OCR
Oxford Cambridge and RSA

# GCE

# Psychology

Unit **H567/03**: Applied psychology

Advanced GCE

# Mark Scheme for June 2017

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support, which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the report on the examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme.

© OCR 2017

**Annotations**

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

**Subject-specific Marking Instructions**

**INTRODUCTION**

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

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

You should ensure that you have copies of these materials.
You should ensure also that you are familiar with the administrative procedures related to the marking process. These are set out in the OCR booklet **Instructions for Examiners**. If you are examining for the first time, please read carefully **Appendix 5 Introduction to Script Marking: Notes for New Examiners**.
Please ask for help or guidance whenever you need it. Your first point of contact is your Team Leader.

**LEVELS OF RESPONSE – LEVEL DESCRIPTORS**

| | AO1 | AO2 | AO3 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Good | Response demonstrates good relevant knowledge and understanding. Accurate and detailed description. | Response demonstrates good application of psychological knowledge and understanding. Application will be mainly explicit, accurate and relevant. | Response demonstrates good analysis, interpretation and/or evaluation that is mainly relevant to the demand of the question. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and argument is highly skilled and shows good understanding. |
| Reasonable | Response demonstrates reasonable relevant knowledge and understanding. Generally accurate description lacking some detail. | Response demonstrates reasonable application of psychological knowledge and understanding. Application will be partially explicit, accurate and relevant. | Response demonstrates reasonable analysis, interpretation and/or evaluation that is partially relevant to the demand of the question. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and argument are competent and understanding is reasonable. |
| Limited | Response demonstrates limited relevant knowledge and understanding. Limited description lacking in detail. | Response demonstrates limited application of psychological knowledge and understanding. Application may be related to the general topic area rather than the specific question. | Response demonstrates limited analysis, interpretation and/or evaluation that may be related to topic area. Some valid conclusions that summarise issues and arguments. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Basic | Response demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding that is only partially relevant. Basic description with no detail. | Response demonstrates basic application of psychological knowledge and understanding. Responses will be generalised lacking focus on the question. | Response demonstrates basic analysis, interpretation and/or evaluation that is not related to the question. Basic or no valid conclusions that attempt to summarise issues. No evidence of arguments. |

**USING THE MARK SCHEME**

Please study this Mark Scheme carefully. The Mark Scheme is an integral part of the process that begins with the setting of the question paper and ends with the awarding of grades. Question papers and Mark Schemes are developed in association with each other so that issues of differentiation and positive achievement can be addressed from the very start.

This Mark Scheme is a working document; it is not exhaustive; it does not provide 'correct' answers. The Mark Scheme can only provide 'best guesses' about how the question will work out, and it is subject to revision after we have looked at a wide range of scripts.

In your marking, you will encounter valid responses which are not covered by the Mark Scheme: these responses must be credited. You will encounter answers which fall outside the 'target range' of Bands for the paper which you are marking. Please mark these answers according to the marking criteria.

Please read carefully all the scripts in your allocation and make every effort to look positively for achievement throughout the ability range. Always be prepared to use the full range of marks.

**INSTRUCTIONS TO EXAMINERS:**
**INDIVIDUAL ANSWERS**
**1** The indicative content indicates the expected parameters for candidates' answers, but be prepared to recognise and credit unexpected approaches where they show relevance.

**2** Using 'best-fit', decide first which set of BAND DESCRIPTORS best describes the overall quality of the answer. Once the band is located, adjust the mark concentrating on features of the answer which make it stronger or weaker following the guidelines for refinement.

**Highest mark**: If clear evidence of all the qualities in the band descriptors is shown, the HIGHEST Mark should be awarded.

**Lowest mark**: If the answer shows the candidate to be borderline (i.e. they have achieved all the qualities of the bands below and show limited evidence of meeting the criteria of the band in question) the LOWEST mark should be awarded.

**Middle mark**: This mark should be used for candidates who are secure in the band. They are not 'borderline' but they have only achieved some of the qualities in the band descriptors.

