undergraduates as participants • use of quantitative data 	4 AO1	<p>4 marks – for a clear response which;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • identifies a similarity • further outlines that similarity • illustrates the similarity with reference to Moray’s study (Experiment 1) • illustrates the similarity with reference to Simon and Chabris’ study. <p>3 marks for a vague response with the all of the above points or for a clear response with three of the points.</p> <p>2 marks for a vague response with three of the above points or for a clear response with two of the points.</p> <p>1 mark for a vague response with two of the above points or for a clear response with the similarity identified/implied.</p> <p>0 marks – no creditworthy response.</p> <p>Max 3 marks if it is not clearly linked to experiment 1 of Moray.</p>

					Do not credit similarities that pertain to the aim, key theme or area of psychology.
5	(a)	<p>Outline one strength and one weakness of the type of data collected by Kohlberg in his study of moral development.</p> <p>Possible strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> rich in detail high construct validity allows for individual response more valid than quantitative data <p>Possible weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> too subjective/open to interpretation harder to draw comparisons/look for patterns less reliable than quantitative data Difficult to analyse Difficult to generalise 	4 AO3 2 + 2	<p>For both the strength and the weakness:</p> <p>1 mark for a valid evaluative point</p> <p><i>Plus</i></p> <p>1 mark for considering this point in the context of the study</p> <p>'in the scenario', 'moral development' not enough for context mark</p> <p>'moral thinking' and 'moral levels' is enough for credit as not repeating question.</p>	
5	(b)	<p>Explain one way Lee et al (1997) attempted to ensure the reliability of their study into lying and truth-telling.</p> <p>Possible ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> matching samples e.g., age, province random assignment of children to conditions use of rating scale across conditions randomisation of order of conditions All asked- 'was what (s)he did good or bad?' Standardised procedures 	3 AO3	<p>3 marks for a clear response which identifies a relevant way the study's design increased reliability, outlines how/why it did (context) and demonstrates an understanding of reliability in the process. (E.g. uses words such as all, everyone, consistent, same, results being similar over time)</p> <p>2 marks for a vague response with all three of the above features or for a clear response with two of the features.</p> <p>1 mark for identifying a relevant way the procedure addressed the issue of reliability.</p> <p>0 marks – no creditworthy response.</p>	

					N.B. Participants are allocated to social or physical story conditions so did not all have same scenarios/conditions.
6	(a)		<p>Explain two defining principles or concepts of the individual differences area.</p> <p>Possible principles/concepts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People are unique/ everyone is different/ we are not the same • Individual personality • Measuring differences • Idiographic approach • Quantifying psychological attributes • Investigating complex behaviours • Use of case studies. • Supports dispositional explanations of behaviour • Holism/ Interactionist approach 	4 AO1 2+2	<p>2+2</p> <p>2 marks for a clear, accurate and developed explanation of one defining principle or concept of the individual differences area. e.g. 1. People are unique; therefore, it is difficult to compare individuals. 2. It attempts to quantify psychological attributes meaning scientific data can be obtained.</p> <p>1 mark for a brief or vague explanation of one defining principle or concept of the individual differences area. There may be some muddling or inaccuracy.</p> <p>0 marks – no creditworthy response.</p>
6	(b)		<p>Outline what is meant by the concept of holism and how this relates to the individual differences area.</p> <p>Holism: This approach believes the ‘the whole is greater than the sum of its parts’ and states that behaviour is the result of lots of things interacting together.</p> <p>Possible content linking to individual difference area: Recognising the people are unique because they have their own set of experiences – so even two similar experiences will have different outcomes for people as they interact with many other factors that have come before which may be related to both nature and nurture. This is why it is difficult to predict any behaviours because they are multi-factorial.</p>	4 AO1	<p>4 marks for a detailed and accurate outline of the concept of holism and effectively applying it to the individual differences area.</p> <p>3 marks for a detailed and accurate outline the concept of holism and an attempt to apply it to the individual differences area, or for a brief outline of the concept of holism and for effectively applying it to the area.</p> <p>2 marks for a detailed and accurate outline of the concept of holism or for a brief outline of the concept and an attempt to apply it to the individual differences area, or for effective application of holism to the area even though the concept is not explicitly defined.</p> <p>1 mark for a brief outline of the concept of holism or an attempt to apply it to the individual differences area.</p>

