



Sample Mark Scheme

AS Level Psychology H169/02 Core studies in psychology

MARK SCHEME

Duration: 1 hour 30 minutes

MAXIMUM MARK 56

Version: **Sample**

This document has 14 pages

MARKING INSTRUCTIONS**PREPARATION FOR MARKING
RM ASSESSOR**

1. Make sure that you have accessed and completed the relevant training packages for on-screen marking: *RM 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 component. 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.

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 Assessor 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 Assessor 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 Assessor **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
KU	Knowledge and Understanding: studies, theories, policies, methods
CON	Sociological evidence/concepts/theory
DEV	Developed Point: fully explained in a relevant way
^	Underdeveloped: Partially explained, but requiring more depth
APP	Application/Interpretation.
L	Lip service:
EVAL	Evaluation
U	Unsubstantiated/undeveloped/implicit: accurate without explanation/support
?	Unclear/confused/lacks sense not creditable
IRRL	Irrelevant: not related to the topic area and/or non-sociological
REP	Repetition

12. Subject Specific Marking Instructions

Section A: Core studies

Q1: Grant et al. investigated context-dependent memory. Identify the two types of tests used to assess memory in this study. (2 marks) [1+1]	
Marking Criteria	Guidance
1 mark: Multiple choice test/recognition test.	Only accept answers as indicated in marking criteria.
1 mark: Short answer test/recall test.	
0 marks: No creditworthy response.	

Q2: Loftus and Palmer investigated eyewitness testimony. Describe the two types of information that go into an individual's memory when witnessing an event, according to Loftus and Palmer. (4 marks) [2+2]	
Marking Criteria	Guidance
For each kind of information:	The two kinds of information are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Information encoded/gathered at the event – such as information about the cars involved in the car accident video clips. ▪ Post event information – such as external information supplied after the perception of the original event, e.g., in the form of leading questions.
1 mark: Type of information identified.	
1 mark: Type of information described with some detail or an example.	
0 marks: No creditworthy response.	

Q3: Explain one difference between Sperry's study into lateralisation of function in the brain and Casey et al.'s study of delayed gratification (4 marks) [1+1+1+1]	
Marking Criteria	Guidance
1 mark: Relevant difference explicitly identified.	<u>Example 4-mark answer:</u> One difference between the two studies is the type of data gathered. Sperry gathered qualitative data, describing what the split-brain participants were able to do when completing the visual and tactile tasks. Whereas Casey et al. only gathered quantitative data – for example number of errors made on the Go/No Go Tasks.
1 mark: Identified difference is explained.	
1 mark: Relevant supporting detail for the difference given from the Sperry study.	
1 mark: Relevant supporting detail for the difference given from the Casey et al. study.	
0 marks: No creditworthy response.	

Q4: Explain one strength of the sample used by Freud in his study of Little Hans. (3 marks)	
Marking Criteria	Guidance
3 marks: A strength of the sample identified and explained in detail in the context of Freud's study of Little Hans.	<u>Possible strengths include:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Studying a small sample made it easier for Freud to conduct a longitudinal study to show developments/changes in Hans' behaviour. ▪ Freud was able to conduct an in-depth study so his theories of psychosexual development could be explored.
2 marks: A strength of the sample identified and briefly explained in the context of Freud's study of Little Hans.	
1 mark: A strength of the sample identified.	
0 marks: No creditworthy response.	

Q5: Describe one way participants were deceived in Milgram's study of obedience. (2 marks)	
Marking Criteria	Guidance
2 marks: A clear and accurate description that both identifies a way participants were deceived and explains the nature of the deception.	<u>Possible answers include:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Participants were under the impression the study was about memory whereas it was, in fact, about obedience. ▪ Participants thought the electric shocks were genuine whilst, in reality, they were fake/the learner did not receive any shocks/no shocks were given. ▪ Participants thought they had an equal chance of becoming either the teacher or the learner whereas, in reality, the selection process was rigged so the participant was always the teacher.
1 mark: Vague or partial answer, i.e. identification of one way participants were deceived.	
0 marks: No creditworthy response.	

Q6: Baron-Cohen et al.'s study into autism in adults gathered quantitative data. Explain one strength of gathering this type of data in this study. (3 marks)	
Marking Criteria	Guidance
3 marks: A strength of gathering quantitative data identified and explained in detail in the context of Baron-Cohen's study.	<u>Example 3-mark answer:</u> Gathering quantitative data allows for easy comparisons to be made between participants or groups of participants. For example, it was easy to compare the results on the Eyes Task between the three groups of participants: normal, autistic/AS and Tourettes to show that the autistic/AS participants performed worse on the task than either of the other two groups.
2 marks: A strength of gathering quantitative data identified and briefly explained in the context of Baron-Cohen's study.	
1 mark: A strength of gathering quantitative data identified.	
0 marks: No creditworthy response.	