**3** Be prepared to use the full range of marks. Do not reserve (e.g.) high Band 6 marks 'in case' something turns up of a quality you have not yet seen. If an answer gives clear evidence of the qualities described in the band descriptors, reward appropriately.

**4** Consideration should be given to the weightings of the assessment objectives within a question, these are clearly stated for each question and care should be taken not to place too much emphasis on a particular skill.

**Section A: Issues in mental health**

| Question | | | Answer | Marks | Guidance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | (a) | | **Outline how mental hospitals failed to detect sanity in the research by Rosenhan (1973).**<br><br>**AO1**<br>Candidates will demonstrate knowledge and understanding by accurately outlining how mental hospital staff failed to detect sanity in the Rosenhan study. Candidates are likely to refer to how in experiment one the pseudopatients were given a diagnosis of mental disorder and admitted on all twelve occasions when they presented themselves at mental hospitals. Better answers will contain fine details (e.g. reference to the symptoms, diagnosis or number of admissions). They could also refer to evidence of continued failure on the part of hospital staff to recognise sanity in the pseudopatients after they had been admitted to hospital. Answers could also legitimately refer to the basis upon which the pseudopatients were discharged - namely, that their schizophrenia was "in remission". | 2 | **2 marks** – A clear, accurate outline of evidence.<br><br>**1 mark** – Vague or partial outline of evidence.<br><br>**0 marks –** No creditworthy response. |
| 1 | (b) | | **Discuss ethical considerations of the research by Rosenhan (1973).**<br><br>**AO1**<br>Candidates will demonstrate knowledge and understanding by accurately referring to the detail of the key research by Rosenhan. Ethical considerations apply to all aspects of the research (i.e. the people studied, the pseudopatients, social sensitivity, the language of 'consent', 'withdrawal', etc., and also the language of 'integrity', 'respect', etc.).<br><br>**AO3**<br>The injunction to 'discuss' invites recognition that whilst | 6 | **5-6 marks** – Response demonstrates good analysis, interpretation and/or evaluation that is mainly relevant to the demand of the question. There is good relevant knowledge and understanding.<br><br>**3-4 marks** – Response demonstrates reasonable analysis, interpretation and/or evaluation that is partially relevant to the demand of the question. There is reasonable relevant knowledge and understanding.<br><br>**1-2 marks** – Response demonstrates limited analysis, interpretation and/or evaluation that may be related to the topic area. There is limited relevant knowledge and understanding. |

| Question | | | Answer | Marks | Guidance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | there may be ways in which the study could be seen as staying within the ethical guidelines (e.g. in study 2, the hospital consented to be involved) nonetheless there are also ways in which the study can be seen as breaching ethical guidelines (e.g. in study 1, the staff in the hospitals were deceived about the status of the pseudopatients – i.e. they weren't real patients). It is acceptable for discussion points made to be criticisms or praise (i.e. they don't have to be on both sides of the argument).<br><br>Other appropriate responses should be credited. | | **0 marks** – No creditworthy response. |
| **2** | | | **How might a clinical psychologist explain to Richard and Wendy the characteristics of a psychotic disorder?**<br><br>**AO1**<br>Candidates will demonstrate knowledge and understanding by referring to the characteristics of a psychotic disorder in support of points made within their answer. Any appropriate psychotic disorder can be referred to.<br><br>**AO2**<br>Candidates should apply their knowledge and understanding of the characteristics of a psychotic disorder to the context of the question. If candidates write about schizophrenia, then they will probably distinguish positive from negative symptoms, but this is not necessary. Good answers can be expected to outline some of the symptoms that characterise a psychotic disorder with either depth or breadth; they may also show an understanding of the way in which psychotic disorders involve a loss of contact with reality.<br><br>Other appropriate responses should be credited. | **6** | **5-6 marks** – Response demonstrates good application of psychological knowledge and understanding. There is good relevant knowledge and understanding.<br><br>**3-4 marks** – Response demonstrates reasonable application of psychological knowledge and understanding. There is reasonable relevant knowledge and understanding.<br><br>**1-2 marks** – Response demonstrates limited application of psychological knowledge and understanding. There is limited relevant knowledge and understanding.<br><br>**0 marks** – No creditworthy response. |

