



**Practice paper – Set 2**  
**A Level Psychology**  
**H567/03 Applied Psychology**

**MARK SCHEME**

**Duration: 2 hours**

**MAXIMUM MARK 105**

**FINAL**

**This document consists of 29 pages**

**MARKING INSTRUCTIONS****PREPARATION FOR MARKING  
SCORIS**

1. Make sure that you have accessed and completed the relevant training packages for on-screen marking: *scoris 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 scoris and mark the **required number** of practice responses (“scripts”) and the **required number** of standardisation responses.

YOU MUST MARK 10 PRACTICE AND 10 STANDARDISATION RESPONSES BEFORE YOU CAN BE APPROVED TO MARK LIVE SCRIPTS.

**TRADITIONAL**

Before the Standardisation meeting you must mark at least 10 scripts from several centres. For this preliminary marking you should use **pencil** and follow the **mark scheme**. Bring these **marked scripts** to the meeting.

**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 scoris 50% and 100% (traditional 50% 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, email or via the scoris messaging system.
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. There is a NR (No Response) option. Award NR (No Response)
  - if there is nothing written at all in the answer space

- OR if there is a comment which does not in any way relate to the question (e.g. 'can't do', 'don't know')
- OR if there is a mark (e.g. a dash, a question mark) which isn't an attempt at the question.

Note: Award 0 marks – for an attempt that earns no credit (including copying out the question).

8. The scoris **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 scoris 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:
- a. **To determine the level** – start at the highest level and work down until you reach the level that matches the answer
  - b. **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
	Unclear
	Attempts evaluation
	Benefit of doubt
	Context
	Cross
	Evaluation
	
	
	Significant amount of material which doesn't answer the question
	Not answered question
	Good use of resources
	Tick
	Development of point
	Omission mark

## 12. 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	Response demonstrates basic analysis, interpretation and/or evaluation that is not related to the question. Basic or no valid conclusions that attempt to summarise

		question.	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)	<p><b>Outline one way of defining abnormality.</b></p> <p><b>AO1 (2 marks)</b> Definitions may refer to the use of categories to define specific disorders such as meeting a set of criteria such as in International Classification of Diseases diagnostic tool (ICD) would be considered abnormal.</p> <p>Candidates may also give definitions based on Rosenhan's definitions such as 'deviation from social norms', 'failure to function adequately' or 'behaviour that does not fit with the context'. They could equally focus on Szasz's criticisms of the concept of abnormality and mental illness.</p> <p>Other appropriate responses should be credited.</p>	2	<p><b>2 marks</b> – A clear, accurate definition.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Vague or partial definition.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy response.</p> <p>To access full marks, the candidate must include one definition that has been cited in psychological literature. Marks will only be allocated to one way of defining abnormality.</p>
2	(b)	<p><b>Discuss the issue of defining abnormality in relation to ethnocentrism.</b></p> <p><b>AO1 (1 mark)</b> Candidates should demonstrate knowledge and understanding of ethnocentrism.</p> <p><b>AO3 (4 marks)</b> Comments may defend or criticise definitions of abnormality in relation to ethnocentrism. It could be argued, for instance, that social norms vary between cultures, as do understandings of what it is to function adequately or what counts as ideal mental health; equally, the statistical frequency of behaviours will vary between cultures. All such points could be used to suggest that definitions of abnormality are ethnocentric in the sense of</p>	5	<p><b>5 marks</b> – Good discussion of defining abnormality in relation to ethnocentrism. At least two lines of argument are explored with relevant supporting evidence.</p> <p><b>3–4 marks</b> – Reasonable discussion of defining abnormality in relation to ethnocentrism. Two lines of argument may be explored with limited supporting evidence or one line of argument may be explored with good supporting evidence.</p> <p><b>1–2 marks</b> – Limited discussion of defining abnormality in relation to ethnocentrism. One line of argument is explored with reasonable or limited supporting evidence.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy response.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>being culture-bound. Against such arguments, candidates might note the way in which diagnostic tools (especially ICD) are used in a wide range of different countries and/or that DSM-5 explicitly addresses 'culture-related diagnostic issues' in relation to disorders. Insofar as these manuals help to define what counts as abnormal behaviour, such points are creditworthy. To be able to access the top band, candidates can be expected to explore at least two arguments.</p> <p>Other appropriate responses should be credited.</p>		
2	<p><b>Outline how the behaviourist approach could be used to explain mental illness.</b></p> <p><b>AO2 (5 marks)</b>            Answers could centre on application of any relevant behaviourist explanation. For example, candidates could refer to associative learning, the role of reinforcement, or social learning. They could refer to one of these behaviourist explanations in depth or to more than one in less depth. Cognitive behavioural explanations are creditworthy but the focus needs to be on the behavioural parts of them for the answer to access the top two bands. Behaviourist explanations need applying to explain mental illness.</p> <p>Other appropriate responses should be credited.</p>	5	<p><b>5 marks</b> – Good application of a clear, detailed and accurate behaviourist approach to explain mental illness. More than one behaviourist explanation may be suggested in less detail.</p> <p><b>3-4 marks</b> – Reasonable application of a behaviourist approach to explain mental illness. More than one behaviourist explanation may be suggested in less detail. Response lacks some detail.</p> <p><b>1-2 marks</b> – Limited application of a behaviourist approach to explain mental illness.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy response.</p>
3	<p><b>Outline how non-biological treatment could be used to treat one specific disorder.</b></p> <p><b>AO2 (5 marks)</b>            Candidates are likely to refer to exposure-based therapies such as systematic desensitisation or flooding, aversion</p>	5	<p><b>5 marks</b> – Good application of a clear, detailed and accurate non-biological treatment to a specified (named) disorder.</p> <p><b>3-4 marks</b> – Reasonable application of a non-biological treatment to a specified (named) or implied disorder.</p>