Section B: Areas, perspectives, issues and debates

Q7a: Explain one weakness of claiming that behaviour is only due to nature. Support your answer with evidence from one appropriate core study. (3 marks)	
Marking Criteria	Guidance
3 marks: Relevant weakness identified, explained in detail and supported with evidence from one appropriate core study.	<u>Possible weaknesses include:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Claiming that behaviour is due to nature is very reductionist as it only focuses on one influence on human behaviour. ▪ Research into 'nature' explanations relies heavily on the use of scientific equipment and requires specially trained personnel to operate machines. ▪ Claiming that behaviour is due to nature is very deterministic as it implies people can't choose how to behave and so can't be held accountable for their behaviour.
2 marks: Relevant weakness identified AND explained in detail OR supported with evidence from one appropriate core study.	
1 mark: Relevant weakness identified.	
0 marks: No creditworthy response.	

Q7b: Describe how the social area provides a situational explanation of behaviour. (3 marks) [1+1+1]	
Marking Criteria	Guidance
1 mark: Understanding of the social area shown.	
1 mark: Understanding of situational explanation of behaviour shown.	
1 mark: Link between the social area and situational explanations clearly shown.	
0 marks: No creditworthy response.	

Q7c*: Discuss the extent to which psychology can be viewed as a science. Support your answer with evidence from appropriate core studies. (12 marks)				
Level	Marking Criteria (AO1)	Level	Marking Criteria (AO3)	Indicative Content
Excellent 4 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The response demonstrates excellent relevant knowledge and understanding of psychological material which is well-developed. ▪ The information presented is accurate. ▪ There is effective use of supporting examples from psychological research. ▪ There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and substantiated. 	Excellent 7–8 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The response demonstrates an excellent ability to analyse, interpret and evaluate psychological material. ▪ A balanced argument should be presented, but there does not need to be equal balance, e.g. three arguments for one side and one for the other side. ▪ Typically, there will be four well-developed, relevant points. 	<p>Possible discussion points include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Considering psychology as a science allows for objective/quantitative data to be gathered. ▪ Considering psychology as a science reduces the possibility of researcher bias influencing findings. ▪ Considering psychology as a science allows for the use of laboratory experiments to test for causal relationships. ▪ Considering psychology as a science is often reductionist.
Good 3 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The response demonstrates good relevant knowledge and understanding of psychological material which is reasonably developed. ▪ The information presented is accurate. ▪ There is reasonable use of supporting examples from psychological research. ▪ There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The information presented is in the most-part relevant and supported by some evidence. 	Good 5–6 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The response demonstrates a good ability to analyse, interpret and evaluate psychological material. ▪ A balanced argument should be presented, but there does not need to be equal balance, e.g. two arguments for one side and one for the other side. ▪ Typically, there will be three reasonably developed. relevant points. 	

<p>Limited 2 marks</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The response demonstrates limited relevant knowledge and understanding of psychological material and development of this is limited. ▪ The information presented may be partially accurate. ▪ There is limited use of supporting examples from psychological research. ▪ The information has some relevance and is presented with limited structure. The information is supported by limited evidence. 	<p>Limited 3–4 marks</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The response demonstrates a limited ability to analyse, interpret and evaluate psychological material. ▪ The argument may not be balanced, e.g., only one side may be discussed. ▪ Typically, there will be two relevant points that show limited development. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Considering psychology as a science often leads to findings lacking qualitative data. ▪ Scientific research often involves the use of highly technical equipment which results in the use of limited/small/restricted samples so findings lack generalisability.
<p>Basic 1 mark</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The response demonstrates basic relevant knowledge and understanding of psychological material and development of this is limited. ▪ The information presented may be partially accurate. ▪ There is very limited, if any, use of supporting examples from psychological research. ▪ 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. 	<p>Basic 1–2 marks</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The response demonstrates a basic ability to analyse, interpret and evaluate psychological material. ▪ Only one side will be discussed. ▪ Typically, there will be one relevant point that shows limited development. 	
<p>0 marks</p>	<p>No creditworthy response.</p>	<p>0 marks</p>	<p>No creditworthy response.</p>	