| Question | | | Answer | Marks | Guidance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | |
| 3 | (a) | | **Outline a biological treatment of one specific disorder.**<br><br>**AO2**<br>Candidates are likely to refer to drug therapy, although references to other biological treatments (e.g. ECT, or psychosurgery) are also creditworthy. Detailed knowledge could include what a drug might be (e.g. SSRI) and how it works (e.g. by stopping reuptake of serotonin, thereby increasing the mood-enhancing effect of serotonin due to increased levels of serotonin in the synapse). Answers must relate to one specific disorder.<br><br>Other appropriate responses should be credited. | 5 | **5 marks** – Good application of a clear, detailed and accurate biological treatment to one specific disorder.<br><br>**3-4 marks** – Reasonable application of a biological treatment to one specific disorder.<br><br>**1-2 marks** – Limited application of a biological treatment with little reference to the treatment of any disorder.<br><br>**0 marks –** No creditworthy response. |
| | (b) | | **Discuss one strength and one weakness of the biological treatment referred to in your answer to question 3(a).**<br><br>**AO1**<br>Candidates will demonstrate knowledge and understanding by commenting accurately on the biological treatment referred to in response to the previous question. For the top band, points made need to be accurate and to be specific to the biological treatment referred to (i.e. be more than just generic points).<br><br>**AO3**<br>Candidates should consider one strength and one weakness of the biological treatment referred to in response to the previous question. Points made could relate to the efficacy of a treatment, practical issues (e.g. cost, availability), side effects, etc. Points need actually to be strengths or weaknesses and should be discussed.<br><br>Other appropriate responses should be credited. | 6 | **5-6 marks** – Response demonstrates good analysis, interpretation and/or evaluation that is mainly relevant to the demand of the question. There is good relevant knowledge and understanding.<br><br>**3-4 marks** – Response demonstrates reasonable analysis, interpretation and/or evaluation that is partially relevant to the demand of the question. There is reasonable relevant knowledge and understanding.<br><br>**1-2 marks** – Response demonstrates limited analysis, interpretation and/or evaluation that may be related to the topic area. There is limited relevant knowledge and understanding.<br><br>**0 marks** – No creditworthy response. |
| 4 | | * | **To what extent are alternatives to the medical model** | 10 | **9–10 marks –** The response demonstrates good knowledge |

| Question | | | Answer | Marks | Guidance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | **of explaining mental illness scientific?**<br><br>**AO1**<br>Candidates should demonstrate knowledge and understanding of what makes something 'scientific'<br><br>**AO3**<br>Candidates should analyse, interpret and evaluate alternatives to the medical model of explaining mental illness in relation to what makes something scientific. Candidates may discuss the following: the possibility of establishing causal links (e.g. classical conditioning); psychodynamic explanations that are hard to falsify; reliance on self-report (e.g. for cognitions); the extent to which there is empirical evidence to support the explanations, and the nature of the research that might lend support to them (e.g. case studies, as opposed to controlled experiments). The injunction 'to what extent' invites consideration of how far alternatives to the medical model of explaining mental illness are scientific.<br><br>Other appropriate responses should be credited. | | and understanding of science. There is a good analysis of science in relation to alternatives to the medical model of explaining mental illness. There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and substantiated.<br>**6–8 marks –** The response demonstrates reasonable knowledge and understanding of science. There is a reasonable discussion of science in relation to alternatives to the medical model of explaining mental illness. There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The information presented is in the most-part relevant and supported by some evidence.<br>**3–5 marks –** The response demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of science. There is a limited discussion of science superficially related to alternatives to the medical model of explaining mental illness. The information has some relevance and is presented with limited structure. The information is supported by limited evidence.<br>**1–2 marks –** The response demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding of science. There is a basic discussion of science which may not be in relation to alternatives to the medical model of explaining mental illness. The information is basic and communicated in an unstructured way. The information is supported by limited evidence and the relationship to the evidence may not be clear.<br>**0 marks –** No creditworthy response. |

