

Psychology

Advanced GCE **A2 7876**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE **AS 3876**

**Combined Mark Schemes
And Report on the Units**

January 2006

3876/7876/MS/R/06J

OCR (Oxford, Cambridge and RSA Examinations) is a unitary awarding body, established by the University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate and the RSA Examinations Board in January 1998. OCR provides a full range of GCSE, A level, GNVQ, Key Skills and other qualifications for schools and colleges in the United Kingdom, including those previously provided by MEG and OCEAC. It is also responsible for developing new syllabuses to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers.

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

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

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the Report on the Examination.

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

© OCR 2006

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annersley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 870 6622
Facsimile: 0870 870 6621
E-mail: publications@ocr.org.uk

CONTENTS

Advanced GCE Psychology (7876)

Advanced Subsidiary GCE Psychology (3876)

MARK SCHEMES FOR THE UNITS

Unit	Content	Page
2540	Core Studies 1	1
2541	Core Studies 2	9
2542	Psychological Investigations	19
2544	Psychology and Education	27
2545	Psychology and Health	45
2546	Psychology and Organisations	57
2547	Psychology and Environment	71
2548	Psychology and Sport	85
2549	Psychology and Crime	99

REPORT ON THE UNITS

Unit	Content	Page
*	Chief Examiner's Report	114
2540	Core Studies 1	115
2541	Core Studies 2	118
2542	Psychological Investigations	121
2544	Psychology and Education	123
2545	Psychology and Health	126
2546	Psychology and Organisations	129
2547	Psychology and Environment	131
2548	Psychology and Sport	133
2549	Psychology and Crime	135
*	Grade Thresholds	137

**Mark Scheme 2540
January 2006**

Cognitive Psychology

- 1 (a) The table below shows the results from the second experiment by Loftus and Palmer. Outline one conclusion from this table.**

Any one from: the majority of participants did not report seeing broken glass therefore many people were not affected by the verb used in the earlier experiment. The control group was similar to the 'hit' group which indicates this verb had little effect on the participant's memory. The verb 'smashed' had the strongest effect on whether participants reported seeing broken glass. (2)

Other appropriate answers (2)

Partially correct answer (1)

- 1 (b) Explain the purpose of the control group in this experiment.**

The control group allows a baseline for comparisons to be made regarding the effects of the verbs on the participants' memory. The control group could show reliability of memory of events from the crash e.g. broken glass without the influence of the verbs used a week earlier. (2)

Other appropriate answers (2)

Partially correct answer e.g. as a comparison – without qualification (1)

- 2 In the study by Baron-Cohen, Leslie and Frith on autism, the mental age of the children in all three groups was measured. Explain why this was done.**

This was done to control for intelligence rather than by chronological age as this enabled the groups to be compared in terms of their theory of mind. To show that intelligence was not related to theory of mind. Full answer for 2 marks. (2)

Other appropriate answers and descriptions of questions (2)

Partially correct answer e.g. used as a control, to make the groups comparable, to control for intelligence – with no explanation. (1)

"matched" = 0

- 3 Gardner and Gardner attempted to teach Washoe sign language. Outline one reason why this study was conducted.**

To see if another species can use language as humans do. (or reference to using features of language e.g. differentiation) It helps us to understand the nature/nurture debate, to learn more about how children develop language.

Point with explanation for 2 marks. (2)

Other appropriate answers. (2)

Partially correct answer: must refer to humans / language (1)

0 marks – to see if chimps can 'talk' 'speak'

- 4 **From the study by Deregowski on perception, outline two difficulties involved in conducting cross-cultural research.** (4)

Two from: ethnocentrism, researcher bias, developing culturally fair materials and methods, language differences, interpretation of participants' responses/behaviour, understanding cultural norms.

Answer should be outlined/explained for two marks. (2 marks each)

Other appropriate answers (2)

Partially correct answer – difficulty not explained/ not relevant to study (1)

Time restraints

Developmental Psychology

- 5 **The study by Samuel and Bryant on conservation highlights a criticism of Piaget's original method of testing. Outline this criticism.**

Piaget originally asked two questions (pre and post transformation) which was thought to confuse the children. Samuel and Bryant asked only one question to compare. (2)

Other appropriate answers (2)

Partially correct answer: 'demand characteristics' – without explanation (1)

- 6 (a) **Explain how one control was used in the study on aggression by Bandura Ross and Ross.**

Any one from: standardised procedure, same models used, same toys, 3ft BoBo doll, staying with child, observation checklist, control group. Control with explanation for two marks, matching levels of aggression, aggression arousal (2)

Other appropriate answers (2)

Partially correct answer identification of control, any of IV's (1)

- 6 (b) **Suggest one reason why it is difficult to generalise from the findings of this study to aggression outside the laboratory.**

One from: Low ecological validity due to: Artificial nature of the study i.e. bobo doll/ no reason for aggression, demand characteristics, type of aggression viewed. (2)

Other appropriate answers (2)

Partially correct answer (1)

- 7 **Suggest an alternative explanation for little Hans' phobia of horses other than the one given the study by Freud.**

Little Hans did see a horse fall down in the street which may have frightened him (behaviourist), he also heard a mother warn her child not to put his finger near the horse as it may bite him. Explanation supported by details in the study or other psychology

2 marks

Other appropriate answers do not have to refer to information in the study (2)

Partially correct answer – suggestion not supported by evidence from the study. (1)

- 8 Outline two weaknesses of the longitudinal approach as used in the study on social relationships by Hodges and Tizard. (4)**

Any two from: ethics, subject attrition, length of study, researcher involvement.
Point about longitudinal approach plus link to study for 2 marks. (2 marks each)

Other appropriate answers (2)
Partially correct answer: weakness of longitudinal approach not linked to study. (1)

Physiological Psychology

- 9 (a) From the study by Schachter and Singer on emotion, outline one way in which the participants may have been harmed.**

One from: some of the participants who were not aware of the adrenaline injection and so may have been alarmed by the symptoms, they may have been stressed by being given an injection, some participants may have felt embarrassed by the questions asked in the angry condition. (2)

Other appropriate answers (2)
Partially correct answer (1)

- 9 (b) Explain why the researchers felt it was necessary to deceive the participants.**

The use of deception was necessary in order to separate the different factors of emotion i.e. cognitive and physiological factors, in order to see if the need for an explanation of the physical symptoms would lead to picking up situational cues i.e. angry/euphoric stooge, participants may not have agreed to take part. (2)

Other appropriate answers (2)
Partially correct answer e.g. to avoid demand characteristics with no explanation (1)

- 10 Explain why the participants in the study by Sperry had previously undergone an operation to disconnect the two hemispheres of the brain.**

The patients were suffering from epilepsy and this operation allowed the epilepsy to be contained in one hemisphere therefore reducing the severity of the symptoms. (2)

Other appropriate answers (2)
Partially correct answer: because the patient had epilepsy (1)

- 11 Outline one difference in brain activity between murderers and the control group in the study by Raine, Buschbaum and La Casse.**

One from: Murderers had lower glucose metabolism in both lateral and medial prefrontal cortical areas, and for left and right medial superior frontal cortex. Murderers had lower parietal glucose metabolism. Murderers had higher occipital lobe glucose metabolism, lower glucose metabolism in the corpus callosum, greater left and right amygdala activity, and greater right thalamic activity. Must mention parts of the brain. (2)

Other appropriate answers (2 marks)
Partially correct answer e.g. lower level of brain activity, difference in glucose. (1)

- 12 In their study on sleep and dreaming Dement and Kleitman used an EEG (electroencephalograph) to record data. Outline one advantage and one disadvantage of using this method. (4)**

One from Advantages: objective measurement, easier to measure, more scientific, more reliable

One from Disadvantages: may not be valid measure of dreaming, reductionist, may interfere with sleep patterns (2 marks each)

Other appropriate answers (2 marks each)

Partially correct answer: advantage/disadvantage not linked to the study of sleep and dreaming. (1)

Social Psychology

- 13 Outline how obedience was measured in the study by Milgram.**

One from: voltage administered to learner beyond willing level. (2)

Other appropriate answers (2)

Partially correct answer: outline of procedure.(1)

- 14 (a) Identify two features of the uniform worn by the prisoners in the study by Haney, Banks and Zimbardo.**

Two from: smock, ankle chain and ball, stocking on head/number (2 marks each)

Other appropriate answers (2)

Partially correct answer (1 mark each)

- 14 (b) Suggest how the prisoners' uniform was designed to bring about a 'psychological state of imprisonment'.**

One from: emasculation, oppression, deindividuation or equivalent description (2)

Other appropriate answers (2)

Partially correct answer: to make them feel like 'real' prisoners (1)

- 15 Give one reason for the lack of diffusion of responsibility found in the subway study by Piliavin, Rodin and Piliavin.**

One from: the emergency was unambiguous; there was no way for passengers to escape, costs of helping were low, in view of each other. (2)

Other appropriate answers (2)

Partially correct answer (1)

- 16 (a) Identify two features of the sample in Tajfel's study on inter-group discrimination.**

Two from: schoolboys, all from the same school, all knew each other, 64 in first study, and 48 in second study. (1 mark each)

Other appropriate answers (1 mark each)

Partially correct answer (1)

16 (b) Suggest two reasons why it would be difficult to generalise from this sample.

Two from: schoolboys are more competitive, one school not generalisable, sample size.

Other appropriate answers (1 mark each)

Partially correct answers: vague answers max of 1 mark (1)

Psychology of Individual Differences

17 From the study by Gould, explain why the IQ of the army recruits was tested.

The IQ testing was to place recruits in suitable positions in the army. Provided a large sample to test IQ tests on (2)

Other appropriate answers (2)

Partially correct answer: (1)

0 marks – to measure intelligence/IQ

18 Outline why Hraba and Grant repeated the study conducted by Clark and Clark in 1939 on doll choice.

The aim of the study was to see if the children's racial identification and racial preference had changed with the changes in society since the earlier study. (2)

Other appropriate answers (2)

Partially correct answer: to study ethnocentrism in black children (1)

19 (a) From the study by Rosenhan (sane in insane places) identify two ways in which the patients' privacy was invaded.

Patient quarters and possessions can be entered and examined by any member of staff at any time, for whatever reason. Personal history and anguish is available to any member of staff who chooses to read it regardless of their therapeutic relationship, personal hygiene may be monitored, toilets may have no doors, monitoring of patients (observation or notes) 1 mark each

Other appropriate answers (1 mark each)

Partially correct answer (1)

19 (b) Give one reason why privacy of psychiatric patients may be invaded.

Can either be from study/or in general

Negative attitudes of staff toward people with mental illness, the idea that mentally ill people have fewer rights, fear of mental illness, dehumanisation of patients by staff and society, to protect from self harm, to make a diagnosis (2)

Other appropriate answers (2)

Partially correct answer (1)

20 Suggest one strength and one weakness of the evidence gathered by Thigpen and Cleckley in their study of multiple personality. (4)

One from Strengths: very detailed data was obtained, variety of methods used, independent tester carried out psychological tests, physiological tests taken to back up qualitative data.

One from weaknesses: interviewer bias, ethics too much involvement may have made Eve worse, psychological/physiological tests may not be reliable or valid.

Acting / Faking (2 marks each)

Other appropriate answers (2 marks each)

Partially correct answer: e.g. can't generalise from one participant (1 mark each)

**Mark Scheme 2541
January 2006**

One common way of collecting data in psychology is to ask participants questions and then to analyse the answers. Such data are referred to as self reports.

1(a) Describe how self report data was gathered in your chosen study.

AO1 Named studies: Freud, Deregowski, Thigpen & Cleckley

Emphasis is on detail of chosen core study.

Indicative content: Most likely answers: (any appropriate answer receives credit):

Freud: Questions to little Hans; Hans comments made to father, mother and maid!

Deregowski: both anecdotal reports (Laws, Fraser & others) and empirical (Hudson) asked participants to self report on what they saw.

Thigpen: use of many methods to gather data: over 100 hours of interviews, also hypnosis and projective tests. Not psychometric or EEG.

No answer or incorrect answer	0
One or two general statements are identified which are basic and lacking in detail. Expression is poor and use of psychological terms is rudimentary.	1-2
Description is accurate with increased detail. Some understanding evident. Expression and use of psychological terms is good.	3-4
*maximum mark if no reference is made to how self report data is gathered (i.e. descriptions of procedure only).	
Description is accurate with appropriate detail. Understanding is good. Omissions are few. Expression and use of psychological terminology is competent.	5-6
For 6 marks quality of written communication must be very good.	
max mark	6

1(b) Briefly discuss two strengths and two weaknesses of using self reports giving examples from your chosen study.

AO2

Candidates should provide a general strength and weakness related to the question.

They should give an example from their chosen study to illustrate the strength or weakness and they should make a comment about the strength or weakness which may be evaluation or implication.

Assessment include strength/weakness, example and comment

Important note: As candidates are required to discuss, strength/weakness must be explained and not merely identified; example must be explained and not just stated; comment must be explained or show understanding and not just stated.

Indicative content: Most likely answers: (any appropriate answer receives credit):

Strength: participants given opportunity to express their feeling and explain their behaviour.

Strength: quality and richness of data gained. Not limited to quantitative.

Strength: participants are less likely to drop out of the study.

Weakness: data may be unique and not comparable to others.

Weakness: participants may provide socially desirable responses

Weakness: participants may respond to demand characteristics.

For each point up to a maximum of FOUR points

No answer or incorrect answer.	0
Any one of three [point/example/comment]	1
Any two of three [point/example/comment]	2
All three [point/example/comment]	3
max mark	12

1(c) Suggest one other way data could have been gathered for your chosen study and say how you think this might affect the results

AO2

Answers must be specific to chosen core study.

NB candidates may offer more than one suggestion.

All marked and best ONE credited.

Any way of collecting data not used in the study itself is acceptable, even if it is another self report.

No answer or incorrect answer.	0
Alternative identified but little or no expansion. Alternative may be peripherally relevant with minimal reference to study. Minimal understanding of implications.	1-2
Relevant alternative described in appropriate detail with understanding of implications.	3-4
<i>How this might affect the results</i>	
Effect of change/alternative referred to briefly but not developed. For 2 marks there may be brief expansion of possible effect but with no analysis (comment but no comprehension).	1-2
Effect of change/alternative considered in appropriate detail with analysis (comment and comprehension). For 4 marks there is clarity of expression and arguments are structured.	3-4
max mark	8

Some psychological studies are done over a short period of time. They are known as snapshot studies. Other studies done over a longer period of time are longitudinal studies.

2(a)
AO1 **Describe the procedure of your chosen study.**

Named studies: Loftus & Palmer/Hraba & Grant/Schachter & Singer

Emphasis is on detail of chosen core study.

Indicative content: Most likely answers: (any appropriate answer receives credit):
Loftus: data gathered via Experiment 1 – responses in mph to one of 5 words.
Experiment 2 – Yes or no responses to question about broken glass.
Hraba: Children given a number of questions: which doll is a nice doll, etc.
Schachter: data gathered through self report questions and through observations.

No answer or incorrect answer	0
One or two general statements are identified which are basic and lacking in detail. Expression is poor and use of psychological terms is rudimentary.	1-2
Description is accurate with increased detail. Some understanding evident. Expression and use of psychological terms is good. *maximum mark if no reference is made to speed of study/snapshot data.	3-4
Description is accurate with appropriate detail. Understanding is good. Omissions are few. Expression and use of psychological terminology is competent. For 6 marks quality of written communication must be very good. max mark	5-6 6

2(b)
AO2 **Briefly discuss two strengths and two weaknesses of snapshot studies giving examples from your chosen study.**

Candidates should provide a general strength and weakness related to the question. They should give an example from their chosen study to illustrate the strength or weakness and they should make a comment about the strength or weakness which may be evaluation or implication.

Assessment include strength/weakness, example and comment

Important note: As candidates are required to discuss, strength/weakness must be explained and not merely identified; example must be explained and not just stated; comment must be explained or show understanding and not just stated.

Indicative content: Most likely answers: (any appropriate answer receives credit):
 Strength: Quick way to collect data; especially if long term development is not relevant.
 Strength: Can be good to get preliminary evidence before getting locked into expensive and time-consuming longitudinal work.
 Strength: may give an indication of how people are likely to respond/ behave.
 Strength: data is likely to be quantitative so statistical analysis possible.
 Weakness: It is not possible to study how behaviour may change over time (development); Cannot see long-term effectiveness/impact of a treatment/exposure to certain stimuli.
 Weakness: Behaviour recorded is limited to that time, place and culture.
 Weakness: Data is likely to be quantitative (numbers) and reasons to explain why a participant behaved in a particular way will not be known.
 Weakness: Cannot see effects of societal changes on people's psychology

For each point up to a maximum of FOUR points

No answer or incorrect answer.	0
Any one of three [point/example/comment]	1
Any two of three [point/example/comment]	2
All three [point/example/comment]	3
max mark	12

2(c) AO2 Suggest one other way data could have been gathered for your chosen study and say how you think this might affect the results

*Answers must be specific to chosen core study.
 NB candidates may offer more than one suggestion.
 All marked and best ONE credited.*

No answer or incorrect answer.	0
Alternative identified but little or no expansion. Alternative may be peripherally relevant with minimal reference to study. Minimal understanding of implications.	1-2
Relevant alternative described in appropriate detail with understanding of implications.	3-4

How this might affect the results

Effect of change/alternative referred to briefly but not developed. For 2 marks there may be brief expansion of possible effect but with no analysis (comment but no comprehension).	1-2
Effect of change/alternative considered in appropriate detail with analysis (comment and comprehension). For 4 marks there is clarity of expression and arguments are structured.	3-4
max mark	8

Description

A number of studies in psychology match participants as a control, where participants in different groups are matched as closely as possible on factors such as age, sex, aggressiveness or intelligence.

3(a) Describe how participants were matched in each of these studies.

AO1

Named studies:

Baron-Cohen, Leslie and Frith (autism);

Bandura, Ross and Ross (aggression);

Hodges and Tizard (social relationships);

Raine, Buchsbaum and LaCasse (brain scans)

Candidates must relate each of the four named studies to the assessment request.

Indicative content: Most likely answers (any appropriate answer receives credit):

Baron-Cohen: autism age related? Is autism intelligence related? Match autistics with non-autistic non-Down syndrome children and Down syndrome children.

Bandura: matched for pre-existing levels of aggression by experimenters and by nursery teacher.

Hodges: ex-institutionals matched with comparison group for sex, one or two parent family, position in family, occupational classification.

Raine: NGRI's matched with controls on sex, age, six on schizophrenia.

For each point up to a maximum of FOUR points (one from each study)

No answer or incorrect answer	0
Identification of point (e.g. a sentence) relevant to question.	1
Brief Description of point relevant to question but with no analysis (comment with no comprehension). OR two points relevant to question are identified.	2
Description of point relevant to question with analysis (comment with comprehension) OR three or more points relevant to question are identified. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are good.	3
max mark	12

3(b) Briefly discuss two advantages and two disadvantages of matching participants using examples from any of these studies.

AO2

Candidates should provide a general advantage/disadvantage related to the question. They should give an example from any of the listed studies to illustrate the advantage/disadvantage and they should make a comment about the advantage/disadvantage which may evaluation or implication.

Assessment includes advantage/disadvantage, example and comment

Important note: As candidates are required to discuss, advantage/disadvantage must be explained and not merely identified; example must be explained and not just stated; comment must be explained or show understanding and not just stated.

Indicative content: Most likely answers (any appropriate answer receives credit):

Adv: participant variables are partly controlled.

Adv: cause and effect more likely to be determined.

Adv: no point to study without matching!

disadv: cannot match on all variables

disadv: still not determine cause and effect

disadv: difficult to find matches – make have small sample; be time consuming.

disadv: loss of one member may be loss of matched pair.

For each point up to a maximum of FOUR points

No answer or incorrect answer.	0
Any one of three [point/example/comment]	1
Any two of three [point/example/comment]	2
All three [point/example/comment]	3
max mark	12
TOTAL MARKS AVAILABLE	24

Some of the core studies take a social approach, which looks at how our behaviour in social situations may be influenced by others.

4(a)

AO1

Describe what each of these studies tells us about social behaviour.

Named studies:

Tajfel (intergroup discrimination);

Milgram (obedience);

Piliavin, Rodin & Piliavin (subway samaritans);

Haney, Banks and Zimbardo (prison simulation).

Candidates must relate each of the four named studies to the assessment request.

Indicative content: most likely answers (any appropriate answer receives credit):

Candidates must answer the question; descriptions of procedure only = 1 mark

Tajfel: outlines processes which explain prejudice and discrimination: in-group favouritism and out-group discrimination on the basis of minimal group categorisation.

Milgram: indicates extent of obedience to authority. Can explain following of orders in wars, etc

Piliavin: decision-making process & costs/benefits of helping or not.

Haney: pathology of power – conforming to role requirements and consequent behaviour.

For each point up to a maximum of FOUR points (one from each study)

No answer or incorrect answer	0
Identification of point (e.g. a sentence) relevant to question.	1
Brief Description of point relevant to question but with no analysis (comment with no comprehension). OR two points relevant to question are identified.	2
Description of point relevant to question with analysis (comment with comprehension) OR three or more points relevant to question are identified. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are good.	3
max mark	12

4(b) Briefly discuss four problems psychologists may have when investigating social behaviour, using examples from any of these studies.

AO2

Candidates should provide a general problem related to the question. They should give an example from any of the listed studies to illustrate the problem and they should make a comment about the problem which may evaluation or implication.

Assessment includes problem, example and comment

Important note: As candidates are required to discuss, problem must be explained and not merely identified; example must be explained and not just stated; comment must be explained or show understanding and not just stated.