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
		<p>therapy, cognitive behavioural therapies, client-centred therapy, or psychotherapy. Candidates must specify the disorder being treated to access the top two bands. Treatments must be non-biological.</p> <p>Other appropriate responses should be credited.</p>		<p><b>1-2 marks</b> – Limited application of a non-biological treatment with little reference to the treatment of any disorder.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy response.</p>
4	(a)	<p><b>In the key research by Szasz (2011), the author refers to “the medicalisation of disturbing or disturbed behaviours.” Explain what Szasz means by this.</b></p> <p><b>AO1 (3 marks)</b>  Szasz argues that, beginning in late 16<sup>th</sup>-century England, there was a movement away from personal suffering being seen as something to be ministered to by individuals themselves (through ‘self-conversation’) or as something requiring divine assistance. Instead, there was a movement towards behaviour perceived by observers as disturbed or disturbing to be seen as medical disability requiring medical treatment. Mental illnesses began to be seen as diseases to be treated in the same way that physical diseases are. ‘Mental patients’ were seen as “passive victims of pathophysiological processes outside their control” rather than as “active players in real life dramas”.</p> <p>Other appropriate responses should be credited.</p>	3	<p><b>3 marks</b> – Good knowledge and understanding of Szasz’s claim about the medicalisation of disturbing or disturbed behaviours.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – Reasonable knowledge and understanding of Szasz’s claim about the medicalisation of disturbing or disturbed behaviours.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Limited knowledge and understanding of Szasz’s claim about the medicalisation of disturbing or disturbed behaviours.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy response.</p>
4	(b)	<p><b>Assuming Szasz is correct to say there has been a “medicalisation of disturbing or disturbed behaviours”, to what extent would you see this as a problem?</b></p> <p><b>AO1 (1 mark)</b></p>	5	<p><b>5 marks</b> – Good discussion of the extent to which “the medicalisation of disturbing or disturbed behaviours” is a problem. At least two lines of argument are explored with relevant supporting evidence.</p> <p><b>3–4 marks</b> – Reasonable discussion of the extent to which</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Arguments should be illustrated with appropriate examples (e.g. of behaviours seen as mental disorders, treatments, etc.).</p> <p><b>AO3 (4 marks)</b>  Comments could see the “medicalisation” that Szasz writes of as a problem, or not. It could be argued, for example, that it is a good thing that such disturbances have been ‘medicalised’ as those experiencing them can then feel reassured that their experience is not completely unusual, the path that it will take can be predicted, and they will receive help (i.e. treatment); viewing such disturbances as equivalent to physical illnesses can also improve access to funding for support services. Such arguments would all run counter to the position being advanced by Szasz. In support of his position, it could be argued that treating disturbances as medical events can lead to individuals being subject to state control (e.g. through being sectioned) and that behaviours simply not approved of or understood by the majority can be labelled as an ‘illness’ when they are nothing more than a bit ‘different’ from the ‘norm’. To be able to access the top band, candidates can be expected to explore at least two arguments and express a judgement about the extent to which they see any “medicalisation” as a problem.</p> <p>Other appropriate responses should be credited.</p>		<p>“the medicalisation of disturbing or disturbed behaviours” is a problem. Two lines of argument may be explored with limited supporting evidence or one line of argument may be explored with good supporting evidence.</p> <p><b>1–2 marks</b> – Limited discussion of the extent to which “the medicalisation of disturbing or disturbed behaviours” is a problem. One line of argument is explored with reasonable or limited supporting evidence.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy response.</p>