**Section B: Options**

| Question | | | Answer | Marks | Guidance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | (a) | * | **Explain how the research by Wood et al (1976) could be used by teachers to help children solve problems.**<br><br>**AO1**<br>Candidates must refer to the key study by Wood et al. to access the top band. Candidates will demonstrate knowledge and understanding of this key study through describing the psychological evidence of the key study appropriately and effectively.<br><br>**AO2**<br>Candidates should *apply* their knowledge and understanding of the study by Wood et al. to explain how the study could be used by teachers to help children solve problems. Answers are likely to focus on the amount and type of support a teacher can expect to have to give young children. Older children are capable of more unassisted acts. The youngest children need to be kept on task, middle age children need verbal prodding and correcting, and the oldest children need only confirming and checking. The best answers are likely to make reference to scaffolding and may focus on application of the key components of the scaffolding process. Less detailed answers or answers that simply describe the study without making suggestions about how it could be used by teachers to help children solve problems will only gain marks in the lower bands. | **10** | PLEASE REFER TO APPENDIX 1 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **(b)** | * | **Discuss the nature-nurture debate in relation to research into cognitive development and education.**<br><br>**AO1**<br>Candidates should demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the nature-nurture debate.<br><br>**AO3**<br>Candidates should analyse, interpret and evaluate the nature-nurture debate in relation to research into cognitive development and education. As well as references to the key research by Wood et al, candidates are likely to cite the work of Piaget, Vygotsky, Bruner and Perry. Whether claiming that a particular psychologist's work supports a nature or nurture position (or both), it is vital that candidates are in control of their argument and clearly understand what they are writing. The different sides of the nature-nurture debate need to be evaluated, rather than simply identified and illustrated.<br><br>Other appropriate responses should be credited. | **15** | PLEASE REFER TO APPENDIX 2 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **(c)** | * | **What suggestions might a psychologist make to Carl about strategies pupils can use to revise effectively for exams?**<br><br>**AO2**<br>Candidates need to apply their knowledge and understanding of strategies to improve revision or learning. Answers could draw upon memory techniques such as mnemonics (visual or auditory). However, better answers are likely to make references to such concepts as semantic processing or the loci technique and to go beyond the anecdotal to references to psychological theory or research. It is important that the suggestions are related to the context of the question.<br><br>Other appropriate responses should be credited. | **10** | PLEASE REFER TO APPENDIX 3 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 6 | (a) | * | **Using the research by Raine et al. (1997), outline how criminal behaviour could be explained through physiological factors.**<br><br>**AO1**<br>Candidates must refer to the key study by Raine et al. to access the top band. Candidates will demonstrate knowledge and understanding of this key study through describing the psychological evidence of the key study appropriately and effectively.<br><br>**AO2**<br>Candidates should *apply* their knowledge and understanding of the study by Raine et al. to outline how criminal behaviour could be explained through physiological factors. Answers are likely to describe the procedure of the study before focussing on the reduced levels of metabolic activity among the NGRIs in the pre-frontal cortex. Activity in other regions of the brain may be referred to as well, such as the amygdala and the corpus callosum. It is important for the answer to explain how criminal behaviour could be explained through physiological factors (levels of brain activity), although the best answers may recognise that 'could' is not the same as 'will' and that the Raine study is not providing evidence of a clear causal link. Less detailed answers or answers that simply describe the study without explaining how criminal behaviour could be explained through physiological factors will only gain marks in the lower bands. | **10** | PLEASE REFER TO APPENDIX 1 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **(b)** | * | **Discuss methodological issues involved when researching what makes a criminal.**<br><br>**AO1**<br>Candidates should demonstrate knowledge and understanding of methodological issues.<br><br>**AO3**<br>Candidates should analyse, interpret and evaluate methodological issues involved when researching what makes a criminal. There are many potential methodological issues such as ensuring that research is valid (i.e. measuring what the researcher wants to measure), samples of participants are representative of the target population, and any control groups are carefully matched. Equally, research needs to be standardised for all participants (reliable), and if self-report is used then issues of demand characteristics or social desirability bias need addressing. Staying within the ethical guidelines can also raise methodological issues, especially if it leads to potentially reduced validity. Methodological issues need to be discussed, rather than simply identified and illustrated.<br><br>Other appropriate responses should be credited. | **15** | PLEASE REFER TO APPENDIX 2 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **(c)** | * | **What suggestions might a psychologist make to Shanaz about biological strategies to prevent criminal behaviour in the families she works with?**<br><br>**AO2**<br>Candidates need to apply their knowledge and understanding of biological strategies for preventing criminal behaviour. Suggestions could centre on dietary interventions (e.g. fish-oil supplements), reduced alcohol intake (especially among pregnant women but also among teenagers), or avoiding lead poisoning. Equally, answers could potentially explore cosmetic surgery or interventions involving reductions in testosterone levels or correction of genetic abnormalities. Suggestions that are biologically-based are creditworthy (e.g. using biological data to inform anger management interventions). It is important that the suggestions are related to the context of the question.