					<p>0 marks – no creditworthy response.</p> <p>N.B. Full marks is possible without reference to research. However, research can be used to explain links made to the area. Therefore, credit research references when used effectively.</p>
6	(c)	<p>Describe one application and explain how it is linked to the individual differences area.</p> <p>Possible applications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Therapy, including counselling, psychotherapy and psychoanalysis. • Treating students as individuals/personalisation/differentiation in education. • Personality testing in recruitment. • Supporting individuals with atypical behaviours e.g. Autism. 	4 AO1	<p>4 marks for a detailed and accurate description of a relevant application with a clear and precise explanation as to how it is linked to the principles or concepts of the individual differences area.</p> <p>3 marks for a detailed and accurate description of a relevant application with a limited explanation of how it is linked to the individual differences area. Or An accurate description with a clear explanation as to how it is linked to the principles or concepts of the individual differences area.</p> <p>2 marks for an accurate description of a relevant application Or Identifying an application followed by a limited explanation of how it is linked to the principles or concepts of the individual differences area.</p> <p>1 mark for identifying an application.</p> <p>0 marks – no creditworthy response.</p>	
6	(d)	<p>Discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the individual differences area.</p> <p>Possible strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Optimistic – potential for change • Success in treating individuals • Avoids over-generalisations 	8 AO3	<p>7-8 marks for a thorough and balanced consideration of at least one strength and one weakness of the individual differences area. Arguments are developed and coherent. There is clear and valid analysis as part of the discussion.</p>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focused on understanding individuals/understanding complex disorders • Recognises the importance of subjective experience in studying behaviours • Holism – multiple factors (takes an interactionist approach) <p>Possible weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too complex to study people reliably • Cannot establish causal relationships • Unable to generalise • Lacks objectivity • Makes people responsible for actions/ignores determinism • Socially sensitive findings 		<p>5-6 marks for a consideration of at least one strength and one weakness of the individual differences area. There is some coherency to the arguments made There is some attempt to include analysis as part of the discussion.</p> <p>3-4 marks for accurately outlining at least one weakness and one strength of the individual differences area. OR accurately outlining two strengths or two weaknesses. OR a thorough consideration of one strength or one weakness.</p> <p>1-2 marks for accurately identifying at least one strength or weakness of the individual differences area.</p> <p>0 marks – no creditworthy response.</p> <p>N.B Do not credit usefulness unless they have said why it is useful e.g. potential for change, success in treatments.</p>
6	(e)	<p>Discuss ethical considerations in psychological research. Support your answer using core studies from both the individual differences area and one other area.</p> <p>Ethical considerations include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • respect, including confidentiality, consent and right to withdraw • competence • responsibility, including protection of participants and debriefing • integrity, including avoiding deception and sharing aims • social sensitivity – as an alternate answer regarding stigma towards a group caused 	15 AO3	<p>12-15 marks for a thorough and balanced discussion that is relevant to the demands of the question. Arguments are coherently presented with clear understanding of the ethical considerations raised. A range (at least 3) of points are considered and are well developed as part of the discussion. There is evidence of valid conclusions that summarise issues very well. Relevant studies are used to good effect to support the points being made. There is consistent use of psychological terminology, and well-developed line of reasoning which is logically structured. Information presented is appropriate and substantiated.</p> <p>8-11 marks for a good and reasonably balanced discussion that is mainly relevant to the demands of the question. Arguments are presented with reasonably clear understanding of the ethical considerations raised. A range (at least 3) of points are considered and some</p>