Indicative content: most likely answers (any appropriate answer receives credit):

problem: process should be ecologically valid: not necessarily performed in a laboratory and the task should not be false.

problem: sample should be representative and not restricted eg males or students or age.

problem: to observe true behaviour study may need to be unethical (no full consent or deception or harm). Ends justify means.

problem: process should not be located in one place or time – society changes and societies are different (historical relativity/ethnocentrism).

For each point up to a maximum of FOUR points

No answer or incorrect answer.	0
Any one of three [point/example/comment]	1
Any two of three [point/example/comment]	2
All three [point/example/comment]	3
max mark	12
TOTAL MARKS AVAILABLE	24

**Mark Scheme 2542
January 2006**

Activity A**1 Describe the sample that you used for this activity. [3]**

Candidates are most likely to provide details of the number of participants, their age, gender and occupation but any other relevant details can be credited.

0 marks – the candidate has not provided any creditworthy information.

1 mark – the candidate has given only one piece of information about the sample.

2 marks – the candidate has given two pieces of information about the sample.

3 marks – the candidate has given at least three pieces of information about the sample.

2 Name and describe the way in which this sample was selected. [3]

Candidates should name and describe a sampling method (most likely opportunity) and explain how this sampling method was used to select the participants for this investigation.

0 marks – the candidate has not provided any creditworthy information.

1 mark - the candidate has simply named the sampling method or they have given a very brief description of the method but this description lacks clarity

2 marks - the candidate has named and described the sampling method.

3 marks - the candidate has named and described the sampling method as it was used to select their sample (e.g. This was an opportunity sample from everyone who was present at the time the investigation took place. This was a lunchtime in the sixth form common room)

3 Explain one advantage and one disadvantage of using this group of participants for your investigation. [6]

Likely answers include: for opportunity sample the advantage is that it is quick and easy to identify sample and the disadvantage is that the sample is unlikely to be representative or that there may be bias in the selection process. For random sample the advantage is that everyone in the target population has an equal chance of being selected, less likely to be biased selection and the disadvantage that this is a complex and time consuming process of selecting a sample. (Note: candidates must explain this in relation to their investigation for full marks)

3 marks for advantage and 3 marks for disadvantage to be awarded as follows:

0 marks – the candidate has not provided any creditworthy information.

1 mark - very brief answer, candidate identifies an advantage / disadvantage but does not explain this fully and does not relate this to their own investigation.

2 marks - advantage / disadvantage identified and fully explained but not related to their own investigation.

3 marks - advantage / disadvantage identified and fully explained and also related to their own investigation.

Activity B**4 Outline the aim of your observation. [2]**

Candidates are likely to have an aim rather than a hypothesis for this Activity. However it would be acceptable for a candidate to state that the aim of their investigation was to test the hypothesis that

0 marks – the candidate has not provided an aim or the aim is very unclear

1 mark - Aim is stated but this lacks detail or clarity. It is not fully clear what the candidate aimed to observe (e.g. to look at gender differences in behaviour)

2 marks - The aim is stated clearly (e.g. to observe gender differences in food choice)

5 Describe the categories that you used for your observation. [4]

The most likely way that a candidate will answer this question is to reproduce their coding scheme. This is acceptable but examiners must ensure that candidates have also described the categories. For example stating 'healthy' versus 'unhealthy' food choices. In this example there would need to be some indication of which foods were categorised as healthy and which as unhealthy.

0 marks – the candidate has not provided any creditworthy information.

1 mark - the candidate has attempted to outline their categories but there is very little description here and it would not be possible to observe behaviour using these categories.

2 marks - the candidate has outlined their categories but they have not been well described. It would not be possible to observe behaviour using these categories.

3 marks - the candidate has described all the categories but it would still be difficult to observe behaviour using these categories.

4 marks - the categories are fully described and it would be possible to observe behaviour using these categories.

6 (a) What is meant by reliability in observational research? [2]

Reliability means consistency. In terms of observational research it means that a number of observers observing the same things will code (or rate) them in exactly the same way. Note: answers attempting to define reliability as 'how reliable something is' will not be awarded any marks.

0 marks – the candidate has not provided any creditworthy information.

1 mark - reliability is defined but the answer is more general than observational research

2 marks - reliability is defined in the context of observational research

6 (b) Explain one way you could make your observation more reliable. [4]

Most likely answers: clarification of coding scheme / categories and /or pilot studies measuring inter-rater reliability to identify the need for clarification. NB Use of pilot studies / inter-rater reliability do not in themselves make observational research more reliable. For full marks answers should be related to the candidates own investigation rather than a general response.

0 marks – the candidate has not provided any creditworthy information.

1 mark - A brief suggestion has been made but this is lacking in detail or clarity. There is no link to the candidates own observation.

2 marks- The suggestion is appropriate, clear and detailed but there is no link to the candidate's own observation.

3 marks - The suggestion is appropriate, clear and detailed and the candidate has made some attempt to link this to their own observation. Alternatively the suggestion may lack detail or clarity although the link to their own observation has been made clear.

4 marks - The suggestion is appropriate, clear and detailed and there is a clear link to the candidates own observation.

Activity C**7 Describe the procedure that you used for your investigation. [4]**

Strong answers will contain a full explanation of how the investigation was conducted. This should include details of both conditions. Most likely answers will include where the investigation was conducted, any instructions given to candidates, the task the candidates were given, any time limits, controls, the way the dependent variable was measured and any debriefing that took place.

0 marks – the candidate has not provided any creditworthy information.

1 mark- Very little detail has been given and it would not be possible to conduct this activity.

2 marks- Some aspects of the procedure have been described but there are crucial omissions and it would not be possible to conduct this activity.

3 marks- Most aspects of the procedure have been described but it would be difficult to replicate this.

4 marks - The procedure has been well described and replication would be possible.

8 Outline two improvements that could be made to your procedure. [4]

The improvements must relate to the procedure of the investigation rather than suggesting using entirely different methods. Suggestions relating to sample may be accepted but not for both improvements.

2 marks for each improvement awarded as follows:

0 marks – the candidate has not provided any creditworthy information.

1 mark - improvement has been suggested but this is vague or lacks clarity

2 marks - the improvement is specific and has been clearly described

9 Explain the likely effect of each of these improvements on the results of your investigation. [6]

3 marks for explanation of each improvement awarded as follows:

0 marks – the candidate has not provided any creditworthy information.

1 mark - brief answer or answer lacking clarity

2 marks – Either - The likely effect of the improvement is well explained but no reference is made to the results of the investigation

Or – the effect of the improvement lacks clarity but there is reference to the results of the investigation.

3 marks- The likely effect of the improvement is well explained and the candidate has made reference to the results.

Activity D**10 State the null hypothesis for your correlation. [3]**

Candidates who produce an alternate (research) hypothesis will not be awarded any marks. Candidates who write both alternate and null hypotheses can have the null credited only if it is identified as such.

0 marks – the candidate has written an alternate hypothesis, a hypothesis stating difference rather than correlation or has provided no creditworthy information.

1 mark - the candidate has written a null hypothesis (stating no correlation or no relationship) but the variables are not included (e.g. There will be no significant relationship in the results) or the candidate refers to variables as A and B (e.g. A is not related to B)

2 marks - The candidate has written a null hypothesis with only one variable clearly described (e.g. there will be no relationship between hours of sleep and the results) or both variables have been identified but lack clarity, or the overall wording of the null lacks clarity (e.g. there will be no positive correlation ..)

3 marks - The candidate has written a null hypothesis and both variables are clearly identified (e.g. There will be no relationship between numbers of hours sleep and the number of words found in a wordsearch)

11 Sketch a scattergraph of your results. [3]

0 marks – the candidate has not drawn a scattergraph or has not included the data or there is no creditworthy information.

1 mark - The candidate has drawn a scattergraph but there are no labels or scales.

2 marks - The candidate has drawn a scattergraph with labels and scales incomplete.

3 marks- The scattergraph has been drawn correctly, both axes have been labelled and the scale is clear.

12 (a) Outline the conclusion that you reached in relation to your hypotheses. [3]

Candidates should state the conclusion clearly and for full marks this should be done in relation to the hypotheses. E.g. The alternate hypothesis, that there is a positive correlation between number of hours of television watched and the number of hours of homework completed was rejected and the null hypothesis accepted. We found no relationship between these two variables.

0 marks – the candidate has provided no creditworthy information.

1 mark - There is a brief or unclear conclusion with no mention of either hypothesis.

2 marks - The conclusion is stated clearly with reference to only one hypothesis. Or both hypotheses are referred to but the conclusion lacks clarity.

3 marks - The conclusion is stated clearly with reference to both hypotheses (null and alternate)

12 (b) Explain how you analysed your data in order to reach this conclusion. [3]

0 marks – no creditworthy content

1 mark - Very brief details given, most likely simply stating which test was used. Lack of understanding evident

2 marks - The statistical results are given although this answer lacks some clarity and is unlikely to mention significance levels / probability

3 marks – The statistical results are given and these are explained in terms of significance levels / probability. Understanding of the link between statistical analysis and conclusion is evident.

**Mark Scheme 2544
January 2006**

GENERAL MARKING GUIDELINES**A2 Psychology Options: Units 2544-9**

The Psychology Option is to be marked to Advanced GCE standard.

The mark scheme gives guidance on the possible responses to each question.

Detailed guidance on the appropriate annotation of scripts will be given in the main standardisation meeting.

Marking must be positive. Candidates should not be penalised for errors, inaccuracies or irrelevancies. Credit should be given for what is there rather than what is not there. Credit should also be given for responses employing unusual approaches not covered explicitly by the mark scheme, which are judged to be valid alternatives. If you are in any doubt as to the validity of a response, consult your Team Leader for further guidance.

It is extremely important that the whole range of marks be used in order to differentiate between candidates. Full marks should be awarded for responses which are the best that can be reasonably expected of A Level candidates who have completed two years of study. A perfect answer is not required. If the candidate's response to a question is such that the mark scheme allows full marks to be awarded, full marks must be given. If a candidate's answer does not deserve any credit, no marks should be awarded.

Responses in continuous prose are required and therefore assessment of the quality of written communication is included. Quality of written communication covers the clarity of expression, the structure of psychological arguments and presentation of ideas, and the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

Its assessment is embedded within the mark scheme and further guidance will be given to Examiners in the main standardisation meeting.

1 (a) Describe one explanation for differences in educational performance. [6]

The difference in educational performance that candidates may choose to focus on could vary, as the specification allows free choice. It is anticipated that the likely differences will be gender differences; ethnic differences and class differences.

Candidates are required to focus on an explanation for differences in educational performance. Those answers just describing differences, without offering any sort of explanation cannot receive full marks.

The question requires the candidate to offer one explanation. Thus, candidates who offer more than one explanation should have all explanations marked separately and then be credited with the best. On occasion, it might be possible that a candidate offers an “umbrella” explanation such as “biological differences”, quoting a number of pieces of research; in such a case, this should be treated and marked as a singular explanation.

Weaker responses will be brief, lack detail, lack understanding of the explanation of individual differences in educational performance.

Stronger responses will have more detail, clarity and demonstrate a sound understanding of the explanation of individual differences in educational performance.

Likely answers:

- Biological differences e.g. differences in the brains of males and females (Dorner 1968, Gray and Buffrey 1971)
- Teachers’ expectations of males vs females e.g. Clarricoats 1987 or Dweck – feedback to students.
- Curriculum content e.g. Lobhan 1974 or bias in assessment tasks.
- Aspects of ethnicity which may be sources of misunderstanding – Bennett
- Racism in the education system e.g. Gilroy 1990, Wright 1992
- Anti-academic street culture – Sewell 2000
- Language e.g. Bernstein’s elaborated and restricted speech codes (1960)
- Cultural capital, Bordieu 1977
- Poverty – Powney 1997
- Social Learning theory explanations

Marks	Mark Descriptor
0 marks	No answer or incorrect answer
1-2 marks	The answer attempts to describe one explanation for differences in educational performance. The answer is largely anecdotal and there is little use of psychological terms or concepts. The answer has errors and omissions, is brief and lacks understanding.
3-4 marks	The answer considers one explanation for differences in educational performance using psychological terms and concepts. The description is mainly accurate and informed and, has some evidence of elaboration and understanding.
5-6 marks	The answer gives a clear account of one explanation for differences in educational performance from a psychological perspective. The answer is detailed, well organised and the candidate clearly understands what they have written.

Total Marks (AO1) [6]

1 (b) Evaluate explanations for differences in educational performance. [10]

This answer is likely to take the form of evaluating two or more explanations for individual differences in educational performance. Stronger responses are likely to evaluate such differences in terms of their explanatory power; whether there is a range of evidence (statistical or psychological research based evidence) to back up such an explanation. Such evaluations will be detailed and show strong understanding. Weaker answers are likely to only evaluate one explanation or contain brief evaluations, e.g. "this theory is not good because it is too reductionist" with little or no further elaboration.

Likely evaluations:

- The validity of explanations as well as the ability to explain changes in educational differences over time.
- Reductionism of certain explanations (e.g. biological differences)
- Determinism of explanations
- Implications of explanations e.g. ethical implications of biological explanations.
- Usefulness of explanations and whether such knowledge can be used practically to create more equality within the educational system.

Marks	Mark Descriptor
0 marks	No answer or incorrect answer
1-4 marks	The answer attempts to evaluate explanations for differences in educational performance. The evidence and explanations are largely anecdotal and psychological concepts and terms are sparsely used. The answer is superficial and lacks detail.
5-7 marks	The answer is appropriate to the assessment request. Some points are discussed in an appropriate way to the issue of evaluations of explanations for differences in educational performance. There is an appropriate use of psychological terms and concepts. The answer shows some evidence of elaboration.
8-10 marks	The answer is appropriate to the assessment request. The answer has a good range of points that evaluate explanations for differences in educational performance. There is confident use of psychological terms and concepts. The answer is clearly explained and elaboration is coherent and thorough.

Total Marks (AO2) [10]

Total marks for question 1: [16] (AO1=6; AO2=10)

2 (a) Describe one study skill for improving learning effectiveness. [6]

Candidates are required to describe one study skill. It is envisaged that candidates' responses will mainly come from the list below. However, it is possible that students may choose something more generic e.g. "revision skills"; such answers should be marked according to their merits.

Candidates have been asked to write about just one study skill. Therefore, candidates who write about two or more study skills should have each one marked separately and be credited with the best.

Stronger responses are likely to be more detailed and thorough, demonstrating an understanding of study skills from a psychological point of view.

Weaker responses are likely to be anecdotal or vague.

Likely answers:

- McCarthy's 4-MAT system
- PQRST method (Atkinson 1993)
- SPELT (Mulcahy 1986)

Marks	Mark Descriptor
0 marks	No answer or incorrect answer
1-2 marks	The answer attempts to describe one study skill. The answer is largely anecdotal and there is little use of psychological terms or concepts. The answer has errors and omissions, is brief and lacks understanding.
3-4 marks	The answer considers one study skill using psychological terms and concepts. The description is mainly accurate and informed and, has some evidence of elaboration and understanding.
5-6 marks	The answer gives a clear account of one study skill. The answer is detailed, well organised and the candidate clearly understands what they have written.

Total marks AO1 = 6

2 (b) Discuss the effectiveness of using study skills. [10]

Candidates are required to consider the effectiveness of study skills. It is likely that candidates will consider the effectiveness of two or more study skills in turn. Candidates may consider such issues as to whether they work, individual differences in the effectiveness, practical problems of implementing such study skills etc.

Stronger responses will demonstrate good question focus, providing detailed discussion of the effectiveness of study skills. It is likely that stronger candidates will be able to consider both advantages and disadvantages of study skills in terms of their effectiveness, demonstrating a more sophisticated understanding of the topic area.

Weaker responses may show poor question focus. Discussion of the effectiveness of study skills may be minimal or superficial/anecdotal.

Possible evaluative points:

- Individual differences in effectiveness e.g. may depend upon learning style of student e.g. PQRST best for collaborative / participant / independent learners.
- 4-Mat targets a wide range of learning styles, therefore maximising learning.
- Many study skills are generic and teachers/students have trouble applying them to specific subjects or topics.
- Some study skills are perhaps too demanding e.g. SPELT requires students to gain awareness of own cognitive processes.
- Study skills are effective as they encourage more student autonomy. However, some students may lack ability or motivation to be autonomous.
- Lefrancois 1997 – 3 year project on 900 students found that SPELT was very effective, especially for students with learning difficulties.

Marks	Mark Descriptor
0 marks	No answer or incorrect answer
1-4 marks	The answer attempts to discuss the effectiveness of study skills. The evidence and explanations are largely anecdotal and psychological concepts and terms are sparsely used. The answer is superficial and lacks detail.
5-7 marks	The answer is appropriate to the assessment request. Some points are discussed in an appropriate way to the issue of the effectiveness of study skills. There is an appropriate use of psychological terms and concepts. The answer shows some evidence of elaboration.
8-10 marks	The answer is appropriate to the assessment request. The answer has a good range of points evaluating the effectiveness of study skills. There is confident use of psychological terms and concepts. The answer is clearly explained and elaboration is coherent and thorough.

Total marks AO2 = 10

Total marks for question 2: [16] (AO1=6; AO2=10)

Section B

3 (a) Describe what psychologists have learned about special educational needs [10]

It is expected that candidates will describe a number of pieces of research which address special educational needs in education. This may include descriptions of special educational needs such as autism, dyslexia, giftedness etc and their symptoms or diagnostic criteria, assessment process of special educational needs, causes of a specific learning difficulty and/or strategies for educating children with special educational needs.

Stronger responses will be characterised by an ability to describe the research or assessment processes accurately and in detail, as well as selecting evidence which covers a range of the factors mentioned above.

Weaker responses will be characterised by brevity and a lack of detail or accuracy.

Likely content:

- Dyslexia; an interference in use of written symbols. Can be sub-divided into auditory dyslexia (dysphonetic), visual dyslexia (dyseidetic) or a mixture. Effects of dyslexia include delays in spoken language, difficulties with reading and spelling, poor organisational skills.
- Giftedness: possessing outstanding ability or abilities (Marland), IQ > 140 (Lefrancois), mentally developmentally advances, superior reasoning powers, intellectual curiosity, ability to retain information, creative or imaginative skills, high levels of task commitment.
- Autistic spectrum: triad of impairments(DSM IV) i.e. (i) impairments in social interaction, (ii) impairments in language and communication, (iii) repetitive and stereotyped behaviour. Lack of theory of mind (Baron-Cohen) . In education, this can lead to problems with pair or group activities, problems to cope with school routines, impact of limited language skills; more common in boys than girls. Prevalence approximately 1/1000. Affects more males than females.
- AD(H)D, Attention Deficity (Hyperactivity) Disorder. – neurological condition resulting from chronic under-arousal. Symptoms include: inability to maintain attention without distraction, overly impulsive, difficulty remaining seated
- Dyscalculia: impaired ability to perform mathematical calculations. Affects understanding of concepts such as time, sequence, order, change and consequence. When using maths, often makes errors of substitution, transposition, omission, reversal. Lacks the bigger picture. Prevalence about 1:25.
- Assessment of SENs
- **Strategies** of educating children with SENs;

Concepts and Terminology (AO1)	
0 marks	Incorrect or inappropriate material is presented.
1 mark	There is some limited use of psychological terms and concepts. Spelling and sentence construction are poor; and punctuation is inappropriate or largely absent.
2 marks	Appropriate terms and concepts are presented, but there is lack of clarity. Spelling and punctuation are reasonable but there are a number of errors.
3 marks	Appropriate terms and concepts are presented and used in a confident way. Spelling is good, although there could be one or two errors. Sentence construction is good with views expressed clearly. Punctuation is appropriate.
Evidence (AO1)	
0 marks	No evidence is presented.
1 mark	Some basic evidence is described which is of peripheral relevance or it is predominantly anecdotal.
2 marks	Some appropriate psychological evidence is described but there are a number of errors and it is limited in scope and detail.
3 marks	Appropriate psychological evidence is accurately described. It is reasonably wide-ranging in scope and is reasonably detailed.
4 marks	Appropriate psychological evidence is accurately described that is wide-ranging in scope and detail.
Understanding (AO1)	
0 marks	The answer is list-like with no attempt to understand what has been written; there is no use of elaboration, clarification or example.
1 mark	The answer demonstrates some understanding but this is sparse.
2 marks	The answer demonstrates good understanding. There is some clarification of terminology, occasional use of examples, some expansion of complex points. There is some coherence and a reasonable structure.
3 marks	The answer demonstrates explicitly applied understanding throughout. There is clarification of terminology, use of examples, expansion of complex points; the answer is coherent and well structured.

Total marks for question part a) (AO1): [10]

- 3 (b) Evaluate what psychologists have learned about special educational needs. [16]

Candidates are required to evaluate research special educational needs. Stronger responses will employ a range of evaluative issues effectively to analyse the material. Evaluations will be detailed showing a thorough understanding of the issues.

Weaker responses are likely to be characterised by a lack of detail, superficial or unsubstantiated evaluations, lack of accuracy.

Likely evaluative issues may be:

- Validity of explanations of SEN
- Usefulness of research; how much can the research be used to provide ways of improving provision for students with SEN in educational settings.
- Problems of reliability or validity with diagnosis of SENs e.g. possible over-diagnosis of ADHD, difficulty of diagnosing ESL students.
- Determinism of explanations of SEN
- Reductionism of explanations or categorisations of SEN.
- Merits/problems of inclusion Vs. segregation e.g. amount of specific help & support available in each setting, labelling of children with SEN, ability to assimilate, outcomes in terms of success of child, arguments of possible interference with education of other children in the classroom.
- Effectiveness of specific techniques e.g. management techniques for dyslexia etc. e.g. effectiveness of Alpha-to-Omega, tinted acetates etc; early intervention for dyslexia tends to be very effective.