<br><br>Other appropriate responses should be credited. | **10** | PLEASE REFER TO APPENDIX 3 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 7 | (a) | * | **Explain how the research by Lord (1994) could be used to improve levels of recycling.**<br><br>**AO1**<br>Candidates must refer to the key study by Lord to access the top band. Candidates will demonstrate knowledge and understanding of this key study through describing the psychological evidence of the key study appropriately and effectively.<br><br>**AO2**<br>Candidates should *apply* their knowledge and understanding of the study by Lord to explain how levels of recycling could be improved. Answers are likely to separate out message approach (positively framed versus negatively framed) from message source (advertisement, newspaper article, personal letter). With regard to findings, "Although positive appeals yielded most favourable levels of beliefs and attitude toward recycling, the greatest increase in recycling behaviour came in response to a negatively framed message conveyed by a personal acquaintance" (Lord, p341). The best answers will make a distinction between attitudes, beliefs and behaviour. It is important for the answer to make the link between the key research and suggestions for how to improve levels of recycling. Less detailed answers or answers that simply describe the study without making suggestions about how it could be used to improve levels of recycling will only gain marks in the lower bands. | **10** | PLEASE REFER TO APPENDIX 1 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **(b)** | * | **Discuss the individual-situational explanations debate in relation to recycling and other conservation behaviours.**<br><br>**AO1**<br>Candidates should demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the debate about individual or situational explanations of behaviour.<br><br>**AO3**<br>Candidates should analyse, interpret and evaluate the individual-situational explanations debate in relation to recycling and other conservation behaviours. Support for situational explanations could come from the impact of prompts, feedback, bottle deposit schemes, apparent social norms, etc., while individual explanations could centre on knowledge deficits, attitudes, values, feelings of self-efficacy, etc. Answers can be broadened out from recycling to other conservation behaviours. Individual or situational explanations need to be discussed, rather than simply identified and illustrated.<br><br>Other appropriate responses should be credited. | **15** | PLEASE REFER TO APPENDIX 2 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **(c)** | * | **What suggestions might a psychologist make to Trevor about techniques for increasing recycling or other conservation behaviours among the children in the school?**<br><br>**AO2**<br>Candidates need to apply their knowledge and understanding of techniques used to increase recycling or other conservation behaviour. Suggestions could take a range of forms (e.g. antecedent or consequent; behavioural or cognitive) and can embrace a range of different conservation behaviours (e.g. turning down the heating; walking or cycling to school; turning off taps). However, the focus must be on increasing conservation behaviours (i.e. not just improving attitudes) and they must be relevant to the school setting and the primary school age group. Suggestions involving advertisements, newspaper articles or even letters from people they know are unlikely to be appropriate for those in the lower years. It is important that the suggestions are related to the context of the question.<br><br>Other appropriate responses should be credited. | **10** | PLEASE REFER TO APPENDIX 3 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 8 | (a) | * | **Using the research by Zajonc et al (1969), explain how sporting performance could be influenced by audiences.**<br><br>**AO1**<br>Candidates must refer to the key study by Zajonc et al. to access the top band. Candidates will demonstrate knowledge and understanding of this key study through describing the psychological evidence of the key study appropriately and effectively.<br><br>**AO2**<br>Candidates should *apply* their knowledge and understanding of the study by Zajonc et al. to explain how sporting performance could be influenced by audiences. Answers are likely to focus on how in the simple 'runway' task running times were fastest in the presence of other cockroaches but how this was reversed in the complex 'maze' task. The best answers can be expected to relate the research to drive theory and/or to make a distinction between co-acting cockroaches and audience cockroaches. It is important for the answer to be related to the context of (human) sporting performance. Less detailed answers or answers that simply describe the study without relating its findings to the context of sport will only gain marks in the lower bands. | **10** | PLEASE REFER TO APPENDIX 1 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **(b)** | * | **Discuss the validity of research into audience effects.**<br><br>**AO1**<br>Candidates should demonstrate knowledge and understanding of validity.<br><br>**AO3**<br>Candidates should analyse, interpret and evaluate the validity of research into audience effects. Validity issues can arise in a number of ways, such as the ecological validity of studies, population validity (especially if trying to generalise across species), or construct validity (e.g. is it actually the effect of audiences that is being measured?; if it is, then is it possible to isolate which aspect of an audience is having an effect?). If some individuals are affected more than others, then personality variables may be a mediating factor that needs addressing; validity can also be affected if research is not standardised and controlled, or if data is collected through self-report (e.g. issues of social desirability bias). Validity issues need to be discussed, rather than simply identified and illustrated.<br><br>Other appropriate responses should be credited. | **15** | PLEASE REFER TO APPENDIX 2 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **(c)** | * | **What advice might a sports psychologist give Lizzie about how to prepare for this match?**<br><br>**AO2**<br>Candidates need to apply their knowledge and understanding of strategies for training for and playing spectator sports. Suggestions may centre on techniques for controlling anxiety such as diaphragmatic breathing, relaxation training programmes, or the following of rituals. Equally, suggestions could focus on practice as a way of developing automatic processing for motor skills, biofeedback, and cognitive behavioural therapy. It is important that the suggested advice is related to the context of the question.<br><br>Other appropriate responses should be credited. | **10** | PLEASE REFER TO APPENDIX 3 |