	<p>Relevant studies from individual differences area:</p> <p>Freud's study of Little Hans</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Consent gained from parents of child (ii) Questions and prompts may have made Little Hans embarrassed etc causing harm (iii) Confidential as given different name is write up (iv) no debrief (v) no deception as Little Hans knew Father was writing to Freud (vi) was Freud competent to analyse when biased towards own theory? <p>Baron-Cohen's study of autism</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Consent gained and participants could withdraw, did participants understand purpose/give informed consent? (ii) no unethical stimuli, debriefed assumed and competent, established researchers (iii) participants were shown respect and psychologists acted responsibly <p>Gould's review of Yerkes' study of intelligence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) issues around informed consent and how testing would/could be used, debrief, ii) psychological harm could have been caused to those with low IQ scores and the implications of this (iii) integrity questionable when proponent of Eugenics carrying out research <p>Hancock et al's study of the language of psychopaths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) participants were active volunteers and not coerced (ii) could the interviews be seen as reinforcing psychotic/criminal behaviours? (iii) harm due to having to recall crimes (if not a psychopath!) <p>Other core studies can be credited if argued to be within this area</p>	<p>are developed as part of the discussion. There is evidence of valid conclusions that summarise issues well. Relevant studies are used mostly to good effect to support the points being made. There is good use of psychological terminology in a response with reasonable structure. Information presented is largely appropriate.</p> <p>4-7 marks for a limited discussion that is has some relevancy to the demands of the question. Arguments are presented but with limited understanding of the ethical considerations raised. Two or more points are considered and may be developed as part of the discussion. There is evidence of attempts to draw conclusions. Relevant studies are used as part of the discussion. There is some use of psychological terminology in a response with limited structure. Information presented is sometimes appropriate.</p> <p>1-3 marks for a basic discussion that is rarely relevant to the demands of the question. Arguments are presented but with weak understanding of the ethical considerations raised. One or a limited range of points are considered with no real development. Use of relevant studies is weak or not apparent at all. There is limited or no use of psychological terminology and structure is poor. Information presented is rarely appropriate.</p> <p>0 marks – no creditworthy response.</p> <p>N.B. If all ethical considerations are made through the context of a study/studies then the answer cannot be placed in the top band. If there is no specific consideration of the Individual differences area or a second area discussed in the response then the answer cannot be placed in the top band. No credit given to a third area discussed.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>Credit any valid ethical considerations discussed</p> <p>Examples of developed evaluation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Breaking ethical guidelines can lead to more valid data. • Demand characteristics are reduced when participants are not informed. • There are implications of breaking ethical guidelines e.g. people may not want to participate in the future. • Breaking ethical guidelines can affect the integrity of psychological research. • Comparison of how ethical considerations are different or similar between areas. <p>Then discussion of studies from one other area e.g. Social</p>		
7	(a)	<p>Outline one weakness of the sample used in this study.</p> <p>Sample has low population validity as it was taken from UK millennium research on 14 year olds. Therefore it is only representative of UK teenagers OR 14 year olds OR participants in the UK Millennium Cohort Study. It can't be generalised beyond that population/to all teenagers</p>	<p>3</p> <p>AO1- 1 AO2- 2</p>	<p>1 mark for identifying a relevant weakness <i>Plus</i></p> <p>1 mark for an explanation/implication of this weakness <i>Plus</i></p> <p>1 mark for considering this in the context of the article</p> <p>Anything relating to sampling method is not creditworthy</p>
7	(b)	<p>With reference to the abstract, outline one positive and one negative correlation found by this study.</p> <p>A positive correlation is as the use of social media increases (1) online harassment increases. (1)</p>	<p>4</p> <p>AO1-2 AO2-2</p> <p>2+2</p>	<p>For each correlation outlined:</p> <p>1 mark for identification of covariables <i>Plus</i></p> <p>1 mark for direction of variables</p>