Range of Issues (AO2)	
0 marks	No material worthy of credit.
1-2 marks	The answer identifies some issues; they could have been related to the question more closely and they could have been elaborated and explained further.
3-4 marks	The answer covers an appropriate range of issues; the issues are identified, made relevant, explained and elaborated.
Evidence for Issues (AO2)	
0 marks	No material worthy of credit.
1-2 marks	Some evidence is identified and an attempt is made to show its relevance to the issues.
3-4 marks	Evidence is appropriately selected to illustrate the issues and commented on effectively.
Analysis (AO2)	
0 marks	No material worthy of credit.
1-2 marks	An attempt is made to provide some analysis.
3-4 marks	The answer contains some analysis most likely in the form of comparisons and contrasts; these are accurate, detailed and effective.
Argument Structure (AO2)	
0 marks	No material worthy of credit.
1-2 marks	The answer has a sound structure and the argument is generally clear and coherent but there is an imbalance and minor weaknesses.
3-4 marks	The structure of the answer is highly effective in providing a cogent framework for compelling arguments that demonstrate originality and insight into evidence.

Total marks for question part (b) (AO2): [16]

- 3 (c) Using your knowledge of psychology, suggest ways of meeting the educational needs of a gifted child within a normal school. Give reasons for your answer. [8]

Stronger responses will be characterised by a detailed suggestion, confidently linked to psychological research.

Weaker responses will be more superficial, lacking detail and probably little reference to psychological research.

Any suitable suggestions relevant to the assessment request may be accepted.

Likely answers

- Suggestions focusing on enrichment e.g. extra activities, broader subject options.
- Suggestions focusing on acceleration e.g. putting up a year/years.
- Suggestions based on differentiation in classrooms.
- Renzulli's revolving door model.

Application (AO1+AO2)	
0 marks	No suggestions made OR suggestions are made which are inappropriate to the assessment request.
1-2 marks	Suggestions are made but it is based on anecdotal or peripherally relevant psychological evidence.
3-4 marks	Suggestions are made that are appropriate to the assessment request and is based on appropriate psychological evidence. The suggestion is detailed and clearly explained.
Application Interpretation: Reasons (AO1+AO2)	
0 marks	The answer shows very little or no understanding.
1-2 marks	The answer attempts to provide a rationale for the suggested way. The reasons given have some relevance to the issue under discussion.
3-4 marks	The answer gives a clear psychological rationale for the suggested application. There is confident use of terminology and expansion of complex points. The answer is coherent and well structured.

Total marks for question part (c) (AO1=4; AO2=4) = [8]

Total marks for question 3: [34] (AO1=14; AO2=20)

4 (a) Describe what psychologists have learnt about disruptive behaviour in school. [10]

It is expected that candidates will describe a range of pieces of research into disruptive behaviour in schools. Candidates may cover types, explanations/causes and effects of disruptive behaviours.

Stronger responses will be characterised by an ability to describe a range of material accurately and in detail.

Weaker responses will be characterised by brevity and a lack of detail or accuracy, superficial or anecdotal coverage.

Likely content:

- A(D)HD
- Bullying e.g. Kidscape survey 1999, Shogukusei 2003; causes or effects of bullying.
- Conduct disorders
- Explanations e.g. family factors, teaching (e.g. Kounin), biological explanations.
- Preventive / corrective strategies e.g. general behaviourist strategies, or particular studies e.g. Meichenbaum and Goodman (1971 – SIT) or Moreno and Torrego 1999 (humanist preventative strategies); or case studies e.g. Wells Park School.

Concepts and Terminology (AO1)	
0 marks	Incorrect or inappropriate material is presented.
1 mark	There is some limited use of psychological terms and concepts. Spelling and sentence construction are poor; and punctuation is inappropriate or largely absent.
2 marks	Appropriate terms and concepts are presented, but there is lack of clarity. Spelling and punctuation are reasonable but there are a number of errors.
3 marks	Appropriate terms and concepts are presented and used in a confident way. Spelling is good, although there could be one or two errors. Sentence construction is good with views expressed clearly. Punctuation is appropriate.
Evidence (AO1)	
0 marks	No evidence is presented.
1 mark	Some basic evidence is described which is of peripheral relevance or it is predominantly anecdotal.
2 marks	Some appropriate psychological evidence is described but there are a number of errors and it is limited in scope and detail.
3 marks	Appropriate psychological evidence is accurately described. It is reasonably wide-ranging in scope and is reasonably detailed.
4 marks	Appropriate psychological evidence is accurately described that is wide-ranging in scope and detail.
Understanding (AO1)	
0 marks	The answer is list-like with no attempt to understand what has been written; there is no use of elaboration, clarification or example.
1 mark	The answer demonstrates some understanding but this is sparse.
2 marks	The answer demonstrates good understanding. There is some clarification of terminology, occasional use of examples, some expansion of complex points. There is some coherence and a reasonable structure.
3 marks	The answer demonstrates explicitly applied understanding throughout. There is clarification of terminology, use of examples, expansion of complex points; the answer is coherent and well structured.

Total mark question part a (AO1) = 10

4 (b) Evaluate what psychologists have learnt about disruptive behaviour in school. [16]

Candidates are required to evaluate research into disruptive behaviour in school. Stronger responses will employ a range of evaluative issues effectively to analyse the research. Evaluations will be detailed showing a thorough understanding of the issues.

Weaker responses are likely to be characterised by a lack of detail, superficial or unsubstantiated evaluations, lack of accuracy.

Any evaluative points can receive credit including:

- Reductionism of explanations
- Validity of explanations
- Usefulness of explanations;
- Effectiveness of strategies for dealing with disruptive behaviour e.g. token reward systems diminish intrinsic motivation to behave; SIT is very time consuming and students may not be able to generalise it to other tasks.
- Comparison of use of corrective strategies versus preventive strategies.
- Side effects of drugs (e.g. Ritalin) for managing ADHD.

Range of Issues (AO2)	
0 marks	No material worthy of credit.
1-2 marks	The answer identifies some issues; they could have been related to the question more closely and they could have been elaborated and explained further.
3-4 marks	The answer covers an appropriate range of issues; the issues are identified, made relevant, explained and elaborated.
Evidence for Issues (AO2)	
0 marks	No material worthy of credit.
1-2 marks	Some evidence is identified and an attempt is made to show its relevance to the issues.
3-4 marks	Evidence is appropriately selected to illustrate the issues and commented on effectively.
Analysis (AO2)	
0 marks	No material worthy of credit.
1-2 marks	An attempt is made to provide some analysis.
3-4 marks	The answer contains some analysis most likely in the form of comparisons and contrasts; these are accurate, detailed and effective.
Argument Structure (AO2)	
0 marks	No material worthy of credit.
1-2 marks	The answer has a sound structure and the argument is generally clear and coherent but there is an imbalance and minor weaknesses.
3-4 marks	The structure of the answer is highly effective in providing a cogent framework for compelling arguments that demonstrate originality and insight into evidence.

Total mark for question part b (AO2) =16

- 4 (c) Using your knowledge of psychology, suggest ways of correcting the behaviour of a group of 13 year olds who frequently shout across the class to each other. Give reasons for your answer. [8]

Any suitable suggestions may be accepted.

Stronger responses will be characterised by a detailed suggestion, confidently linked to psychological research.

Weaker responses will be more superficial, lacking detail and probably reference to psychological research.

Possible answers may be:

- Behaviourist-style strategies e.g. positive reinforcement, negative reinforcement, Premack principle (i.e. rewarding good behaviour with preferred activities such as play time, "golden time" etc), token economies etc., ignoring bad behaviour.
- Cognitive-style strategies, encouraging students to understand the impact and disruption of shouting across class
- Humanist – teacher understanding why they shout. Encouraging more engagement with lesson. Democratic-class decisions about measures to correct the behaviour.

Application (AO1+AO2)	
0 marks	No suggestions made OR suggestions are made which are inappropriate to the assessment request.
1-2 marks	Suggestions are made but it is based on anecdotal or peripherally relevant psychological evidence.
3-4 marks	Suggestions are made that are appropriate to the assessment request and is based on appropriate psychological evidence. The suggestion is detailed and clearly explained.
Application Interpretation: Reasons (AO1+AO2)	
0 marks	The answer shows very little or no understanding.
1-2 marks	The answer attempts to provide a rationale for the suggested way. The reasons given have some relevance to the issue under discussion.
3-4 marks	The answer gives a clear psychological rationale for the suggested application. There is confident use of terminology and expansion of complex points. The answer is coherent and well structured.

Total marks for question part (c) (AO1=4; AO2=4) = [8]

Total marks for question 4: [34] (AO1=14; AO2=20)

Assessment grid

Question Assessment Criteria	1a) or 2a)	1b) or 2b)	3a) or 4a)	3b) or 4b)	3c) or 4c)	Total
AO1	6		10		4	20
AO2		10		16	4	30
Total	6	10	10	16	8	50

TOTAL UNIT MARK = 50 (AO1 = 20; AO2 = 30)

**Mark Scheme 2545
January 2006**

Section A

- 1 (a) Outline one campaign to improve health in the general public. [6]

There are many possible answers to this question. Indeed you might argue that most of the course deals with attempts to improve health in the general public. The most likely answers are the community based campaigns such as the Harvard heart programme or skin cancer initiatives. Smoking cessation might also be a popular choice. Also acceptable are description of work with selected groups such as healthy schools programmes or campaigns on homelessness.

Marks	Mark Descriptor
0 marks	No answer or incorrect answer
1 - 2 marks	The answer attempts to describe one campaign to improve health in the general public. The answer is largely anecdotal and there is little use of psychological terms or concepts. The answer has errors and omissions, is brief and lacks understanding.
3 -4 marks	The answer considers one campaign to improve health in the general public using psychological terms and concepts. The description is mainly accurate and informed and, has some evidence of elaboration and understanding.
5 - 6 marks	The answer gives a clear account of one campaign to improve health in the general public from a psychological perspective. The answer is detailed, well organised and the candidate clearly understands what they have written.

(b) Discuss why many health promotion campaigns have only limited success.[10]

The question requires an evaluation of health promotion campaigns with a focus on explaining their limited success. Weaker answers will most commonly give more information about health promotion or will give anecdotal suggestions with little explanation. Better answers will offer clear suggestions for why the campaigns are relatively unsuccessful and give psychological evidence to back them up. The most likely reasons are the strength of habit, the pressure of social norms, the inappropriateness of the message, the cost - benefit analysis of change, etc.

Marks	Mark Descriptor
0 marks	No answer or incorrect answer.
1 - 4 marks	The answer attempts to evaluate why health promotion campaigns commonly have only limited success. The evidence and explanations are largely anecdotal and psychological concepts and terms are sparsely used. The answer is superficial and lacks detail.
5 - 7 marks	The answer is appropriate to the assessment request. Some evaluative issues are raised and applied in an appropriate way to the issue of why health promotion campaigns commonly have only limited success. There is appropriate use of psychological terms and concepts. The answer has a reasonable range of points and there is some evidence of elaboration.
8 - 10 marks	The answer is appropriate to the assessment request. The answer has a good range of points that consider the issues surrounding the poor success rates of health promotion campaigns. There is a confident use of psychological terms and concepts. The answer has an impressive range of points each of which is clearly explained and elaboration is coherent and thorough.

2 (a) Outline one explanation of why a person abuses a substance. [6]

The most likely answers will focus on (a) biological explanations such as addiction or even central structures such as reinforcement centres (Olds and Milner), or (b) social explanations such as peer pressure or availability, or (c) personal explanations such as stress reduction or esteem needs. There are many possible explanations. Weaker answers will commonly not rise above broad generalisations and anecdotes. Stronger answers will clearly explain a reason in terms of psychological ideas.

Marks**Mark Descriptor**

0 marks No answer or incorrect answer

1 - 2 marks

The answer attempts to describe one explanation of why a person abuses a substance. The answer is largely anecdotal and there is little use of psychological terms or concepts. The answer has errors and omissions, is brief and lacks understanding.

3 -4 marks

The answer considers one explanation of why a person abuses a substance using psychological terms and concepts. The description is mainly accurate and informed and, has some evidence of elaboration and understanding.

5 - 6 marks

The answer gives a clear account of one explanation of why a person abuses a substance from a psychological perspective. The answer is detailed, well organised and the candidate clearly understands what they have written.

(b) Discuss the difficulties in explaining why a person abuses a substance. [10]

As suggested above, there are many ways of explaining why people abuse substances, and this is one of the problems. There are many explanations but none of them have much predictive value. They are mostly post hoc and therefore relatively difficult to test. The most common answers to this might suggest some of the following difficulties, (a) individual differences, (b) cultural differences, (c) people are poor judges of their own motivation, (d) multiple causes rather than individual ones.

Marks**Mark Descriptor**

0 marks No answer or incorrect answer.

1 - 4 marks

The answer attempts to discuss the difficulties in explaining why people abuse substances. The evidence and explanations are largely anecdotal and psychological concepts and terms are sparsely used. The answer is superficial and lacks detail.

5 - 7 marks

The answer is appropriate to the assessment request. Some evaluative issues are raised and applied in an appropriate way to the issue that consider difficulties of explaining why people abuse substances. There is appropriate use of psychological terms and concepts. The answer has a reasonable range of points and there is some evidence of elaboration.

8 - 10 marks

The answer is appropriate to the assessment request. The answer has a good range of points that consider difficulties explaining why people abuse substances. There is a confident use of psychological terms and concepts. The answer has an impressive range of points each of which is clearly explained and elaboration is coherent and thorough.

Section B

Indicative content

- 3 (a) Describe what psychologists have discovered about the relationships between patients and their practitioners. [10]

Candidates may select from a wide range of possible material in answer to this question. In past sessions candidates have been very well prepared to describe evidence on the relationship between patients and practitioners. They might well look at the effect of first impressions and mention studies on the appearance of doctors and/or patients. They may also look at communication and ways of improving it between patients and practitioners. Another appropriate line of evidence comes from work on doctor-centred and patient-centred styles. Answers might also contain work on diagnosis and decision making.

Weaker answers are likely to describe some relevant or partially relevant material without fully addressing the command in the question to consider the relationships between patients and their practitioners. Stronger answers will commonly select three or four pieces of evidence that directly answer the question.

- (b) Evaluate what psychologists have discovered about the relationships between patients and their practitioners. [16]

Key issues concern the collection and the interpretation of the evidence. Any collection of data is either intrusive or remote. Students might refer to the relative merits of self report measures and observational techniques. Relationships are very complex and the attempt by researchers to reduce them to tightly defined variables brings some problems with it. Students might deal with these under the heading of reductionism. Another salient issue concerns individual differences and the problems of making generalisations about personal relationships. In a similar vein they might also consider issues around group differences such as class and ethnicity.

Answers that follow the formulaic route of "my first issue is ..." can attract high marks as long as the issues they choose are relevant to the question. Weaker answers that adopt this strategy sometimes give general points that make only passing reference to the question and only marginally apply to it. Stronger answers will identify three or four evaluative issues and make them relevant to the issue of patient practitioner relationships. Weaker answers will be unlikely to show this level of focus on the question.

- (c) **One doctor in a group practice finds that elderly patients prefer to go to her colleagues rather than make an appointment to see her. Suggest how she might change her behaviour to encourage elderly patients to make appointments with her. Using your knowledge of psychology, give reasons for your answer. [8]**

The suggestion for improving take up of appointments is likely to attract a number of anecdotal answers or suggestions of psychological techniques that have only marginal relevance to this issue. Many candidates might identify some likely problems with the approach of the doctor and use this as a starting point to suggest some changes. The changes suggested might be cognitive for example in her attitude to the patients and her decision making processes. They might also be behavioural in terms of interactional style or simple issues of dress and communication. Weaker answers will commonly make anecdotal suggestions with little or no connection to psychological ideas. Stronger answers will make considered suggestions that have a clear psychological rationale and are focused on the problem.

- 4 (a) **Describe what psychologists have found out about lifestyle and health behaviour. [10]**

The material in the specification under this heading is wide ranging and diverse. They might use work on poverty which is the best predictor of morbidity and mortality. They might take behavioural patterns such as Type and they might consider other lifestyle issues such as religiosity. There are many cultural and developmental factors that can be used to answer this question and candidates might well describe studies on the effects of bullying or on the effects of traditional health practices. Also in this section of the specification is work on health belief models and although this work does not appear to answer the question directly, it is acceptable. The most likely material under this heading will be a description of the health belief model.

Weaker answers are likely to describe some relevant or partially relevant material without fully addressing the command in the question to consider effects of lifestyle on health. Stronger answers will select three or four pieces of evidence that directly answer the question.

- (b) Evaluate what psychologists have found out about lifestyle and health behaviour. [16]**

The most appropriate issues for this answer depend on the choice of information in part (a). If they look at behavioural factors then they might comment on the difficulty of separating out the various lines of evidence. For example, with poverty are the problems due to poor diet, poor living and working conditions, poor education, or health damaging behaviours such as smoking? Students might comment on the reliability and validity of the information given the difficulty of comparing like with like in this work. With regard to the health belief models they might comment on the cognitive bias of the work and its basic model of rational choice. They might also comment on the issue of ethnocentrism and the difficulties of trying to understand communities and cultures other than your own. They might also comment on the complexity of the data and the difficulty of identifying the key components of lifestyle that have health consequences. Much of the evidence is correlational and therefore there is something to say about issues of causation.

Answers that follow the formulaic route of "my first issue is ..." can attract high marks as long as the issues they choose are relevant to the question. Weaker answers that adopt this strategy may sometimes give general points that make only passing reference to the question and only marginally apply to it. Stronger answers will identify three or four evaluative issues and make them relevant to the issue of lifestyle and health. Weaker answers will be unlikely to show this level of focus on the question.

- (c) A local community appears to have an unhealthy diet. They eat foods with a high fat, sugar and salt content. Using your knowledge of psychology, suggest an explanation for their choice of diet. Give reasons for your answer. [8]**

This question is asking for an informed explanation of behaviour choice. The most likely answers will centre on the health belief model or the theory of planned action. At one level it is possible to make anecdotal suggestions and weaker answers will get no further than this. Stronger answers will make an informed explanation and relate it to psychological theories and/or concepts. The notion of cost-benefit analysis is one of the two key questions in the health belief model and students might well use this to good effect. There might also be some useful discussion of people's perceptions of the seriousness of the general and personal risks.

Part (a)**CONCEPTS AND TERMINOLOGY [A01]**

- 0 marks Incorrect or inappropriate material is presented.
- 1 mark There is some limited use of psychological terms and concepts. Spelling and sentence construction are poor; and punctuation is inappropriate or largely absent.
- 2 marks Appropriate terms and concepts are presented, but there is lack of clarity. Spelling and punctuation are reasonable but there are a number of errors.
- 3 marks Appropriate terms and concepts are presented and used in a confident way. Spelling is good, although there could be one or two errors. Sentence construction is good with views expressed clearly. Punctuation is appropriate.

EVIDENCE [A01]

- 0 marks No evidence is presented.
- 1 mark Some basic evidence is described which is of peripheral relevance or it is predominantly anecdotal.
- 2 marks Some appropriate psychological evidence is described but there are a number of errors and it is limited in scope and detail.
- 3 marks Appropriate psychological evidence is accurately described. It is reasonably wide-ranging in scope and is reasonably detailed.
- 4 marks Appropriate psychological evidence is accurately described that is wide-ranging in scope and detail.

UNDERSTANDING [A01]

- 0 marks The answer is list-like with no attempt to understand what has been written; there is no use of elaboration, clarification or example.
- 1 mark The answer demonstrates some understanding but this is sparse.
- 2 marks The answer demonstrates good understanding. There is some clarification of terminology, occasional use of examples, some expansion of complex points. There is some coherence and a reasonable structure.
- 3 marks The answer demonstrates explicitly applied understanding throughout. There is clarification of terminology, use of examples, expansion of complex points; the answer is coherent and well structured.

Total 10 marks for question part (a)

Part (b)**RANGE OF ISSUES**

- 0 marks No material worthy of credit
- 1-2 marks The answer identifies some issues; they could have been related to the question more closely and they could have been elaborated and explained further
- 3-4 marks The answer covers an appropriate range of issues; the issues are identified, made relevant, explained and elaborated

EVIDENCE FOR ISSUES

- 0 marks No material worthy of credit
- 1-2 marks Some evidence is identified and an attempt is made to show its relevance to the issues
- 3-4 marks Evidence is appropriately selected to illustrate the issues and commented on effectively

ANALYSIS

- 0 marks No material worthy of credit
- 1-2 marks An attempt is made to provide some analysis
- 3-4 marks The answer contains some analysis most likely in the form of comparisons and contrasts; these are accurate, detailed and effective

ARGUMENT STRUCTURE

- 0 marks No material worthy of credit
- 1-2 marks The answer has a sound structure and the argument is generally clear and coherent but there is an imbalance and minor weaknesses
- 3-4 marks The structure of the answer is highly effective in providing a cogent framework for compelling arguments that demonstrate originality and insight into evidence

Total 16 marks for question part (a)

Part (c)**APPLICATION [A01/AO2]**

- 0 marks No suggestions made OR suggestions are made which are inappropriate to the assessment request.
- 1 -2 marks An appropriate suggestion is made but it is based on anecdotal or peripherally relevant psychological evidence.
- 3 - 4 marks A suggestion is made that is appropriate to the assessment request and is based on appropriate psychological evidence. The suggestion is detailed and clearly explained.