**APPENDIX 1 Generic mark scheme for Section B PART (a) QUESTIONS**

*AO1: Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of scientific ideas, processes, techniques and procedures (5 marks)*
*AO2: Apply knowledge and understanding of scientific ideas, processes, techniques and procedures (5 marks)*

| Level | Marks | Generic mark scheme (Part a) |
|---|---|---|
| **4** | **9 – 10** | Response demonstrates good relevant knowledge and understanding. Accurate and reasonably detailed description. There is appropriate selection of material to address the question.<br><br>Response demonstrates a good application of psychological knowledge and understanding to the question. Application will be explicit, accurate, and relevant to the question.<br><br>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and substantiated. |
| **3** | **6 – 8** | Response demonstrates reasonable relevant knowledge and understanding. Generally accurate description lacking some detail. There is some evidence of selection of material to address the question.<br><br>Response demonstrates a reasonable application of psychological knowledge and understanding to the question. Application will be clear and focused on the question.<br><br>There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The information presented is in the most-part relevant and supported by some evidence. |
| **2** | **3 – 5** | Response demonstrates limited relevant knowledge and understanding. Limited description lacking in detail. There is some evidence of selection of material to address the question.<br><br>Response demonstrates a limited application of psychological knowledge and understanding to the question. Application may be related to the general topic area rather than the specific question.<br><br>The information has some relevance and is presented with limited structure. The information is supported by limited evidence. |
| **1** | **1 – 2** | Response demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding. Description is basic. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question.<br><br>Response demonstrates a basic application of psychological knowledge and understanding to the question. Knowledge will be only partially relevant to the question: responses will be generalised; lacking focus on the question.<br><br>The information is basic and communicated in an unstructured way. The information is supported by limited evidence and the relationship to the evidence may not be clear. |
| **0** | | No creditworthy response. |