		<p>A positive correlation is as the use of social media increases (1) depressive symptoms increase. (1)</p> <p>A positive correlation is as online harassment increases (1) depressive symptoms increase. (1)</p> <p>A negative correlation is as the use of social media increases (1) the self-esteem of the teenager decreases. (1)</p> <p>A negative correlation is as the depressive symptoms increase (1) self-esteem decreases (1).</p> <p>A negative correlation is as the use of social media increases (1) mental health decreases. (1)</p> <p>A negative correlation is as online harassment increases (1) self-esteem decreases (1)</p>		
7	(c)	<p>Outline one limitation of using a correlational technique in this study</p> <p>Limitation of using a correlation e.g., inability to establish cause and effect,</p> <p>Information about the study e.g. does use of social media lead to poor mental health or do young people use it more when they experience poor mental health?</p> <p>Further elaboration: other aspects of social life like friendship networks and family relationships may also be having an impact as well as social media. (Introduction of a third variable).</p> <p><u>Limitations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of causation or knowing one causes the other. 	3 A02-1 AO3-2	<p>1 mark for identification of limitation <i>Plus</i></p> <p>1 mark for clear link to research of social media <i>Plus</i></p> <p>1 mark for elaboration in relation to the context</p> <p>No credit for evaluation relating to quantitative data.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We can't know if depression causes higher social media use or if social media use causes depression. There may be a third variable such as low school attendance which is related to depression and higher social media use. 		
7	(d)	<p>Describe Bandura's study into the transmission of aggression and briefly explain how this may relate to the effects of social media.</p> <p>Possible key features for description of study:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Background to study Aims and hypotheses Design Sample Procedure Materials Key findings Conclusions drawn <p>How the study relates to the effects of social media:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> People on social media may act as negative role models. Mental health behaviours may be observed and imitated from social media. 	7 AO1-5 AO2-2	<p>5 marks for a detailed and accurate description which identifies a range of key features of the study (procedure and findings are essential).</p> <p>3-4 marks for an accurate description which identifies some of the key features of the study (procedure or findings).</p> <p>1-2 marks for a brief or vague description of the study which identifies some of the key features.</p> <p>0 marks – no creditworthy response.</p> <p>For application to the effects of social media;</p> <p>2 marks a relevant link which is clearly explained.</p> <p>1 mark for a brief but clear link or for one which is not well explained.</p> <p>0 marks – no creditworthy response.</p>
7	(e)	<p>Using your knowledge of psychology, suggest different ways in which psychologists could use social media to promote positive mental health in young people.</p> <p>Possible suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> social media sites that promote positive role models who have good mental health or have overcome mental health problems 	8 AO2	<p>7-8 marks for a high standard of knowledge and understanding of the ways in which psychologists could use social media to promote positive mental health in young people. There is very effective application of psychological knowledge within these suggestions. The suggestions are largely accurate and several details have been included about how they could be implemented and developed. At least two suggestions are covered.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • social media platforms that only allow positive comments or positive reinforcers (likes) • social media apps where young people can quickly access expert support if feeling anxious or depressed • virtual support networks for people experiencing the same mental health issues • social media sites for making friends e.g. if someone had just moved to a new area. 		<p>5-6 marks for a good standard of knowledge and understanding of the ways in which psychologists could use social media to promote positive mental health in young people. There is effective application of psychological knowledge within these suggestions. The suggestions are mostly accurate and some details have been included about how they could be implemented and developed. At least two suggestions are covered.</p> <p>3-4 marks for reasonable knowledge and understanding of the ways in which psychologists could use social media to promote positive mental health in young people. There is some application of psychological knowledge within these suggestions. The suggestions are partially accurate.</p> <p>1-2 marks for basic knowledge and understanding of the ways in which psychologists could use social media to promote positive mental health in young people. There is weak application of psychological knowledge within these suggestions. The suggestions may have limited accuracy.</p> <p>0 marks – No creditworthy response.</p> <p>N.B. If only one suggestion is made then a maximum of 4 marks to be awarded. Award marks in line with the descriptors above.</p>
7	(f)	<p>Evaluate the suggestions you have made in part (e) using your knowledge of psychology.</p> <p>Potential issues for evaluation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assumptions relating to nature/nurture e.g. potential to learn/change behaviours from negative to positive • Assumptions relating to freewill/determinism e.g. can mental health problems be changed through freewill 	10 AO3	<p>9-10 marks for demonstrating good evaluation that is relevant to the demand of the question. The arguments are coherently presented with clear understanding of the points raised. A range of appropriate evaluation points are considered. The evaluation points are in context and supported by relevant evidence of the description given in 7e. More than one suggestion is evaluated.</p> <p>6-8 marks for demonstrating reasonable evaluation</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assumptions relating to reductionism/holism e.g. do apps etc oversimplify complex problems? • Assumptions relating individual/situational explanations e.g. are mental health issues too unique to be addressed by generic apps? • Usefulness e.g. practicalities of suggested ways, will they make a difference? • Ethical considerations e.g. manipulation of behaviours • Social sensitivity e.g. are people with mental health problems being stigmatised? • Psychology as a science e.g. are theories well tested? • Ethnocentrism – who decides what counts as positive mental health? does it depend on cultural norms? • Validity – are social media platforms ‘real’ enough to encounter genuine, real-life issues? • Reliability – do apps have same effect on all? 	<p>that is mainly relevant to the demand of the question. The arguments coherently presented in the main with reasonable understanding of the points raised. A range of appropriate evaluation points are considered. The evaluation points are mainly in context and supported by relevant evidence of the description given in 7e.</p> <p>3-5 marks for demonstrating limited evaluation that is sometimes relevant to the demand of the question. The arguments may lack clear structure/organisation and show limited understanding of the points raised. The evaluation points are occasionally in context and supported by relevant evidence of the description given in 7e.</p> <p>1-2 marks for demonstrating basic evaluation that is rarely relevant to the demand of the question. Any arguments lack clear structure/organisation and show a very basic understanding of the points raised. The evaluation points are not necessarily in context and are not supported by relevant evidence of the description given in 7e.</p> <p>0 marks – No creditworthy response.</p> <p>N.B. If only one suggestion is evaluated then a maximum of 6 marks to be awarded. If only one evaluation point is made but is done well it can achieve a maximum of 4 marks. Award marks in line with the descriptors above.</p>
--	--	---	---