APPLICATION INTERPRETATION: REASONS [AO1/AO2]

- 0 marks The answer shows very little or no understanding.
- 1- 2 marks The answer attempts to provide a rationale for the suggested application/intervention. The reasons given have some relevance to the issue under discussion and some relevance to the evidence discussed elsewhere in the answer.
- 3 - 4 marks The answer gives a clear rationale for the suggested application. There is confident use of terminology, use of examples, and expansion of complex points. The answer is coherent and well structured.

Total 8 marks for question part (c)

Total question mark 34 [AO1=10; AO2=24]

TOTAL MODULE MARK = 50 [AO1=20; AO2=30]

**Mark Scheme 2546
January 2006**

- 1 (a) Describe one type of psychometric test used to select people for work.

[6] [AO1]

Most likely answers will distinguish between ability or aptitude tests. Indicate that ability tests confirm what can be done and aptitude tests assess potential, examples could include; psycho-motor tests; general intellectual ability; specific ability tests, such as verbal reasoning and decision making. Knowledge of how the test is conducted is not required. Weaker answers will be anecdotal, stronger answers will make clear links between the test and how this is used to select for work. Candidates may describe personality tests provided these are linked to selection processes these can be accepted.

Marks	Descriptor
0 marks	No answer or incorrect answer.
1-2 marks	The answer attempts to describe what is meant by psychometric testing. The answer is largely anecdotal and there is little use of psychological terms or concepts. The answer has errors and omissions, is brief and lacks understanding.
3-4 marks	The answer considers one of the areas of psychometric testing using psychological terms and concepts. The description is mainly accurate and informed and, has some evidence of elaboration and understanding.
5-6 marks	The answer gives a clear account of one of the psychometric tests from a psychological perspective. The answer is detailed, well organised and the candidate clearly understands what they have written.

- 1 (b) Evaluate the effectiveness of using psychometric tests to select people for work. [10] [AO2]

Most likely advantages would include; effective deployment of staff; provides a fair selection procedure; allows for great equality. Disadvantages may include; negative discrimination for ethnic/cultural groups; individual differences will not be recognised; validity and reliability can be questioned; dependent on the person who administer the test and fails to provide a picture of the whole person. Weaker responses will not make clear links between the psychological concepts and whether the techniques mentioned above are reliable or valid. Stronger candidates will make use of a range of psychological principles and relate these to selection procedures.

Marks	Descriptor
0 marks	No answer or incorrect answer.
1-4 marks	The answer attempts to evaluate the effectiveness of using psychometric tests. The evidence and explanations are largely anecdotal and psychological concepts and terms are sparsely used. The answer is superficial and lacks detail.
5-7 marks	The answer is appropriate to the assessment request. The answer attempts to evaluate the effectiveness of using psychometric tests. There is appropriate use of psychological terms and concepts. The answer has a balance of strength and weaknesses points and there is some evidence of elaboration for higher marks.
8-10 marks	The answer is appropriate to the assessment request. The answer has a good range of points that consider the effectiveness of using psychometric tests. There is a confident use of psychological terms and concepts. The answer has an impressive range of points each of which is clearly explained and elaboration is coherent and thorough.

- 2 (a) Outline one technique used to improve the motivation of individuals in an organisation. [6] [AO1]

Most likely answers will include Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs (1954), McClelland's NACH (1961), expectation (Leon, 1981 and Schwab et al 1979), equity theories (Vroom, 1964, Adams, 1965) and Goal Setting (Arnold, 1998 and Locke and Latham, 1990). Stronger candidates may suggest improving motivation by the application of the principles in the above theories, weaker candidates will highlight fewer links to psychologically based principles.

Marks	Descriptor
0 marks	No answer or incorrect answer.
1-2 marks	The answer attempts to describe improving motivation. The answer is largely anecdotal and there is little use of psychological terms or concepts. The answer has errors and omissions, is brief and lacks understanding.
3-4 marks	The answer considers improving motivation using appropriate psychological terms and concepts. The description is mainly accurate and informed and, has some evidence of elaboration and understanding.
5-6 marks	The answer gives a clear account of improving motivation from a psychological perspective. The answer is detailed, well organised and the candidate clearly understands what they have written.

- 2 (b) Discuss the effectiveness of using motivational techniques on individuals in an organisation.

[10] [AO2]

The lack of empirical data for Maslow and the assumption that all individuals are motivated by the same things, Betz (1982) questions the hierarchical structure and Alderfer (1972) claims all categories can be equally effective; McClelland's assumption that we all have similar needs Triandis (1994) regards this as a Western phenomenon; equity is ever changing and is a reflection of the time (Radford, 2000). Stronger candidates may highlight the reliability and validity of the evidence suggested above and provide a more 'questioning' answers, weaker candidates are more likely to provide an anecdotal discussion of motivational techniques.

Marks

Descriptor

0 marks

No answer or incorrect answer.

1-4 marks

The answer attempts to discuss the effectiveness of using motivational techniques. The evidence and explanations are largely anecdotal and psychological concepts and terms are sparsely used. The answer is superficial and lacks detail.

5-7 marks

The answer is appropriate to the assessment request. The answer attempts to discuss the effectiveness of using motivational techniques. There is appropriate use of psychological terms and concepts. The answer has a balance of strengths and weaknesses points and there is some evidence of elaboration for higher marks.

8-10 marks

The answer is appropriate to the assessment request. The answer has a good range of points that consider the effectiveness of using motivational techniques. There is a confident use of psychological terms and concepts. The answer has an impressive range of points each of which is clearly explained and elaboration is coherent and thorough.

- 3 (a) Describe what psychologists have learned about interpersonal communication systems. [10]

Types of communication channel face to face, telephone, writing, e-mail, meetings. Lengel and Daft (1988) channel is determined by the richness of the information, richer media provides multiple cues. Muchinsky (1997) preference for face to face, negative correlation to written material. Communication networks, upward, downward and lateral, workers happier to receive downward communication and give upward communication, lateral communication can result in gossip (Baird, 1997 and Koehler, 1981). Decentralized (circle) and centralized networks (wheel, chain, y) (Bavelas, 1969). Leavitt, 1951 – centralized better for simple tasks, decentralized for complex tasks. Improving communication flow by avoiding distortion (censoring, encoding exaggeration, feedback and grapevine effects) Bartlett, 1932. Coding needs to make sense to the sender and receiver.

Stronger candidates will select three or four pieces of evidence that are directly linked to interpersonal communication, weaker candidates will usually select fewer pieces of evidence and only partially relate these to interpersonal communications.

Concepts and Terminology (AO1)

- 0 marks Incorrect or inappropriate material is presented.
- 1 mark There is some limited use of psychological terms and concepts. Spelling and sentence construction are poor; and punctuation is inappropriate or largely absent.
- 2 marks Appropriate terms and concepts are presented, but there is lack of clarity. Spelling and punctuation are reasonable but there are a number of errors.
- 3 marks Appropriate terms and concepts are presented and used in a confident way. Spelling is good, although there could be one or two errors. Sentence construction is good with views expressed clearly. Punctuation is appropriate.

Evidence (AO1)

- 0 marks No evidence is presented.
- 1 mark Some basic evidence is described which is of peripheral relevance or it is predominantly anecdotal.
- 2 marks Some appropriate psychological evidence is described but there are a number of errors and it is limited in scope and detail.
- 3 marks Appropriate psychological evidence is accurately described. It is reasonably wide-ranging in scope and is reasonably detailed.
- 4 marks Appropriate psychological evidence is accurately described that is wide-ranging in scope and detail.

Understanding (AO1)

- 0 marks The answer is list-like with no attempt to understand what has been written; there is no use of elaboration, clarification or example.
- 1 mark The answer demonstrates some understanding but this is sparse.
- 2 marks The answer demonstrates good understanding. There is some clarification of terminology, occasional use of examples, some expansion of complex points. There is some coherence and a reasonable structure.
- 3 marks The answer demonstrates explicitly applied understanding throughout. There is clarification of terminology, use of examples, expansion of complex points; the answer is coherent and well structured.

3 (b) Evaluate what psychologists have learned about interpersonal communication systems.

[16]

Most likely evaluation points will include, individual differences, problems of self report, demand characteristics and usefulness of the findings. Research methodology, including Halo and Hawthorn effects. Theoretical issues of reductionism or determinism.

Stronger answers will identify three or four evaluative issues and make these relevant to interpersonal communication and the issues related to the study and findings on interpersonal communication. There may be 'formulaic answers' that refer to a series of issues, for these to obtain high marks the relation to the command in the question must be clear. Weaker candidates will select fewer issues and not relate these directly to the issues of interpersonal communication.

Range of Issues (AO2)

- 0 marks No material worthy of credit.
- 1-2 marks The answer identifies some issues; they could have been related to the question more closely and they could have been elaborated and explained further.
- 3-4 marks The answer covers an appropriate range of issues; the issues are identified, made relevant, explained and elaborated.

Evidence for Issues (AO2)

- 0 marks No material worthy of credit.
- 1-2 marks Some evidence is identified and an attempt is made to show its relevance to the issues.
- 3-4 marks Evidence is appropriately selected to illustrate the issues and commented on effectively.

Analysis (AO2)

- 0 marks No material worthy of credit.
- 1-2 marks An attempt is made to provide some analysis.
- 3-4 marks The answer contains some analysis most likely in the form of comparisons and contrasts; these are accurate, detailed and effective.

Argument Structure (AO2)

- 0 marks No material worthy of credit.
- 1-2 marks The answer has a sound structure and the argument is generally clear and coherent but there is an imbalance and minor weaknesses.
- 3-4 marks The structure of the answer is highly effective in providing a cogent framework for compelling arguments that demonstrate originality and insight into evidence.

- 3 (c) Using your psychological knowledge suggest ways to improve communication between employees taking orders in a busy restaurant to reduce the number of mistaken orders. Give reasons for your answer.

[8]

Likely suggestions to improve communication will include; richness of the medium (Lengel and Daft, 1988); face to face interviews (Muchinsky, 1977); use of suitable communication network (Baird, 1977 and Koehler, 1981) and improvements to communication flow (Bartlett, 1932). It is expected that stronger candidates will produce answers that reflect different levels of communication whereas weaker answers are likely to be anecdotal and not make the psychological rationale clear.

Application (AO1/AO2)

- 0 marks No suggestions made OR suggestions are made which are inappropriate to the assessment request.
- 1-2 marks An appropriate suggestion is made but it is based on anecdotal or peripherally relevant psychological evidence.
- 3-4 marks A suggestion is made that is appropriate to the assessment request and is based on appropriate psychological evidence. The suggestion is detailed and clearly explained.

Application Interpretation: Reasons (AO1/AO2)

- 0 marks The answer shows very little or no understanding.
- 1-2 marks The answer attempts to provide a rationale for the suggested application/intervention. The reasons given have some relevance to issue under discussion and some relevance to the evidence discussed elsewhere in the answer.
- 3-4 marks The answer gives a clear rationale for the suggested application. There is confident use of terminology, use of examples, and expansion of complex points. The answer is coherent and well structured.

- 4 (a) Describe what psychologists have found out about group behaviour in organisations. [10]

Group decision making strategies and pitfalls e.g. individual vs group decision making, Stoner (1961) Risky shift, (Fraser, 1971) if group members are cautious to start they remain so. Group polarization. Group think (Janis, 1982), illusion of power, closed mindedness and pressure to conform. Minority views (Moscovici, 1985) will be taken into account if they are confident and constant. Team roles and team building (Belbin, 1993, Furnam, 1997 could find no psychometric evidence for this.) sources and management of group conflict, co-operative vs competitive goals and rewards (Kabanoff 1985, Aronson 1978 Jigsaw, Deutsch 1949 student scores increased when working co-operatively). Problems of interdependence of tasks and role ambiguity. Group identity, Tajfel (1971) and Sherif (1961). Contact hypothesis, bringing together to engage in friendly competition.

Stronger candidates will select three or four pieces of evidence that are directly linked to group processes in organisations, weaker candidates will usually select fewer pieces of evidence and only partially relate these to group behaviours

Concepts and Terminology (AO1)

- 0 marks Incorrect or inappropriate material is presented.
- 1 mark There is some limited use of psychological terms and concepts. Spelling and sentence construction are poor; and punctuation is inappropriate or largely absent.
- 2 marks Appropriate terms and concepts are presented, but there is lack of clarity. Spelling and punctuation are reasonable but there are a number of errors.
- 3 marks Appropriate terms and concepts are presented and used in a confident way. Spelling is good, although there could be one or two errors. Sentence construction is good with views expressed clearly. Punctuation is appropriate.

Evidence (AO1)

- 0 marks No evidence is presented.
- 1 mark Some basic evidence is described which is of peripheral relevance or it is predominantly anecdotal.
- 2 marks Some appropriate psychological evidence is described but there are a number of errors and it is limited in scope and detail.
- 3 marks Appropriate psychological evidence is accurately described. It is reasonably wide-ranging in scope and is reasonably detailed.
- 4 marks Appropriate psychological evidence is accurately described that is wide-ranging in scope and detail.

Understanding (AO1)

- 0 marks The answer is list-like with no attempt to understand what has been written; there is no use of elaboration, clarification or example.
- 1 mark The answer demonstrates some understanding but this is sparse.
- 2 marks The answer demonstrates good understanding. There is some clarification of terminology, occasional use of examples, some expansion of complex points. There is some coherence and a reasonable structure.
- 3 marks The answer demonstrates explicitly applied understanding throughout. There is clarification of terminology, use of examples, expansion of complex points; the answer is coherent and well structured.

- 4 (b) Evaluate what psychologists have learned about group behaviour in organisations. [16]

Difficulties may relate to; psychometric testing relating to individuals rather than groups (Furnham, 1997); the cultural setting of research (Tiandis, 1994); conflict can have positive and negative effects (Riggio, 1990). Issues of reductionism, determinism and research methodology may also be raised.

Stronger answers will identify three or four evaluative issues and make these relevant to group behaviour and the issues related to the study and findings on group processes. There may be 'formulaic answers' that refer to a series of issues, for these to obtain high marks the relation to the command in the question must be clear. Weaker candidates will select fewer issues and not relate these directly to the issues of group behaviour.

Range of Issues (AO2)

- 0 marks No material worthy of credit.
- 1-2 marks The answer identifies some issues; they could have been related to the question more closely and they could have been elaborated and explained further.
- 3-4 marks The answer covers an appropriate range of issues; the issues are identified, made relevant, explained and elaborated.

Evidence for Issues (AO2)

- 0 marks No material worthy of credit.
- 1-2 marks Some evidence is identified and an attempt is made to show its relevance to the issues.
- 3-4 marks Evidence is appropriately selected to illustrate the issues and commented on effectively.

Analysis (AO2)

- 0 marks No material worthy of credit.
- 1-2 marks An attempt is made to provide some analysis.
- 3-4 marks The answer contains some analysis most likely in the form of comparisons and contrasts; these are accurate, detailed and effective.

Argument Structure (AO2)

- 0 marks No material worthy of credit.
- 1-2 marks The answer has a sound structure and the argument is generally clear and coherent but there is an imbalance and minor weaknesses.
- 3-4 marks The structure of the answer is highly effective in providing a cogent framework for compelling arguments that demonstrate originality and insight into evidence.

- 4 (c) You are a psychologist advising the staff of a health and fitness club. Suggest one psychological team building technique that could be used to improve their effectiveness at work. Give reasons for your answer. [8]

It is likely that candidates will suggest; the balancing of negative influences (Kabanoff, 1985); Co-operative working (Aronson 1978, Deutsch 1949); the awareness of team roles, Belbin 1993); resolving group identities; the use of super-ordinate goals, Stagner and Eflal 1982.

Stronger candidates are more likely to make the psychological rationale for the above techniques clear, whereas weaker candidates will tend towards anecdotal suggestions with few links to psychological principles.

Application (AO1/AO2)

- 0 marks No suggestions made OR suggestions are made which are inappropriate to the assessment request.
- 1-2 marks An appropriate suggestion is made but it is based on anecdotal or peripherally relevant psychological evidence.
- 3-4 marks A suggestion is made that is appropriate to the assessment request and is based on appropriate psychological evidence. The suggestion is detailed and clearly explained.

Application Interpretation: Reasons (AO1/AO2)

- 0 marks The answer shows very little or no understanding.
- 1-2 marks The answer attempts to provide a rationale for the suggested application/intervention. The reasons given have some relevance to issue under discussion and some relevance to the evidence discussed elsewhere in the answer.
- 3-4 marks The answer gives a clear rationale for the suggested application. There is confident use of terminology, use of examples, and expansion of complex points. The answer is coherent and well structured.

**Mark Scheme 2547
January 2006**

Section A

- 1 (a) Outline one model or study of the scenic environment. [6]

Any research which investigates the scenic environment may be used. For example, models such as Russell and Lanius' (1984) model of the affective quality of places; Kaplan and Kaplan (1989) preference model; Berlyne (1960) what makes a scene aesthetically pleasing – four collative properties – complexity, novelty, incongruity, surprisingness.

Methods of measuring appraisal of the scenic environment may be used for example Environmental Quality Index

Research such as Real et al (2000) or Herzog and Chernick (2000) factors affecting the perceived scenic quality of landscape types, and Ulrich (1984) on looking at scenes of nature

Marks	Mark Descriptor
0 marks	No answer or incorrect answer.
1-2 marks	The answer attempts to describe research on the scenic environment. The answer is largely anecdotal and there is little use of psychological terms or concepts. The answer has errors and omissions, is brief and lacks understanding.
3-4 marks	The answer considers research on the scenic environment using psychological terms and concepts. The description is mainly accurate and informed and has some evidence of elaboration and understanding.
5-6 marks	The answer gives a clear account of research on the scenic environment from a psychological perspective. The answer is detailed, well organised and the candidate clearly understands what they have written.

Total Marks [6]

- 1 (b) Discuss difficulties psychologists could have investigating the scenic environment [10]

Any difficulties psychologists may face can be used. For example, generalisability problems due to sample limitations, individual differences, methodological problems due to type of research method used or problems of measurement

Marks	Mark Descriptor
0 marks	No answer or incorrect answer.
1-4 marks	The answer attempts to address the question. The evidence and explanations are largely anecdotal and psychological concepts and terms are sparsely used. The answer is superficial and lacks detail.
5-7 marks	The answer is appropriate to the assessment request. Some difficulties are mentioned. There is appropriate use of psychological terms and concepts. The answer has a reasonable range of points and there is some evidence of elaboration.
8-10 marks	The answer is appropriate to the assessment request. There is a confident use of psychological terms and concepts. The answer has an impressive range of points each of which is clearly explained and elaboration is coherent and thorough.

Total Marks [10]

- 2 (a) Describe one piece of research on crowds in emergency situations. [6]

Any piece of research which investigates crowds in emergency situations may be used. For example, Donald and Canter (1992) Kings Cross fire; Mintz (1951) laboratory study with aluminium cones

Marks	Mark Descriptor
0 marks	No answer or incorrect answer.
1-2 marks	The answer attempts to describe a study which investigates crowds in emergency situations. The answer is largely anecdotal and there is little use of psychological terms or concepts. The answer has errors and omissions, is brief and lacks understanding.
3-4 marks	The answer considers a study investigating crowds in emergency situations using psychological terms and concepts. The description is mainly accurate and informed and, has some evidence of elaboration and understanding.
5-6 marks	The answer gives a clear account of a study investigating crowds in emergency situations from a psychological perspective. The answer is detailed, well organised and the candidate clearly understands what they have written.

Total Marks [6]

2 (b) Evaluate methods used to investigate crowds in emergency situations. [10]

Many different methods have been used by psychologists e.g. laboratory based experiments, self-report methods – interview/questionnaires, analysis of archive data and candidates may therefore evaluate these methods relative to crowds in emergency situations (e.g. ecological validity, generalisability, ethics etc). Weaker answers may merely evaluate or just describe methods but not link back to crowds in emergency situations.

Marks	Mark Descriptor
0 marks	No answer or incorrect answer.
1-4 marks	The answer attempts to address the question. The evidence and explanations are largely anecdotal and psychological concepts and terms are sparsely used. The answer is superficial and lacks detail.
5-7 marks	The answer is appropriate to the assessment request. Some points are raised and applied in an appropriate way. There is appropriate use of psychological terms and concepts. The answer has a reasonable range of points and there is some evidence of elaboration.
8-10 marks	The answer is appropriate to the assessment request. The answer has a good range of points that consider the methods used to investigate crowds in emergency situations. There is a confident use of psychological terms and concepts. The answer has an impressive range of points each of which is clearly explained and elaboration is coherent and thorough.

Total Marks [10]

Section B

Part (a) – AO1

- 3 (a) Describe what psychologists have found out about architecture and behaviour. [10]

*Architectural determinism may be discussed and theories of effects of urban living (e.g. overload, environmental stress, behaviour constraint and adaptation level). Research into the effects of urban living on **health** (both physical and mental) – e.g. Goldstein et al (1990) on stress and well-being; Yip et al (2000) urban/rural differences in suicide rates; and on social **behaviour** – e.g. Webber (1963) propinquity; Bornstein (1979) pace of life; Newman and McCawley (1977) eye contact in city or rural areas may be considered; Milgram (1977) responses to handshaking. Urban renewal is an integrated series of steps taken to maintain and upgrade the environmental, economic and social health of an urban area. Studies such as Fried (1963) on residential relocation of Italian working class can be used. Housing design e.g. Pruitt-Igo; comparison of high rise/low rise multiple-unit residences (McCarthy et al 1978) Also research into defensible space (e.. Oscar Newman)*

Weaker answers may describe some partially relevant research or anecdotal evidence with no clear understanding of the research or its relevance to the topic area.