5	<p>* <b>Compare the biochemical explanation of mental illness with brain abnormality as an explanation of mental illness.</b></p> <p><b>AO1 (5 marks)</b>  Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of the</p>	10	<p><b>9–10 marks</b> – A good understanding of the key assumptions of both biochemical and brain abnormality explanations of mental illness. Points of comparison (similarities and/or differences) are clearly identified and referenced appropriately to both explanations. There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>biochemical explanation is likely to be achieved through reference to chemical imbalance. Reference is likely to be made to disrupted levels of serotonin or dopamine, but any biochemical explanation is creditworthy. Explanations in relation to brain abnormality are likely to make reference to the volumes of brain structures, the size of ventricles, or levels of activity in different regions of the brain, but any explanation in relation to brain abnormality is creditworthy including reference to tumours or accidents. The candidate may refer to disorders to elaborate on the explanation or they may use empirical evidence as elaboration of the explanation – both would be creditworthy.</p> <p><b>AO3 (5 marks)</b> The injunction to ‘compare’ invites candidates to explore similarities and/or differences between the explanations. Points of comparison could be based around debates (e.g. usefulness; social sensitivity; reductionism/holism) or methodological issues such as the type of research supporting the explanation; however, other points of comparison can be expected (e.g. in relation to the area of psychology both explanations come from, or the sorts of treatment that they may lead to). Each point should be clearly identified, and linked to both explanations. Again, empirical evidence might be used but will only be creditworthy where it is appropriately used to support the similarity or difference being discussed. The question does not ask for simple evaluation of the explanation or research and such material would not be creditworthy.</p> <p>Other appropriate responses should be credited.</p>		<p>information presented is relevant and substantiated.</p> <p><b>6–8 marks</b> – A reasonable description of the key assumptions of both biochemical and brain abnormality explanations of mental illness. This may lack detail or be unbalanced. Comparison is made in some detail with reference to both explanations. There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The information presented is in the most-part relevant and supported by some evidence.</p> <p><b>3–5 marks</b> – A limited description of the key assumptions of both biochemical and brain abnormality explanations of mental illness. This will lack detail, be unbalanced or superficial. A point of comparison in some detail with some reference to both explanations. The information has some relevance and is presented with limited structure. The information is supported by limited evidence.</p> <p><b>1–2 marks</b> – A basic description of the key assumptions of either biochemical or brain abnormality explanations OR superficial description of both biochemical and brain abnormality explanations. Some basic comparison made but with no reference to the explanations. 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> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy response.</p>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>35</b>	