Section C: Practical applications

Q8a: Explain how this article relates to two defining principles/concepts of the developmental area. (4 marks) [2+2]	
Marking Criteria	Guidance
For each point made:	<u>Possible defining principles/concepts could include:</u>
1 mark: Understanding of a defining principle/concept of the developmental area shown.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Changes in behaviour occur throughout the lifespan. ▪ Behaviour is a result of the interaction between nature (inherited factors) and nurture (lifetime experiences).
1 mark: Explanation of how the stated principle links to the article.	
0 marks: No creditworthy response.	
Q8b: Describe two findings from Bandura et al's (1961) study into transmission of aggression and explain how they may relate to the article. (6 marks) [3+3]	
Marking Criteria	Guidance
For each finding given:	<u>Findings from the study include:</u>
3 marks: Finding from the Bandura et al. study correctly stated/identified, with detailed explanation given as to how this finding relates to the article.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Overall boys produced more imitative physical aggression than girls. ▪ Children in the aggressive condition showed significantly more imitation of physical and verbal aggressive behaviour and non-aggressive verbal responses than children in the non-aggressive or control conditions. ▪ Children who saw the same sex model imitated the model's behaviour significantly more in some categories. ▪ The behaviour of the male model exerted greater influence than the female model.
2 mark: Finding from the Bandura et al. study correctly stated/identified, with brief explanation given as to how this finding relates to the article.	
1 mark: Finding from the Bandura et al. study correctly stated/identified.	
0 marks: No creditworthy response.	
	<u>Possible links to article:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Gender differences in imitation of role models/characters on television. ▪ Different types of role model/characters on television will have differing types of influences on children.

Q8c: Using your knowledge of psychology, suggest and explain one strategy that teachers could use to encourage sharing behaviour in children. (4 marks)		
Level	Marking Criteria	Guidance
Excellent 4 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A valid strategy suggested that teachers could use to encourage sharing behaviour in children. ▪ There is excellent application of psychological knowledge within the suggested strategy – several different details have been included about how they could be implemented and developed. ▪ The strategy is explicitly related to the context of the question 	<p>Suggested strategies could include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Use of positive reinforcement (e.g. rewards for displaying sharing behaviour) ▪ Showing children role models behaving in desired ways in the hope that the child will imitate this behaviour instead (based on Bandura) ▪ Use of punishment (e.g. taking away a child's break time at school until they behave in an appropriate way).
Good 3 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A valid strategy suggested that teachers could use to encourage sharing behaviour in children. ▪ There is good application of psychological knowledge within the suggested strategy – some details have been included about how they could be implemented and developed. ▪ The strategy is explicitly related to the context of the question 	
Limited 2 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A valid strategy suggested that teachers could use to encourage sharing behaviour in children. ▪ There is limited application of psychological knowledge within the suggested strategy. ▪ The strategy may not be explicitly related to the context of the question. 	
Basic 1 mark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A valid strategy suggested that teachers could use to encourage sharing behaviour in children. 	
0 marks	No creditworthy response.	

Q8d: Evaluate the suggestion you have made in 8c using your knowledge of psychology. (6 marks)		
Level	Marking Criteria	Indicative Content
Excellent 5–6 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The response demonstrates excellent evaluation. ▪ The evaluation points are in the context of the suggestion(s) presented in Q8c. ▪ A balanced argument should be presented with both strengths and weaknesses discussed, but there does not need to be equal balance between both. ▪ Typically, there will be two well-developed, relevant points. 	Evaluation points could include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Commenting on the suggestions in relation to the different debates (e.g., linking them to the nurture side of the nature-nurture debate) ▪ Commenting on methodological issues (e.g., explaining why a particular role model may be ethnocentric). ▪ Reference to the psychological basis of the suggestion (e.g., pointing out that research based on children aged 3-5 years may not necessarily apply to children who are older) ▪ Practical considerations (e.g., the financial cost of implementing a suggestion). ▪ Other approaches to evaluation could also be creditworthy.
Good 3–4 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The response demonstrates good evaluation. ▪ The evaluation points are in the context of the suggestion(s) presented in Q8c. ▪ The argument may not be balanced, e.g., only strengths or weaknesses may be discussed. ▪ Typically, there will be two reasonably developed, relevant points. 	
Limited 1–2 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The response demonstrates limited evaluation. ▪ The evaluation points may not be in the context of the suggestion(s) presented in Q8c. ▪ Typically, there will be one relevant point that show limited development. 	
0 marks	No creditworthy response.	