Concepts and Terminology (AO1)

0 marks	Incorrect or inappropriate material is presented.
1 mark	There is some limited use of psychological terms and concepts. Spelling and sentence construction are poor; and punctuation is inappropriate or largely absent.
2 marks	Appropriate terms and concepts are presented, but there is lack of clarity. Spelling and punctuation are reasonable but there are a number of errors.
3 marks	Appropriate terms and concepts are presented and used in a confident way. Spelling is good, although there could be one or two errors. Sentence construction is good with views expressed clearly. Punctuation is appropriate.

Evidence (AO1)

- | | |
|---------|--|
| 0 marks | No evidence is presented. |
| 1 mark | Some basic evidence is described which is of peripheral relevance or it is predominantly anecdotal. |
| 2 marks | Some appropriate psychological evidence is described but there are a number of errors and it is limited in scope and detail. |
| 3 marks | Appropriate psychological evidence is accurately described. It is reasonably wide-ranging in scope and is reasonably detailed. |
| 4 marks | Appropriate psychological evidence is accurately described that is wide-ranging in scope and detail. |

Understanding (AO1)

- | | |
|---------|---|
| 0 marks | The answer is list-like with no attempt to understand what has been written; there is no use of elaboration, clarification or example. |
| 1 mark | The answer demonstrates some understanding but this is sparse. |
| 2 marks | The answer demonstrates good understanding. There is some clarification of terminology, occasional use of examples, some expansion of complex points. There is some coherence and a reasonable structure. |
| 3 marks | The answer demonstrates explicitly applied understanding throughout. There is clarification of terminology, use of examples, expansion of complex points; the answer is coherent and well structured. |

Total marks for question part (a): [10]

Part (b) – AO2

- (b) Evaluate what psychologists have found out about architecture and behaviour. [16]**

*Note – any evaluative point may receive credit, for example
Methods used by psychologists in this topic area
Individual differences
Generalisability of the research findings
Ecological validity*

Range of Issues (AO2)

- 0 marks No material worthy of credit.
- 1-2 marks The answer identifies some issues; they could have been related to the question more closely and they could have been elaborated and explained further.
- 3-4 marks The answer covers an appropriate range of issues; the issues are identified, made relevant, explained and elaborated.

Evidence for Issues (AO2)

- 0 marks No material worthy of credit.
- 1-2 marks Some evidence is identified and an attempt is made to show its relevance to the issues.
- 3-4 marks Evidence is appropriately selected to illustrate the issues and commented on effectively.

Analysis (AO2)

- 0 marks No material worthy of credit.
- 1-2 marks An attempt is made to provide some analysis.
- 3-4 marks The answer contains some analysis most likely in the form of comparisons and contrasts; these are accurate, detailed and effective.

Argument Structure (AO2)

- 0 marks No material worthy of credit.
- 1-2 marks The answer has a sound structure and the argument is generally clear and coherent but there is an imbalance and minor weaknesses.
- 3-4 marks The structure of the answer is highly effective in providing a cogent framework for compelling arguments that demonstrate originality and insight into evidence.

Total marks for question part (b): [16]

Part (c) – AO1/AO2

- (c) Residents have complained that there is no community spirit in their town. Using your knowledge of psychology, suggest design features that could encourage people to socialise and feel proud of their town. Give reasons for your answer. [8]

Markscheme guidelines apply in that any reasonable suggestion is acceptable.

Socialise – communal seating (sociopetal rather than sociofugal); attractive seating areas eg with fountains, trees, facilities (Whyte 1974); use of communal space (Howell 1980); need for defensible space to feel safe, e.g. Pruitt-Igoe

Application (AO1/AO2)

- | | |
|-----------|--|
| 0 marks | No suggestion is made OR a suggestion(s) is made which is inappropriate to the assessment request. |
| 1-2 marks | Appropriate suggestions are made but are based on anecdotal or peripherally relevant psychological evidence. |
| 3-4 marks | Suggestions are made that are appropriate to the assessment request and are based on appropriate psychological evidence. The suggestions are detailed and clearly explained. |

Application Interpretation: Reasons (AO1/AO2)

- | | |
|-----------|---|
| 0 marks | The answer shows very little or no understanding. |
| 1-2 marks | The answer attempts to provide a rationale for the suggested application/intervention. The reasons given have some relevance to issue under discussion. |
| 3-4 marks | The answer gives a clear rationale for the suggested application/intervention. There is confident use of terminology, use of examples, and expansion of complex points. The answer is coherent and well structured. |

Total marks for question part (c): [8]

Total question mark: [34] (AO1=14; AO2=20)

- 4 (a) Describe what psychologists have found out about climate and/or weather. [10]

Answers may distinguish between climate (average weather conditions over a period of time) and weather (changing conditions). Candidates may discuss climatological determinism.

Research on effects of climate and weather on performance such as productivity of workers (Link & Pepler 1970); classroom performance (Pepler 1972) may be used. Effects on social behaviour such as Goransen & King (1970) heat and aggression; Cohn and Rotton (2000) weather and property crimes; Baron & Bell (1975); and studies on heat and attraction Ruback and Pandy (1992); Griffit (1970) could be considered. Also Cohn (1993) - wind and domestic violence and Cunningham (1979) - effects of light on social behaviour. Candidates may also discuss the effects of moon phases and research into Seasonal Affective Disorder.

Weaker answers may describe anecdotal evidence or some partially relevant research with no clear understanding of the research or its relevance to the topic area.

Concepts and Terminology (AO1)

0 marks	Incorrect or inappropriate material is presented.
1 mark	There is some limited use of psychological terms and concepts. Spelling and sentence construction are poor; and punctuation is inappropriate or largely absent.
2 marks	Appropriate terms and concepts are presented, but there is lack of clarity. Spelling and punctuation are reasonable but there are a number of errors.
3 marks	Appropriate terms and concepts are presented and used in a confident way. Spelling is good, although there could be one or two errors. Sentence construction is good with views expressed clearly. Punctuation is appropriate.

Evidence (AO1)

0 marks	No evidence is presented.
1 mark	Some basic evidence is described which is of peripheral relevance or it is predominantly anecdotal.
2 marks	Some appropriate psychological evidence is described but there are a number of errors and it is limited in scope and detail.
3 marks	Appropriate psychological evidence is accurately described. It is reasonably wide-ranging in scope and is reasonably detailed.
4 marks	Appropriate psychological evidence is accurately described that is wide-ranging in scope and detail.

Understanding (AO1)

0 marks	The answer is list-like with no attempt to understand what has been written; there is no use of elaboration, clarification or example.
1 mark	The answer demonstrates some understanding but this is sparse.
2 marks	The answer demonstrates good understanding. There is some clarification of terminology, occasional use of examples, some expansion of complex points. There is some coherence and a reasonable structure.
3 marks	The answer demonstrates explicitly applied understanding throughout. There is clarification of terminology, use of examples, expansion of complex points; the answer is coherent and well structured.

Total marks for question part (a): [10]

Part (b) – AO2**(b) Evaluate what psychologists have found out about climate and/or weather. [16]**

Note: Any evaluative point can receive credit

*e.g. Climatological determinism
Implications
How psychologists gain their evidence
Individual differences
Cultural differences*

Range of Issues (AO2)

0 marks	No material worthy of credit.
1-2 marks	The answer identifies some issues; they could have been related to the question more closely and they could have been elaborated and explained further.
3-4 marks	The answer covers an appropriate range of issues; the issues are identified, made relevant, explained and elaborated.

Evidence for Issues (AO2)

0 marks	No material worthy of credit.
1-2 marks	Some evidence is identified and an attempt is made to show its relevance to the issues.
3-4 marks	Evidence is appropriately selected to illustrate the issues and commented on effectively.

Analysis (AO2)

0 marks	No material worthy of credit.
1-2 marks	An attempt is made to provide some analysis.
3-4 marks	The answer contains some analysis most likely in the form of comparisons and contrasts; these are accurate, detailed and effective.

Argument Structure (AO2)

0 marks	No material worthy of credit.
1-2 marks	The answer has a sound structure and the argument is generally clear and coherent but there is an imbalance and minor weaknesses.
3-4 marks	The structure of the answer is highly effective in providing a cogent framework for compelling arguments that demonstrate originality and insight into evidence.

Total marks for question part (b): [16]

Part (c) – AO1/AO2

- (c) **Some individuals find that climate and weather can have a negative effect on their health. Using your knowledge of psychology suggest how to help them cope with these effects. Give reasons for your answer. [8]**

Mark scheme guidelines apply in that any reasonable suggestion is acceptable, e.g. use of lightbox to overcome effects of SAD (Rosenthal et al., 1984); telling people about negative effects of heat gives more perceived control (Ruback & Pandey, 1992). Studies on acclimatisation to extremes of temperature or to high altitude or research into the effects of positive/negative ions may also be considered.

Application (AO1/AO2)

- | | |
|-----------|--|
| 0 marks | No suggestion(s) made OR suggestion(s) made which is/are inappropriate to the assessment request. |
| 1-2 marks | Appropriate suggestion(s) made but based on anecdotal or peripherally relevant psychological evidence. |
| 3-4 marks | Suggestion(s) made that is/are appropriate to the assessment request and based on appropriate psychological evidence. The suggestion(s) is/are detailed and clearly explained. |

Application Interpretation: Reasons (AO1/AO2)

- | | |
|-----------|--|
| 0 marks | The answer shows very little or no understanding. |
| 1-2 marks | The answer attempts to provide a rationale for the suggested application/intervention. The reasons given have some relevance to issue under discussion. |
| 3-4 marks | The answer gives a clear rationale for the suggested application. There is confident use of terminology, use of examples, and expansion of complex points. The answer is coherent and well structured. |

Total marks for question part (c): [8]

**Total question mark: [34] (AO1=14; AO2=20)
TOTAL MODULE MARK = [50] (AO1=20; AO2=30)**

**Mark Scheme 2548
January 2006**

Section A**1 (a) Describe one way in which imagery can be used in sport.**

By using mental images of success, self confidence may be increased. Images to help with relaxation can control arousal and reduce anxiety. Imagery can help an athlete work through possible techniques to explore different approaches. Imagery can also provide practice by repeatedly running through routines. Imagery is also useful during periods of injury. Weaker candidates may try to use unsubstantiated ideas such as 'visualisation'. This is acceptable, but the stronger candidate will set the concept in the context of a more complete response.

Marks**Mark Descriptor**

0 marks

No answer or incorrect answer.

1-2 marks

The answer attempts to outline one way in which imagery can be used in sport. The answer is largely anecdotal and there is little use of psychological terms or concepts. The answer has errors and omissions, is brief and lacks understanding.

3-4 marks

The answer outlines one way in which imagery can be used in sport, using psychological terms and concepts. The description is mainly accurate and informed and has some evidence of elaboration and understanding.

5-6 marks

The answer gives a clear outline of one way in which imagery can be used in sport. The answer is detailed, well organised and the candidate clearly understands what they have written.

Total Marks: (6)

1 (b) Discuss the effectiveness of the use of imagery in sport.

The evaluation requires discussion on how effective imagery might be. Better answers will consider different uses of imagery and to what extent they may be effective, such as relaxation may be more effective in some contexts, or that it allows more practice trials than real life practice. Issues may not necessary be positive, e.g. mental rehearsal when injured is no substitute for the real thing.

Marks

Mark Descriptor

0 marks

No answer or incorrect answer.

1-4 marks

The answer attempts to discuss the effectiveness of the use of imagery in sport. The evidence is largely anecdotal and psychological concepts and terms are sparsely used. The answer is superficial and lacks detail.

5-7 marks

The answer is appropriate to the assessment request. Some points are raised and applied in an appropriate way to discuss the effectiveness of the use of imagery in sport. There is appropriate use of psychological terms and concepts. The answer has a reasonable range of points and there is some evidence of elaboration.

8-10 marks

The answer is appropriate to the assessment request. The answer has a good range of points that discuss the effectiveness of the use of imagery in sport. There is a confident use of psychological terms and concepts. The answer has an impressive range of points each of which is clearly explained and elaboration is coherent and thorough.

Total Marks: (10)

2 (a) Describe one piece of research into personality and sports performance.

The question asks for research so theories, studies or concepts are all acceptable. Answers may focus on personality differences between athletes and non-athletes, the elite athlete in contrast to the novice, personality requirements of one sporting activity in relation to another, or personality differences within a sport of one team position as opposed to another.

Marks**Mark Descriptor**

0 marks

No answer or incorrect answer.

1-2 marks

The answer attempts to describe research which investigates personality and sports performance. The answer is largely anecdotal and there is little use of psychological terms or concepts. The answer has errors and omissions, and lacks understanding.

3-4 marks

The answer describes research that investigates personality and sports performance, using psychological terms and concepts. The description is mainly accurate and informed and has some evidence of elaboration and understanding.

5-6 marks

The answer clearly describes research that investigates home advantage in sport from a psychological perspective. The answer is detailed, well organised and the candidate clearly understands what they have written.

Total Marks: (6)

2 (b) Discuss limitations of research into personality and sports performance.

*Any evaluation issues which are relevant are acceptable and they must address the **limitations** part of the question. Hence, methodological limitations are most likely. Generalising from one sport to another, often due to sampling limitations, provides a likely response, as does the ethnocentric nature of much of the research.*

Marks

Mark Descriptor

0 marks

No answer or incorrect answer.

1-4 marks

The answer attempts to discuss the limitations of research which investigates personality and sports performance. The evidence and explanations are largely anecdotal and psychological concepts and terms are sparsely used. The answer is superficial and lacks detail.

5-7 marks

The answer is appropriate to the assessment request. Some points are raised and applied in an appropriate way to the limitations of research which investigates personality and sports performance. There is appropriate use of psychological terms and concepts. The answer has a reasonable range of points and there is some evidence of elaboration.

8-10 marks

The answer is appropriate to the assessment request. The answer has a good range of points that discuss the limitations of research into personality and sports performance. There is a confident use of psychological terms and concepts. The answer has an impressive range of points each of which is clearly explained and elaboration is coherent and thorough.

Total Marks: (10)

Section B**3 (a) Describe what psychologists have learned about arousal and anxiety in sport.**

Candidates may look at research into arousal, types and measures of anxiety, reducing anxiety and optimising arousal. Theories, most likely drive theory and the inverted U hypothesis, as well as types of arousal such as electrocortical and autonomic, are admissible, as are trait, state and multidimensional models of anxiety. Psychometric measures may well contribute to answers, such as Marten's SCAT test or CSAI-2. Catastrophe theory may well be a popular response, but is often not so well reported. Somatic and cognitive techniques to enhance arousal and control anxiety are also relevant.

Concepts and Terminology (A01)

- 0 marks Incorrect or inappropriate material is presented.
- 1 mark There is some limited use of psychological terms and concepts. Spelling and sentence construction are poor; and punctuation is inappropriate or largely absent.
- 2 marks Appropriate terms and concepts are presented, but there is lack of clarity. Spelling and punctuation are reasonable but there are a number of errors.
- 3 marks Appropriate terms and concepts are presented and used in a confident way. Spelling is good, although there could be one or two errors. Sentence construction is good with views expressed clearly. Punctuation is appropriate.

Evidence (A01)

- 0 marks No evidence is presented.
- 1 mark Some basic evidence is described which is of peripheral relevance or it is predominantly anecdotal.
- 2 marks Some appropriate psychological evidence is described but there are a number of errors and it is limited in scope and detail.
- 3 marks Appropriate psychological evidence is accurately described. It is reasonably wide-ranging in scope and is reasonably detailed.
- 4 marks Appropriate psychological evidence is accurately described that is wide-ranging in scope and detail.

Understanding (A01)

- 0 marks The answer is list-like with no attempt to understand what has been written; there is no use of elaboration, clarification or example.
- 1 mark The answer demonstrates some understanding but this is sparse.
- 2 marks The answer demonstrates good understanding. There is some clarification of terminology, occasional use of examples, some expansion of complex points. There is some coherence and a reasonable structure.
- 3 marks The answer demonstrates explicitly applied understanding throughout. There is clarification of terminology, use of examples, expansion of complex points; the answer is coherent and well structured.

Total Marks: (10)

3 (b) Evaluate what psychologists have learned about arousal and anxiety in sport.

There is a range of approaches to addressing this part of the question. A comparison or contrast of research in terms of evaluation issues is a sound way to respond. Issues of measurement and definition related to reliability and validity are appropriate, as are usefulness and ecological validity. An ethical consideration of effects on performance may also be considered.

Range of Issues (AO2)

- 0 marks No material worthy of credit.
- 1-2 marks The answer identifies some issues; they could have been related to the question more closely and they could have been elaborated and explained further.
- 3-4 marks The answer covers an appropriate range of issues; the issues are identified, made relevant, explained and elaborated.

Evidence for Issues (AO2)

- 0 marks No material worthy of credit.
- 1-2 marks Some evidence is identified and an attempt is made to show its relevance to the issues.
- 3-4 marks Evidence is appropriately selected to illustrate the issues and commented on effectively

Analysis (AO2)

- 0 marks No material worthy of credit.
- 1-2 marks An attempt is made to provide some analysis.
- 3-4 marks The answer contains some analysis most likely in the form of comparisons and contrast; these are accurate, detailed and effective.

Argument Structure (AO2)

- 0 marks No material worthy of credit.
- 1-2 marks The answer has a sound structure and the argument is generally clear and coherent but there is an imbalance and minor weaknesses.
- 3-4 marks The structure of the answer is highly effective in providing a cogent framework for compelling arguments that demonstrate originality and insight into evidence.

Total Marks: (16)

- 3 (c) Suggest how a sports psychologist could help a Formula One racing driver who complained of suffering with 'nerves' before a race? Give reasons for your answer.**

Suitable answers will include the identifying optimal levels of arousal and controlling anxiety. Techniques may be cognitive, behavioural or physiological. Additional references may be made to attentional narrowing required by the sport, or the fact that we are dealing with an elite performer.

Application (AO1/AO2)

- 0 marks No suggestions made or suggestions are made which are inappropriate to the assessment request.
- 1-2 marks An appropriate suggestion is made but it is based on anecdotal or peripherally relevant psychological evidence.
- 3-4 marks A suggestion is made that is appropriate to the assessment request and is based on appropriate psychological evidence. The suggestion is detailed and clearly explained.

Application Interpretation: Reasons (AO1/AO2)

- 0 marks The answer shows very little or no understanding.
- 1-2 marks The answer attempts to provide a rationale for the suggested application/intervention. The reasons given have some relevance to issue under discussion and some relevance to the evidence discussed elsewhere in the answer.
- 3-4 marks The answer gives a clear rationale for the suggested application. There is confident use of terminology, use of examples, and expansion of complex points. The answer is coherent and well structured.

Total Marks: (8)

- 4 (a) **Describe what psychologists have discovered about social influence in sport.**

Candidates may look at team cohesion, individual performances within a team setting, audience effects and home advantage related to audience characteristics. Likely responses include theories of group cohesion such as Tuckman (1975) or social loafing (Ringelmann Effect). Social Facilitation research by Zajonc or Evaluation Apprehension research such as Cottrell's may well be a regular inclusion. Research by Schwartz and Barsky tends to lead the way with research into home advantage and audience characteristics.

Concepts and Terminology (A01)

- 0 marks Incorrect or inappropriate material is presented.
- 1 mark There is some limited use of psychological terms and concepts. Spelling and sentence construction are poor; and punctuation is inappropriate or largely absent.
- 2 marks Appropriate terms and concepts are presented, but there is lack of clarity. Spelling and punctuation are reasonable but there are a number of errors.
- 3 marks Appropriate terms and concepts are presented and used in a confident way. Spelling is good, although there could be one or two errors. Sentence construction is good with views expressed clearly. Punctuation is appropriate.

Evidence (A01)

- 0 marks No evidence is presented.
- 1 mark Some basic evidence is described which is of peripheral relevance or it is predominantly anecdotal.
- 2 marks Some appropriate psychological evidence is described but there are a number of errors and it is limited in scope and detail.
- 3 marks Appropriate psychological evidence is accurately described. It is reasonably wide-ranging in scope and is reasonably detailed.
- 4 marks Appropriate psychological evidence is accurately described that is wide-ranging in scope and detail.

Understanding (A01)

- 0 marks The answer is list-like with no attempt to understand what has been written; there is no use of elaboration, clarification or example.
- 1 mark The answer demonstrates some understanding but this is sparse.
- 2 marks The answer demonstrates good understanding. There is some clarification of terminology, occasional use of examples, some expansion of complex points. There is some coherence and a reasonable structure.
- 3 marks The answer demonstrates explicitly applied understanding throughout. There is clarification of terminology, use of examples, expansion of complex points; the answer is coherent and well structured.

Total Marks: (10)

- 4 (b) **Evaluate what psychologists have discovered about social influence in sport.**

There is a range of approaches to addressing this part of the question. A comparison or contrast of research in terms of evaluation issues is a sound way to respond. Ethnocentrism is a key evaluative issue as so much research is centred in the West, and more particularly the US (note common references to terms such as 'home court advantage'). Collectivist cultures may well provide alternative commentary on social influence in sport (eg Triandis 1990). Usefulness and ecological validity may also be considered, as may an ethical consideration of social influence in sport.

Range of Issues (AO2)

- 0 marks No material worthy of credit.
- 1-2 marks The answer identifies some issues; they could have been related to the question more closely and they could have been elaborated and explained further.
- 3-4 marks The answer covers an appropriate range of issues; the issues are identified, made relevant, explained and elaborated.

Evidence for Issues (AO2)

- 0 marks No material worthy of credit.
- 1-2 marks Some evidence is identified and an attempt is made to show its relevance to the issues.
- 3-4 marks Evidence is appropriately selected to illustrate the issues and commented on effectively

Analysis (AO2)

- 0 marks No material worthy of credit.
- 1-2 marks An attempt is made to provide some analysis.
- 3-4 marks The answer contains some analysis most likely in the form of comparisons and contrast; these are accurate, detailed and effective.

