



GCSE (9–1)

Psychology

J203/01: Studies and applications in Psychology 1

General Certificate of Secondary Education

Mark Scheme for November 2020

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 2020

Annotations

Annotation	Meaning
/	Separate
?	Meaning unclear
APP	Application
BOD	Benefit of doubt
NBOD	No benefit of doubt
λ	Omission
✗	Incorrect
✓	Correct
E	Expansion
EVAL	Evaluation
IRRL	Irrelevant
↓	Band down
KU	Knowledge & understanding
REP	Repetition
SEEN	Seen
TV	Too vague

Question		Answer	Mark	Guidance															
1	(a)	B	1																
	(b)	C	1																
	(c)	D	1																
2	(a)	George	1																
	(b)	Gita	1																
3		1 mark for each correctly placed term as shown below; Study 1 was a longitudinal study that took place over five years. The sample was made up of students . Their motivation was measured using a questionnaire and scores on this were compared with scores from maths tests.	4																
4	(a)	1 mark for a row/column for each age group 1 mark for a row/column for recording conservation e.g. <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Age</td> <td>Can conserve</td> <td>Cannot conserve</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4yrs</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>6yrs</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>8yrs</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>10yrs</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	Age	Can conserve	Cannot conserve	4yrs			6yrs			8yrs			10yrs			2	Do not penalise candidates if they do not refer to years when including ages but all four ages must be included. Rule of thumb: the chart should be feasible to use for data collection rather than data presentation.
Age	Can conserve	Cannot conserve																	
4yrs																			
6yrs																			
8yrs																			
10yrs																			

4	(b)	(i)	1 mark for 72	1	Allow 71 or 73.
		(ii)	1 mark for an answer between and including 15 to 18	2	If candidate gives a range do credit if it falls within or matches stated range.
		(iii)	1 mark for 90:10 (or 90/10) 1 mark for lowest form = 9:1		Do not credit answer as 1:9
	(c)		1 mark for ordering scores and identifying the middle two e.g. 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 8 9 1 mark for answer = 7	2	
5			1 mark for a brief or basic point 2 marks for a more developed point clearly related to the study <u>Examples of 1 mark answers</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">the study lacked ecological validitythe sample was culturally biasedthe findings lacked construct validity <u>Examples of 2 mark answers</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">study lacked ecological validity (1) as the conservation task was quite artificial (1)the sample was culturally biased (1) as Piaget only studied Swiss children (1)Piaget is criticised for asking the same question twice as this may explain why younger children changed their answer (1) thinking they had got something wrong even though they understood conservation (1)	2	For both marks to be awarded, the criticism should be contextualised through reference to the study. It is permissible to back credit a descriptive statement if the criticism is clear, e.g. Piaget tested conservation of number through use of counters (1) which could be seen as lacking construct validity (1).
6	(a)		1 mark for 8.6×10^{10}	1	
	(b)	(i)	1 mark for naming any one of the stages below; <ul style="list-style-type: none">pre-natalchildhoodadolescenceadulthood	1	

		(ii)	<p>1 mark for each feature of the stage given or up to 2 marks for a well described feature of the stage.</p> <p><u>Example of 1 mark answer</u> (childhood) The amount of grey matter in the brain peaks at this stage.</p> <p><u>Example of a 2 mark answer</u> (pre-natal) The brain has a fore, mid and hind section at the start (1) and by mid-pregnancy the brain has fused and connected to all parts of the body (1).</p> <p><u>Example of a 3 mark answer</u> (adolescence) The adolescent brain undergoes a lot of re-modelling (1) and this is particularly true of the prefrontal cortex which is developing throughout this period (1). For this reason, adolescents often rely on their limbic system for decision making (1).</p>	3	<p>If the stage and description do not match (or stage has been misnamed or omitted) credit (b)(ii) instead of (b)(i) provided it is clear which stage is being outlined.</p> <p>NB Only credit features pertaining to the development of the <i>brain</i>.</p>
7	(a)		A	1	
	(b)		C	1	
	(c)		C	1	
8	(a)		<p>1 mark for an accurate definition of a stigma, e.g. negative thinking, stereotype, making unfair assumptions, strong sense of disapproval about something</p> <p>1 mark for relating stigma to David's son thinking his father is a madman or to his workplace worrying if he will not get well enough.</p>	2	<p>It is possible to award one mark without the other.</p>
	(b)		<p>1 mark for an accurate definition of discrimination, e.g. treating someone differently, treating someone unfairly, acting on prejudices, etc.</p> <p>1 mark for relating this to David being told he cannot be considered for a promotion.</p>	2	<p>It is possible to award one mark without the other.</p>