**APPENDIX 2 Generic mark scheme for Section B PART (b) QUESTIONS**

*AO1: Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of scientific ideas, processes, techniques and procedures (2 marks)*

*AO3: Analyse, interpret and evaluate scientific information, ideas and evidence (13 marks)*

| Level | Marks | Generic mark scheme (part b) |
|---|---|---|
| **4** | **12–15** | Response demonstrates good relevant knowledge and understanding.<br>Response demonstrates many points of analysis, interpretation and evaluation covering a range of issues. The argument is competently organised, balanced and well developed. The answer is explicitly related to the context of the question. Effective use of examples where appropriate. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and argument is highly skilled and shows good understanding.<br>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and substantiated. |
| **3** | **8–11** | Response demonstrates good relevant knowledge and understanding.<br>Response demonstrates a reasonable number of points of analysis, interpretation and evaluation covering a range of issues. The argument is well organised, but may lack balance or development, and is related to the context of the question. Reasonable use of examples where appropriate. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments are competent and understanding is reasonable.<br>There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The information presented is in the most-part relevant and supported by some evidence. |
| **2** | **4–7** | Response demonstrates reasonable knowledge and understanding.<br>Response demonstrates a limited number of points of analysis, interpretation and evaluation which are limited in range. Argument and organisation is limited, and some points are related to the context of the question. Some valid conclusions that summarise issues and arguments. Demonstrates some understanding.<br>The information has some relevance and is presented with limited structure. The information is supported by limited evidence. |
| **1** | **1–3** | Response demonstrates reasonable knowledge and understanding.<br>Response demonstrates a few basic points of analysis, interpretation and evaluation. No evidence of argument. Points are not organised, and are of peripheral relevance to the context of the question. Sparse or no use of supporting examples. Basic or no valid conclusions that attempt to summarise issues and arguments show little understanding. The information is basic and communicated in an unstructured way.<br>The information is supported by limited evidence and the relationship to the evidence may not be clear. |
| **0** | | No creditworthy response. |

**APPENDIX 3**

**GENERIC MARK SCHEME FOR SECTION B PART (c) QUESTIONS**

*AO2: Apply knowledge and understanding of scientific ideas, processes, techniques and procedures (10 marks)*

| Level | Marks | Generic Mark Scheme (part c) |
|---|---|---|
| **4** | **9 – 10** | Response demonstrates a good application of psychological knowledge and understanding to the question. Application will be explicit, accurate, and relevant to the question.<br>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and substantiated. |
| **3** | **6 – 8** | Response demonstrates a reasonable application of psychological knowledge and understanding to the question. Application will be clear and focused on the question.<br>There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The information presented is in the most-part relevant and supported by some evidence. |
| **2** | **3 – 5** | Response demonstrates a limited application of psychological knowledge and understanding to the question. Application may relate to the general topic area rather than the specific question.<br>The information has some relevance and is presented with limited structure. The information is supported by limited evidence. |
| **1** | **1 – 2** | Response demonstrates a basic application of psychological knowledge and understanding to the question. Knowledge will be only partially relevant to the question: Responses will be generalised; lacking focus on the question. The information is basic and communicated in an unstructured way.<br>The information is supported by limited evidence and the relationship to the evidence may not be clear. |
| **0** | | No creditworthy response. |

**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)**
**1 Hills Road**
**Cambridge**
**CB1 2EU**

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**Education and Learning**
Telephone: 01223 553998
Facsimile: 01223 552627
Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

**www.ocr.org.uk**

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

**Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations**
**is a Company Limited by Guarantee**
**Registered in England**
**Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU**
**Registered Company Number: 3484466**
**OCR is an exempt Charity**

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

**© OCR 2017**

PART OF THE CAMBRIDGE ASSESSMENT GROUP

LLOYD'S REGISTER QUALITY ASSURANCE · ISO9001 · UKAS MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS 001