Argument Structure (AO2)

- 0 marks No material worthy of credit.
- 1-2 marks The answer has a sound structure and the argument is generally clear and coherent but there is an imbalance and minor weaknesses.
- 3-4 marks The structure of the answer is highly effective in providing a cogent framework for compelling arguments that demonstrate originality and insight into evidence.

Total Marks: (16)

- 4 (c) **A team leader feels she is receiving full effort from only some of her players. Using your knowledge of Psychology, what advice would you give her to help achieve maximum effort from ALL individuals in her team? Give reasons for your answer.**

Various suggestions are acceptable, better answers should deal group cohesion, team building and team performance. Social loafing may be referred to with suggestions at reporting individual performance within the team context. Other areas of the syllabus may be appropriate too, but must respond to the question i.e. achieving full effort from all individuals.

Application (AO1/AO2)

- 0 marks No suggestions made or suggestions are made which are inappropriate to the assessment request.
- 1-2 marks An appropriate suggestion is made but it is based on anecdotal or peripherally relevant psychological evidence.
- 3-4 marks A suggestion is made that is appropriate to the assessment request and is based on appropriate psychological evidence. The suggestion is detailed and clearly explained.

Application Interpretation: Reasons (AO1/AO2)

- 0 marks The answer shows very little or no understanding.
- 1-2 marks The answer attempts to provide a rationale for the suggested application/intervention. The reasons given have some relevance to issue under discussion and some relevance to the evidence discussed elsewhere in the answer.
- 3-4 marks The answer gives a clear rationale for the suggested application. There is confident use of terminology, use of examples, and expansion of complex points. The answer is coherent and well structured.

Total Marks: (8)

**Mark Scheme 2549
January 2006**

AO1

- 1 (a) Describe one piece of research which has investigated children as witnesses. (6)

There are many pieces of research which could appear here such as, Bidrose and Goodman (2000), Bottoms et al (1993), Ceci & Bruck (1993), Leippe et al and many more.

A good description will cover who did the research, the aim of the research, what method was used, what size and sort of sample was used, the results, type of data and the conclusions that can be drawn from it. Top level answers will have this level of detail which shows real knowledge and understanding.

Marks	Mark Descriptor
0 marks	No answer or incorrect answer.
1-2 marks	The answer attempts to describe what is meant by one piece of research which has investigated children as witnesses. The answer is largely anecdotal and there is little use of psychological terms or concepts. The answer has errors and omissions, is brief and lacks understanding.
3-4 marks	The answer considers one piece of research which has investigated children as witnesses using psychological terms and concepts. The description is mainly accurate and informed and, has some evidence of elaboration and understanding.
5-6 marks	The answer gives a clear account of one piece of research which has investigated children as witnesses from a psychological perspective. The answer is detailed, well organised and the candidate clearly understands what they have written.
Total Marks [6]	

AO2

- 1 (b) **Discuss the problems faced by psychologists when conducting research into children as witnesses** (10)

Answers may take a general or more specific route. Specific answers are likely to revolve around the main problems of the ages of the children and therefore what sort of method is suitable for a child which is not leading and lacking in ecological validity. As some research is intended to test ability to give accurate evidence in child abuse cases, researchers face the problem of coming up with ethical ways of testing knowledge of intimate contact between child and adult. This has most often been done as memory for a medical exam which has questionable ethical acceptability. Also relevant would be reference to Samuel and Bryant's work demonstrating the influence of adult questioning.

Ainsworth identifies three problems: children's cognitive abilities less well developed children's ability to distinguish fantasy from reality and suggestibility of child witnesses.

Stress and repeated questioning are also relevant areas which also raise ethical problems.

A more general approach might look at the reliability and validity of the research in a methodological way. Both approaches will gain credit.

Marks	Mark Descriptor
0 marks	No answer or incorrect answer.
1-4 marks	The answer attempts to discuss the problems faced by psychologists when conducting research into children as witnesses The evidence and explanations are largely anecdotal and psychological concepts and terms are sparsely used. The answer is superficial and lacks detail.
5-7 marks	The answer is appropriate to the assessment request. Some problem issues are raised and applied in an appropriate way to the issue of conducting research into children as witnesses. There is appropriate use of psychological terms and concepts. The answer has a reasonable range of points and there is some evidence of elaboration.
8-10 marks	The answer is appropriate to the assessment request. The answer has a good range of points that consider the problems faced by psychologists when conducting research into children as witnesses. There is a confident use of psychological terms and concepts. The answer has an impressive range of points each of which is clearly explained and elaboration is coherent and thorough.

Total Marks [10]
(Total: 16 marks)

Question 2 (AO1)**2 (a) Describe one psychological offender treatment programme (6)**

Any recognised programme could be described. For the top mark band, candidates should be able to describe the psychological theory on which it is based, the rationale behind it (or key assumptions) research examples of it in practice and a non-evaluative statement of its effectiveness. Suggested programmes are likely to be anger management, social skills training, token economies, cognitive behavioural therapy, individual or group therapy using psychodynamic or humanistic approaches.

Marks	Mark Descriptor
0 marks	No answer or incorrect answer.
1-2 marks	The answer attempts to describe what is meant by a psychological offender treatment programme. The answer is largely anecdotal and there is little use of psychological terms or concepts. The answer has errors and omissions, is brief and lacks understanding.
3-4 marks	The answer considers psychological offender treatment programmes using psychological terms and concepts. The description is mainly accurate and informed and, has some evidence of elaboration and understanding.
5-6 marks	The answer gives a clear account of psychological offender treatment programmes from a psychological perspective. The answer is detailed, well organised and the candidate clearly understands what they have written.

Total Marks [6]

AO2

2 b) Evaluate offender treatment programmes.

(10)

(Total: 16 marks)

Evaluation is likely to take the form of studies quoting recidivism rates at some later date following time spent on the programmes. It may also include methodological weaknesses such as lack of controls, poor matching of criminal to programme and lack of generalisability of the programme to real life. Other issues are problems with the use of psychometrics to measure a change in attitudes before and after the programme. Ethical issues associated with token economies. Problems with the assumptions behind the programme e.g. are criminals lacking in social skills or more prone to anger than the rest of us?

The best answers will be detailed with good psychological content covering a range of points. Weaker answers will be superficial and anecdotal.

Marks	Mark Descriptor
0 marks	No answer or incorrect answer.
1-4 marks	The answer attempts to evaluate the effectiveness of psychological offender treatment programmes. The evidence and explanations are largely anecdotal and psychological concepts and terms are sparsely used. The answer is superficial and lacks detail.
5-7 marks	The answer is appropriate to the assessment request. Some evaluation issues are raised and applied in an appropriate way to the issue of the effectiveness of psychological offender treatment programmes. There is appropriate use of psychological terms and concepts. The answer has a reasonable range of points and there is some evidence of elaboration.
8-10 marks	The answer is appropriate to the assessment request. The answer has a good range of points that consider the effectiveness of psychological offender treatment programmes. There is a confident use of psychological terms and concepts. The answer has an impressive range of points each of which is clearly explained and elaboration is coherent and thorough.

Total Marks [10]

Section B**Question 3**

- 3 (a) Describe what psychologists have found out about criminal thinking patterns (10)**

Answers may include material from morality, social cognition or rationality and crime. Theories of moral development such as Kohlberg, Piaget, Freud. Attribution theory, social learning theory, Yochelson and Samenow's thinking errors, Cornish and Clarke's rational choice are likely to appear. Any other recognised research will be given credit. If Freud's theory is described, it could be done using key ideas of superego, guilt and conscience related to his stage theory.

The best answers will clearly relate the material to the question and will describe the theory, where possible with reference to supporting research, including method used, type of sample, type of data (quantitative/qualitative/correlational), results and conclusions.

Concepts and Terminology (AO1)

- | | |
|---------|--|
| 0 marks | Incorrect or inappropriate material is presented. |
| 1 mark | There is some limited use of psychological terms and concepts. Spelling and sentence construction are poor; and punctuation is inappropriate or largely absent. |
| 2 marks | Appropriate terms and concepts are presented, but there is lack of clarity. Spelling and punctuation are reasonable but there are a number of errors. |
| 3 marks | Appropriate terms and concepts are presented and used in a confident way. Spelling is good, although there could be one or two errors. Sentence construction is good with views expressed clearly. Punctuation is appropriate. |

Evidence (AO1)

- | | |
|---------|--|
| 0 marks | No evidence is presented. |
| 1 mark | Some basic evidence is described which is of peripheral relevance or it is predominantly anecdotal. |
| 2 marks | Some appropriate psychological evidence is described but there are a number of errors and it is limited in scope and detail. |
| 3 marks | Appropriate psychological evidence is accurately described. It is reasonably wide-ranging in scope and is reasonably detailed. |
| 4 marks | Appropriate psychological evidence is accurately described that is wide-ranging in scope and detail. |

Understanding (AO1)

- | | |
|---------|---|
| 0 marks | The answer is list-like with no attempt to understand what has been written; there is no use of elaboration, clarification or example. |
| 1 mark | The answer demonstrates some understanding but this is sparse. |
| 2 marks | The answer demonstrates good understanding. There is some clarification of terminology, occasional use of examples, some expansion of complex points. There is some coherence and a reasonable structure. |
| 3 marks | The answer demonstrates explicitly applied understanding throughout. There is clarification of terminology, use of examples, expansion of complex points; the answer is coherent and well structured. |

Total marks for question part (a): [10]

Part (b) – AO2**(b) Evaluate what psychologists have found out about criminal thinking patterns. (16)**

A range of issues may be evaluated including ecological validity, reliability, methodology, usefulness of research. Theories could be considered as interactionist, determinist or promoting the idea of freewill and choice.

The best answers will have clearly defined issues as above linked to psychological evidence, (Including research, concepts or theories) and will flow from point to point avoiding a list type response (argument). Comparisons and contrasts will be evident and analysis may also take the form of strengths and weaknesses or reliability/validity/usefulness etc. of the research or theories quoted (analysis).

Range of Issues (AO2)

0 marks	No material worthy of credit.
1-2 marks	The answer identifies some issues; they could have been related to the question more closely and they could have been elaborated and explained further.
3-4 marks	The answer covers an appropriate range of issues; the issues are identified, made relevant, explained and elaborated.

Evidence for Issues (AO2)

0 marks	No material worthy of credit.
1-2 marks	Some evidence is identified and an attempt is made to show its relevance to the issues.
3-4 marks	Evidence is appropriately selected to illustrate the issues and commented on effectively.

Analysis (AO2)

0 marks	No material worthy of credit.
1-2 marks	An attempt is made to provide some analysis.
3-4 marks	The answer contains some analysis most likely in the form of comparisons and contrasts; these are accurate, detailed and effective.

Argument Structure (AO2)

0 marks	No material worthy of credit.
1-2 marks	The answer has a sound structure and the argument is generally clear and coherent but there is an imbalance and minor weaknesses.
3-4 marks	The structure of the answer is highly effective in providing a cogent framework for compelling arguments that demonstrate originality and insight into evidence.

Total marks for question part (b): [16]

Part (c) – AO1/AO2

- (c) **Some criminals see nothing wrong with offending. From your knowledge of psychology, suggest how criminals could be encouraged to change their thinking so that they obey the law. Give reasons for your answer.** (8)

Suggestions are likely to refer to crime as a rational choice or the result of thinking errors. Some candidates may answer with suggestions that crime runs in families or that it is the result of social deprivation. This is acceptable providing the answer focuses on the criminal's thinking. Suggestions for how to change the criminals thinking could come from across the specification including criminal explanations and treatment programs, meeting victims, deterrence models etc. All reasonable suggestions will gain credit.

The best answers will have good psychological reasons for the suggestions made and may show an awareness of limitations of the explanation.

Weak answers will have little or no psychological content and will be largely anecdotal.

Application (AO1/AO2)

0 marks	No suggestions made OR suggestions are made which are inappropriate to the assessment request.
1-2 marks	An appropriate suggestion is made but it is based on anecdotal or peripherally relevant psychological evidence.
3-4 marks	A suggestion is made that is appropriate to the assessment request and is based on appropriate psychological evidence. The suggestion is detailed and clearly explained.

Application Interpretation: Reasons (AO1/AO2)

0 marks	The answer shows very little or no understanding.
1-2 marks	The answer attempts to provide a rationale for the suggested application/intervention. The reasons given have some relevance to issue under discussion and some relevance to the evidence discussed elsewhere in the answer.
3-4 marks	The answer gives a clear rationale for the suggested application. There is confident use of terminology, use of examples, and expansion of complex points. The answer is coherent and well structured.

**Total marks for question part (c): [8]
Total question mark: [34] (AO1=14; AO2=20)**

Part (a) – AO1**4 (a) Describe research into crime- victim interaction. (10)**

Answers may include; who are the victims, fear of crime, responses to crime and crime reporting and intervention. Statistical evidence is acceptable here as well as actual research studies on the impact of crime on victims. Key ideas covered might be locus of control and its effect on how a victim perceives the risk of becoming a victim of crime and how Belief in a Just World might affect a victim. PTSD and stress could also be covered and the British Crime Survey and police statistics.

Concepts and Terminology (AO1)

0 marks	Incorrect or inappropriate material is presented.
1 mark	There is some limited use of psychological terms and concepts. Spelling and sentence construction are poor; and punctuation is inappropriate or largely absent.
2 marks	Appropriate terms and concepts are presented, but there is lack of clarity. Spelling and punctuation are reasonable but there are a number of errors.
3 marks	Appropriate terms and concepts are presented and used in a confident way. Spelling is good, although there could be one or two errors. Sentence construction is good with views expressed clearly. Punctuation is appropriate.

Evidence (AO1)

0 marks	No evidence is presented.
1 mark	Some basic evidence is described which is of peripheral relevance or it is predominantly anecdotal.
2 marks	Some appropriate psychological evidence is described but there are a number of errors and it is limited in scope and detail.
3 marks	Appropriate psychological evidence is accurately described. It is reasonably wide-ranging in scope and is reasonably detailed.
4 marks	Appropriate psychological evidence is accurately described that is wide-ranging in scope and detail.

Understanding (AO1)

0 marks	The answer is list-like with no attempt to understand what has been written; there is no use of elaboration, clarification or example.
1 mark	The answer demonstrates some understanding but this is sparse.
2 marks	The answer demonstrates good understanding. There is some clarification of terminology, occasional use of examples, some expansion of complex points. There is some coherence and a reasonable structure.

3 marks

The answer demonstrates explicitly applied understanding throughout. There is clarification of terminology, use of examples, expansion of complex points; the answer is coherent and well structured.

Total marks for question part (a): [10]

Part (b) – AO2**4 (b) Evaluate research into crime- victim interaction (16)**

Issues for evaluation could include, self-report measures, methodology, sampling, ethics, usefulness. Content could include the British Crime Survey, Crime statistics, Research into fear of crime and who are the victims.

The best answers will have clearly defined issues as above linked to psychological evidence, (Including research, concepts or theories) and will flow from point to point avoiding a list type response (argument). Comparisons and contrasts will be evident and analysis may also take the form of strengths and weaknesses or reliability/validity/usefulness etc. of the research or theories quoted (analysis).

Range of Issues (AO2)

0 marks	No material worthy of credit.
1-2 marks	The answer identifies some issues; they could have been related to the question more closely and they could have been elaborated and explained further.
3-4 marks	The answer covers an appropriate range of issues; the issues are identified, made relevant, explained and elaborated.

Evidence for Issues (AO2)

0 marks	No material worthy of credit.
1-2 marks	Some evidence is identified and an attempt is made to show its relevance to the issues.
3-4 marks	Evidence is appropriately selected to illustrate the issues and commented on effectively.

Analysis (AO2)

0 marks	No material worthy of credit.
1-2 marks	An attempt is made to provide some analysis.
3-4 marks	The answer contains some analysis most likely in the form of comparisons and contrasts; these are accurate, detailed and effective.

Argument Structure (AO2)

0 marks	No material worthy of credit.
1-2 marks	The answer has a sound structure and the argument is generally clear and coherent but there is an imbalance and minor weaknesses.
3-4 marks	The structure of the answer is highly effective in providing a cogent framework for compelling arguments that demonstrate originality and insight into evidence.

Total marks for question part (b): [16]

Part (c) – AO1/AO2

- 4 (c) **An elderly relative has read about a local victim of a serious crime and now is afraid to go out. Using your knowledge of psychology, suggest how they might be helped to overcome this fear.(8)**

Suggestions might include educating them about the true risk of the elderly becoming a victim, by reference to crime statistics and the impact newspaper reports might be having in creating a sense of fear.(Heath L 1984). There is also specific research into elderly victims of crime which could be relevant.

They might be helped by understanding how they could apply the ideas of locus of control or Belief in a Just World which could help them rationalise their fear. Any reasonable suggestion backed by psychological ideas is acceptable and should get credit.

Best answers will have good psychological reasons for the suggestions made and may show an awareness of limitations of the explanation.

Weak answers will have little or no psychological content and will be largely anecdotal.

Application (AO1/AO2)

- | | |
|-----------|--|
| 0 marks | No suggestions made OR suggestions are made which are inappropriate to the assessment request. |
| 1-2 marks | An appropriate suggestion is made but it is based on anecdotal or peripherally relevant psychological evidence. |
| 3-4 marks | A suggestion is made that is appropriate to the assessment request and is based on appropriate psychological evidence. The suggestion is detailed and clearly explained. |

Application Interpretation: Reasons (AO1/AO2)

- | | |
|-----------|--|
| 0 marks | The answer shows very little or no understanding. |
| 1-2 marks | The answer attempts to provide a rationale for the suggested application/intervention. The reasons given have some relevance to issue under discussion and some relevance to the evidence discussed elsewhere in the answer. |
| 3-4 marks | The answer gives a clear rationale for the suggested application. There is confident use of terminology, use of examples, and expansion of complex points. The answer is coherent and well structured. |

**Total marks for question part (c): [8]
Total question mark: [34] (AO1=14; AO2=20)**

Report on the Units January 2006

Chief Examiners Report

General Comments

The pattern of entry for units taken this January continues to change. The significant majority of candidates taking AS units 2540 and 2541 are re-sitting. For AS unit 2542 most candidates were taking the examination for the first time and for this session the entry increased significantly. For A2 many Centres allowed students to take one of the two options in January. Some A2 units saw a significant increase in numbers (crime and health) whilst others saw a decrease.

The Psychology examiners for OCR have always enjoyed good relationships with their teachers and this is partly due to the open and honest way we share information through reports, INSET meetings and via the e-list. For example, in order to assist the reliability of script marking, Principal Examiners have increased the amount of indicative content they provide in their mark schemes. Perhaps just as importantly, it is useful information for teachers to guide what they might consider teaching. Increased guidance is also provided in this report on what to do and what not to do for each paper so we can help candidates to improve their performance.

The e-list is an ever popular resource for teachers. Non-members can join by accessing <http://community.ocr.org.uk/community/psychology-a/home>. A common question posed frequently on the list relates to examination papers. Awarding bodies are not allowed to publish papers and mark schemes until after results are published.

In unit 2540, Core studies 1, in general candidates attempted all 20 questions. It is important that in preparation for the examination candidates are told to look for 20 questions and it may be necessary to turn over the page.

There was a large increase in entries of 2000 candidates on unit 2542 this January compared to the previous January. In unit 2542 psychological investigations it is important to remind centres that research should not be conducted with participants who are under 16 years of age and the consideration of ethical issues should be a fundamental element of the work. It is not permissible to include evaluative comments in the practical investigations folder.

Principal Examiner's Report 2540 January 2006

1 General comments

In general the range of answers varied from centre to centre with some candidates obviously better prepared for the exam and having done more revision. Candidates scoring higher marks were able to give both brief and more detailed answers where required and could attempt all of the questions as opposed to leaving gaps for questions on studies not known or revised. The full range of marks was awarded suggesting the exam paper differentiated well. Candidates should be made aware of the need to give a more detailed explanation for questions that contain requests to 'outline' or 'describe' whilst very brief answers are more suitable for questions where candidates are required to 'identify'. It was noted that candidates realised that there were 20 questions and not 16 which was not the case for some candidates in the last session. Again, this should be reiterated to candidates prior to the exam as it will not always be possible to fit all 20 questions on two sides, and it may be necessary for candidates to turn over the page in future sessions. Some candidates gave impressive answers and displayed considerable knowledge and understanding of the studies.

2 Comments on individual questions

Question 1

Part a was answered well by most candidates but part b proved more difficult with many candidates not understanding the purpose of the control group.

Question 2

Some candidates were able to answer this question correctly referring to the need to control intelligence in establishing this was not related to theory of mind.

Question 3

Many candidates referred to the nature/nurture debate on language or made reference to the skills of animals in using language in the way that humans do. Some candidates referred to the use of sign language as opposed to spoken language given the lack of vocal chords in chimpanzees, this however did not answer the question about why the study was conducted.

Question 4

Better answers referred to language barriers, cultural bias or understanding cultural norms. Weaker answers made reference to cross-cultural studies being time consuming or expensive. Better answers linked the difficulties to the Deregowski study.

Question 5

This question was answered well by those who knew the study and badly by those who were guessing and did not understand the relevance of Piaget's work as background to the study.

Question 6

In answer to Part a there were many controls which could be referred to including details of the standardised procedure, the observation checklist etc. Some candidates answered this well but others merely referred to the independent variables including the gender of the model or whether the model was aggressive.