9	(a)	Lucy	1	
	(b)	Dan	1	
	(c)	<p>1 mark for naming or identifying a relevant psychotherapy, e.g. cognitive behavioural therapy, counselling psychoanalysis, etc.</p> <p>1 mark for demonstrating some knowledge of how this therapy works</p> <p>1 mark for applying it to the symptoms of the chosen individual (who should be named)</p> <p><u>Examples of 1 mark answers</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dan could be treated using CBT • Paul could talk through why he feels he will be embarrassed in public. <p><u>Examples of 2 mark answers</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lucy could undergo psychoanalysis (1) where she could explore her childhood conflicts to see if they have caused her disorder (1). • Dan could be made to change his beliefs about events (1) so that he makes more rational decisions to help him eat or sleep better (1). <p><u>Example of 3 mark answer</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dan could go through counselling (1) where he will be supported to raise his self-esteem through the counsellor essentially listening to him (1) so that he ends up being motivated to start doing the things that he has stopped doing like eating and sleeping properly (1). 	3	

10		<p>For each criticism:</p> <p>1 mark for a brief or basic point 2 marks for a more developed point clearly related to the study</p> <p><u>Examples of 1 mark answers</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The study is culturally biased • People could lie about their Facebook usage <p><u>Examples of 2 mark answers</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The sample may be unrepresentative (1) as journalism students may use social media differently from other students because of their interest in this field (1). • There may have been issues with social desirability (1) as participants may have wanted to underplay the time they spent on Facebook or how envious they were so they did come across in a bad light (1). 	2 x 2	<p>For both marks to be awarded, a criticism must be contextualised through reference to the study.</p> <p>It is permissible to back credit a descriptive statement if the criticism is clear, e.g. envy and depression were measured using a rating system (1) therefore the findings may lack construct validity (1).</p>
11		<p><u>AO1 marks</u> Description of evolutionary function of depression, role of conflict and loss, security of adopting a lower rank, keeping of order, etc.</p> <p><u>AO3 marks</u> Evaluation can include over-emphasising the role of nature, too reductionist, too deterministic, does not explain suicide, does not explain why successful people get depressed, etc.</p> <p>AO1 Level 2 (3-4 marks): There is a good description of the theory. This is done with accuracy and clarity. The information presented is relevant.</p> <p>Level 1 (1-2 marks):</p>	8	

		<p>There is a basic description of the theory. This may include some inaccuracy. The information has some relevance.</p> <p>(0 marks): No credit worthy response.</p> <p>AO3</p> <p>Level 2 (3-4 marks): There is a good evaluation which offers breadth and/or depth. Points may be brief but should still be relevant and used to reach a supported judgement in response to the question.</p> <p>Level 1 (1-2 marks): There may be some basic attempt at evaluation but it will be weak and some points may be inaccurate. Judgements will be either unclear or absent.</p> <p>(0 marks): No credit worthy response.</p>		
12	(a)	A	1	
	(b)	D	1	
	(c)	D	1	
13		<p>For each criticism;</p> <p>1 mark for a brief or basic point 2 marks for a more developed point clearly related to explaining criminal behaviour</p> <p><u>Examples of 1 mark answers</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The theory ignores nature. 	2	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why can't criminals just unlearn their behaviours then? <p><u>Examples of 2 marks answers</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The theory ignores the role of nature (1) such as the idea that there may be a criminal gene (1). If criminal behaviour is learned from previous generations (1) then it does not explain where these behaviours originated from in the first place (1). 		
14		<p>1 mark for naming or identifying a relevant form of rehabilitation, e.g. restorative justice, use of positive role models, etc.</p> <p>1 mark for demonstrating some knowledge of how this form of rehabilitation works</p> <p>1 mark for applying it to the source through reference to changing the criminal behaviour</p> <p><u>Examples of 1 mark answers</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use positive role models. Bethan could be made to apologise to the shops she has stolen from. <p><u>Examples of 2 mark answers</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use positive role models (1) who Bethan could observe getting excitement from other activities besides crime (1). Restorative justice (1) gets offenders to empathise with their victims by meeting them face-to-face (1). <p><u>Examples of 3 mark answers</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use positive role models (1) who Bethan could observe getting excitement from other activities besides crime, e.g. sport (1). Then Bethan would 	3	