Section B: Options

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance
6	(a)	*	<p><b>Using the research by Johnson and Young (2002), explain how children’s advertising reinforces gender stereotypes.</b></p> <p><b>AO1 (5 marks)</b> Candidates must refer to the key study by Johnson and Young 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.</p> <p><b>AO2 (5 marks)</b> Candidates should <i>apply</i> their knowledge and understanding of the study by Johnson and Young to explain how children’s’ advertising reinforces gender stereotypes. Answers can be expected to refer to the way in which toys were used within adverts, the nature of voice-overs, the verbs (verb elements) used in adverts, the speaking roles of boys and girls within adverts, and power discourse. Less detailed answers or answers that simply describe the study without making suggestions about how it can explain how children’s advertising reinforces gender stereotypes will only gain marks in the lower bands.</p>	10	PLEASE REFER TO APPENDIX 1

	(b)	<p>* <b>Assess the usefulness of research into the impact of advertising on children.</b></p> <p><b>AO1 (2 marks)</b> Candidates should demonstrate knowledge and understanding of usefulness.</p> <p><b>AO3 (13 marks)</b> Candidates should analyse, interpret and evaluate usefulness of research into the impact of advertising on children. Answers could centre on the usefulness of such research to parents (e.g. to limit children’s exposure to advertising) or to teachers (e.g. as the basis for discussion about advertisements within lessons). Reference could also be made to the usefulness of such research to manufacturers or advertisers themselves (e.g. for ideas about how to achieve more sales) or to the Government (e.g. to place restrictions upon advertising aimed at children or, alternatively, to adopt some of its strategies within health promotion campaigns for children). In assessing the usefulness of research, candidates can be expected to acknowledge limits to its usefulness (e.g. because of pressures from commercial enterprises to be allowed to continue advertising to children; the growing extent of media platforms) and may refer to limitations within the research itself (e.g. connected to validity, reliability, sampling bias, etc.) as part of this. The extent to which research is useful needs to be assessed, rather than simply identified and illustrated.</p> <p>Other appropriate responses should be credited.</p>	15	PLEASE REFER TO APPENDIX 2
--	-----	---	----	----------------------------

	(c)	<p data-bbox="315 169 1128 272">* <b>What suggestions might a psychologist make to Hannah about how she can reduce the impact of advertising which is aimed at children?</b></p> <p data-bbox="365 312 584 344"><b>AO2 (10 marks)</b></p> <p data-bbox="365 347 1128 719">Candidates need to apply their knowledge and understanding of strategies to reduce the impact of advertising which is aimed at children. Answers could focus on Hannah laying on 'media literacy' lessons at school in which adverts are discussed and analysed; Hannah could also offer suggestions to parents/carers (e.g. to limit children's exposure to advertising) and could provide them with questions that they could discuss with their children when watching advertisements together. Any relevant suggestion is creditworthy. It is important that the suggestions are related to the context of the question.</p> <p data-bbox="365 754 994 786">Other appropriate responses should be credited.</p>	10	PLEASE REFER TO APPENDIX 3
--	-----	---	----	----------------------------

7	(a)	<p>* <b>Explain how the research by Dixon et al. (2002) could be used to improve the court system.</b></p> <p><b>AO1 (5 marks)</b> Candidates must refer to the key study by Dixon 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.</p> <p><b>AO2 (5 marks)</b> Candidates should <i>apply</i> their knowledge and understanding of the study by Dixon et al to explain how it can be used to improve the court system. Answers are likely to focus on ways of reducing the impact of defendants' accents on verdicts. Suggestions could centre on training defendants to speak in a more 'standard' way, actors speaking on behalf of defendants, jurors being advised not to infer guilt or innocence from a defendant's accent, etc. Answers could also focus on the defendant's ethnicity, with suggestions for improving the court system centring on the use of screens, juror training, etc. If focusing on ethnicity, though, it needs to be emphasised that this was only found to be relevant for 'blue collar' crimes. Less detailed answers or answers that simply describe the study without making suggestions about how it could be used to improve the court system will only gain marks in the lower bands.</p>	10	PLEASE REFER TO APPENDIX 1
---	-----	---	----	----------------------------

	(b)	<p>* <b>Discuss the validity of research into psychology and the courtroom.</b></p> <p><b>AO1 (2 marks)</b> Candidates should demonstrate knowledge and understanding of validity.</p> <p><b>AO3 (13 marks)</b> Candidates should analyse, interpret and evaluate the validity of research into psychology and the courtroom. Candidates may acknowledge the way in which the validity of research is enhanced by the use of controlled experiments and by participants being unaware of the researchers' aims; however, they may criticise the way in which research using mock juries lacks ecological validity, or raise issues with population validity, socially desirable responses, demand characteristics, etc. The validity of research needs to be discussed, rather than simply identified and illustrated.</p> <p>Other appropriate responses should be credited.</p>	15	PLEASE REFER TO APPENDIX 2
--	-----	---	----	----------------------------