Need to get in touch?

If you ever have any questions about OCR qualifications or services (including administration, logistics and teaching) please feel free to get in touch with our customer support centre.

Call us on

01223 553998

Alternatively, you can email us on

support@ocr.org.uk

For more information visit



ocr.org.uk/qualifications/resource-finder



ocr.org.uk



Twitter/ocrexams



/ocrexams



/company/ocr



/ocrexams



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS & ASSESSMENT

OCR is part of Cambridge University Press & Assessment, a department of the University of Cambridge.

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored. © OCR 2023 Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations is a Company Limited by Guarantee. Registered in England. Registered office The Triangle Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge, CB2 8EA.

Registered company number 3484466. OCR is an exempt charity.

OCR operates academic and vocational qualifications regulated by Ofqual, Qualifications Wales and CCEA as listed in their qualifications registers including A Levels, GCSEs, Cambridge Technicals and Cambridge Nationals.

OCR provides resources to help you deliver our qualifications. These resources do not represent any particular teaching method we expect you to use. We update our resources regularly and aim to make sure content is accurate but please check the OCR website so that you have the most up-to-date version. OCR cannot be held responsible for any errors or omissions in these resources.

Though we make every effort to check our resources, there may be contradictions between published support and the specification, so it is important that you always use information in the latest specification. We indicate any specification changes within the document itself, change the version number and provide a summary of the changes. If you do notice a discrepancy between the specification and a resource, please [contact us](#).

Whether you already offer OCR qualifications, are new to OCR or are thinking about switching, you can request more information using our [Expression of Interest form](#).

Please [get in touch](#) if you want to discuss the accessibility of resources we offer to support you in delivering our qualifications.