		<p>hopefully be motivated to imitate these activities rather than going shoplifting especially if she sees them as more rewarding (1).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bethan could be made to meet with the shopkeepers (1) where they would explain to her the consequences of her actions on them (1). If this makes her feel guilt or ashamed it may put her off wanting to steal from people again (1). 		
15		<p>Possible content includes reference to the link between personality traits and relevant parts of human physiology, e.g. reticular activating system (extraversion), autonomic nervous system (neuroticism), dopaminergic neurons (psychoticism).</p> <p>3 marks for a detailed and coherent description which includes accurate use of neuropsychological concepts.</p> <p>2 marks for a reasonably detailed description which includes some accurate use of neuropsychological concepts.</p> <p>1 mark for a basic description which may muddle some neuropsychological concepts.</p>	3	<p>If the description of Eysenck's theory does not make reference to the neuropsychological elements, (e.g. just a description of traits) then no credit given.</p> <p>Full marks can be credited for focusing on one aspect of neuropsychology but this would need a good level of technical detail to secure the marks.</p>
16		<p><u>AO1 marks</u> Description of Cooper & Mackie's study and at least one other study where ethical issues can be identified. Demonstrating awareness and understanding of ethical issues, e.g. consent, right to withdraw, confidentiality, protecting the welfare of participants, integrity, etc.</p> <p><u>AO3 marks</u> Use of studies to debate ethical issues, e.g. cost-benefit analysis/greater good argument, risk of demand characteristics/issues of validity, ways of addressing issues, e.g. debriefing, piloting, surveying participants.</p>	13	

	<p>AO1</p> <p>Level 3 (5-6 marks): There is a thorough description of studies and a strong awareness of ethical issues. This is demonstrated with accuracy and clarity. The information presented is relevant and in a very well structured.</p> <p>Level 2 (3-4 marks): There is a good description of studies and a reasonable awareness of ethical issues. This is demonstrated with some accuracy and clarity. The information presented is relevant and in a good structure.</p> <p>Level 1 (1-2 marks): There is a basic description of at least one study and some awareness of ethical issues. This may include some inaccuracy. The information has some relevance but is presented with limited structure.</p> <p>(0 marks): No credit worthy response.</p> <p>AO3</p> <p>Level 3 (5-7 marks): There is a thorough evaluation which offers breadth and/or depth covering at least two different points. Points are coherent and relevant and the response is developed in order to reach a substantiated judgement in response to the question.</p> <p>Level 2 (3-4 marks): There is a good evaluation which offers breadth and/or depth covering at least two different points. Points may be brief but should still be relevant and used to reach a supported judgement in response to the question.</p> <p>Level 1 (1-2 marks): There may be some basic attempt at evaluation but it will be weak. Judgements will be either unclear or absent.</p> <p>(0 marks):</p>	<p>For AO1: to be placed in Level 2 or above, the response must refer to both Cooper & Mackie's (1986) study and at least one other study from another area of psychology.</p> <p>For AO3: to be placed in Level 2 or above, the response must refer to both Cooper & Mackie's (1986) study and at least one other study from another area of psychology.</p>
--	--	---