	(c)	<p>* <b>What advice might a criminal psychologist give the judge about how to direct jurors in their decision-making?</b></p> <p><b>AO2 (10 marks)</b>  Candidates need to apply their knowledge and understanding of strategies to influence jury decision-making. Suggestions could relate to the level of confidence displayed by the defendant, the ethnicity of the defendant, or to the 'halo effect', with jurors being directed not to let the 'attractiveness' of the defendant affect them. The judge could also be encouraged to direct jurors to be wary of strategies used by lawyers to influence them, such as the order in which witnesses have been called up ('story order', as opposed to 'witness order'), barristers saying things that are ruled inadmissible, or the use of expert witnesses. It is important that the suggestions are related to the context of the question.</p> <p>Other appropriate responses should be credited.</p>	10	PLEASE REFER TO APPENDIX 3
--	-----	--	----	----------------------------

8	(a)	*	<p><b>Explain how the research by Black and Black (2007) could be used in the management of aircraft noise.</b></p> <p><b>AO1 (5 marks)</b> Candidates must refer to the key study by Black and Black 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.</p> <p><b>AO2 (5 marks)</b> Candidates should <i>apply</i> their knowledge and understanding of the study by Black and Black to explain how it could be used in the management of aircraft noise. Answers could centre on individual-focused strategies (e.g. anti-hypertensive medication, or mindfulness-based stress reduction programmes) as the researchers suggest, or they could go further to make suggestions for airlines (e.g. quieter aircraft engines), airport managers (e.g. limiting the hours when aircraft are permitted to take off or land), or local planners (e.g. restrict house-building within the vicinity of airports, and/or insist on enhanced levels of sound insulation within such buildings), etc. Less detailed answers or answers that simply describe the study without making suggestions about how it could be used in the management of aircraft noise will only gain marks in the lower bands.</p>	10	PLEASE REFER TO APPENDIX 1
---	-----	---	--	----	----------------------------

	(b)	<p>* <b>Discuss the freewill-determinism debate in relation to stressors in the environment.</b></p> <p><b>AO1 (2 marks)</b> Candidates should demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the freewill-determinism debate.</p> <p><b>AO3 (13 marks)</b> Candidates should analyse, interpret and evaluate the freewill-determinism debate in relation to stressors in the environment. In addition to noise, answers could relate to a wide range of potential environmental stressors such as temperature, overcrowding, catastrophic events, etc. In discussing the freewill-determinism debate, candidates could explore the findings from empirical research (e.g. about the extent to which these suggest that stress will arise from a particular event), individual differences, issues with isolating specific causes of stress, causation versus correlation, etc. Answers could include reference to biological processes and could also explore the extent to which individuals are able to exercise control over the environments they live in or at least their responses to the environments they live in. Points about the freewill-determinism debate need to be discussed, rather than simply identified and illustrated.</p> <p>Other appropriate responses should be credited.</p>	15	PLEASE REFER TO APPENDIX 2
--	-----	---	----	----------------------------

	(c)	<p>* <b>What suggestions might a psychologist make to Marie about how she can minimise environmental stress in the office block she is designing?</b></p> <p><b>AO2 (10 marks)</b>  Candidates need to apply their knowledge and understanding of strategies for managing environmental stress. Suggestions could centre on noise levels within the office, how closely the workspaces are positioned together (in relation to feelings of crowdedness), the office temperature, etc. Candidates may also draw upon research from other areas of the specification, making suggestions to do with enhancing feelings of personal space (e.g. by allowing screening in 'open-plan' offices) or territory (e.g. permitting personalisation of desks, or avoiding 'hot-desking'), privacy, or referring to views from windows; however, if doing this, the candidate needs to make it clear how these relate to workplace stress. It is important that the suggestions are related to the context of the question.</p> <p>Other appropriate responses should be credited.</p>	10	PLEASE REFER TO APPENDIX 3
--	-----	--	----	----------------------------

<p>9</p>	<p>(a)</p>	<p>*</p> <p><b>Using the research by Kroll and Crenshaw (1970), explain how personality can be related to participation in sport.</b></p> <p><b>AO1 (5 marks)</b> Candidates must refer to the key study by Kroll and Crenshaw 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.</p> <p><b>AO2 (5 marks)</b> Candidates should <i>apply</i> their knowledge and understanding of the study by Kroll and Crenshaw to explain how personality can be related to participation in sport. Answers are likely to focus on how results from the study showed high-level players of American football and wrestlers to have similar personality profiles; footballers and wrestlers differed significantly from participants in karate and gymnastics in their personality profiles; and participants in karate and gymnastics differed from each other in their personality profiles. Answers may also make reference to those factors on which there were the greatest differences (e.g. group-dependence versus self-sufficiency for participants in football and karate; being shy versus venturesome for participants in football or wrestling and participants in gymnastics); similarities may also be referred to. Less detailed answers or answers that simply describe the study without making suggestions about how it can explain the relationship between personality and participation in the context of sport will only gain marks in the lower bands.</p>	<p>10</p>	<p>PLEASE REFER TO APPENDIX 1</p>
----------	------------	---	-----------	-----------------------------------