Question 7

The majority of candidates gave an alternative explanation for little Hans' phobia but better answers referred to details from the study including him seeing a horse fall down. Equally good answers referred to psychological concepts including stimulus response, social learning theory etc to support their suggestion.

Question 8

Most candidates referred to subject attrition as a weakness of the longitudinal approach. As with question 4 better answers used the study as an example of the weakness (Hodges and Tizard).

Question 9

In part (a), most candidates correctly outlined one way in which the participants may have been harmed including being stressed by the injection or alarmed by the symptoms they were not prepared for. Some candidates stated that the adrenaline injection might have physically harmed the participants failing to acknowledge that Schachter and Singer had checked for health conditions in the participants. There were good answers to part (b) with reference to the need to separate cognitive and physiological factors.

Question 10

The majority of candidates knew that the participants in the study by Sperry had previously undergone an operation to disconnect the two hemispheres of the brain to treat epilepsy. Better answers went on to explain that the separation of the hemispheres allowed the epilepsy to be contained reducing the effects.

Question 11

There was a range of answers to this question, better answers identified specific areas of the brain and whether the glucose activity was higher or lower. Weaker answers were vague with no reference to specific differences in brain activity.

Question 12

Again a range of answers were elicited by this question, better answers made reference to the use of EEG to study sleep and dreaming when outlining advantages and disadvantages.

Question 13

The majority of candidates correctly referred to the level of voltage administered by the participants as a measure of obedience.

Question 14

Part a was well answered except by those who got confused between the prisoners and guards. Part b was also answered well, better answers linked features of the prisoners' uniform to processes such as deindividuation, emasculation, oppression etc.

Question 15

Good answers explained the lack of diffusion of responsibility found in the Piliavin, Rodin and Piliavin study as being due to unambiguous nature of the emergency or the costs and rewards of the situation. However weaker answers gave reasons why people didn't help suggesting they had misread the question.

Question 16

Part a was answered well by most candidates who correctly identified two features of the sample in the Tajfel study. Part b was also answered well with reference to age, schoolboy mentality or the number of participants.

Question 17

Some good answers were given for this question but weaker answers merely stated that the IQ of the army recruits was tested to measure intelligence rather than giving reasons why this was done.

Question 18

The majority of candidates showed a good understanding of why Hrabá and Grant repeated the study by Clark and Clark making reference to the effect of societal changes and their effect on racial preference and identification.

Question 19

Candidates showed a good understanding of Rosenhan's study in parts a and b of this question. The majority were able to identify ways in which the patients' privacy was invaded and gave insightful reasons why the privacy of psychiatric patients may be invaded including attitudes to mental illness. Weaker answers referred specifically to the pseudo patients in part (b) therefore missing the point of the question.

Question 20

This question was answered well by most who showed a good understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of the evidence gathered by Thigpen and Cleckley in their study of multiple personality disorder.

2541 Core Studies 2

General comments

In this examination some 95% of candidates were re-sitting the paper for a second time. Whilst many answers were much improved many candidates did not improve and probably some did not perform as well as in the June sitting. This could be explained through either a lack of revision or through poor examination technique. Examination technique can be improved but only if candidates know how to improve. What follows is an outline of some common errors made by candidates with suggestions on how to overcome them.

1. Many candidates 'ran out of time'. Often a candidate adds a 'dear examiner' note, pleading for leniency. The examiner has little sympathy with this as the candidate has merely shown their lack of ability to organise themselves. As a 'rule of thumb', candidates should spend 30 minutes on section A and 30 minutes on section B. More specifically, Section A (a) 7 mins and ½ side; (b) 15 mins and 1 side; (c) 8 mins and ½ side. Section B (a) 15 mins and 1 side; (b) 15 mins and 1 side. The amount of writing suggested is the average length for the candidate with average size writing.

2. The mark scheme for part (b) of all questions requires candidates to write their answers according to the 'point, example, comment' format. It is recommended that candidates follow the requirements of the mark scheme and answer in the point/example/comment format.

3. Often candidates fail to give sufficient detail in their part (b) answer. Typically if a candidate writes "one problem is ethics" they do not score marks because the answer a] fails to say what the problem in relation to ethics actually is and b] this could relate to any question rather than the question set. Were the candidate to add a little more detail "some studies may need to be unethical if they are to be useful" not only tells an examiner what the problem actually is, it is also clear what the question is. Not much extra detail is added but a maximum mark can be given without any doubt or ambiguity.

4. Candidates often do not answer both parts of Section A question part (c). Initially the question asks for one other way in which data could be collected. This is generally answered well by most candidates. The second part of the question asks candidates to 'say how this may affect the results of the study'. Candidates frequently state that the study may be more ecologically valid; that it may be more ethical, etc. In doing this they consider the implications of their suggested alternative rather than the effect on the results. The mark scheme is as follows: Suggestion: 3-4 marks: *Relevant alternative described in appropriate detail with understanding of implications*. This clearly places implications in this section of the mark scheme. Candidates should therefore consider much more explicitly the effect the change would have on the results. The most clear would be to suggest how actual data may change. For example, In the Loftus and Palmer study, if it is suggested that a real accident be staged participants may become emotionally involved. This might mean that their estimations of speed are different from those in a laboratory, perhaps increasing from 40.8 mph to over 50mph.

5. For section A, candidates should read the questions before choosing the core study. A favourite study may not automatically lead to good answers to the questions, whereas another study might well do so. The choice of the Freud study is always popular but it is, perhaps, more difficult to answer question part (c) with say Thigpen and Cleckley or Deregowski.

Comments on specific questions

Section A Questions 1 and 2

For question 1 candidates chose from one of three core studies, those of Freud, Deregowski and Thigpen and Cleckley. Although the Freud study was by far the most popular, there was no difference in the range of marks achieved by candidates across these studies. For those answering question 2 there was equally a choice of one of three core studies, those of Loftus and Palmer, Hraba and Grant and Schachter and Singer. Preference here was distinctly in favour of Loftus and Palmer.

Question part (a): pleasingly very few candidates scored 0, 1 or 2 marks, with most descriptions scoring higher. However, some descriptions were too brief to score top marks. Also to score top marks, candidates did have to refer to self reports in question 1 and an awareness of time in question 2.

Question part (b) required candidates to discuss two strengths and two weaknesses. Many candidates scored very high marks with ease, producing answers which showed full understanding and excellent knowledge of psychological terms and concepts. Others appeared not to have prepared very well at all and struggled to answer the question set. It is recommended that candidates follow the requirements of the mark scheme and answer in the point/example/comment format.

For question 1 (self report data) the more common strengths and weaknesses included:

- quality and richness of data gained;
- participants given opportunity to express their feeling and explain their behaviour;
- participants may provide socially desirable responses;
- the experimenter may bias the results gathered.

For question 2 (snapshot studies) the more common strengths and weaknesses included:

- it is a quick way to collect data; especially if long term development is not relevant;
- data is likely to be quantitative so statistical analysis possible;
- it is not possible to study how behaviour may change over time (development);
- data is likely to be quantitative and reasons to explain why a participant behaved in a particular way will not be known.

Importantly, for all question (b)'s the mark scheme states:

Indicative content: Most likely answers: (**any appropriate answer receives credit**). This means that the bullet points above are merely suggestions rather than law.

Question part (c) required candidates to suggest an alternative way in which data could be gathered. At this point it was clear that some candidates realised that their chosen study did not lend itself easily to an alternative. Candidates are always reminded to read all question parts before choosing their core study. As was stated above, the *effect on the results* rather than the *implications* must be explicitly stated by candidates.

Section B Questions 3 and 4

As always a small number of candidates chose to write about just one study (and so scored a maximum 3 out of the 12 marks available). Although question 3 on 'matching participants' has never appeared before, this is done in many core studies in order to control what goes on. Candidates choosing this question achieved marks that were equivalent to those choosing question 4. For question 3 candidates could write an answer in the form of a list. For the Hodges study for example inclusion of matching by one or two parent family, position in family, occupational classification would be appropriate.

Question 4 answers were often impressive with many students able to think and write about the social processes that were going on. Weaker answers merely described the study with little or no reference to any social behaviour.

Comments about questions 1 and 2 part (b) outlined above also apply here.

For question 3 (matching participants) the more common strengths and weaknesses included:

- participant variables are partly controlled;
- cause and effect are more likely to be determined;
- it may be difficult to find matches;
- loss of one member may be loss of a matched pair.

For question 4 (social behaviour) the more common problems included:

- behaviour should be ecologically valid; not necessarily performed in a laboratory and the task should not be false;
- The sample should be representative and not restricted e.g. males or students or age;
- to observe true behaviour the study may need to be unethical (no full consent or deception or harm);
- behaviour should not be located in one place or time – society changes and societies are different (historical relativity/ethnocentrism).

2542 Psychological Investigations

General comments

There was a large increase in entries this session with more centres entering their candidates for the January session of this unit. The overall standard was high and the majority of candidates are able to describe their data collecting activities clearly. However many candidates are still struggling with questions that ask them to evaluate their activities. This is particularly evident where all candidates from a centre have conducted the same activity, presumably one designed by a teacher. Candidates who have been able to design their own activities are more able to suggest strengths, weaknesses and improvements. Further, even candidates who seem to have a good understanding of the issues often fail to give enough detail in their answers to be awarded full marks. Specifically candidates often fail to relate to their answers directly to their own investigations.

Ethical Issues

There were some ethical concerns raised by examiners this session although it is worth reminding centres that candidates should not conduct research with participants under the age of 16 and should avoid asking questions about personal or potentially distressing material. Candidates should also avoid the inclusion of any evaluative comments in their Practical Investigations Folder.

Section A: Questions, self-reports and questionnaires.

- 1 Most candidates scored full marks for this question.
- 2 The majority of candidates were able to achieve two marks here although few candidates described precisely how *their* sample was collected. For example, candidates were able to say that they had used an opportunity sample but did not say where from. Candidates often used the term 'random' incorrectly here.
- 3 This question achieved good differentiation between candidates. It is worth noting that candidates should allow at least six or seven minutes to answer this question. Many simply wrote that the advantage was that 'it was easy' and the disadvantage that 'it was biased'. This type of answer will not be awarded any more than 2 marks (1 mark for advantage and 1 mark for disadvantage). Even candidates who expanded on their answers and clearly understood the issues they were discussing often failed to relate their answers to their own investigations. The question directed them to think about the advantages and disadvantages of *using this group of participants for their investigation* rather than simply a strength and weakness of the sampling method they had used.

Section B: An Observation

- 4 This question was usually answered very well but there were some candidates who wrote very vague aims such as 'to compare the behaviour of males and females' without any indication of what behaviours were being observed.
- 5 Again most candidates answered this well although it is evident that very complex observation schedules often prove difficult for candidates to describe clearly. Sometimes key categories such as male and female were missing in the description despite being a central part of the aim described in q4.
- 6 a) This question was not well answered. Many candidates offered definitions of experimental reliability (such as 'if you repeat your experiment you will get the same results') and many, as always, confused reliability and validity.

- b) This proved to be a challenging question for many candidates. Many seem to think that simply having another observer somehow increases the reliability and many discussed how to assess inter-rater reliability with no mention of how this would improve reliability. There were few answers that specifically considered how to improve reliability in the candidate's own investigation. When candidates did grasp what they were being asked to do, they made excellent suggestions relating to changing or clarifying their categories, training observers in the use of the categories or conducting pilot studies to test the use of the categories. Unfortunately such answers were rare.

Section C: Comparison of two conditions

- 7 Most students were able to describe the procedure that they had followed for this activity although there was often a crucial piece of information missing. There were a number of candidates who described this from the perspective of the participant suggesting that the entire investigation had been designed and conducted by the teacher. Candidates who are taught in this way find description difficult and evaluation (as asked for in questions 8 and 9) almost impossible.
- 8 There were lots of very weak answers here. Candidates did not appear to have been prepared for this question very well and many just offered general improvements (that might apply to any activity) such as 'test more people'. Stronger answers were those that made specific suggestions for improving the procedure of their own investigation.
- 9 Weaker answers went no further than a very general comment on the effect of the suggested improvement with no consideration of the effect of the improvement on the results of the specific activity. This meant that there was a huge range of responses from the very vague 'this would make the results better' to candidates who spent several minutes discussing specific possible effects on their results. As with Question 3 (Activity A above) candidates should be able to spend at least six minutes on this question and it was rare to see an answer that might have taken this length of time.

Section D: Correlation between two independent measures

- 10 Most candidates were able to state a clear null hypothesis with only a very small majority stating 'no difference' rather than 'no correlation' or 'no negative correlation'. More worryingly, the activities conducted by some candidates were not actually correlations, having clear IV – DV effects or including non continuous variables such as gender. There were also strong centre effects here with whole centres producing poorly worded null hypotheses or null hypotheses for experiments rather than correlations.
- 11 Most candidates were able to produce a scattergraph although these were often not fully labelled. Where the activity conducted was not a correlation candidates were obviously unable to plot data on a scattergraph and were unable to achieve any marks.
- 12 a) Most candidates were able to achieve some marks here although many simply stated that 'the hypothesis was supported and the null rejected'. Some showed a great deal of confusion here suggesting that their hypotheses were supported even though they hadn't found significant correlations. Some candidates included the statistical analysis here rather than in 12b but did not include a conclusion.
- b) Most students realised that this question was about statistical analysis although there were a significant number of responses that made no mention of the statistical analysis at all. Some simply stated the test used and some copied out the whole calculation. Some confused calculated (observed) values and critical values and others confused the critical values and the probability values. Many candidates claimed that their Rho values were above 1 and very few candidates showed a clear understanding of probability. Many candidates are simply presenting material from their folders which they clearly do not understand. However, there are candidates who show a very good understanding of the nature of statistical analysis and were able to present a very clear response to this question.

2544: Psychology and Education

General comments

The paper was generally well answered although it did not obtain the full range of marks. There was a significant preference for Q1 (differences in educational performance) with only a few candidates attempting Q2 (study skills); Q3 (SEN) was more popular than Q4 (Disruptive behaviour) by about 3:1. The questions clearly followed the syllabus headings and sub-headings and it is hoped that this added to the accessibility of the paper. Certainly some centres were well prepared and the candidates scored highly, these often resulted in similar answer styles that may also have prevented some of the more able students from being more creative with their responses. Question 1 was not answered well, despite the fact that nearly all candidates attempted this question and will be discussed later. General issues still include candidates attempting to fit 'famous' studies to answers, rather than offer more suitable examples. Maslow, Skinner/Watson, Gould and the 'brain differences' are regular features and candidates need to consider if these are always the best source of evidence. Similar comments can be made when dealing with evaluation issues; EV; reductionism; individual differences etc., these terms are not always fully understood, indeed more candidates need to define these terms before using them. The justification of the evaluative issue linked to a study is not always clear. These two previous points are the main reason for good pieces of writing being awarded low marks, as they simply fail to answer the question, preferring instead to write what they know, not what is required. Some centres have clearly given candidates a 'template' to present answers, while this is not wrong and clearly supports less able candidates, centres need to encourage candidates to extend and expand answers to offer their opinions (backed by psychological evidence). It is clear that some centres are unclear as to what the exam board regard as evaluation, as these centres seemed to present more evidence in the evaluation sections. I would encourage candidates to be clearer in their definition of terminology and to clarify the inclusion of psychological evidence. For example to define ecological validity and to link to a study that highlights this by being clear about where the connections are. Good candidates do this whereas lower grade candidates offer vague terminology often supported by inappropriate evidence, often only anecdotal and not linked to psychology.

Comments on Individual Questions

- 1 a) This question has proved problematic due to the request to **describe** an **explanation**. Large numbers of candidates simply described a difference in educational performance such as, gender, cultural differences. Few candidates described the explanation such as, brain hemisphere functioning, socialisation, language/meaning differences. Descriptions of explanation were only able to obtain a maximum of 6/10.
- b) Another problematic answer due to few candidates evaluating the explanation for an educational difference. It was more likely for candidates to score higher here as they did often raise general evaluative issues and related these to differences in educational performance. This had the impact of preventing many of the answers from obtaining marks from the higher range.
- 2 a) Seldom answered. Wide ranges of responses were presented by those who attempted this question. Study skills were not always the focus of the answer but rather more general, and very popular, answers relating to learning styles. If the candidate framed this in a way to suggest it would improve study technique it received full credit.
- b) Most responses focussed on individual differences as the evaluative focus. Boys/girls; cultural differences were the common points raised for evaluation.
- 3 a) This question provided a wide range of responses, many did not follow the indicative comments in the mark scheme but were clearly and often solely linked to issues such as ADHD. These included identification of symptoms, and debates about reliability of measurement technique. These answers are all acceptable but candidates still need to be reminded of the need to be explicit about why these issues are linked to special education needs and to represent the coverage of the syllabus. The demonstration of confident use of terminology comes from the defining of a view point and supporting this with appropriate psychological evidence.
- b) Section B (b) questions were of a varying standard. Some candidates produced very formulaic answers that enabled them to obtain good marks, other candidates (centres?) seemed to have little understanding of evaluation. Most candidates attempted to define/explore evaluative points but this was not always used in the justification for the selection of evidence. Care is needed to ensure that definitions are correct and the evidence is suitable. Too many candidates offered definitions of EV; reductionism and usefulness that were either poorly defined or not supported by suitable evidence. Being ecologically valid is not necessarily equivalent to being useful. The amount and structure of comparison and contrasting between evidence bases was good with appropriate evidence being regularly presented. There is still an issue – usually centre based – on candidates commenting on general evaluative issues and not relating these fully to the question or in fact the evidence they present. A wide range of issues were raised particularly the methodological problems of measuring types of SEN.
- c) This question discriminated well and provided an excellent variety of responses that challenged candidates to apply their psychological knowledge. The issue of gifted and talented was often overlooked to provide a ‘general’ SEN answer. Simple grouping or differentiation was popular but also more complex responses suggesting the impact of social issues were presented. It is useful for candidates to identify the skills that might be required for the task before applying psychological knowledge. The suggestions made need to be developed from an understanding of the issue backed up by sound psychological knowledge. The discussion of these two points will provide a clear rationale. This is not always the case.

- 4 a) Similar issues to 3 (a). Many candidates provided an answer that could have been used for 3 or 4! Behaviour problems due to ADHD and G and T were popular. More anecdotes appeared here but was often used well to highlight theoretical issues; this is entirely appropriate but weaker candidates often failed to make the theory link. These answers are all acceptable but candidates still need to be reminded of the need to be explicit about why these issues are linked to special education needs and to represent the coverage of the syllabus. The demonstration of confident use of terminology comes from the defining of a view point and supporting this with appropriate psychological evidence.
- b) Similar issues to those in 3 (b). Possibly less well answered due to the temptation to discuss 'naughty students I have known!'
- c) Similar issues to 3 (c)...But a stronger psychological base to the responses. The age of the students and location in the room were often ignored and standard answers that included reward/punishment. Draconian beatings were suggested and considered in relation to the psychological evidence provided. More complex answers acknowledged the difficulty of the social situation and even suggested CBT for teacher and pupils. Again all answers taken on their psychological merit.

2545: Psychology and Health

General Comments

Overall this paper was successful in eliciting the full range of marks; it allowed for knowledgeable and well prepared candidates to demonstrate what they had learned about Psychology and Health whilst also distinguishing between these candidates and those who were less knowledgeable or prepared. By far the most popular questions were 1 (Health promotion) and 3 (Patient and Practitioner relationships) with questions 2 (Substance abuse) and 4 (Lifestyles) being rarely chosen. There were some clear general patterns noted by examiners which are worthy of mention here. Questions 1 and 2 parts (b) clearly discriminate between candidates with only the very strongest candidates showing the ability to engage with the question, raising and applying relevant issues. The majority of candidates managed to identify issues but failed to make them truly relevant to the question. Similarly in questions 3 and 4 part (b) the majority of candidates fell into one of two categories: those who could identify explain and apply relevant issues to the research and theory described in part (a) and those who simply described more findings and concepts which receives little or no credit on the mark scheme for this section of the paper. In a similar vein answers to questions 3 and 4 part (c) tended to be polarised: Many candidates were well prepared for the demands of these questions and clearly offered their suggestions which they backed up with evidence and well explained psychological rationale. Weaker candidates tended to mis-interpret the question or offer answers which were purely descriptive.

Comments on the Individual Questions

Question 1

Part (a) required candidates to outline one campaign to improve health in the general public. Many candidates failed to consider the question and simply offered any study of health promotion, Janis and Feshbach being by far the most common offering. Only those candidates who were able to illustrate how fear or self efficacy for example may be applied to a "campaign" to improve health achieved full marks. Many other candidates appropriately described campaigns to improve health but failed to support these with psychological rationale for the highest marks available.

Part (b) required candidates to discuss why many health promotion campaigns have only limited success. It was encouraging to note a number of candidates who were able to answer this question by addressing a number of key issues such as the balance of the use of fear in relation to self efficacy, the medium in which the message is presented, issues of over-optimism and individual and cultural differences. The very best of these answers were supported with examples and used psychological terminology. Weaker answers tended to list evaluative issues and attempt to apply them to evidence which may or may not have been presented in part (a). This attracted little credit from the mark scheme as it essentially failed to answer the question.

Question 2

Although this question was answered by a very few candidates it was successful in discriminating between them. Good answers to part (a) typically offered a sound explanation of why a person may abuse a substance, supported with psychological evidence and rationale. Weaker answers to this question tended to be anecdotal. Some of the strongest answers focussed on the fact that there may be many reasons why a person abuses a substance, then proceeding to explore a combination of social, biological and psychological explanations.

Part (b) challenged candidates to discuss the difficulties in explaining why a person abuses a substance. The strongest candidates were able to raise and apply appropriately a range of relevant issues such as individual differences, cultural differences, the problems of relying on self report measures etc.. Weaker answers tended to raise evaluative issues but failed to apply them in a meaningful way to answering the question.