		No credit worthy response.		
17		<p>1 mark for a correct stem, i.e. one that predicts no difference</p> <p>1 mark for reference to both variables from the investigation</p> <p><u>Examples of 1 mark answer</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There will be no difference between driving and talking. • There will be a difference in how safely people drive when talking or when not talking. <p><u>Examples of 2 mark answer</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There will be no difference in how safely participants drive depending on whether they are talking to someone or not. • People that talk when driving will not drive any more safely than people who are not talking when driving. 	2	<p>Do not credit a hypothesis which refers to a correlation rather than a difference.</p> <p>Both conditions of the IV must be referred to for a hypothesis to be awarded full marks.</p> <p>If a hypothesis includes both required elements but is muddled then limit to 1 mark.</p> <p>Alternative hypothesis can be credited with 1 mark.</p>
18		<p>1 mark for identifying the DV as how safely participants drive.</p> <p>1 mark for a feasible way that this could be measured, e.g. use of driving Apps, computer simulation which records crashes/near misses/law breaking, using driving instructor/examiner as judge during live driving, etc.</p>	2	<p>N.B. These marks can be awarded independently of each other.</p> <p>It is not necessary for the candidate to outline their scoring system to earn the second mark – just how it would be set up.</p>
19	(a)	1 mark for naming their experimental design. Likely to be independent measures or repeated measures but do credit matched pairs.	1	Accept independent groups instead of independent measures. Do not accept individual measures.
19	(b)	<p>1 mark for a relevant strength of the chosen design plus 1 further mark for applying this to the investigation.</p> <p><u>Examples of 1 mark answer</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No participant variables. (repeated measures) 	2	If candidate is evaluating a design other than the one named then credit the evaluation rather than the name of the design.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The participants can't work out the experiment is about safe driving. (independent measures) <p><u>Examples of 2 mark answer</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no individual differences (1) so if a participant is a big risk taker this will affect both conditions as they take part in both (1). I will only need to recruit 20 participants as they are going to drive while talking on loudspeaker and then not (1) which saves me time and money (1). 		<p>It is possible to award credit for an answer to (b) if response to (a) has not been credited as long as it is obvious which type of design is being evaluated.</p>
19	(c)	<p>1 mark for a relevant weakness of the chosen design plus 1 further mark for applying this to the investigation.</p> <p><u>Examples of 1 mark answer</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Order effects. (repeated measures) Change of participants is an extraneous variable. (independent measures) <p><u>Examples of 2 mark answer</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The participants may appear to drive more safely in the second condition (1) because they have got used to the driving simulator and are therefore making fewer mistakes (1). (repeated measures) If I find a difference between conditions it could actually be due to individual differences (1) like the participants in the non-talking condition having more experience of driving than the other group (1). 	2	<p>If candidate is evaluating a design other than the one named then credit the evaluation rather than the name of the design if this is consistent with their answer to (b).</p> <p>It is possible to award credit for an answer to (c) if response to (a) has not been credited as long as it is obvious which type of design is being evaluated and is consistent with their answer to (b).</p>
20		<p>1 mark for identifying a basic procedure and/or one feature of the procedure.</p> <p>2 marks for a reasonably feasible procedure and/or two features of the procedure.</p> <p>3 marks for describing a feasible procedure and/or three features of the procedure.</p>	3	<p>Do not credit features that have been awarded marks in responses to other questions.</p> <p>Creditworthy features could include;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> type of experiment sampling method operationalisation of IV scoring system for DV

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • how data will be presented/analysed • control of extraneous variables • ethical considerations not covered elsewhere
21		<p>1 mark for identifying a relevant ethical issue either by name or through description</p> <p>1 mark for outlining how the issue should be managed in this investigation</p> <p><u>Examples of 2 mark answers</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One issue is that identities need to be protected (1) as participants may be embarrassed if others found out they were bad drivers (1). • Informed consent is an issue (1) so my participants would be told that someone is going to sit next to them to assess their driving (1). • Participants may feel scared once they start driving around the obstacle course (1) so I would need to make sure that they know they can withdraw (1). 	2	It is not possible to credit the 2 nd mark without the first.
22		<p>Credit evaluation points that refer to the experimental method in psychology, or specific types used in this investigation (laboratory, field). Points can be positive, (e.g. establishing cause and effect, high levels of control, replicability, ecological validity in field) or negative, (e.g. demand characteristics, lack of construct validity, low ecological validity if lab). The points should apply to the planned investigation whether explicitly or implicitly.</p> <p>Level 2 (3-4 marks): There is a detailed evaluation of the experimental method. This should be done with accuracy and clarity and clearly apply to the investigation whether implicitly or explicitly. There should be evidence of coherency.</p> <p>Level 1 (1-2 marks):</p>	4	

		<p>There is a basic attempt to evaluate the experimental method. Evaluation may be more common sense than technical. Points may only apply to the investigation in an implicit way.</p> <p>(0 marks):</p> <p>No credit worthy response.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
The Triangle Building
Shaftesbury Road
Cambridge
CB2 8EA

OCR Customer Contact Centre

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

www.ocr.org.uk

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