	(b)	<p>* <b>Discuss the reductionism-holism debate in relation to personality in sport.</b></p> <p><b>AO1 (2 marks)</b> Candidates should demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the reductionism-holism debate.</p> <p><b>AO3 (13 marks)</b> Candidates should analyse, interpret and evaluate the reductionism-holism debate in relation to personality in sport. Answers could explore the way in which Cattell’s 16PF Questionnaire (as used in the key research) contained 16 primary personality factors: does the inclusion of so many different factors make it holistic, or does the individual analysis of these factors constitute a form of reductionism? Reference can also be made to other theories of personality (e.g. Eysenck’s trait theory, Freud’s tripartite theory, five-factor models, HEXACO-PI-R): are these examples of reductionism or holism? Are they more or less reductionist than the 16PF Questionnaire? As well as considering the content of such theories, candidates may also explore the biological, psychodynamic, etc., basis of such theories, considering whether personality can be explained within such terms. Discussion needs to be in relation to sport. The reductionism-holism debate needs to be discussed, rather than simply identified and illustrated.</p> <p>Other appropriate responses should be credited.</p>	15	PLEASE REFER TO APPENDIX 2
--	-----	---	----	----------------------------

	(c)	<p>* <b>What suggestions might a sports psychologist make to Kabir about how he could use knowledge of personality to improve his pupils' sports performance?</b></p> <p><b>AO2 (10 marks)</b>                  Candidates need to apply their knowledge and understanding of strategies for using knowledge of personality to improve sports performance. Suggestions are likely to centre on providing pupils with opportunities to try out as wide a range of sports as possible so that they can find one that suits their personality the best, steering pupils towards sports that might fit with their personalities, or equipping pupils with strategies to overcome personality-based weaknesses. Candidates may also try arguing that knowledge of personality could potentially have applications for team sports such as selection of players to particular positions within the team (e.g. defender, rather than striker), for particular matches (e.g. high-importance games), for positions of responsibility (e.g. captain), or to achieve harmony within the team. These can be seen as creditworthy provided they are grounded in references to dimensions of personality. Answers need to relate to improvement in sporting performance. It is important that the suggestions are related to the context of the question.</p> <p>Other appropriate responses should be credited.</p>	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	<p>Response demonstrates good relevant knowledge and understanding. Accurate and reasonably detailed description. There is appropriate selection of material to address the question.</p> <p>Response demonstrates a good application of psychological knowledge and understanding to the question. Application will be explicit, accurate, and relevant to the question.</p> <p>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and substantiated.</p>
3	6 – 8	<p>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.</p> <p>Response demonstrates a reasonable application of psychological knowledge and understanding to the question. Application will be clear and focused on the question.</p> <p>There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The information presented is in the most-part relevant and supported by some evidence.</p>
2	3 – 5	<p>Response demonstrates limited relevant knowledge and understanding. Limited description lacking in detail. There is some evidence of selection of material to address the question.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The information has some relevance and is presented with limited structure. The information is supported by limited evidence.</p>

<b>1</b>	<b>1 – 2</b>	<p>Response demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding. Description is basic. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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>
<b>0</b>		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)*

<b>Level</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>Generic mark scheme (part b)</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>12–15</b>	<p>Response demonstrates good relevant knowledge and understanding.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and substantiated.</p>
<b>3</b>	<b>8–11</b>	<p>Response demonstrates good relevant knowledge and understanding.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The information presented is in the most-part relevant and supported by some evidence.</p>
<b>2</b>	<b>4–7</b>	Response demonstrates reasonable knowledge and understanding.

		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. 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. 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. 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.  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.  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.  The information has some relevance and is presented with limited structure. The information is supported by

		limited evidence.
<b>1</b>	<b>1 – 2</b>	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. The information is supported by limited evidence and the relationship to the evidence may not be clear.
<b>0</b>		No creditworthy response.