Question 3

By far the most popular question; the majority of candidates selecting this question were able to offer relevant concepts, terminology and evidence to the area of Patient and Practitioner relationships. Many different combinations of evidence were successfully presented to achieve full marks in section (a). It was not necessary to cover all three sub-sections of the specification in order to provide a suitable answer due to the openness of the question. Nonetheless those candidates who did present evidence covering the three areas frequently did so very effectively.

The answers to part (b) of this question which required candidates to evaluate what Psychologists have discovered about the relationships between patients and their practitioners produced in general one of two responses: by far the most common response was to consider a range of issues such as validity, ethics, usefulness and so on, and how these impinged on the research presented in section (a). A less common approach was to take a less structured strategy to analysing and evaluating the research. In both instances however the most credit went to answers which clearly identified, explained and made relevant the issues to the context of patient and practitioner relationships and the research carried out in this area.

As with previous sessions, reported on every session, there were many candidates who fail to appreciate the demands of this section of the question and simply offer more description.

Part (c) was on the whole answered extremely well with the majority of candidates able to make a sensible suggestion on how the doctor might change her behaviour. The very strongest answers supported their suggestions with appropriate evidence and explained the reasons for their suggestions using clear psychological rationale. This part of the question offered candidates the opportunity to demonstrate their ability to apply psychology to a situation. An impressive number of candidates demonstrated the ability to do this effectively.

Question 4

This question was answered by a small number of candidates and whilst the open nature of the question allowed for a wide range of evidence and pieces of research to be offered appropriately the actual answers were, in the main, very disappointing. The strongest answers often discussed factors such as poverty, religiosity and type A and B behaviours or focused on cultural and individual differences in health behaviours. Some candidates addressed health belief models which was also appropriate. Successful answers applied models to explaining health behaviours. Many weak answers were seen to this question which tended to offer predominantly anecdotal evidence.

The points outlined in relation to question 3 part (b) are again relevant here. Few candidates successfully evaluated what psychologists have found out about lifestyle and health. Many simply offered further description of lifestyle issues. The strongest answers raised, explained and made relevant a number of issues which they went on to evaluate in relation to the evidence presented in part (a). Only the very strongest candidates demonstrated the ability to offer analysis in the form of comparisons and contrasts between the issues as applied to the evidence presented. In general argument structure tended to be weak, often a result of candidates failing to present a meaningful answer to the question.

By far the greatest error in answering part (c) was that many candidates attempted to make suggestions of how the diet of the community might be changed which was not the question. This was clearly due to candidates answering a question they had expected rather than the question set. Those candidates who did correctly identify the demand of the question were often able to suggest a suitable explanation for the choice of diet. Once again the answers attracting the most credit were those which supported their suggestions with appropriate evidence and explained it using psychological rationale and terminology. Once again it was pleasing to note a number of candidates who demonstrated an impressive ability to apply psychology in a given situation. The clear lesson to be learned however is that candidates must expect to read the question and should not expect the command of this part of the examination to always be the same!

2546: Psychology and Organisations

General Comments

Only seventy candidates entered for this Unit and there were fewer high standard scripts than in the Summer. There were minimal timing difficulties or rubric errors and most candidates had a reasonable understanding of the requirements of the questions. A small minority of students lacked sufficient knowledge to give anything more than an anecdotal response and a few students did not respond directly to the requirements of the questions. Where students are using psychological evidence that is not obviously relevant they have to make a clear connection to the question or they will get very little credit. Questions 1 and 4 tended to produce better responses with more accurate psychological evidence and they were the most popular. However, well prepared candidates were getting into the top mark bands for questions 2 and 3.

Comments on Individual Questions

Section A

- 1
 - a) This question was generally well answered with the focus on a specific aptitude test, a personality test or IQ test and its use in selection for work. Wechsler was a popular choice of IQ test and many candidates knew this in sufficient detail to get into the top mark band. A small minority did not understand 'psychometric' and answered the question on interview technique.
 - b) It was pleasing to note that most candidates attempted to evaluate the effectiveness of psychometric tests rather than giving general evaluation. Some candidates were able to use their knowledge of a number of tests to provide a variety of points about their effectiveness. Many candidates referred to the weaknesses they had learned from the Gould study such as ethnocentrism and applied them to the effectiveness of tests.
- 2
 - a) Some candidates gave a description of Maslow's hierarchy of needs or an equity theory without actually saying how it could be used to improve motivation. Better responses linked the theory directly to the question.
 - b) Some of the responses to this question were largely anecdotal and strayed away from discussing the effectiveness of motivational techniques towards a straightforward description of a variety of techniques.

Section B

- 3
 - a) Some candidates did not have the breadth or depth of knowledge of psychological evidence to give an effective response to this question. There was a limited use of terms and concepts in some answers, although sentence construction was good with views expressed clearly. Most candidates had a good understanding of interpersonal communication systems but did not make sufficient use of examples or expand on complex points.
 - b) Most candidates identified three or four relevant evaluative issues which they explained clearly. However, without a detailed knowledge of appropriate psychological evidence it was difficult for some candidates to reach the top mark bands on evidence, analysis or argument structure. Candidates made use of Leavitt's work on centralised and decentralised networks but some were limited to this.

- c) Good candidates gave realistic suggestions linked to psychology. However, many responses either gave detailed suggestions such as the use of codes or shorthand with no link to theory or a course of action which either lacked detail or was impractical. The responses that focused on communication through a centralised network were the most effective.
- 4
- a) This was the most popular section B question. It was generally well answered although some candidates tried to use leadership studies or AS studies such as Zimbardo without justifying their use. Stronger candidates selected three or four pieces of evidence which are directly linked to group behaviour in organisations and described these clearly, accurately and showed good understanding.
 - b) Many of these responses were of a good standard as candidates are familiar with a range of issues such as methodology, individual differences, effectiveness etc. and could relate these to the question. Although the evidence base was sometimes limited, candidates made use of what they knew to make comparisons and contrasts and formulate a well-structured, analytical response. Only a few students seemed to waste time describing new research and focused on evaluation.
 - c) Some candidates gave practical responses with appropriate psychological evidence to support them, but their suggestions of 'away days and cooperative activities' could have been described more fully in the context of a health and fitness club and its staff. Awareness of team roles and the use of super-ordinate goals were commonly used but could have been applied more specifically to the question.

2547: Psychology and Environment

General Comments

The standard of entry for Environment was good with many candidates achieving high marks. There were very few rubric errors although a small number of candidates ran out of time.

Section A part (a) was generally answered well although weaker answers contained only brief details of research evidence. Section A part (b) was more variable. Stronger answers put forward three or four points and discussed these in relation to research or evidence from the topic area. Weaker answers tended to make a number of points but not discuss or elaborate on them.

Section B - candidates were in the main well prepared for Section B part (a) with most candidates citing a range of research/theory/evidence from the topic area. There was more of a centre-effect for part (b) with some excellent detailed and evaluative answers from some centres but also candidates from other centres sometimes failing to meet the requirements of the markscheme. Weaker candidates often failed to make a study relevant to the question or tended to rely heavily on anecdotal or peripherally relevant evidence. Section B part (c) was generally answered less well than parts (a) and (b) with candidates often making a reasonable suggestion but then failing to relate this to psychological theory or research or failing to give a rationale for the application.

Comments on Individual Questions

Section A

- 1 a) Outline one model or study of the scenic environment – this question was less popular but elicited some very good detailed answers and also some very short mainly anecdotal answers. Some candidates wrote about cognitive maps (usually referring to Lynch) rather than the scenic environment.
- b) Discuss difficulties psychologists could have investigating the scenic environment – generally answered well. A good range of difficulties were addressed and linked effectively to the topic area. Weaker answers tended either to merely list difficulties without discussing them or failed to make points relevant to the topic.
- 2 a) Describe one piece of research on crowds in emergency situations - This question was the more popular of the two Section A questions. It was generally well answered although some candidates wrote about crowds in general rather than emergency situations. Some candidates wrote about a crowd study or theory and then applied it to an emergency situation and therefore received credit for this.
- b) Evaluate methods used to investigate crowds in emergency situations – Most candidates were able to consider a range of different methods used to investigate crowds in emergency situations with good links back to the topic. A small number of candidates merely described different methods without evaluation. Regrettably some candidates seemed to have learned prepared answers for part (b) and listed a number of issues such as E.V., ethics, demand characteristics without really linking them to a method.

Section B

- 3 a) (Architecture and behaviour) – This was less popular than question 4 but was generally answered well with a good range of studies. Better answers describing three very detailed or four less detailed studies - most popular were Newman, the Pruitt-Igoe research, Van Dyke and Brownsville housing estates, effects of urban living such as Krupat or Milgram. Theories of urban living were effectively related to the research evidence.

- b) Some Centres were very well prepared for Section B part (b) answers with a good range of issues, selecting appropriate evidence for discussion and comparing and contrasting within each issue. Weaker answers merely listed points, for example, 'X had a small sample and in contrast Y has a bigger sample' – without developing an argument or discussing what effect this might have on the research evidence. A number of candidates evaluated each study individually making it more difficult to gain marks for analysis.
 - c) Suggest design features that could encourage people to socialise and feel proud of their town – some good suggestions based on relevant psychological research – e.g. sociopetal seating areas or buildings facing inwards to a communal area. In both 3 (c) and 4 (c) candidates sometimes failed to discuss their suggestion in relation to the research/evidence/theory and therefore lost marks on the 'Application Interpretation: Reasons' section of the markscheme.
- 4
- a) (Climate and/or weather) – By far the most popular Section B question. Candidates seemed to have a good understanding of the research and this section produced some excellent answers. Most popular were Cunningham, Pepler, Griffitt, Baron & Bell, Kenrick & McFarlane
 - b) As 3(b)
 - c) Suggest how to help individuals cope with the negative effect of climate and weather on their health – most commonly candidates referred to Seasonal Affective Disorder (SAD) describing the symptoms and usually suggesting a lightbox to help. Most managed to relate SAD to psychological research or described the physiological effect. Weaker answers made a suggestion such as move to a warm country, put on warm clothing but failed to link their suggestion to psychological research.

2548: Psychology and Sport

General comments

The performance of candidates in this examination represented the wide range of abilities, and appeared to be fair, presenting no consistent confusion or difficulty. A good range of marks was achieved, better candidates being able to reach top marks. There was inevitably some centre variation in preparation and essay structure, but this is becoming less pronounced.

Most candidates referred to psychological theory, evidence and concepts, but to varying degrees of detail, accuracy and, most notably, breadth. Differentiation occurred in section A where better candidates read and responded with care and precision to the specific wording of the questions. The evaluation (part b in both section A and section B) were the greatest means of differentiation. Weaker candidates offered little or no evaluation, preferring to stick to extended narrative. Better candidates made evaluative observations. Best candidates were able to extend and elaborate on their evaluations, maybe with examples and/or reference to psychological research. Reading and responding directly to the requirements of the question was another means of differentiating, such as weaker candidates omitting reference of psychological material to the sporting context. Some candidates failed to use their psychological knowledge in reference to sport. Many centres had prepared their candidates well, and understanding beyond a formulaic response had generally improved. There were virtually no rubric errors. In general, candidates who were well prepared seemed comfortable with this paper.

Comments on Individual Questions

- 1 Despite being the least popular of the two questions, this was the more consistently well answered question. It seems that candidates were confident in their knowledge of different uses of imagery and responded quite precisely. The need to discuss the effectiveness was again a precise and quite challenging demand which by-and-large, candidates responded to precisely, maybe stating why one way was effective, or challenging the research, as well as comparing uses of imagery.
 - a) Few candidates used anecdotal material, and most seemed to appreciate that the answer required a specific response to *how* imagery can be used and described it quite well. Better answers explicitly and precisely described one way in which imagery could be applied to a sporting context. Weaker answers were more general or outlined imagery without relating it to sport.
 - b) Weaker answers restated or developed uses of imagery without offering evaluative comment. Slightly better than this were pre-prepared candidates who churned out evaluative issues but struggled to relate them to the question's demand of *discussing effectiveness*. The better answer, as suggested above, came from candidates who responded to the question precisely, maybe stating why one way was effective, or challenging the research, as well as comparing uses of imagery.
- 2 A more popular question but some candidates failed to get much beyond the word 'personality'. Weaker answers used material on personality in Psychology and did not relate to sport at all. Better answers related their chosen research to sport. Better answers still described research relating to sport *performance*, e.g. using personality measures to find which sport, or position in a team, a performer may be best suited to.
 - a) As suggested above, better responses dealt with research into personality and sports performance, as the question requested. There was detail and clear application. A number of candidates referred to Eysenck or Cattell, for example, without referencing it to sport. Better 'Eysenck' responses could use EPQ to identify introversion or extroversion, and so suggest a preferred sport for that athlete.

- b) Generally well answered with many candidates seeming able to respond to the question, i.e. discussing *limitations* of research. Overly prepared answers sometimes resulted in candidates offering evaluation points but failing to respond to the specific demand of the question or failing to engage with the material offered.
- 3 a) Generally well answered, though candidates often restricted their answers to theories only. Better candidates offered greater breadth by referring to research studies or measures, for example. Many answers were quite good but lacked the detail needed to gain full marks. For example, references to Fazez and Hardy would commonly talk about performance simply crashing after the optimal point and would be difficult to regain. Whereas this is not incorrect, it denies the complexity of the pre-requisites for 'catastrophe', which should at least be acknowledged if not described.
- b) Some good answers which identified, explained and related issues to the question. Some centres have moved from the 'formulaic' to the 'well prepared', and these candidates have excelled. Weaker candidates did not clearly identify issues and struggled to identify/evaluate these issues within the evidence they were presenting.
- c) Generally well answered. Candidates responded well to the question, providing a good range of possible suggestions related to relevant supporting material, ranging from imagery for practise or relaxation (eg PMR) through to cognitive suggestions such as self-talk. In each case, the quality of response varied but the range of suggestions was encouraging. One weaker response suggested a way to reduce anxiety was to 'breathe in and out'. Whereas this is not wrong, a little more would have to be offered for full marks'
- 4 a) Generally well answered, with candidates comfortable in applying research to the sporting context. Better candidates were able to provide broader ranges of answers including audience effect and home court advantage, weaker candidates tending to restrict themselves to a limited range e.g. only social loafing or one study, such as Tuckman's forming, storming, norming and performing. Stronger candidates were able to use terminology precisely and with confidence.
- b) As 3b). Some centres are teaching their students the same three or four evaluation issues whatever the area. This is a shame as certain issues are more key in some areas. Few candidates referred to ethnocentric bias, for example, which is not only an obvious area for evaluative consideration, but research to back the debate is readily available.
- c) Most students were able to attempt an answer with a reasonable spread of suggestions from across the specification. Most candidates were able to apply this with varying degrees of realistic and effective suggestions. Weaker candidates gave general responses to motivation and getting the team to try hard. Better answers picked up on the fact that the leader needed to get *everyone* to make full effort i.e. social loafing, or referred to application of effective leadership, for example.

2549 Psychology of Crime

General Comments

This paper was considered fair and there were roughly equal attempts at all the questions. The marks showed differentiation across the whole range of marks. There were many poor responses where it seemed that little had been learned in the course of a term. It also seems that some candidates prepare just 2 or 3 topics and when these are not on the paper they try unsuccessfully to fit what they know into the question e.g. Lombroso and Sheldon into criminal thinking patterns. This session's spelling mistake was definitely burglar/ burgald/ burgeled. We are seeing the emergence of over stretching the point with some of the evaluation issues. Candidates are automatically criticising 'sample' for instance in victim surveys by being too small or ethnocentric or androcentric without really applying their points to the question or thinking about why these might be unavoidable problems in some circumstances. They are also saying things like it is unethical to ask victims of crime about their experiences because you might upset them again by reminding the victim about circumstances they would rather forget. This may well be true but a better evaluation would be that such interviews need to be sensitively conducted with an eye to ethical guidelines but in the end we do need this knowledge to advance methods of victim support and to catch criminals. Please remind students that evaluation can be positive as well as negative.

Question No 1

- a) A wide range of evidence was presented for this question and many candidates knew it well and were able to achieve the full 6 marks. Candidates who failed to achieve this were either vague or incorrect or sometimes missing the conclusion of the research. The weakest candidates presented Bandura and Samuel and Bryant or Loftus with no real attempt at answering the question.
- b) This question asked about the problems researchers face when using children as witnesses and many candidates were well prepared for it. Those who lost marks did so because they evaluated the witness research without addressing the injunction (problems). Many candidates could achieve 4/5 marks here by sensible suggestions which were rooted in psychological knowledge without being very elaborate.

Question No 2

- a) Once again candidates lost marks here by referring to prison and fines as treatment programs without expanding on any of the programs that actually do take place in some establishments. This happened on a previous paper where they were asked about prevention. There is much research on treatment programs and their effectiveness so it should not be a problem. Candidates were given credit where they did show some awareness of treatment as opposed to punishment. However there were some excellent answers here too.
- b) The effectiveness of treatments attracted more anecdotal answers than the problems of child witnesses in 1(b) but equally some very good and well prepared ones. Candidates did try to stay focussed on the injunction even when they had little to say. Most marks were lost when candidates reviewed the effectiveness of punishments or prison.

Question No 3

- a) Sheldon, Bowlby, Eysenck and Raine all found their way in here with little or no link to criminal thinking. There is plenty of good research to use here in the range of textbooks now available and candidates who knew it were able to marshal a really strong section which lead to some good evaluation in part (b) The best candidates began by outlining the three areas of the topic and then presenting a study or theory from each.
- b) If a good range of research had been chosen in part (a) there was plenty of material for evaluation by methodological or theoretical issues. Methods used to investigate criminal thinking offer opportunities to make points on sample, validity and reliability and also the chance to explore freewill vs. determinism, reductionism and nature /nurture. If the wrong material had been chosen in part (a) then a corresponding effect on the marks was seen here too as the evidence was not illustrating the issues correctly in answer to the question.
- c) Not many candidates gained full marks here. These parts of the questions still work to find the best candidates. Again, if good research had been selected earlier, the candidate stood a better chance of applying psychology to the scenario. Weakest responses were often highly unethical and we had references to capital punishment to 'give them something to think about' and lots of vague suggestions about increasing empathy for the victim. The best answers gave a detailed suggestion, made a link to psychological research and then considered how it might work.

Question 4

- a) Some very good material was presented here a lot of it from a recently published textbook. Candidates had learned the research off by heart and the evaluation too, so that in one centre it felt as though I was marking the author. Nevertheless, the research was detailed, relevant and the candidates were usually able to apply it to the question with some understanding and so did well. Weaker candidates resorted to offender profiling here with John Duffy's behaviour towards his victims. The British Crime Survey is still being used in its out of date form. This is actually a very impressive piece of research which addresses all the usual weaknesses of surveys and candidates should find the latest on-line version.
- b) Evaluation of the British Crime Survey in this section was usually incorrect because of the old version of the report that some candidates still use. With the up to date version they would know that the sample is very large with an ethnic minority booster added. It also accesses young people of 16 and is conducted on a laptop in total privacy. The researchers do not go to the post office for a list of names but they do have access to the small user post code directory which means that domestic addresses receiving minimal mail are included. This survey has responded to most criticisms in successive versions over the years and could now be considered fairly exemplary.
- c) Those candidates who had learnt about the work of Heath on media reports of crime were able to make a good suggestion here. There were also many good sensible suggestions to help the elderly neighbour. Most candidates referred to the fact that statistics showed that the elderly are less likely to be attacked and that was supported by the BCS. As usual the best answers gave a detailed suggestion which was linked to psychological evidence and then considered for its effectiveness.

**Advanced Subsidiary GCE Psychology 3876
January 2006 Assessment Session**

Unit Threshold Marks

Unit		Maximum Mark	a	b	c	d	e	u
2540	Raw	60	46	40	34	29	24	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2541	Raw	50	34	30	26	22	19	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2542	Raw	50	40	36	32	29	26	0
	UMS	100	80	60	60	50	40	0

Specification Aggregation Results

Overall threshold marks in UMS (i.e. after conversion of raw marks to uniform marks)

	Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
3876	300	240	210	180	150	120	0

The cumulative percentage of candidates awarded each grade was as follows:

	A	B	C	D	E	U	Total Number of Candidates
3876	7.8	30.1	58.8	78.6	96.5	100	559

For a description of how UMS marks are calculated see;
www.ocr.org.uk/OCR/WebSite/docroot/understand/ums.jsp

Statistics are correct at the time of publication

**Advanced GCE Psychology 7876
January 2006 Assessment Session**

Unit Threshold Marks

Unit		Maximum Mark	a	b	c	d	e	u
2544	Raw	50	37	32	28	24	20	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2545	Raw	50	38	33	29	25	21	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2546	Raw	50	38	33	28	24	20	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2547	Raw	50	39	35	31	27	23	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2548	Raw	50	40	35	30	25	21	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2549	Raw	50	39	34	29	24	20	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0

Specification Aggregation Results

Overall threshold marks in UMS (i.e. after conversion of raw marks to uniform marks)

	Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
7876	600	480	420	360	300	240	0

The cumulative percentage of candidates awarded each grade was as follows:

	A	B	C	D	E	U	Total Number of Candidates
7876	18.9	56.8	94.6	97.3	100.0	100.0	66

For a description of how UMS marks are calculated see;
www.ocr.org.uk/OCR/WebSite/docroot/understand/ums.jsp

Statistics are correct at the time of publication

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

OCR Information Bureau

(General Qualifications)

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: helpdesk@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

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

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



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

© OCR 2006